AQA

AS
Philosophy

PHLS1 Epistemology and Philosophy of Religion
Mark scheme

2175
June 2016

Version 1.0: Final Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A – Epistemology

1 What is the tripartite view of propositional knowledge?

[2 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
2 AO1	2	A clear and correct answer, with no significant redundancy.
	1	A partial answer, possibly in the form of fragmented points. Imprecise and/or significant redundancy.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content for full marks:

- The view that S knows that p if and only if S is justified in believing that p, p is true and S believes that p.
- [and/or] The view that S knows that p if and only if S has a justified belief that p and p is true.
- [and/or] The view that knowledge should be defined (analysed) as being justified true belief.
- [and/or] The view that having a justified true belief is both a necessary and a sufficient condition for having propositional knowledge.

Notes

- Naturally we are looking for all three elements for full marks (truth, justification and belief) expressed clearly and correctly. If students get one or two of the elements (eg. 'on the tripartite view, knowledge is 'justified belief'), this is a partially correct answer and should receive one mark.
- There are no marks available for students who simply provide a definition of 'propositional knowledge' and nothing else, although this is certainly *not* 'significant redundancy'.

2 Explain the empiricist distinction between simple and complex concepts.

[5 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
5 A01	5	A full, clear and precise explanation. The student makes logical links between precisely identified points, with no redundancy.
	4	A clear explanation, with logical links, but some imprecision/redundancy.
	3	The substantive content of the explanation is present and there is an attempt at logical linking, but the explanation is not full and/or precise.
	2	One or two relevant points made, but not precisely. The logic is unclear.
	1	Fragmented points, with no logical structure.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- **Difference 1:** Simple concepts are phenomenally simple or 'uncompounded', such as shades of colour and tastes. They cannot be analysed in terms of other concepts whereas complex concepts can be broken down (eg table).

- **Difference 2:** Simple concepts are the effects or copies of impressions (Hume) or of reality (Locke), but complex concepts need not be a copy of anything that exists and are formed through combination (to form concepts of even non-existent things like golden mountains, virtuous horses, unicorns etc) or through abstraction (to form general complex concepts like dog(ness), etc).

- **Difference 3**: [For Locke] Complex ideas are of modes, substances and/or relations whereas simple ideas are of qualities (sensation) or operations of mind (reflection).

- **Difference 4:** [For Locke] Simple ideas are always adequate (ie they represent the intended object fully): they "perfectly represent those archetypes which the mind supposes them taken from: which it intends them to stand for, and to which it refers them" (*An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 1689, II.xxxi.1). This is because they are just the effects of their causes (and effects can't exist without a cause). Complex ideas (eg of substances) may not be adequate.

- **Difference 5**: [For Locke] Words standing for simple ideas are less likely to be misapplied: "Simple ideas least likely to be false in reference to others of the same name*."* It would be odd, if not impossible, to apply the word 'red' to the idea 'green'. But words for complex ideas are more likely to be misapplied: we are "much more uncertain; it being not so easy to determine of several actions, whether they are to be called justice or cruelly, liberality or prodigality" [*An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, II.xxxii.9-10].

Notes:

- There is no requirement for any particular amount of differences to be discussed and in fact it is likely that only the first two differences (above one or both) will be discussed. This is fine.

- Examples are not asked for or required, but they will probably be given, and if they help to make points clearer then they should be credited within the levels.

3 Outline Descartes' 'evil deceiver' argument **and** explain what he then says about his knowledge of his own existence.

[9 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
9 A01	7-9	The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct. The material is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely. There may be some redundancy or lack of clarity in particular points, but not sufficient to detract from the answer. Technical philosophical language is used appropriately and consistently.
	4-6	The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified. The content of the answer is largely correct, though not necessarily well integrated. Some points are made clearly, but relevance is not always sustained. Technical philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.
	1-3	Some relevant points are made, but no integration. There is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant. There may be some attempt at using technical philosophical language.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

"Outline Descartes' 'evil deceiver' argument…"

- Students may briefly, as context, explain that this follows two other arguments (illusion/perceptual error and dreaming). They cannot gain significant credit just for explaining these arguments, but if they make connections (finding commonalities) between the 'evil deceiver' (or 'evil demon') argument and those other sceptical arguments, then they should be credited within the levels.

