



---

# **GCE AS MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2022**

**AS  
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 2  
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF  
RELIGION  
B120U20-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

## **Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:**

### **Positive marking**

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- “Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.”
- “This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.”

### **Rules for Marking**

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.
2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.
3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

### **Banded mark schemes**

Banded mark schemes are divided so that each band has a relevant descriptor. The descriptor provides a description of the performance level for that band. Each band contains marks. Examiners should first read and annotate a candidate's answer to pick out the evidence that is being assessed in that question. Once the annotation is complete, the mark scheme can be applied. This is done as a two-stage process.

## **Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band**

When deciding on a band, the answer should be viewed holistically. Beginning at the lowest band, examiners should look at the candidate's answer and check whether it matches the descriptor for that band. Examiners should look at the descriptor for that band and see if it matches the qualities shown in the candidate's answer. If the descriptor at the lowest band is satisfied, examiners should move up to the next band and repeat this process for each band until the descriptor matches the answer.

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a 'best fit' approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content.

Examiners should not seek to mark candidates down as a result of small omissions in minor areas of an answer.

## **Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark**

Once the band has been decided, examiners can then assign a mark. During standardising (at the Examiners' marking conference), detailed advice from the Principal Examiner on the qualities of each mark band will be given. Examiners will then receive examples of answers in each mark band that have been awarded a mark by the Principal Examiner. Examiners should mark the examples and compare their marks with those of the Principal Examiner.

When marking, examiners can use these examples to decide whether a candidate's response is of a superior, inferior or comparable standard to the example. Examiners are reminded of the need to revisit the answer as they apply the mark scheme in order to confirm that the band and the mark allocated is appropriate to the response provided. Indicative content is also provided for banded mark schemes. Indicative content is not exhaustive, and any other valid points must be credited. In order to reach the highest bands of the mark scheme a learner need not cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content, but must meet the requirements of the highest mark band.

## **Awarding no marks to a response**

Where a response is not creditworthy, that is it contains nothing of any relevance to the question, or where no response has been provided, no marks should be awarded.

## AS Generic Band Descriptors

Band	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions [25 marks]</b></p> <p><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i></li> <li><i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i></li> <li><i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i></li> <li><i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i></li> </ul>
5	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-25 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set.</li> <li>The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
4	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>16-20 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set.</li> <li>The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
3	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-15 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set.</li> <li>The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
2	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-10 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance.</li> <li>A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set.</li> <li>The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
1	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1-5 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance.</li> <li>A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question.</li> <li>The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary.</li> </ul> <p><b>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</b></p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevant information.</li> </ul>

<b>Band</b>	<b>Assessment Objective A02- Part (b) questions [25 marks]</b> <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
<b>5</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-25 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>16-20 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed.</li> <li>• The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-15 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed.</li> <li>• Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-10 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed.</li> <li>• A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1-5 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence.</li> <li>• Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant analysis or evaluation.</li> </ul>

## EDUQAS GCE AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES

### COMPONENT 2: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

#### SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic level descriptors provided.

#### Section A

1. (a) Explain Descartes' and Malcolm's ontological arguments for the existence of God.

[AO1 25]

**Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.**

- Candidates may mention the concept of deductive proof which is *a priori*. This relies on the analysis of a definition or an idea in order to come to a logically necessary conclusion. It may be contrasted with the concept of inductive proof, which is *a posteriori*.
- Ontology is the study of being. So, the ontological argument analyses the being of God in order to conclude that God exists or to show how self-evident the existence of God is once we have accepted the definition.
- Candidates may simply refer to St Anselm, but credit should only be given to responses that highlight the nature of ontological arguments through doing this. Credit for the contribution of scholars should be limited to Descartes and Malcolm.
- Descartes saw the ontological argument as deductive and *a priori*, based on theoretical deduction rather than observation or experience. His definition of God was one of a 'supremely perfect being.' He saw existence as a quality that integrally belonged to God in the same way that three angles make a triangle or as a mountain entails a valley. For God, existence is a predicate, God's defining predicate. One cannot conceive of a supremely perfect being without existence.
- Descartes argued that, as he could conceive of his own existence, he could also conceive of the existence of the perfect being. Descartes offered his own form of the argument; God, a supremely perfect being, has all perfections. Existence is a perfection. Therefore God, a supremely being, exists.
- In 'Meditation 5', Descartes argued that there were some qualities that an object necessarily has to have or else it would not be that object. Therefore, existence cannot be separated from the concept of God.
- Norman Malcolm developed the ontological argument. He noted that in Proslogion 2 Anselm uses existence as a predicate. This is not the area that Malcolm focuses on.
- Malcolm states that this is not the case in Proslogion 3 and thus develops Anselm's second form. God's existence is either impossible or necessary. It cannot be impossible since the concept is not self-contradictory. His development thus includes the ideas that God's existence is necessary. If God did not exist then God could not come into existence or he would not be God. God is an unlimited being.

**This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.**

**(b) 'Ontological arguments are more persuasive than cosmological arguments for God's existence.'**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 25]**

**Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.**

- Ontological arguments are regarded as persuasive because they are *a priori* arguments and a deductive proof with a logically inescapable conclusion. They present a logically necessary conclusion once the premises are shown to follow on successively in a coherent fashion. This is attractive to believers of theistic religions, because for them the existence of God is self-evident. This is a better line of argument than the inductive *a posteriori* proofs which only lead to a possible conclusion.
- However, supporters of cosmological arguments may argue otherwise. It can be said that inductive arguments, although they do not offer definitive 'proof', are far more reliable than deductive arguments. Cosmological arguments in this way are more persuasive.
- Cosmological arguments rest on sound assumptions including the idea that all things need a cause and that there is a link between cause and effect. The rejection of infinity is also a persuasive aspect of the cosmological argument.
- However, there are unpersuasive aspects to the cosmological argument. The argument rests on the need to find a cause to the universe. If there is no such need and an acceptance that the world 'just is' then the argument fails. Similarly, even if a cause of the universe is accepted, this does not mean that the cause can be established as being the God of Classical Theism.
- A further objection to the persuasiveness of cosmological arguments may be that one cannot move from part to whole. That is, just because things in the universe need to have a cause, this does not mean that the Universe as a whole needs a cause (the fallacy of composition.)
- Regarding ontological arguments, they do seem to be logical in its assertion that we cannot explain the concept of God properly without coming to the conclusion that he exists. That is, if one understands the definition of God then it will be an obvious deduction that God does indeed possess the property of existence. To deny this would be tantamount to being a fool.
- However, there is a powerful and obvious conclusion that you cannot define something into existence. Those who disregard it cite the effectiveness of counter claims e.g. Gaunilo's 'greatest island' or Kant's use of examples such as thalers, mountain and valley and a triangle.
- For the higher Bands, expect candidates to perform a comparative evaluation of ontological and cosmological arguments, rather than stand-alone evaluations of the two.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.**



