



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

**A LEVEL
RELIGIOUS STUDIES – COMPONENT 2
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
A120U20-1**

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 or all 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.

A Level Generic Band Descriptors

Band	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 20 marks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> - <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> - <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> - <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">17-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied. • An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">13-16 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied. • A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">9-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied. • A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">5-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied. • A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Some accurate use of some specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought. • Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. <p>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant information.

Band	Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5	25-30 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context. • Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	19-24 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context. • Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	13-18 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context. • Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	7-12 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Basic use of the views of scholars/schools of thought appropriately and in context. • Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	1-6 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought. • Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES – COMPONENT 2

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

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

Section A

1. (a) **Explain the views of John Randall and Paul Tillich on religious language as symbolic.**

[AO1 20]

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

- Randall's background – holding a coherence theory of truth and as accepting anti-realism may be noted along with reference to his conception of religion as being a body of symbols and myths.
- It may be explained that Randall links religious symbols with social and artistic symbols as being non-representative and non-cognitive.
- Randall understands symbols as having a fourfold function:
 - i. Arousing emotion/stirring people to action/strengthening people's commitment to what they believe to be right.
 - ii. Stimulating cooperative action/binding a community together through a common response to its symbols.
 - iii. Communicating qualities of experience that cannot be expressed by the literal use of language.
 - iv. Evoking/fostering/clarifying human experience of an aspect of the world that can be called "order of splendour" or the Divine.
- Randall's view may be given: God or the Divine does not exist as a reality independently of the human mind, but is an intellectual symbol for the religious dimension.
- Tillich's approach is that religious faith – being ultimately concerned about the ultimate – can only be expressed in symbolic language.
- Tillich rejects the use of all other forms of human language – based on finite human experience – as it cannot be adequate to apply to God and can lead to anthropomorphism.
- For Tillich, all religious language – with one exception that God is Being itself – is symbolic and cannot be absolutised as this would lead to idolatry.
- Tillich's distinction between sign and symbol may be highlighted along with the link he makes between religious symbols and the arts in that they open up new levels of sensitivities and powers of appreciation.
- Tillich's six characteristics of symbols may be described:
 - I. Symbols point beyond themselves to something else.
 - II. Symbols participate in that to which they point.
 - III. Symbols open up otherwise closed levels of reality.
 - IV. Symbols unlock otherwise closed dimensions and elements of the soul.
 - V. Symbols are not arbitrary but grow out of the individual/collective unconscious.
 - VI. Symbols have their own span of life and may have their decay and death.

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

(b) 'Symbolic language fails to give religious language meaning.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates can be credited for approaching the question via: a critique of the positions held by Randall and/or Tillich, the use of specific symbolic religious language, and different forms of exemplification.
- In disagreement with the statement, it might be argued that symbolic language has just as much meaning for religious believers as scientific language which is based on empirical knowledge and logic.
- Symbolic language could be seen as allowing for imagination and creativity in its links with the world of art, literature and poetry and is thus more than adequate through being evocative.
- That it has meaning can be seen in the way in which it successfully attempts to link the finite human mind with metaphysical/religious/spiritual truths.
- As a form of language, symbolic language has been used by peoples of all ages and cultures as it has a natural shared quality which can open higher levels of reality.
- It could be argued that symbolic language has meaning because as Jung suggests symbols themselves express collective unconscious individuation and have always been an innate part of human language.
- Given that symbolic language does not claim to be cognitive but rather is based on feelings, emotions and beliefs, it has a greater degree of flexibility than other forms of language thus providing it with meaning.
- In agreement with the statement, it might be argued that symbolic language fails to give meaning because it is not subject to verification or falsification and must therefore be meaningless/nonsense.
- Symbolic language might be viewed as belonging to a wholly different and dated worldview the concepts of which are no longer suited to our modern rational culture rooted as it is in empiricism and a scientific worldview.
- That symbolic language fails to give meaning is evident from the fact that whilst it tries to point to 'something' beyond itself and aims to participate in that 'something' there is no evidence at all that it gives any insight or accurate representation of that 'something'.
- It could be argued that symbolic language fails to give meaning because symbols have their own span of life/decay/death which shows that such language cannot be consistent, constant and coherent at all times and in all places.
- The lack of meaning in symbolic language is clear from the fact that it only succeeds in half-revealing and half-concealing concepts and therefore clouds understanding and does not provide clarity.
- From another perspective the question might be questioned in that the whole point of symbolic language is that it does not aim to provide meaning in the first place, but is instead entirely non-representative and non-cognitive.