- Descartes' purpose is to subject himself and his opinions to radical scepticism (the 'method of doubt') with the aim of finding certainty/indubitability/knowledge. The possibility of an 'evil deceiver' is discussed in this context, but only once he has briefly considered the possibility of a deceiving God. The best students will recognise this distinction and focus on the former, but examiners should still credit material which shows an understanding of the relevant sceptical considerations (whoever or whatever is the cause of 'deceptions' we could be subject to).

- The 'evil deceiver' possibility (scenario/hypothesis): there is an evil being ensuring that I have no true beliefs. It is important that students do not suggest that Descartes thinks such an evil deceiver in fact exists; he is merely claiming that such a being's existence is possible.

- Students may set it out as a step by step argument (though it may of course be differently explained/structured). Here are two possible formats, but there are others:

    - P1: I am certain of a proposition (I know it) only if there are no grounds for doubting it.
    - P2: For all propositions, the possibility of an evil deceiver gives sufficient grounds for doubting them.
    - C: Therefore, I am not certain of any propositions (I have no knowledge).

  Or:

    - P1: I am certain of a proposition (I know it) only if I can rule out the possibility of it being false.
    - P2: If I am being deceived by an evil deceiver then all propositions I believe are false.
    - C1: Therefore, in order to be certain of a proposition I need to rule out the evil deceiver possibility.
    - P3: I cannot rule out the evil deceiver possibility.
    - C2: Therefore, I am not certain of any propositions (I have no knowledge).

"…and explain what he then says about his knowledge of his own existence":

Students may make any number of the following points:

- Descartes thinks the proposition 'I exist' is something…

    - that escapes this sceptical 'evil deceiver' argument, since even if I am being deceived, I must exist in order for this deception to take place - "this proposition: I am, I exist, whenever it is uttered from me, or conceived by the mind, necessarily is true" (*Meditations on First Philosophy*, 1641, Second Mediation §25);
    - that cannot possibly be doubted, and so (on Descartes' strict definition of knowledge) is something we know;
    - that is known through reason rather than through experience (and so might be said to be a priori) (NB: the terms 'a priori' and 'a posteriori' were not used by Descartes himself in this context, but they can acceptably be used by students);
    - that is known by intuition: ie it is direct and non-inferential knowledge/awareness - you do not infer your existence from something else, rather you just know it immediately without needing to argue for it; all you have to do is consider it and it becomes clear in your mind that it has to be true;
    - that is a substantial synthetic truth and so not merely true by definition (NB: the terms 'synthetic' and 'analytic' were not used by Descartes himself, but they can acceptably be used by students).

Notes

- This question requires students to do two things, and the weight falls on the second part of the question: *explain* rather than *outline*. Nevertheless, candidates could (in principle) write proportionately more on the 'evil deceiver' argument and still acquire full marks, so long as their explanation of what Descartes 'says about knowledge of his own existence' possesses the requisite top band qualities: clarity, precision, integration, technical language etc.

- The best answers (top band) will tend to treat the arguments alluded to in the question (covered by Descartes in Meditations 1 and 2) in their own right and with due precision. But if students do answer through the prism of the *Meditations* as a whole, when the existence of a perfect God has been demonstrated to Descartes' satisfaction, then their appeal to the existence of God as relevant to our knowledge (including of our own existence) is not to be rejected as irrelevant. After all, Descartes does experiment with the idea of a 'deceiving God' in Meditation 1.