2. (a) Explain challenges to ontological arguments with reference to Kant and Gaunilo.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Ontological arguments are *a priori* arguments and attempts to prove God's existence by using the meaning of the word 'God'. It is deductive and analytic because the truth or falsity of the argument is determined by the meaning of the words used. One reason for the challenges to the arguments is that the nature of such arguments is that they fail. The argument has been accused of using circular logic. One may well accept the premises but then the conclusion may not necessarily follow.
- This is coupled by the fact that the argument's success relies on the acceptance of the definition of the word 'God'. Critics argue that there is no clear agreement on what the word 'God' means or the definition, as given by various proponents of the ontological argument, could simply be wrong.
- A further challenge concerns the idea of the 'greatest or most perfect being.' Are such terms meaningful and does 'most loving' have a maximum? This aspect of the ontological argument has been severely challenged by numerous scholars.
- Gaunilo's challenges centre on the view that replacing the word 'God' with 'greatest island' produces true premises, but a false conclusion. The greatest island must possess all perfections, including existence according to St. Anselm's logic. However, as Gaunilo pointed out this certainly does not mean that such an island exists in reality. We can always think of a bigger or better island, but such an island cannot have an 'intrinsic maximum.'
- As some have also pointed out, against St. Anselm, there are some things that are actually greater in the mind than in reality. Our minds can conjure up fantastic ideas which, if they materialise, may not be anywhere near as great as they were when conceived in the mind.
- Kant argues that existence is not a real predicate because it does not tell us what an object is like. The rejection of 'existence' as a predicate is a very popular challenge to the ontological argument.
- Moreover, the word 'exist' merely states that a concept has an actuality. It does not actually add anything to the concept. The real contains no more than the merely possible. Kant used the example of 100 really thalers/100 real thalers existing. They contain no more thalers than the merely possible.
- He challenges the view that God is a necessary or 'first order' predicate as it only uses concepts and not realities. He claimed that God cannot be argued into existence and therefore, existence cannot be a predicate. Thus, if you have a triangle, then you must have three angles, but if you do not have a triangle, then you do not have three angles. One can reject the triangle along with its properties. So too one can reject God along with God's properties.

**This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.**

**(b) 'A *a priori* arguments for God's existence are not persuasive.'**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 25]**

**Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.**

- Ontological arguments are *a priori* arguments and may appear to be persuasive as a 'proof.' This is because the argument is presented in a logical, sequenced fashion with premises that lead us to an inescapable conclusion. Many would accept premises such as the definition of God given by Anselm. If the premises are correct, then it is possible that the conclusion is also correct.
- However, *a priori* arguments do rely on the premises being correct in order that a correct conclusion may follow. Also, even if the premises of an argument are correct then the conclusion may still be incorrect thus making *a priori* arguments unpersuasive in proving God's existence.
- It could be argued though that *a priori* arguments are 'pure' arguments in the sense that they do not rely on (subjective) evidence unlike *a posteriori* arguments. Supposed evidence can be wrong due to misinterpretation. The persuasiveness of an *a priori* argument rests on the notion that they can be deemed to be universally valid. Once a definition is established in an *a priori* fashion then it cannot be rejected. For example, a bachelor is always an unmarried man.
- Contrary to this though, it could be argued that *a priori* arguments are not persuasive due to the very fact that they are not based on evidence and experience. This would lead us to contend that *a posteriori* arguments are far more persuasive. Today's world asks for empirical proof before accepting something as valid. *A priori* arguments cannot give us this 'scientific' proof and they are therefore unreliable.
- Classical arguments for God's existence such as the cosmological and teleological arguments are both examples of *a posteriori* arguments. They provide us with far more reliable grounds for proving God's existence than *a priori* proofs do. They have stood the test of time and their inductive nature is persuasive.
- Some indeed say that *a priori* proofs are nothing more than circular arguments which really present us with no new information and do not actually 'prove' anything.
- *A priori* arguments rely on the understanding of the use of language such as definitions of words. This can be viewed in two ways. First, they can be deemed to be unpersuasive as they are merely a play on words, pure semantics. However, on the other hand it could be argued that they are untainted by changing times and are therefore persuasive.
- Specific reference may be made to the persuasiveness or not of ontological arguments, but the question is wider than that alone.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.**

## Section B

3. (a) Explain the problem of evil with reference to William Rowe and Gregory S. Paul.

[AO1 25]

**Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.**

- Evidential arguments from evil seek to show that the presence of suffering in the world supports or makes likely the claim that the God of Classical Theism does not exist.
- Rowe focuses on a particular kind of evil that is found in our world in abundance: pointless or unnecessary suffering. He selects intense human and animal suffering as this occurs on a daily basis, there is a lot of it, and it is a clear case of evil. More precisely, it is a case of *intrinsic* evil: it is bad in and of itself, even though it sometimes is part of, or leads to, some good state of affairs.
- It may be accepted that some amount of suffering may have some purpose, but there exist instances of intense suffering which an omnipotent, omniscient being could have prevented without thereby losing some greater good or permitting some evil equally bad or worse. An omniscient, wholly good being would prevent the occurrence of any intense suffering it could, unless it could not do so without thereby losing some greater good or permitting some evil equally bad or worse. So, there does not exist an omnipotent, omniscient, wholly good being.
- Consider the lingering death of a fawn. Such suffering seems preventable and pointless. With respect to the fawn's suffering, Rowe asks: is it reasonable to believe that there is some greater good so intimately connected to that suffering that even an omnipotent, omniscient being could not have obtained that good without permitting that suffering or some evil at least as bad? Rowe claims that it is not reasonable to believe this.
- Paul stated that the large-scale deaths of children is evidence against the existence of a good God. He concludes that the widely held free will and best of all possible worlds hypotheses are not correct.
- Some say that God doesn't prevent bad things from happening because that would interfere with free will. They claim we are free to choose our path and to make choices that affect our lives here on earth and decide where we will spend eternity. This is one of the most common arguments in defence of God allowing evil to exist. Paul's study considers the fact that there have been multitudes that have never had the choice to live the way God commands.
- There have been hundreds of billions of conceptions and at least fifty billion children that have died before reaching the age of mature consent. The great majority of these died from non-human causes, such as malaria as well as from war and conception that did not result in childbirth. There was no opportunity for exercising free will.
- Therefore, what Paul calls 'the Holocaust of the Children', stops an enormous portion of humans from making a decision about their eternal fate while maximising their suffering. He states that this means that the classic Christian 'free will' and 'best of all possible worlds' hypotheses are therefore wrong. If a creator exists, then it has chosen to fashion a habitat that has maximized the level of suffering and death among young humans that are due to factors beyond the control of humans over most of their history.

**This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.**

**(b) 'Irenaean type theodicies solve the problem of evil.'**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 25]**

**Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.**

- It could be said that this type of theodicy reflects our understanding of evolution and therefore solves the problem of evil for that reason. The theodicy stands up to modern scientific findings and also shows that the reason for the existence of evil and suffering is due to free will. In addition, suffering is of benefit to humans as it enables humans to spiritually develop. The idea of growth as a result of hardship could be consolidated by examples throughout history.
- Candidates may refer back to Rowe and Paul to question the idea the suffering has meaning.
- Candidates may focus on the strengths and weaknesses of Irenaeus or Rowe and Paul or even use as an alternative line of reasoning the ideas of Augustine.
- However, the authenticity of his Biblical references may be called into question and may therefore suggest that his theodicy is unsuccessful in solving the problem of evil. If humans were not made in the image of God, then the development to likeness suggested is also called into question. It could also be suggested that often suffering is not soul-making but is rather, soul-breaking.
- It may well be true that some suffering does allow humans to develop morally; it does generate characteristics of fortitude and courage. However, suffering can also lead to more suffering and no benefit to human characteristics is gained. For some, inflicting pain and suffering on others is something they may thrive upon.
- For some, God's omnibenevolence squares with the idea of universal salvation whereby all will be able to attain perfection in heaven. However, for others this is the weakness of the theodicy. It is an unjust concept and does not square with a fair God. There would be no need to live a morally good life if everyone is going to heaven.
- The suggestion that the theodicy relies on there being an after-life can be used both as a success and as a weakness, hence affecting whether it solves the problem of evil. If there is an after-life, it may succeed, but if there isn't one then it seems that the theodicy may fail to solve the problem of evil. Irenaean type theodicies rely on the development process continuing in the afterlife, where God's plan will be understood, and suffering will be justified. What if there is an after-life and it is exactly the same as this life, where evil and suffering still abound? This could show that this type of theodicy fails to solve the problem of evil as evil persists in heaven.
- Many will argue that God creating the world deliberately imperfectly is morally dubious to say the least. If God is omnipotent surely God could make the world perfectly where humans still have free-will?
- Others would argue that this is logically contradictory. One cannot be both free yet also under God's constant surveillance. Indeed, with God overwhelming human existence, no action at all would be free anyway.
- Ultimately, candidates could grapple with the characteristics of the God of Classical Theism and evaluate whether Irenaean type theodicies retain these characteristics. If they do, then that is on the way to solving the problem of evil. If these characteristics are lost, then it may appear that the problem of evil remains.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.**

