A-Level

Philosophy

PHLS1 Epistemology and Philosophy of Religion
Final Mark Scheme

2175
June 2017

Version/Stage: v1.0

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 solipsism?

[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

Metaphysical solipsism:

- The claim/belief that only my mind exists (there are no other minds, nor are there any mind-independent objects or properties)
- The claim/belief/ that the only thing that is real is my own mind/mental states (there is no world, physical or otherwise, beyond my experiences)
- The claim/belief that I alone exist (*solus ipse*) as a thinking thing (*res cogitans*)

Epistemological solipsism:

- The claim/belief that it is not possible for me to know about the existence of anything apart from my mind/mental states (I cannot know if there are other minds or mind-independent objects)
- The claim that all I know is that I alone exist (*solus ipse*) as a thinking thing (*res cogitans*)

Solipsism at the level of meaningfulness:

- The claim/belief that only propositions about my own mind/mental states are meaningful (any claims about anything beyond my experiences are nonsense)

NB:
- There is no expectation that students use the italicised names for the different way of expressing solipsism, nor that they use the additional material in brackets.
- Some students will frame their answer in terms of 'you' or 'your': for example, 'The claim that only *your* mind exists'; or 'The belief that *you* can only know that *your* own mind exists and nothing else.' That is acceptable phrasing. So long as a plurality isn't explicitly suggested.

Indicative content for 1 mark

- The claim/belief that only I exist
- A sceptical claim/belief about the existence of the external world
- The claim/belief that I can only know that I exist (or know about by own existence)

Notes:
- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

2   Explain Russell's claim that the existence of the external world is the 'best hypothesis'.

[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

- Students may situate this as a response to scepticism about the existence of the external world (possibly identified with solipsism or idealism). Russell refers to "the external world' in key passages (see below), but this is within the context of a chapter on the existence of matter, and students may present this argument as a defence of the reality of matter / physical objects etc.
- Arguing that H is the "best hypothesis" as an explanation of X, Y and Z is to claim that H best explains X, Y and Z being true (ie better than other competing explanations): in this case, the existence of an external world/material world is preferable to any alternative. This argument is characterised by abductive reasoning: inference to the best explanation (which some see as a species of inductive reasoning).
- Russell makes the following points in *The Problems of Philosophy*, which may furnish the students' responses with important details.
  - It is true that we cannot prove for certain that external objects exist which cause our experiences, and that alternatives (e.g. the dream hypothesis) are possible – this is why it is a (mere) hypothesis. Nevertheless, the existence of a persisting mind-independent reality is to be preferred because:
    a) it is *simpler*, in the sense that it accounts better for the differences in perceived properties between multiple experiences – e.g. experiences of a cat which (1) is in one location, and then later in another; and (2) is not hungry, and then later is hungry; the best explanation of this is that these experiences are caused by a mind-independent cat that persists and changes while unobserved.
    b) our belief in an external world is originally *instinctive* and should not be dropped unless a superior alternative is available: "Since this belief does not lead to any difficulties, but on the contrary tends to simplify and systematize our account of our experiences, there seems no good reason for rejecting it. We may therefore admit, though with a slight doubt derived from dreams, that the external world does really exist, and is not wholly dependent for its existence upon our continuing to perceive it".

NB: Russell does not identify 'simplicity' with 'Ockham's razor' (the limiting of explanatory entities); he uses it here to communicate the idea that our 'natural' view of the world (as independent of our own experience) best explains the coherence and consistency of our sense data.

Notes:

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

3   Briefly outline the tripartite view of knowledge **and** explain how a case of a lucky true belief (a Gettier-style problem) can be used to argue against this view.