4 Outline Berkeley's idealism **and** explain how it could lead to solipsism.

[9 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
9 AO1	7-9	The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct. The material is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely. There may be some redundancy or lack of clarity in particular points, but not sufficient to detract from the answer. Technical philosophical language is used appropriately and consistently.
	4-6	The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified. The content of the answer is largely correct, though not necessarily well integrated. Some points are made clearly, but relevance is not always sustained. Technical philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.
	1-3	Some relevant points are made, but no integration. There is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant. There may be some attempt at using technical philosophical language.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Answering this question well would require an understanding of (1) Berkeley's idealism, (2) what 'solipsism' might mean, and (3) how the former view might lead to the latter.
- (1) Berkeley's idealism:
    - "The immediate objects of perception (ie ordinary objects such as tables, chairs, etc) are mind-dependent objects" [AQA Specification]. Berkeley is an immaterialist: he denies the existence of material substance.
    - NB: Berkeley's idealism is not the view that *everything* is mind-dependent, given that God, as infinite mind or spiritual substance, is not dependent on anything. Our finite minds (or spiritual substances) are dependent on God, however.
    - His 'Master' argument can be interpreted as demonstrating that we can have no meaningful /coherent concept of mind-independent perceptible objects (ie of an external material world).
    - His denial of the traditional (Lockean) primary/secondary property distinction is part of his attempt to show that all perceptible properties are mind-dependent.

- (2) Solipsism (there are various ways this may be understood/explained):
    - Only my mind exists - there are no other minds nor are there any mind-independent objects or properties (some may refer to this as 'metaphysical solipsism', though this is not required).
    - It is not possible for me to know about the existence of anything apart from my mind. I cannot know if there are other minds or mind-independent objects (some may refer to this as 'epistemological solipsism', though this is not required).
    - A broadly epistemological definition may be put in terms of meaningfulness: ie claims about anything apart from my own mind are not meaningful (because they could not possibly have any meaningful content).
- (3) Why Berkeley's idealism would lead to solipsism:
    - If only my mind and its contents exist, then (metaphysical) solipsism, is true.
    - If all I can know is that my mind exists, then (epistemological) solipsism is true.
    - If all I can meaningfully/coherently understand and talk about is my own mind, then solipsism is the only meaningful position to take.

Notes:

- This question requires students to do two things. It is quite possible that many will spend proportionately less time/words on the second part of the question (solipsism), and this does not in and of itself preclude them from getting full marks if the explanations of *both* parts possess the requisite top band characteristics: clarity, precision, integration, technical language etc.
- Students may refer to the role God plays when explaining Berkeley's idealism. They may also mention that he does not himself take a solipsist position (ie at least God's mind exists in addition to my own, and Berkeley believes it is likely that there are other minds in addition to these).
- They may (perhaps in relation to the point above) incorporate any problems that Berkeley may have in proving that there is a God as part of their explanation of why solipsism arises for him (ie any solution to solipsism that relies on God's existence would be undercut by any such problems), and this is fine.

5 Are direct realists right to claim that the immediate objects of perception are mind-independent?

[15 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
15 7 AO1 8 AO2	13-15	The student argues with clear and sustained intent. A complete and coherent argument leads to a clear conclusion. The content is detailed and correct, and sufficient material is selected and deployed to answer the question fully. The conclusion is arrived at through a balancing of arguments, with appropriate weight given to each argument and to the argument overall. Where there are crucial arguments, these are distinguished from less crucial ones. There may be trivial mistakes – both relating to the content and to the logic – but they do not detract from the argument.
	10-12	The student argues with intent, though this is not necessarily sustained. A complete and coherent argument leads to a conclusion. The content is detailed and correct and most of it is integrated. There is a recognition of arguments and counter-arguments, but balance is not always present and the weight to be given to each argument is not always fully clear.
	7-9	There is some evidence that the student is trying to answer the question. An argument to a conclusion is set out, but not fully coherently. The content is largely correct, though there may be some gaps and lack of detail. Relevant points are recognised/identified and mentioned, but not integrated in a coherent way. Alternative positions may be identified and juxtaposed, but not necessarily precisely and their relative weightings may not be clear.
	4-6	There is limited evidence that the student is trying to answer the question. There may be a conclusion and several reasonable points may be made, but there is no clear relationship between the points and the conclusion. There may be much that is missing, or the essay may be one-sided. There might be substantial gaps in the content, or evidence of serious misunderstandings. Several reasonable points are made and there are some attempts to make inferences.
	1-3	Simple mention of points, no clear argument.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Note on QWC
The level descriptors focus on the philosophical skills which students are required to demonstrate, through the medium of written communication. The Quality of Written Communication (QWC) requirements (which are assessed in the 15-mark questions) are essential to philosophical argument, so are subsumed within the level descriptors.

The QWC requirement for the clear and coherent organisation of material, in an appropriate style or styles, is addressed by the requirements for the selection and deployment of material in the form of argument.