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

2. (a) Explain the verification principle within Logical Positivism and criticisms of the verification principle.

[AO1 20]

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

- Logical Positivism may be identified as the group of academics meeting in the 1920s and 1930s associated with the Vienna Circle and including the thought of early Wittgenstein and of Ayer.
- It may be explained as being “positivism” because it recognised only the positive sciences – and not metaphysical speculation – as providing valid sources of human knowledge; it also focussed on the logical structure of scientific statements.
- The roots of Logical Positivism in Hume and empiricism may be noted: all our ideas are based on sensations/experiences and such knowledge is therefore “matter of fact”.
- The view of Logical Positivism may be examined – that whether or not religious ethical statements were true or false was not an issue because such statements were without meaning.
- The meaningfulness of knowledge gained by the senses through empirical evidence leading to synthetic statements was upheld by the principle of verification as found within Logical Positivism.
- In addition, the meaningfulness of knowledge gained by logical reasoning leading to analytic statements could be upheld as in mathematical equations ($1 + 1 = 2$), and tautologies (“a triangle is three sided”).
- The verification principle can therefore be explained as the theory that sentences are only meaningful if they can be verified by the senses/empirical data: since all statements of ethics, religion and aesthetics cannot be verified they are meaningless.
- One criticism of the verification principle is that the principle as expressed is in itself not subject to verification since it is neither logically obvious nor is it supported by empirical evidence.
- Another criticism is that the verification principle had to be modified by incorporating the form of weak verification which would allow for the verification ‘in principle’ of historical events.
- Universal scientific and inductive statements can only be subject to weak verification ‘in principle’ since - using Ayer’s example - ‘all human beings are mortal’ could only be verified by the death of all human beings.
- Similarly, in terms of universal scientific statements, Popper’s approach argues that these are not verifiable but only falsifiable as the laws of science refer to an unlimited number of instances.
- Through his concept of eschatological verification in the Parable of the Celestial City, John Hick argued against Ayer that even if we cannot verify the existence of God in this life, that does not make religious language meaningless because experiences of God post-mortem would verify the truth of the existence of God.

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

- (b) 'Logical Positivism successfully demonstrates that religious language is meaningless.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- In agreement with the statement, it could be argued that Logical Positivism successfully proves that religious language – such as “God exists” - is meaningless through its application of the empirical/scientific method.
- That it is successful can be seen in the fact that propositions in religious language are not the same as propositions conveyed in other language – “it is raining” is meaningful as it can be verified whereas “God exists” is meaningless because it cannot be verified.
- Its success can be seen in that it is clear that propositions such as “it is raining” are synthetic and *a posteriori* based on empirically proved evidence whereas this can never be said of propositions in religious language.
- Analytic propositions - such as those found in mathematics and in tautologies - which are self-explanatory and true by definition are meaningful *a priori* in a way which Logical Positivism successfully proves cannot be the case with religious language.
- The success of Logical Positivism can be found in the way in which today a modern secular and scientific mindset is able to adopt its approach in treating all religious language with suspicion as being meaningless.
- Attempts to challenge Logical Positivism and its proof that religious language is meaningless – such as Hick’s eschatological verification and the falsification principle presented by Hare, Mitchell and Swinburne - have failed showing the success of Logical Positivism.
- Disagreeing with the statement, it may be argued that Logical Positivism has been unsuccessful because Ayer himself concluded that whilst the spirit of the verification principle worked it could not be defined clearly enough.
- That Logical Positivism has been unsuccessful is clear in the fact that the verification principle cannot itself be verified – no sense experience can count in its favour thus the theory itself is not verifiable. Accepting the theory would mean accepting that the proposition expressing the theory is meaningless.
- Its lack of success can be found in the argument that with regard to meaningful language, the “clearing house” is too small (Tillich); aesthetic, ethical, religious, fictional, poetic, imaginative language have all taught humanity in the past and continue to shape everyone’s worldview in a meaningful way.
- That Logical Positivism has been unsuccessful is apparent from the way in which the introduction of weak verification and verification in principle have made it possible to argue that nearly everything can be verified even, according to Hick, God’s existence through eschatological verification.