4. (a) **Explain Caroline Franks Davis' challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience.**

[AO1 25]

**Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.**

- Candidates may examine the concepts of objectivity and authenticity and explain in general terms why these may be questioned with regard to religious experience. They may also comment on why it is important to some to be able to establish authenticity and/or objectivity in other spheres of life. This is because the concept of truth and the lack of subjective bias are important factors in any claim.
- Caroline Franks Davis summarised three challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience which candidates can explore with appropriate exemplification.
- Description-related. There is no evidence or proof to support the claim that 'God' or 'the Divine' has been experienced. The description is therefore to be refuted. Authenticity and objectivity should be granted to that which conforms to everyday experience. Religious experiences do not conform to everyday experiences. It is not the norm for humans to experience that which would be described as God. Our everyday experiences allow us to describe an apple or a car, but not the Divine.
- Subject-related. The subject is the person who receives the claimed experience. S/he is always considered unreliable. They may suffer from episodes of hallucinations or from mental illness (described further under 'naturalistic explanations', they may be in a fragile mental state, they have been mistaken and misguided. Examples may be cited regarding mystics whose experience is akin to the experience of a person who has taken a particular drug. Hence, those who say that they have had a religious experience are not making a truth claim, but rather making a subjective comment about something which has been induced by drugs or their mind.
- Object-related. This relates to the object that the person claims to have experienced. The likelihood that the object described has indeed been experienced, is as unlikely as the most unlikely object we can imagine has been experienced. If someone claimed to have experienced something preposterous, we would be unlikely to believe her or him. This reaction would conform to that which we would expect in our everyday experience if we are told that someone has an experience of an object that we believe to be highly unlikely. This should also be the case with a religious experience.

**This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.**

**(b) 'Religious experience has no impact on religious belief and practice.'**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 25]**

**Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.**

- Many religious believers have never had a religious experience. Their beliefs are due to other reasons such as upbringing. This means that religious belief and practice for many believers is not in any way connected to a religious experience and their beliefs are strong without one. The practices that follow those beliefs are as a result of the beliefs rather than as a result of a religious experience.
- William James as a pragmatist would look to the 'fruits' of the religious experience. His view is that such experiences do positively impact upon a person's life and the effects can be seen in a change in their behaviour. However, it could be suggested that a change in a person's beliefs and practices cannot be proved as a direct result of their religious experience, but could be explained on psychological grounds.
- It could be argued that religious experiences clearly change the beliefs and practices of the person who has the experience. There are many examples of individuals whose experience has really changed their life. This can be seen in a variety of types of religious experience. Candidates may refer to specific examples such as the Buddha's Awakening, the Prophet Muhammad's encounter where he received the words of the Quran, Wesley, C.S. Lewis to name but a few.
- Others may contend that the relationship is the other way around. That is, that it is a person's beliefs and practices that induces a religious experience. Indeed, how do we define a 'religious experience'?
- Many religious experiences lead to a complete transformation in the person's life and compel that person to action. Saul's conversion experience for example covers both of these aspects and it is undoubtedly the case that it was the experience that prompted this.
- However, others may argue that it was not the experience that led to Paul's change of heart. Rather, it was an inner battle that he had been fighting for some time and the change would have occurred anyway. In this sense, the experience did not play a major role in the change of belief and practice.
- It is also a question as to whether a religious experience has an impact on the beliefs and practices of anyone other than the person having the experience. This can be answered in both the negative and the affirmative. For some, the experience is entirely personal and is not extended at all to the beliefs and practices of another. However, others will argue that when people have believed the experience of another to be valid, that experience has altered the lives of other people too. Indeed, there are examples of communal religious experiences which have a major impact on the beliefs and practices of many people.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.**

5. (a) Outline David Hume's challenges to cosmological and teleological arguments.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