The QWC requirements for the use of appropriate vocabulary and for accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar are addressed through the philosophical requirement for clarity.

Indicative content

- Students may well explain what is meant by "mind-independent objects" – objects which exist whether or not they are perceived or conceived of.

- Students may also expand slightly on the definition of 'direct realism' implicit in the question: the theory that 'the immediate objects of perception are mind-independent objects and their properties' (AQA Specification).

- A distinction may also be made between 'naïve realism' (that we directly perceive mind independent objects, and that those objects are always as they appear in our perceptions), and 'sophisticated' or 'scientific' direct realism (that we do *directly* perceive mind independent objects, but this does not entail that the world of mind independent objects always is at it appears: there are good scientific reasons for the differences between appearance and reality which do not require a mediator.

- Conclusions may be drawn by arguing for and against some of the following positions, drawing from the supporting content bullet-pointed underneath (though this list is not exhaustive):

  YES: the immediate objects of perception are mind-independent (ie arguing for direct realism) *for broadly metaphysical/ontological reasons*:

  - This avoids problems arising from the view that mind-dependent objects (particularly non-physical sense-data) represent mind-independent objects: there is not enough in common between these different types of objects to sustain this relationship of representation - this may be linked to questions about intentionality/representative content and/or Berkeley's "likeness" principle.

  - This avoids problems arising from the view that mind-dependent objects (particularly non-physical sense data) are caused by mind-independent objects: there is not enough in common between these different types of objects to sustain this relationship of causation – this may be linked to questions about mind-body causation and so put as an anti-dualist and pro-materialist argument.

  - This avoids other problems associated with sense-data: location issues (where are they?), and the issue of indeterminacy (eg the speckled hen problem).

YES: the immediate objects of perception are mind-independent (ie arguing for direct realism) *for broadly epistemological reasons*:

- Such immediate awareness of mind-independent reality is required in order for knowledge of reality to be possible (a transcendental-style argument) – this view avoids the scepticism that faces indirect realism (the 'veil of perception').
- This is how things appear introspectively (the 'transparency' of experience).
- Statements about external mind-independent objects are irreducible to statements about 'mere' experiences.
- It can be argued that arguments against this view (see below) are invalid and/or rest on confusions and hence pose no real threat.

NO: the immediate objects of perception are never mind-independent, although mind-independent objects (probably/definitely) do exist: i.e. arguing for indirect realism.

- The argument from illusion.
- The argument from hallucination (the possibility of experiences that are subjectively indistinguishable from veridical perception).
- The time-lag argument.
- The argument from science (differences between the ordinary or folk conception of objects and the scientific conception).

NO: the immediate objects of perception are never mind-independent because mind-independent objects do not exist (ie arguing for either idealism or some form of phenomenalism).

- Berkeley's 'Master' argument (and other arguments he gives) can be interpreted as demonstrating that we cannot have a meaningful or coherent concept of anything mind-independent, and it may therefore follow that such objects are impossible.

NO: the immediate objects of perception are not mind-independent, ie arguing generally against direct realism.

- The argument from perceptual variation (Russell's table example), which can be used to support either indirect realism or idealism.
- Berkeley's arguments against Locke's primary/secondary property distinction: intended to show that all the immediate properties of perception are mind-dependent.

SOMETIMES: the immediate objects of perception are sometimes but not always mind-independent, ie arguing for a metaphysical disjunctivism in which illusions and/or hallucinations do have sense-data as immediate objects of perception (eg as with Austin).

- Doing so by attacking the 'common factor principle' in arguments from illusion and hallucination, ie denying that subjectively indistinguishable experiences must involve immediate perception of the same kind of object.

CAN'T BE ANSWERED: this is a question that, for some reason, it is impossible to answer: perhaps because there is no way of telling, from the first-person perspective (from 'the inside'), what it is that you are aware of during perception.

Section B – Philosophy of Religion

6 What does it mean to claim that God is eternal?

[2 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
2 AO1	2	A clear and correct answer, with no significant redundancy.
	1	A partial answer, possibly in the form of fragmented points. Imprecise and/or significant redundancy.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- God exists (or has life) outside of/apart from/independently of time.
- God exists (or lives) timelessly.
- God exists (or lives) a-temporally.