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

Section B

3. (a) Explain developments of the ontological argument, with reference to Descartes and Malcolm.

[AO1 20]

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

- The ontological argument is deductive and is based on the prior thought of Anselm's 'Prosologion' and God as the greatest possible being – **That Than Which Nothing Greater Can Be Conceived** – and God as having necessary existence.
- In the 17th century Descartes develops the ontological argument in the 'Meditations' to support his argument that the existence of God is a guarantor for the certainty that the external world exists.
- Descartes develops the approach taken by Anselm by beginning with God described in positive terms as "a supremely perfect being, having all perfections".
- The perfections ascribed to God by classical theism include God as being omnipotent, omniscient and omnibenevolent. Descartes develops this by adding existence as a perfection.
- Existence cannot be separated from the essence of God – God as a supremely perfect being exists.
- In his development of the ontological argument, Descartes uses the analogy of the triangle: its three angles must be equal to two right angles. That is its essence. By analogy, God's existence is a necessary part of what any definition of God can be.
- He also uses the analogy of mountains and valleys: in the same way that is impossible to conceive of a mountain which has no valley – since where there is one the other has always to be – it is impossible to think of God (a supremely perfect being) as being devoid of necessary existence which is a perfection.
- In the 20th century Malcom presented a development of the ontological argument in 'Philosophical Review' with the focus on God as unlimited being and God's existence as necessary rather than just possible.
- Malcolm develops the ontological argument by supporting Kant's rejection of the argument in 'Prosologion' 2 but accepting that in 'Prosologion' 3.
- "Existence is not a perfection but the logical impossibility of non-existence is a perfection."
- "If God is conceived to be an absolutely unlimited being, God must be conceived to be unlimited in regard to his existence as well as his operation."
- "Necessary existence is a property of God in the same sense that necessary omnipotence and necessary omniscience are His properties."
- God's existence is either impossible or necessary – it can only be impossible if TTTWNGCBC is self-contradictory or absurd. Given that it is neither of these, it follows that God necessarily exists.

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

(b) 'Ontological arguments for God's existence are very effective.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Ontological arguments for God's existence could be seen as very effective because they proceed from the idea of God i.e. *a priori* and not *a posteriori*.
- They are very effective because they have all the strengths of a deductive argument using logical premises and reason leading to an inescapable conclusion.
- The fact that an ontological argument depends on a deductive argument means that it provides the same starting point for everyone regardless of religious belief which makes it very effective.
- The ability of an ontological argument to be re-shaped and re-formulated over the centuries in response to criticism indicates that it is very effective i.e. Anselm, Gaunilo, Descartes, Kant and Malcolm.
- That an ontological argument is very effective can be shown by the way in which it complements inductive arguments for God's existence such as the cosmological and teleological arguments.
- The foundations for an ontological argument are straightforward (such as Anselm's concept of greatness, Descartes' concept of perfection and Malcolm's concept of necessary existence) which make it very effective.
- On the contrary, ontological arguments could be seen as ineffective because they depend on whether the logical premises are accepted e.g. do we know what 'God' means, do we have a concept of 'greatest' or 'perfect' being, is it the case that something existing in the mind and in reality is greater than that which exists only in the mind?
- The ineffective nature of an ontological argument can be seen in that those who have formulated and reformulated it (Anselm, Descartes and Malcolm) are religious believers which means that it has a religious foundation.
- That an ontological argument is ineffective is evident from the way in which it tries to make a proof through logical tricks – is it possible to move from a concept of God to the reality of God; showing that the existence of God is possible is not the same thing as showing that the existence of God is actual.
- Its ineffective nature is apparent in the way that "existence" is used: as Kant argues, existence is not a real predicate – it does not tell us what an object is like; in addition, we do not make a concept greater by adding reality – "existence" adds nothing to the concept of God.
- Gaunilo pointed out the ineffective nature of an ontological argument through his 'Lost Island' analogy – because the concept can be formed in the mind does not mean that it exists in reality – we cannot mentally define something into existence.
- Whatever the strengths of ontological arguments, they have become increasingly ineffective in the light of the discoveries of modern science regarding cosmology where the starting point is observation and experience of the universe.