[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

- This question relates to propositional knowledge (knowing 'that'), which may be distinguished from acquaintance knowledge (knowing 'of') and ability knowledge (knowing 'how').
- The tripartite view (the 'traditional' view, the Platonic view, JTB theory) is the view that S knows that p if and only if (1) S is justified in believing that p, (2) p is true and (3) S believes that p. These conditions are both individually necessary and jointly sufficient for knowledge.
- Gettier-style problem have been used to show that the conditions are not sufficient (Gettier's own original claim), such that someone can have a justified true belief that p, but not know that p. But they can also be used to argue that one of the conditions is unnecessary (e.g. justification).
- Students could discuss the idea of a Gettier-style case in the abstract but, firstly, this is unlikely, and, secondly, a specific example is very likely to increase the clarity of the answer. Examples that students will use may very well include one (or more) of the following:
    - o Cases of justified true belief when a propositional belief happens (by luck) to match some factual state of affairs: e.g. Gettier's own example where Smith and Jones are going for the same job; Smith has good reasons for believing that the man with "ten coins in his pocket" is "the man who will get the job"; a man matching that profile does indeed get the job (Smith); but when Smith formed this true belief, he actually had Jones in mind.
    - o Cases of justified true belief which are due to a lucky disjunction: e.g. the second of Gettier's own cases, this time concerning Smith, Jones's car, and the location of Smith's friend, Brown.

In this case Smith forms the true belief that "Either Jones owns a Ford, or Brown is in Barcelona", inferring the latter from the (seemingly well evidenced) former; but the former is false (Jones *hired* the Ford), and the latter is true by pure chance (Smith had no idea where Brown was).

o   Non-inferential cases of justified true belief: e.g. Goldman's Barn Country example, where Henry's true belief is lucky because he just happens to have correctly identified the only barn (in Barn Country) that is not a fake (he is not aware of the context in which he is forming his belief).

NB: Students need not use an original Gettier case (nor the alternative suggested above). The important thing here is that students make the appropriate connection between the tripartite view they have outlined and the details of their chosen case---a case which is designed to show that justified true belief does not always yield knowledge (because of the luck involved).

Notes:

- Students should not be penalised for using more than one case/example, but equally do not need more than one case/example.
- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

4 Briefly explain direct realism **and** explain how the 'argument from hallucination' can be used to argue against this view.

[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

Direct realism claims that we perceive mind-independent objects directly / immediately: without any form of mediation
  o NB: direct realism might be explicitly or implicitly treated in one of two ways and this would have implications for how much argument (based on hallucination) is needed to disprove it.
  1. DR (1): All experiences involve direct / immediate / unmediated perception of mind-independent objects.
  2. DR (2) Some (most) of our experiences involve direct / immediate / unmediated perception of mind-independent objects.
- Hallucinations can be used first to challenge (1) above and then to subsequently challenge (2).
- A hallucination is an experience that is subjectively indistinguishable from a possible veridical perception of an ordinary (mind-independent) object but in which no object (of the relevant sort / in the relevant location) exists.

A step-by-step version of the argument (though there are other reasonable ways of phrasing this argument):

This first stage aims to disprove DR (1) above:

- P1: During hallucinations, it appears to you that something exists
- P2: If it appears to you that something exists, then you must immediately perceive something which does exist (the 'phenomenal principle')
- C1: Therefore, you immediately perceive something that exists
- P3: There is no suitable mind-independent object at all that exists
- C2: Therefore, during hallucinations, the thing which you immediately perceive (which exists) is not a mind-independent object
- C3: Therefore, during hallucinations, the thing which you immediately perceive (which exists) is a mind-dependent object
- C4: Therefore, not all experiences involve immediate perception of mind-independent objects and so DR (1) is false

Students may then continue the argument to challenge DR (2) above using this second stage:

- P4: Hallucinations are subjectively indistinguishable from veridical experiences
- P5: Subjectively indistinguishable experiences must involve perception of the same kind of object (the 'common factor' principle) / must be experiences of the same psychological kind (the 'common kind' principle)
- C5: Therefore, (given C3 above) the thing which you immediately perceive is a mind-dependent object even in veridical cases
- C6: Therefore none of our experiences involve direct / immediate perception of mind-independent objects and so DR (2) is false

Notes:

- It is possible for students to get full marks for explaining only the <u>first</u> stage above in a way that meets the relevant level requirements on the mark scheme.
- It is also possible for students to get full marks for explaining only the <u>second</u> stage in a way that meets the relevant level requirements of the mark scheme.
- No example is necessary, but the argument might be phrased throughout in terms of a specific example (e.g. Macbeth's dagger) and this is fine. Alternatively, an example may subsequently be used as a way of further explaining the argument.
- Students may claim that this argument supports the existence of sense data (Russell), but they need not mention this at all.
- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

5   Are concept empiricists right to claim that all concepts derive from experience?

[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 want to define what they understand by term 'concept' (the meaning of this is, of course, a subject of philosophical debate in its own right). The may define it as: a 'constituent of a proposition', or something that does not have a truth value (unlike a proposition).
- The word 'idea' may be used instead of 'concept' and this is fine (so long as it is not conflated with the propositional use of 'idea' – e.g. "I've had a good idea, I'm going to go shopping").
- Any discussion of the origin of propositional knowledge would have to be clearly linked to the question of the origin of the constituent concepts in order for its relevance to the question to be clear.
- The claim that all concepts derive from experience (including sensation and reflection/introspection) may be identified as concept empiricism and associated with philosophers such as Locke, Hume and the logical positivists.
- The claim may be explained as involving a denial of both:
  - the existence of any innate concepts and so the claim that the mind is a tabula rasa (a blank slate) at birth / the first moment of consciousness
  - the possibility of acquiring concepts after birth through a priori means.
- The view may be further explained in terms of Locke and Hume's account of experiences/impressions causing simple ideas/concepts and then the production of complex ideas/concepts (by combination, abstraction or the invention of original concepts).

- Conclusions may be drawn by arguing for and against some of the following positions and content discussed may be drawn from the supporting content bullet-pointed underneath:

NO: it is not the case that all concepts are derived from experience (ie arguing against concept empiricism and for some form of concept innatism associated with rationalism). This could be an argument for the weak(er) claim that some concepts are not derived from experience, or the strong(er) claim that no concepts are derived from experience (e.g. Plato).

Arguments for concept innatism (rationalism): there are at least some innate concepts *(and then possible concept empiricist responses to these are provided in brackets)*:
- 'Easy' cases like 'unicorns' might be discussed as posing problems for concept empiricism (*responses could be in terms of simple and complex concepts, e.g. Hume's 'virtuous horse' or 'golden mountain'*).
- Descartes' 'trademark' argument – the concept of God as innate (*students* could use *Hume's response that this concept comes from "augmenting human characteristics without lim"'*).
- Perhaps there are now issues for concept empiricism with the fact that this Hume's response seems to rely on a notion of infinity (*Locke's response is that our negative concept of infinity is merely the feeling that we can go on counting; he denies that we have a "positive idea of infinity"*).

- Universals and/or causation; this may be discussed in terms of Kant, e.g. the requirement for an a priori concept of causation/time/good in order to recognise causal and temporal order/morally good actions (*Hume's views on causality can be used as a response although, of course, Hume pre-dates Kant, and historically his arguments are best understood as a response to Descartes and his principle of causal adequacy*).
- Leibniz argues that many concepts are innate: being, unity, change, action. He considered the mind to be immaterial, reasoned that 'ideas' (mental content) cannot be caused by material/physical substance, and so empiricist views which assume a material world playing some causal role in the formation of our concepts is false (*this is of course vulnerable to any argument that can challenge immaterialism with respect to the mind, including Locke who seriously entertained the idea of "thinking matte"*).
- Mathematical and geometrical concepts (*Locke's response that 'children and 'idiots' have no mathematical and geometric concepts are birth*).

YES: all concepts are derived from experience (ie arguing for concept empiricism) because of problems with the notion of innate concepts (with some possible responses from innatists in bullet points):

Locke's argument from lack of universal agreement

> P1: If a concept is innate, then it is universal (every person's mind contains it from birth / first consciousness)
> P2: There are no such universal concepts (in support of this, Locke discusses the different concepts of God that exist in different cultures, along with the absence of any concept of God in some)
> C: Therefore, there are no concepts that are innate

- Leibniz denies that a commitment to innate ideas need be based on universal agreement (certainly not on controversial metaphysical issues) but that we nevertheless routinely use concepts which come from "within" the mind (e.g. contradiction and non-contradiction).