Notes

- If students answer simply by exchanging the term 'eternal' with a synonymous term (e.g. "God is timeless") their response should receive one mark. This would be a partial answer.
- If students answer by saying that 'God exists without beginning or end' (or the same idea with alternative wording), this should receive one mark: it is true of an 'eternal' God, but it is also true of an 'everlasting' God. This would be a partial answer.
- It is perfectly acceptable for students to frame their answer in terms of God's 'life' rather than 'existence': this was the preferred terminology in the formative medieval tradition of thought on divine eternity. Boethius defined divine eternity as "the complete possession all at once of illimitable life" (*The Consolations of Philosophy*, bk. v, ps. 6)

7 Outline Descartes' version of the ontological argument.

[5 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
5 AO1	5	A full, clear and precise explanation. The student makes logical links between precisely identified points, with no redundancy.
	4	A clear explanation, with logical links, but some imprecision/redundancy.
	3	The substantive content of the explanation is present and there is an attempt at logical linking, but the explanation is not full and/or precise.
	2	One or two relevant points made, but not precisely. The logic is unclear.
	1	Fragmented points, with no logical structure.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- The starting point is the idea of God that we have (some students may mention that for Descartes this is present innately in the mind).
- Step-by-step version of the argument:
  - P1: My (or the) idea of God is an idea of a supremely perfect being.
  - P2: A supremely perfect being has all perfections.
  - P3: Existence is a perfection.
  - C: Therefore God exists.
- Students might also respond in terms of the distinction between existence and essence and argue that the existence of God can no more be separated from the essence of God than can the idea of a mountain from that of a valley or the idea of angles that add up to 180 degrees from that of a triangle.
- Some students might add that this is an a priori and deductive argument, and what this means.
- Students might respond explicitly in terms of rational intuition and clear and distinct ideas though this is not necessary.
- It is worth adding that Descartes at times seems to treat this not as an (extended deductive) argument but instead as a self-evident intuition.
- Some students may add what Leibniz saw as the necessary and suppressed premises - namely that such an idea must be coherent and that it is coherent – but this is neither asked for nor necessary.
- Some students may include the definition of a perfection as a state of completeness: to be perfectly powerful is to be completely powerful, for example.

8 Explain Mitchell's view of religious language **and** how he uses his 'Partisan' story to illustrate this.

[9 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
9 AO1	7-9	The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct. The material is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely. There may be some redundancy or lack of clarity in particular points, but not sufficient to detract from the answer. Technical philosophical language is used appropriately and consistently.
	4-6	The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified. The content of the answer is largely correct, though not necessarily well integrated. Some points are made clearly, but relevance is not always sustained. Technical philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.
	1-3	Some relevant points are made, but no integration. There is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant. There may be some attempt at using technical philosophical language.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Mitchell accepts Flew's view that for a claim to be meaningful it must be falsifiable – ie the person making the claim understands that there is possible evidence that would count against it (this would include any actual evidence as well).

- However, Mitchell says that the believer's religious claim is still meaningful. Religious believers agree that there is evidence that counts against their belief, but their attitude of trust means that they will not in the end allow this evidence to change their minds: "[T]he theologian <u>does</u> recognise the fact of pain counting against Christian doctrine. But it is true that he will not allow it-or anything-to count decisively against it; for he is committed by his faith to trust in God. His attitude is not that of the detached observer, but of the believer" (Mitchell, in Flew, Mitchell and Hare, 'Theology and Falsification', in Mitchell [ed.], *The Philosophy of Religion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971, p. 18).

- The Parable of the Partisan illustrates this view of Mitchell's. The believer has an attitude of trust in the partisan and, as a result, will not easily give up his belief despite acknowledging the existence of contrary evidence. It is not possible to say in advance how much evidence would falsify the claim that the partisan is on his side, but this does not render the claim meaningless.