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

4. (a) Examine Jung's explanation of how religious belief is necessary for personal growth.

[AO1 20]

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

- Jung's explanation of how religious belief is necessary for personal growth may focus on how it helps human beings discover both what they are and what they are capable of becoming. This may be examined using the following points:
- Jung's division of the mind into three parts: the ego/unconscious, the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious may be noted.
- His development of Freud in agreeing that the personal unconscious consists of lost/repressed memories, but below that there is the collective unconscious.
- Jung's division of the mind into three parts: the ego/unconscious, the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious may be examined with the focus on the collective unconscious.
- The collective unconsciousness may be explained as the underlying layer of pre-existent forms that is shared by the whole of humanity and consists of primordial images/ideas which derive from our ancestral past.
- Archetypes are the specific reaction patterns that the collective unconscious communicates to us: religious stories, symbolism and ritual are all ways to identify the archetypes. Archetype figures often occur but the four actual archetypes (patterns of behaviour) are:
 - i. the persona
 - ii. the shadow
 - iii. the anima/animus
 - iv. the self.
- Individuation is achieving the self and takes place after we are able to integrate those attributes of our true self which we have repressed to conform to the archetype. The symbols of the archetypes help us to achieve individuation: these symbols are the images, dogmas and rites that form religious tradition.
- God within is the result of individuation – the images associated with the self-archetype that aims for wholeness, completeness or perfection share a common ground with those images generated by the God archetype and religion.
- The ritual aspect of a mandala in religion as a means to ultimate integration of the Self with the divine: the mandala represents this absorption.
- Jung's view was that religion is a positive factor of psychological value which provides a source of comfort and promotes positive personal and social mindsets – all of which arise from religious belief and all of which lead to personal growth.

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

(b) 'Jung was much more positive than Freud about the idea of God.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- In agreement with the statement, it could be argued that whereas Freud sees religion as a neurosis – a harmful mental illness – Jung regards it as a positive force in individuation through finding the God within.
- Whilst Freud regarded religion as being an illusion which in some patients might cause suffering and pain, Jung regarded it as an essential human activity which would help people achieve healing and wholeness and move on from depression and neurosis.
- Jung's view of God is that he is a positive reality from the deepest part of the human collective unconscious whereas for Freud God is the construct of an individual mind with each of God's attributes being the answer to wish-fulfilment.
- Whilst Freud regarded the rituals of religion as being a way of avoiding reality, Jung saw religious symbols and experiences as a way to gain knowledge of realities imaging the deeper self and a means to achieving individuation.
- Jung's view of God is that belief in God helps to achieve integration within an individual and ultimately within society, whereas Freud views such belief as making people infantile with God as a father who will do things for them.
- Disagreeing with the statement, neither Jung nor Freud viewed God in the positive way of traditional religious believers in terms of, for example, a loving relationship between the individual and God.
- Jung was not entirely positive because, like Freud, he noted that neurosis, depression and anxiety were all wrapped up in unresolved issues regarding the concept of God.
- That Jung was not entirely positive about the idea of God is clear from the way in which he agreed with Freud about religion having a complex mythological background which meant that it was not real but imaginary.
- Jung might not be seen as entirely positive about God because, whilst not explicitly an atheist as was Freud, it is difficult to be clear as to whether Jung actually believed in God rather than just in the idea of there being a God.
- From another perspective, neither Jung nor Freud were entirely positive about God because what they taught challenged traditional religious beliefs – particularly the Abrahamic religions – with Jung focussing in large part on Buddhism which is atheistic.
- Arguably, Freud was positive about the idea of God in the sense that some of his views seem to fit in religious beliefs such as the struggle in the human person following the Fall between the Id (representing desire and sin) and the ego (representing the true self) with the superego (representing the conscience) acting as umpire.