Locke's argument against the possibility of innate concepts that one is not aware of:

- He argues against the claim that these concepts could be present universally without people (yet) being aware of them: if a person's mind contained an innate concept from birth, that person would have to be aware of this from birth (this argument may be conjoined with the argument above).
- Leibniz's "marble" analogy might be used as a response: innate concepts are not derived from experience but need experience to shape/develop/ uncover them. Moreover, we use make use of the concepts of 'identity', 'contradiction' and 'non-contradiction' all the time without consciously 'attending to the matter'.

Locke's argument universal agreement would not guarantee innateness:

- He argues that even if there were universal agreement on certain concepts, this would not mean that they were innate (presuming the agreement can be explained in other ways – see previous points).
- Again, Leibniz denies that a commitment to innate ideas need be based on universal agreement; he takes 'general agreement' between people as 'signs' they are innate; any proof of this would come from further enquiry, and the principles on which that enquiry proceeds will "come from within" (be innate).
Locke's argument that none of the alleged innate concepts are clear and obvious to us: He also argues that if a concept were innate, it ought to be "clear and obvious to us…even from our cradles", but concepts such as identity and impossibility (which feature in the supposedly innate truths he mentions) are not clearly understood, even by adults.
- Leibniz might be summoned on to deny that some concepts aren't "clear and obvious to us" (with some counter examples), or else his 'marble analogy' may be pressed into service again to show how concepts (we may not be conscious of as children) may be revealed overtime.

<u>There is also the objection that concept innatism relies on the non-natural</u>:

- Plato's world of the forms and Descartes' claim that our concept of God is actually caused by God; by contrast, the naturalism of concept empiricism is simpler (metaphysically and / or epistemologically).
- It may be objected that (a) this is not a good enough reason to reject anti-empiricist accounts if there are independent reasons for accepting them and/or (b) that there could be a naturalistic account of the presence of concepts that do not derive from (but, rather, are triggered by) experience (e.g. the evolutionary process).

Notes:
- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

Section B – Philosophy of Religion

6   What does Hare mean by the term 'blik'?

[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

- Bliks are attitudes/beliefs towards/about reality that are not sensitive to empirical evidence (neither grounded in it, verified by it, nor falsified by it, but they are nevertheless meaningful).
- Students may, but need not, go on to explain that they are fundamental/important/meaningful in so far as they determine what counts as evidence and affect what we believe and do.
- Textual support from Hare's contribution to the debate originally published in the journal *University*: because the term is introduce by Hare specifically, some might make their points with reference to the following evidence his Hare's own writings:
    - Bliks are attitudes/beliefs towards/about reality: "[B]liks [are] about the world"
    - Bliks are not sensitive to empirical evidence: "a blik does not consist in an assertion or system of them' since they are "compatible with any finite number of tests and "differences between bliks about the world cannot be settled by observation of what happens in the world" (Hare)
    Bliks are nonetheless meaningful in in so far as they determine what counts as evidence and affect what we believe and do: *'*our *whole commerce with the world depends upon our bliks about the world'*; '*it is very important to have the right blik'; '[I]t is by our blik that we decide what is and what is not an explanation'*.

NB:

- There is no expectation that students either quote directly from Hare nor that they supply the additional material in brackets. This is provided for the assistance of examiners.
- Hare calls beliefs that *are* sensitive to empirical evidence "assertions", but students do not need to use that language.

Indicative context for 1 mark

- Bliks are attitudes about the world
- Bliks are not based on (verified by or falsified by) evidence

7   Outline the Kalam cosmological 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 Kalam argument belongs to the cosmological 'family' of arguments. It is distinctive in that it centres on the claim that physical reality/the universe began to exist, and it uses this to argue for the existence of God as the first (temporal) cause of the universe. The original deductive (and valid) argument is typically presented in its simplest form in something like the following way (it may be differently phrased / ordered by students, and that is fine):
  o P1: Everything that begins to exist has a cause (of its existence)
  o P2: The universe (ie complete physical reality) began to exist
  o C1: Therefore, the universe had a cause of its existence.
- To achieve full marks students need not include the material in brackets, but they should at some point identify the existence of 'God' or a 'first cause' (uncaused cause) as the purported achievement of this argument. They need not, but very well might, add one or more additional premises in their presentation and develop their conclusion accordingly, for example:
  o P3: The cause of the universe's existence must be distinct from the universe
  o C2: Therefore, the universe had a cause of its existence that is distinct from itself