- The table below clearly summarises the sorts of points that students might make:

Partisan parable	**Meaning in relation to religious language**
The Partisan meets a Stranger, who deeply impresses him and the Stranger tells him he is a member of the resistance movement.	The religious believer comes across some form of evidence that for him supports the existence of God.
The Partisan is utterly convinced of the Stranger's sincerity and decides to trust him.	The religious believer develops an attitude of trust in God.
The Stranger acts ambiguously: sometimes he is seen acting in ways which help the resistance; sometimes in ways which help the enemy.	Some evidence supports the existence of God and some challenges it.
The Partisan accepts that some behaviours count against his claim - and this is shown by the fact that he has doubts on occasion about the identity of the Stranger - but he continues to assert "The Stranger is on our side", and in the end argues that the Stranger has good reasons for his ambiguous behaviour.	The believer accepts that some evidence challenges his claim - and this is shown by the fact that he has doubts on occasion about the existence of God - but he continues to assert "God exists", and in the end argues that there must be reasons for the challenging evidence.
This means that the Partisan's claims are falsifiable.	This means that the believer's claims are falsifiable.
But, when pressed, the Partisan needn't (and perhaps couldn't) say how much evidence against his claim would be needed for him to give up that claim.	But, when pressed, the believer needn't (and perhaps couldn't) say how much evidence against his claim would be needed for him to give up that claim.

9 Outline and explain Swinburne's version of the argument from design.

[9 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
9 AO1	7-9	The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct. The material is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely. There may be some redundancy or lack of clarity in particular points, but not sufficient to detract from the answer. Technical philosophical language is used appropriately and consistently.
	4-6	The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified. The content of the answer is largely correct, though not necessarily well integrated. Some points are made clearly, but relevance is not always sustained. Technical philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.
	1-3	Some relevant points are made, but no integration. There is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant. There may be some attempt at using technical philosophical language.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Swinburne presents an inductive teleological argument. This features analogy, but it's distinctive focus is the temporal order/regularities of succession within the universe as a whole (ie the regular and universal fundamental laws of nature) in order to demonstrate that the existence of God is likely.
- Step-by-step version of the argument (though it may of course be structured/explained differently):
    - P1: The universe as a whole contains temporal order/regularities of succession (ie the regular and universal fundamental laws of nature).
    - P2: There are two possible hypotheses: (H1) temporal order has a scientific explanation; or (H2) temporal order has a personal explanation (eg explaining the singing of song over time in terms of the singer's intentions).
    - P3: (H1) fails: science can only explain the existence of regularities of succession in terms of more fundamental regularities of succession. So, we cannot give a scientific explanation of the temporal order displayed in the fundamental laws of science (science cannot itself explain why the fundamental laws of science exist as they do).

  - P4: (H2) can explain (fundamental) scientific regularities of succession. They are similar to regularities of succession produced by human agents (the singing of the song), and so, by analogy, are produced by rational agency.

  - P5: The agency in question would have to be of immense power and intelligence, free and disembodied, which is to say God.

  - C1: Therefore, God exists.

- Students may just claim that Swinburne concludes that a designer exists without going on to look at the further argument that it is likely to be God and this would be fine.

- Students may point out that the argument is an inductive one: the conclusion (God exists) is probable, not certain given the truth of the premises.

- Students may add that Swinburne says that God is a simpler hypothesis too. For if there is no God, then there are two types of regularities of succession: scientific and personal. If there is a God, then there is fundamentally one type: personal (this is in his 1968 paper).

- Students may add that God is the simplest hypothesis with reference to (i) God's uniqueness; (ii) God's infinitude; (iii) God's uncreated nature because (i) it is simpler to suppose one God than many; (ii) it is simpler for God to have unlimited (eg) power: any finite degree of power would require an explanation (why that value?); (iii) there would otherwise be an infinite regress.

- Students may add that Swinburne also argues against a third possibility (H3) that the existence of the basic scientific regularities of succession is a brute fact. Since there are so many other ways the world could have been that are no less simple and hence no less probable, the probability of this universe existing is relatively low and "cries out for explanation". Reference may be made to the kidnapper/card-machine to illustrate this.

- Students may add that Swinburne sees two main advantages to this approach over arguments from spatial order: (1) temporal order cannot be explained in terms of evolution in the way that spatial order can; (2) there is no temporal disorder to account for (the laws of nature are unchanging) as there is spatial disorder (eg blindness); (3) spatial order presupposes temporal order: evolution requires there to be laws of nature.