**Cosmological**

- Expect reference to Hume's empirical objections such as his critique that it is illogical to seek a first cause since the notions of eternity and infinity renders the quest irrelevant.
- Hume was also critical of the very vague notion of arbitrarily linking cause and effect. We may do this because of habit or laziness; we see an effect and infer a cause. Similarly, like causes do not mean like effects, nor do like effects mean similar causes.
- We cannot go from part to whole. It is an inductive leap to say that things in the universe have a designer to concluding that the universe has a designer. He rejected the notion that a principle that was relevant to the 'part' (i.e. a cause) could be applied to the 'whole' (i.e. universe); Hume argued that this was 'an arbitrary act of the mind'. Russell later developed this, referring to it as the 'fallacy of composition'.

**Teleological**

- Hume's objections to the teleological argument were mainly based around the watchmaker analogy. He argued that the analogy between the universe and the watch is weak, thus challenging the entire argument. He comments that the universe is really nothing like a mechanical object. Also, there are better analogies – the universe has greater similarity to a vegetable than to a mechanical object, something that grows of its own accord, not needing a designer.
- He commented, in his Epicurean hypothesis that the universe was bound to have an appearance of design, even though it 'just is.' This is because the universe over time produced itself to be as it is out of the 'spring of order.' He distinguished between deliberate and authentic design.
- Even if we did accept that analogy then that would lead to some rather unsavoury conclusions particularly with reference to the nature of God. He accepted that we may end up with a designer, but this designer is certainly not necessarily the God of Classical Theism. It is more likely that there may have been a team of gods, just as many contribute to the design of a watch. For Hume, this would suggest that polytheism is more reasonable than monotheism. Alternatively, we may end up with an old God or an absent God, who has left its design or considering the disorder in the world, a young apprentice God who produced 'the first rude essay of an infant deity.'
- Also, we infer that a house or a ship has builders as we can infer this from past experience. However, we have no experience of universes being made so we cannot comment on the design of this one.

**This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.**

- (b) **‘Teleological arguments for God’s existence are persuasive in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.’**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 25]**

**Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.**

- It may be argued that teleological arguments for God’s existence are persuasive in the 21<sup>st</sup> century as arguments from design are still popular today. There are many scholars and philosophical movements advocating design.
- Anthropic arguments show that teleological arguments complement evolution and indeed suggest that evolution can only occur with the aid of some teleological purpose. God’s design allows for the conditions necessary for evolution. Candidates may give examples from the work of F.R. Tennant in order to illustrate that the universe is specifically designed for intelligent human life.
- However, it could also be argued that teleological arguments are unpersuasive in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There is no need to refer to God’s design as evolution can explain everything about life, without reference to God whatsoever. Candidates may use Darwin’s theory of evolution by natural selection as an evaluative tool in order to denounce the persuasiveness of teleological arguments in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
- It is clear though that the Universe does show some evidence of design. This design can be ascribed to God, but even if not, then this can still show that teleological arguments are still useful and persuasive today. Examples may be given from scholars such as Aquinas and Paley in order to consolidate the suggestion that the world is designed.
- It may be pointed out that it is true that both animate and inanimate objects do seem to have a purpose which cannot be achieved unless directed. This is a persuasive argument as it can be observed. An acorn will always become an oak tree. A watch can only function if it has been designed.
- However, if teleological arguments need to prove God’s existence in order to be persuasive, then this may be a tenuous argument. This is because teleological arguments may point to a designer of some kind, but this designer may well not be the God of Classical Theism.
- Tennant’s aesthetic argument may show that teleological arguments for God’s existence are persuasive. This is because it is a clear and persuasive point that humans do enjoy things that are not needed for survival. This could show that a purely evolutionary stance is unpersuasive. God designed humans specifically in order that they may enjoy the world.
- On the other hand, it can be argued that humans have simply developed the need for ‘higher pleasures’ which are integral to their life and indeed possibly to their survival. This has nothing to do with a telos or purpose being instilled by a divine designer.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.**