- Some students may supplement their outline with support for key premises, for example:
  o In defence of P1 students may mention the inconceivability / implausibility of things merely 'popping into existence.'
  o It might be argued that P2 has empirical/scientific support (the big bang, expanding universe etc.), and some philosophers have always argued for P2 on a priori grounds (usually because of the alleged impossibility of an actual infinity)

NB: a common mistake is for students to phrase the argument in terms of existing rather than beginning to exist: i.e. they constructs the argument as follows: P1: Everything that exists has a cause; P2: The Universe exists; C: The Universe has a cause, God. If students do not identify the idea of the universe having a beginning in their outline, then they cannot be said to have captured the substantive content of this argument.

Notes:

- The Kalam argument has been developed (e.g. by Craig) in an attempt to demonstrate the attributes of this 'first cause'. Students are not expected to know this, and it is *not* required for full marks, but nor should it be regarded as 'redundant'. Craig argues, for example, that the first cause would be a personal being, immaterial, eternal, and enormously powerful etc.
- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

8   Outline the problem of evil **and** explain Hick's soul-making response to it.

[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.

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

- The context the problem of evil could refer to either or both of the following:
    - the logical problem of evil (deductive) - the existence of an omnipotent, omniscient and supremely good God is incompatible with (deductive) the existence of evil
    - the evidential problem (inductive) - the existence of an omnipotent, omniscient and supremely good God is unlikely (or highly improbable) given the existence/ extent/distribution of evil.

- There is no requirement for both to be discussed by students, but the best responses will clearly connect Hick's response to the version/s outlined.
- The soul-making response addresses these problems by arguing that God creates a world permitting evil because it is required for the moral growth and character-development of his creation towards perfection. Evil is necessary for the development of our good, and the development of our good is part of God's providential plan.
- The general argument is as follows but it is unlikely that this will be explained in a step-by-step way:
  - o P1: A world containing evil is required for humans to be capable of moral development, including the acquisition of certain virtues (e.g. compassion, courage, charity)
  - o P2: A supremely good God would want his creatures to be capable of moral development, including the acquisition of such virtues, as we strive for perfection / to be like God (a process which continues after our physical death)
  - o C1: Therefore, if God creates a world, then it must be a world with evil
- For Hick it is crucial that this process continues into the afterlife (this is part of how he explains seemingly pointless ('dysteleological') suffering.
- Students may use analogies for P1: e.g. parents allow children to make mistakes so that they learn from this (charity, compassion etc).
- For Hick, although there seems to be too much evil for there to be a God (the evidential problem explained above), it is important that this is the case in order for there to be sufficient 'epistemic distance' in order for us to freely love Him.
- Students may discuss the way in which this deals specifically with physical/natural evil.

NB:
- Do not penalise students who omit 'omniscience' in their articulation of the problem of evil, but if they do use it then they should, of course, use it correctly and consistently.
- If students refer to our 'perfectibility' when explaining Hick's theodicy, or the process whereby we become 'like God', then this can be taken to imply the eschatological dimension that is crucial to Hick's argument (since 'perfection' and 'God likeness' seem otherwise unachievable), and they can be awarded full marks (assuming all other requirements are met).

Notes:

- Although 'free will' does not play the central role in Hick's theodicy that it does in some other responses to the problem of evil, it is not irrelevant. Freedom is an important gift from God: the value attached to the performance of moral actions and the cultivation of moral character depends in large part on this freedom.
- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

9   Briefly define 'omniscience' **and** then explain the argument that human freedom is impossible if God is omniscient.