- Students may add that Swinburne adds this inductive reasoning to the other inductive arguments he has considered (cosmological and religious experience) as part of a cumulative argument for God's existence.

Notes:

- There is a lot of detail here with the aim of helping examiners to recognise creditable content, but it is certainly not expected that students would write anything like this much and in this much detail.

- It is expected that students will be examining the argument of Swinburne from his 1968 paper (as per the specification), and that study of his later work is unnecessary. However (for completeness) in later work Swinburne (eg 1979/1991) develops the argument in a number of ways. The 'brute fact' possibility is dealt with explicitly and the presentation of the argument is more complex: the design argument is introduced as what he calls a C-inductive (confirmation) argument (one that is part of a large P-inductive (probability) argument). Given the advanced nature of this material, and its absence from the syllabus, it is not expected that students should address it in any way, but it should certainly be credited if they utilise it in their answers.

- In cases where students *are* drawing on later developments of Swinburne's work, they may say that the argument is a C-inductive argument where the premises P make the conclusion C more probable than it would otherwise be. They may then phrase the argument thus: the hypothesis that God exists (given the nature of the universe) is more probable than the hypothesis that God does not exist (given the nature of the universe).

10 Does the existence of evil mean that an omnipotent, omniscient and supremely good God does not exist?

[15 marks]

Marks	**Levels of response mark scheme**	
15 7 AO1 8 AO2	13-15	The student argues with clear and sustained intent. A complete and coherent argument leads to a clear conclusion. The content is detailed and correct and sufficient material is selected and deployed to answer the question fully. The conclusion is arrived at through a balancing of arguments, with appropriate weight given to each argument and to the argument overall. Where there are crucial arguments, these are distinguished from less crucial ones. There may be trivial mistakes – both relating to the content and to the logic – but they do not detract from the argument.
	10-12	The student argues with intent, though this is not necessarily sustained. A complete and coherent argument leads to a conclusion. The content is detailed and correct and **most of it** is integrated. There is a recognition of arguments and counter-arguments, but balance is not always present and the weight to be given to each argument is not always fully clear.
	7-9	There is some evidence that the student is trying to answer the question. An argument to a conclusion is set out, but not fully coherently. The content is largely correct, though there may be some gaps and lack of detail. Relevant points are recognised/identified and mentioned, but not integrated in a coherent way. Alternative positions may be identified and juxtaposed, but not necessarily precisely and their relative weightings may not be clear.
	4-6	There is limited evidence that the student is trying to answer the question. There may be a conclusion and several reasonable points may be made, but there is no clear relationship between the points and the conclusion. There may be much that is missing, or the essay may be one-sided. There might be substantial gaps in the content, or evidence of serious misunderstandings. Several reasonable points are made and there are some attempts to make inferences.
	1-3	Simple mention of points, no clear argument.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Note on QWC
The level descriptors focus on the philosophical skills which students are required to demonstrate, through the medium of written communication. The Quality of Written Communication (QWC) requirements (which are assessed in the 15-mark questions) are essential to philosophical argument, so are subsumed within the level descriptors.

The QWC requirement for the clear and coherent organisation of material, in an appropriate style or styles, is addressed by the requirements for the selection and deployment of material in the form of argument.

The QWC requirements for the use of appropriate vocabulary and for accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar are addressed through the philosophical requirement for clarity.

Indicative content

- Students may well begin by explaining and illustrating what evil is, perhaps distinguishing between moral evil and natural evil:

    - Moral evil: pain or suffering which results from the intentions (and/or negligence) of moral agents.

    - Natural/physical evil: pain or suffering which does not result from the intentions (and/or negligence) of moral agents.

- Students are likely to explain the problem of evil and may refer to either or both of the following issues in the course of their answer.

    - The logical problem of evil (a good God is logically incompatible with evil): God's omnipotence, omniscience and supreme goodness and the existence of evil are inconsistent. Students may say that this is a deductive argument.

    - The evidential problem: a supremely good God is incompatible with the extent/distribution/amount of evil and renders his existence unlikely / improbable. Students may say that this is an inductive argument.

- The classical attributes of God can be understood/defined in various ways, and this may be discussed in the context of deciding whether the existence of evil is incompatible with the existence of God.