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

5. (a) **Examine David Hume's scepticism of miracles.**

[AO1 20]

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

- Reference may be made to chapter ten of Hume's 'Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding'.
- Hume's scepticism is based on the principle of induction – judgments based on many instances.
- General point regarding Hume's empiricism – the belief that all knowledge is based on sense experience with evidence that can be judged, assessed and evaluated.
- Hume's definition of a miracle may be noted: "a transgression of a law of nature by a particular volition of the Deity or by some interposition of some invisible agent".
- Reference may be made to Hume's scepticism based on it being highly irrational to believe the highly improbable (miracles), as this is to believe against the weight of the evidence (highly probable laws of nature).
- Reference could also be made to the "wise man proportioning his belief to the evidence" which should be founded on "an infallible experience".
- Past constant experience leads to assurance and "full proof of future existence of that event"; past variable experience leads to increasing "doubtful expectation of any event".
- Regarding miracles, "no testimony sufficient" unless "its falsehood would be more miraculous" than the miracle itself.
- Argues that there "there never was a miraculous event established" on full evidence.
- Problem of lack of sufficient people of "unquestioned good sense" etc. to provide testimony.
- Problem of human interest in "surprise and wonder" of miracles leading to belief in them.
- Problem of the "supernatural and miraculous" observed chiefly among "ignorant and barbarous nations".
- Problem of every type of religion having its own miracle which supports its claim leading to "the credit of all miracles" being cancelled out.

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

(b) 'Swinburne's defence of miracles in response to Hume is not valid.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Swinburne's defence of miracles could be seen as lacking validity because of Swinburne's *a priori* belief in God which means that he has a position of belief to defend.
- It could be seen as lacking validity because Swinburne's "non repeatable counter instances" which he labels miracles could in principle be adequately explained by science, which is similar to Hume's laws of nature.
- That idea that Swinburne's defence of miracles is lacking validity could be seen in that he is only arguing that "there could be strong historical evidence for the occurrence of miracles" rather than that such evidence exists and can be accepted.
- Swinburne's defence of miracles could be seen as lacking validity because in the last analysis he holds that empirical data from the senses can be relied upon whereas the senses deceive us constantly.
- It could be seen as lacking validity because Swinburne's reliance on multiple similar testimonies does not make allowance for the extent to which this can be flawed through irrational reasons of witnesses, deceit or a desire to see the miraculous.
- In disagreement with the statement, Swinburne's defence of miracles could be seen as valid regarding the contradictory nature of faith claims because different religions each claiming miracles do not contradict each other, but rather show God's/gods' potency at work.
- It could be seen as valid because Swinburne's response to Hume supports the credibility of witnesses: a person's memory can be relied upon that x has happened.
- Swinburne's response to Hume is valid as it proposes that testimonies from different witnesses can be assessed, verified or falsified and that the principle of belief rather than disbelief should be applied when numerous witnesses attest to a miracle.
- It could be seen as valid because multiple similar testimony from different witnesses against a small number of contrary testimonies should be given weight – so accounts should be believed unless there is a serious reason not to believe.
- Swinburne's response could be seen as valid as he recognises the limitations of the empirical scientific method and the view that an occasional intervention in history by God/gods does not undermine or invalidate the general laws of nature.

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