[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

- God being omniscient might be explained in one or more of the following ways:
    - God knows all true propositions
    - God knows everything that it is possible to know
    - God knows everything that it is possible for a being of his nature to know
    - one of the claims above + God believes no false propositions
    - for all propositions, God knows whether they are true or false
    - some might include non-propositional knowledge (ie capacity and acquaintance knowledge).
- Students may give examples (imagined or from sacred texts) of specific things that God would therefore know, or of types of knowledge that God would therefore have.
- This second part of the question is about "*The compatibility, or otherwise, of the existence of an omniscient God and free human beings*".
- This is the claim/argument that an <u>omniscient</u> God is not possible assuming that free human beings exist (and/or vice versa): God's infallible knowledge is incompatible with humans making free choices.
- This may also be expressed as a conflict that arises when combining God's omniscience with God's <u>supreme goodness,</u> if it is assumed that a good God would give human beings free will.
- Students are likely to equate free will with a human's counter-factual ability to have done otherwise than what they do (this is what has been used for the example argument below).This said, there are many accounts of free will that have been given and could be employed in relation to this question but it is impossible in this mark scheme to deal with all such possibilities.

- The argument can be presented with greater and lesser precision/detail than the version below and can be presented in other formats (e.g. it may not be presented with a conditional first premise and a conditional conclusion).
    - o P1: God is omniscient if and only if God knows all true propositions.
    - o P2: There are true propositions about the future.
    - o P3: God knows all true future propositions if and only if it is impossible for me to do otherwise than that which God knows.
    - o P4: It is impossible for me to do otherwise than that which God knows if and only if I am not free.
    - o C: Therefore, God is omniscient if and only if I am not free.
- It is trivially true that if God decides the future, and no-one can prevent God from carrying out these decisions, then God knows the future. However, if students merely put this in terms of God deciding our future without reference to his knowledge then this misses the point of the question somewhat: this is not a question about predestination.

Notes:

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

10 Does the ontological argument prove the existence of God?

[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.

Indicative content

- Conclusions may include:
    - at least one version of the ontological argument proves (conclusively) that God exists
    - all versions of the ontological argument discussed in the students answer fail to prove (conclusively) that God exists
    - some philosophers (e.g. Plantinga) have argued that the ontological argument does not *prove* the existence of God, but demonstrates the rationality of theistic belief for those committed to the truth of the premises

- Ontological arguments are a priori arguments for the existence of God (in the sense that all of the premises involved are themselves a priori). They are advanced as deductive arguments, intended to yield decisive conclusions given the truth of the premises.
- Students may define God as a 'supremely perfect' or 'maximally great being' (omnipotent, omniscient, supremely good and eternal or everlasting etc; or possibly maximally powerful, maximally good…etc). This might depend on which argument(s) they are considering.
- In terms of the types of ontological arguments that might be discussed, students will likely draw from definitional, conceptual, and modal versions. There are other versions, however, including 'experiential' and so called 'high order' arguments, though it is unlikely they will be utilised.

NB:

    - There is no overwhelming philosophical consensus on the way different ontological arguments should be classified (even famous ones), and it is recognised that certain arguments can have features of different types. The emphasis should be on the details of particular argument rather than the type they might be said to belong to.
    - Ontological arguments are distinct from arguments like Descartes's trademark argument, which are related to the (causal) *origin* of the concept of GOD (although Descartes's doctrine of innate ideas is relevant to both his trademark argument *and* his ontological argument, see below for details).

Students may discuss one or more of the following ontological arguments (with some possible objections offered below each):

Anselm's argument (a typical interpretation):
- This argument functions as a reductio ad absurdum of atheism, the "fool who says in his heart there is no God"; taking the idea of God as "that than which nothing greater can be conceived"; claiming that a being that exists in reality is greater than a being that exists in the mind alone; recognising the absurdity of conceiving of a being greater than which nothing can be conceived; and concluding that a being greater than which nothing can be conceived must exist.
    - Expect critical responses to come from Gaunilo's "lost island" / "most perfect island" argument. This has spawned a host of parodies of ontological arguments, whereby parallel arguments are constructed so as to (attempt to) mirror the logic of ontological arguments, delivering either absurd conclusions or conclusions which are antithetical to theism (e.g. arguments concluding that God cannot exist).
    - Although Aquinas wasn't responding to Anselm directly, students may discuss his influential objection to a priori arguments for the existence of God: what people understand by "God" may differ, and we do not have enough understanding of the "essence of God" for it to be either self-evident that God exists, nor for us to demonstrate God's existence from premises drawn from reflection on the divine nature.