    - Is God's *omnipotence* to be understood as 'the power to do anything', or 'the power to do anything that is logically possible'? How a student understands this divine attribute may reasonably inform the answer that they give. Students might even deny God's omnipotence, as in process theology (see below).

    - Is God's *omniscience* to be understood as the perfect (and simultaneous) knowledge of past, present and future time, or is to be understood as perfect knowledge of all that has actually happened since the beginning of time (as in open theism)? How a student understands this divine attribute may reasonably inform the answer that they give.

- Is God's *supreme goodness* to be understood in terms of benevolence (or other moral qualities), or is it to be understood as co-extensive with being (as in much of the Scholastic tradition, represented today by philosophers like Davies)? On this latter view, to say 'God is supremely good' means that God is fully actualised and perfect (complete) being itself. How a student understands this divine attribute may reasonably inform the answer that they give.

▪ Conclusions may be formed around the following positions, and the content discussed may be drawn from the following bullet-pointed material (though this list is not exhaustive).

YES: Arguing that the existence of evil shows that God does not and, indeed, could not possibly exist (ie there is a logical problem of evil) – a deductive argument.

- Some may use Mackie's attacks on the Free Will Defence to support this view: ie his argument that a world with human beings that always choose freely to do good is a logically possible world and so is the world that God ought to have actualised.

YES: Arguing that the existence of evil (and perhaps its extent/distribution/amount) shows that it is likely that God does not exist (ie there is an evidential problem of evil) – an inductive argument.

YES: Arguing that the existence of evil shows that God does not have one or more of the attributes that he has standardly been claimed to have.

- Some may continue by arguing that God is not, for example, omnipotent or omniscient and so the problem of evil does not arise – eg process theology or open theism.

YES: Arguing that the existence of evil shows that we need to re-define one or more of the attributes that God is standardly said to have.

Some may argue that the goodness of God is not be confused with moral goodness: the latter is an attribute of creatures not of their creator.

YES/NO: Arguing that the existence of evil is not compatible with God's existence but that this should not count against belief in God's existence and nature as we should still have faith in the face of such paradoxes, suspend our reason and believe "by virtue of the absurd" (Kierkegaard's view).

NO: Arguing that the Free Will Defence can be used to show that a supremely good God would create people with free will (as only then will their good choices have value), even if this leads to (or at least risks) the existence of evil; evil is therefore our fault rather than God's.

- Students may refer to Plantinga here and some may therefore discuss transworld depravity.

- Students may discuss Augustine's theodicy in this context (with or without its biblical dimensions).

- Students may discuss the evil caused by the free choices made by supernatural beings (angels/the Devil). They may relate this to physical/natural evil (arguing that even so-called 'physical/natural evil' is in fact moral evil).

NO: Arguing that the 'soul-making' defence can be used to show that a supremely good God would be right to create/permit evil in order for people to grow morally and spiritually and achieve higher-order goods that rely on the presence of evil

- Students may discuss Hick and perhaps Irenaeus in this context.

- They may, therefore, discuss Hick's response to the evidential problem that evil is required to keep God sufficiently "hidden" and to maintain epistemic distance so that faith/belief is of more value.

NO: Arguing that the existence of evil does not mean that God does not exist since, given God's goodness, this must be the best of all possible worlds.

- Students may appeal to Leibniz's claim that it is wrong to claim that human happiness is the sole standard by which the goodness of worlds is to be judged.

NO: Arguing (perhaps in connection with the point above) that evil is a necessary result of laws of nature, but that these laws are good as they are required for events to take place in a regular way, and this is required in order for us to act in the world effectively. Evil is the result of such laws and a world without such laws would be a worse world.

NO: Arguing that goodness in some sense requires evil:

- The possibility of goodness logically requires the possibility of evil.

- The actual existence of goodness requires the actual existence of evil.

- An appreciation of goodness requires experience of evil (that possessing the concept of goodness relies on possessing the concept of evil).

NO: Arguing (in some way) that there is no such thing as evil and so this poses no problem for the existence of God.

YES: Arguing (contra the point above) that the non-existence of evil/good might be seen as possible only if there is not a God.

NB: Some students may give one conclusion for moral evil and another for natural evil – eg that moral evil can be explained in one of the ways given but natural evil cannot.