- o Although Kant's "existence (or being) is not a predicate" objection was aimed at Cartesian ontological arguments at the time of its composition (see below), it has been used against Anselm too.

NB: Some twentieth century interpreters of Anselm (eg. Malcolm, Plantinga, and Anscombe) have rejected the relevance of Kant's classic objection to Anselm's version. It has been argued (from the *Proslogion* and Anselm's reply to Gaunilo) that he never intended "existence" to function as a "predicate" (or "perfection") when arguing for God's existence; he intended "*necessary* existence" to function as a "predicate" or "perfection", which he (reasonably) understood as a "great making property".

Descartes's argument (a typical presentation):
- 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 must (necessarily) exist.
- At times Descartes seems to treat this not as an (extended deductive) argument but instead as a self-evident intuition: it starts with an innate concept of God that we may attend to or discover within our minds (expect analogies of triangles and mountains/valleys).
- o Expect critical responses to be drawn from Hume, who argued that nothing necessarily exists, and no synthetic claims can be demonstrated a priori.
- o Kant argued that "existence/being" cannot be considered "a (real) predicate". Descartes's argument is especially vulnerable to this objection when he is interpreted as advancing an argument of the definitional variety, where "existence" appears in a list of "perfections" Descartes insists on using to define God (but one need not be committed to this understanding of Descartes).
- o Leibniz argued that there is a missing (or supressed) premise in Descartes's presentation of the argument (see next point).

Leibniz's extension of / improvement to Descartes's argument:
- Leibniz added what he saw as crucial additional premise (that the concept of God must be coherent), and he offered an argument in support of this premise (that it is coherent because perfections are simple and unanalysable, so they cannot contradict each other).
- o Responses might take the form of an attack on Leibniz's claim that there can be qualities that are simple and unanalysable.
- o The coherence of the concept of God may he challenged: alleged contradictions between God's traditional attributes/perfections, or between God's attributes/perfections and other knowledge (or intuitions) we may have about the world.

Malcolm's (modal) argument (a modern restatement / reinterpretation of Anselm):
- God is conceived as an absolutely unlimited being (this excludes contingent beings); the existence of an absolutely unlimited being is either logically necessary or logically impossible (because of some internal contradiction in its properties); there is no contradiction in this idea of God, so God's existence is not impossible; therefore God's existence is necessary.
- o Responses may centre on Malcolm's narrow understanding of what a contradiction amounts to and point to his failure to provide any explicit defence of the coherence of the idea of God (conceived as "absolutely unlimited being"), and that coherence might indeed be challenged (see previous points).
- o It might be objected that Malcolm relies on a false dichotomy (God either exists by logical necessity *or* is logically impossible), and that he confuses two notions of "necessity": 1) necessity as a property of God, *should such a being exist*; and 2) necessity as a logical (sure and certain)

truth, in this case centring on *whether something must exist* (in all possible worlds). One might accept that necessity belongs to the idea of *God* and that it would be true of God if God exists, and yet deny Malcom's existential / ontological inference.

     <u>Plantinga's (modal) argument:</u>

- Plantinga understands God as a "maximally great being" (with all "great making properties": omnipotence, omniscience, supreme goodness etc); this being exists in one possible world (the concept of a "maximally great being" is logically consistent/coherent); but for a being to be "maximally great" it would have to exist with all its "great making" properties in every possible world; since such a being exists in at least one possible world, it must therefore exist in every possible world.
  - Some respondents to Plantinga have questioned the principle of modal logic underlying the argument that "if a maximally great being" exists in one possible world then such a being "must exist in every possible world."
  - More likely, students' responses will revolve around whether the existence of a "maximally great being" is possible (again, doubts about the coherence of the idea may be raised).

Notes:

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.