

1: What does Aquinas mean by 'motion', when he refers to it in his 1st Way argument? [3 Marks]

AO1 = 3

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
3	A full and correct answer, given precisely, with little or no redundancy.
2	The substantive content of the answer is correct, but there may be some redundancy or minor imprecision.
1	Relevant, but fragmented, points.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content:

For Aquinas, 'motion' is more than simply movement, but rather changing between two states. Students might refer to Aquinas' example of wood catching fire and changing from cool (actual state) to hot (potential state)

Two marks if reference is made to actual/potential, but it is still described as "movement" rather than change

No marks if there is no implication he means "change".

2: Outline how the Kalām argument can be used to prove God’s existence [5 Marks]

AO1 = 5

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
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):
 - P1: Everything that begins to exist has a cause (of its existence)
 - P2: The universe (ie complete physical reality) began to exist
 - 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:
 - P3: The cause of the universe’s existence must be distinct from the universe
 - 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:
 - In defence of P1 students may mention the inconceivability / implausibility of things merely ‘popping into existence.’
 - 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.
- 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.
-

3: Explain how inductive and deductive arguments for the existence of God differ [5 marks]

AO1 = 5

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
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 choose to answer this by discussing what in general makes an argument for God fit into either of these categories, or they may use one or more specific examples of arguments to explain the difference.

The following table indicates the sort of content we would expect to see in responses:

	Inductive argument for the existence of God	Deductive argument for the existence of God
Type of argument / conclusion	An inductive argument is one where the argument is intended to be strong.	A deductive argument is one where the argument is intended by the proponent to be valid.
	An inductively strong argument: if the premises are true, the conclusion is probable (it is possible for the premises to be true and the conclusion to be false).	A deductively valid argument: if the premises are true, the conclusion must be true (it is impossible for the premises to be true and the conclusion to be false).
	An inductively strong argument with actually true premises is “cogent”.	A deductively valid argument with actually true premises is “sound”.
	An inductive argument provides reasons at best to believe that the conclusion is probably true.	A deductive argument provides reasons to believe that the conclusion is certainly true.
Application to the existence of God	Successful inductive arguments for God at best establish God’s probable existence.	Successful deductive arguments for God establish the existence of God with certainty.
Clear examples from the specification that may be used	Analogical design argument (as presented by Hume). Swinburne’s abductive/analogical design argument.	Anselm’s, Descartes’ and Malcolm’s ontological arguments; Descartes’ cosmological argument/s (my mind’s continuous existence and the “trademark” argument); and any of Aquinas’s first three ways (from motion/change, from efficient causality, from possibility and necessity).
More complicated / controversial examples	Paley’s design argument Though some have historically interpreted it as analogical... ...the standard current interpretation is that it is deductive. Plus, regardless of whether the argument for a designer is deductive or	

	inductive, the further inference from “designer” to “God” (as traditionally understood) if not intended to be valid would then be inductive.	
	Most cosmological arguments are more difficult to characterise:	
	The first stage of proving a first cause/first beginner/prime mover/first changer/necessary being is deductive (intended to be valid).	There may then be differences between whether the proponents of such arguments see the next step to this being God as deductive or inductive.

- Students are not required to explain what such arguments have in common – ie that they are arguments for the existence of God. However, some might explain what is meant by God’s existence in this context (ie, what kind of being’s existence these arguments are intending to establish).
 - A being with a large proportion of the following characteristics (there is obviously dispute over the characteristics): omnipotent, omniscient, omnibenevolent/morally perfect, eternal or everlasting.
 - Or, in more generally terms: a supremely perfect being (Descartes); the greatest conceivable being (Anselm); an unlimited being (Malcolm).
- There is disagreement about how the term ‘inductive argument’ should be understood. Some understand abductive and or analogical arguments as being types of inductive argument. Some see one or both of these as being distinct from inductive arguments. We will accept all such interpretations.

NB: Students who progress to Level 3 and beyond will apply the distinction between the types of argument with specific reference to arguments for the existence of God.

•

4: Outline Descartes' argument based on his continuing existence and how Hume might challenge it [12 marks]

AO1= 12

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
10–12	The answer is set out in a precise, fully-integrated and logical form. The content is correct and demonstrates detailed understanding. Points are made clearly and precisely. Relevance is sustained, with very little or no redundancy. Philosophical language is used precisely throughout.
7–9	The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct and demonstrates detailed understanding. The content is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely. Any lack of clarity with respect to particular points is not sufficient to detract from the answer. Relevance is largely sustained. There may be some redundancy, though not sufficient to detract from the answer. Philosophical language is used correctly throughout.
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 and most points are made clearly. Relevance is not always sustained and there is some redundancy. Philosophical language is used correctly, with any minor errors not detracting from the response.
1–3	There are some relevant points made, but no integration. Some points are clear, but there is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant. Philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

Outline Descartes' argument based on his continuing existence:

- Descartes' cosmological ('Trademark') argument: students may discuss either or both of the following arguments (though for Descartes they are two parts of one overall argument):
 - (1) God as cause of my idea of God: I have an idea of a supremely perfect being (ie God): that is, an infinite being. By the 'causal adequacy principle' (ie that there must be at least as much (total) reality in the cause as in the effect), I cannot be the cause of this idea as I am finite. Only God could be the cause of this idea and so God must exist.
 - (2) God as cause of my existence (with an idea of God in my mind): I exist as a being with an idea of a supremely perfect being. The only possible cause of my existence as such is God. I cannot be the cause of myself as I would then be God and I know I am not. No other being(s) could be the cause because either the question would be raised about them (leading to a regress) or they could not account for the idea of God that I have. Nor can I have no cause, as a cause is needed to sustain anything finite from one moment to the next.

and how Hume might challenge it:

- It is not the case that everything needs a cause/explanation (or at least we cannot know whether it is the case a priori or a posteriori)
- our inferences from effects to causes are based on repeated observations (Hume – 'constant conjunctions') between two events. However, in the case of the universe, we only have experience of one universe and therefore cannot legitimately make any inference to a purposeful cause (unlike human creations, which we have so much experience of). We can never tell, from a single instance of an event, what the cause is, let alone that it is an intelligent, purposeful agency. To make an inference

about the production of universes we would need to have experience of many universes, which we lack.

- Could also use the copy principle and how we do not have a clear and distinct idea of a perfect/infinite God as we do not have an impression of God. Instead the ideas of infinity and perfection are complex ideas, gained from extending the impressions we have of actions we think are good and of large things/long time.

5: How successful is the design argument in proving the existence of God? [25 marks]

AO1 = 5, AO2 = 20

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
21–25	<p>The student argues with clear intent throughout and the logic of the argument is sustained.</p> <p>The student demonstrates detailed and precise understanding throughout.</p> <p>The conclusion is clear, with the arguments in support of it stated precisely, integrated coherently and robustly defended.</p> <p>Arguments and counter-arguments are stated in their strongest forms. Reasoned judgements are made, on an ongoing basis and overall, about the weight to be given to each argument. Crucial arguments are clearly identified against less crucial ones.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used precisely throughout.</p>
16–20	<p>The student argues with clear intent throughout and the logic of the argument is largely sustained.</p> <p>The content is correct and detailed – though not always consistently.</p> <p>The conclusion is clear, with a range of appropriate arguments supporting it.</p> <p>Arguments are generally stated in their strongest forms. There is a balancing of arguments, with weight being given to each – so crucial arguments are noted against less crucial ones. Arguments and counter-arguments are stated clearly, integrated coherently and defended.</p> <p>There may be trivial mistakes, as long as they do not detract from the argument.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly throughout.</p>
11–15	<p>A clear response to the question, in the form of an argument, demonstrating intent.</p> <p>The content is detailed and correct and most of it is integrated.</p> <p>A conclusion and reasons are given and those reasons clearly support the conclusion. There might be a lack of clarity/precision about the logic of the argument as a whole.</p> <p>Arguments and counter-arguments are given, but there may be a lack of balance. Not all arguments are stated in their strongest forms. Stronger and weaker arguments are noted and there are attempts to identify the weight to be given to different arguments, but not necessarily those which are crucial to the conclusion.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly, with any minor errors not detracting from the argument.</p>
6–10	<p>The response to the question is given in the form of an argument, but not fully coherently.</p> <p>The content is largely correct, though there are some gaps and a lack of detail. Relevant points are recognised/identified, but not integrated.</p> <p>Alternative positions are identified, but not precisely. Counter-arguments might be stated in weak forms or even slightly misrepresented. Arguments and counter-arguments are juxtaposed, so similarities and contrasts identified, rather than their impact being clear.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used throughout, though not always fully correctly and/or consistently.</p>
1–5	<p>There is little evidence of an argument.</p> <p>There may be missing content, substantial gaps in the content or the content may be one-sided.</p> <p>There may be a conclusion and several reasonable points may be made. There may be some connections between the points, but there is no clear relationship between the points and the conclusion.</p> <p>There is some basic use of philosophical language.</p>
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content:

Conclusions may include:

- **SUCCESSFUL:** some version of the design argument proves the existence of God (either conclusively or to a high degree of probability)
- **PARTIALLY SUCCESSFUL:** some version of the design argument proves the existence of a designer (either conclusively or to a high degree of probability), but not necessarily the God of classical theism / the Abrahamic traditions.
- **UNSUCCESSFUL:** no version of the design argument proves the existence of God nor a designer of any kind.

- Students are free to determine the scope of their response. They may focus on one or several versions of the argument.
- Students may explain general features of arguments from design at the outset:
 - they are teleological: concerned with the 'ends', 'goals', or 'purposes of phenomena in nature;
 - they are a posteriori, arguing from observable features of the universe to the existence of a being (God) who designed the universe;
 - they are generally inductive: striving to deliver probable conclusions in favour of God/a designer's existence.
- Design arguments are sometimes divided up into those that focus on instances of spatial regularity and those that focus on temporal regularity, although they can also be used in combination.
- Students are likely to select from the following arguments and responses.

The design argument from analogy (as presented by Hume)

- P1: In the organisation of parts for a purpose nature resembles the products of human design
- P2: Similar effects have similar causes
- P3: The cause of the products of human design is an intelligent mind that intended the design
- P4: A designer must be distinct from what is designed
- C1: Therefore, the cause of nature is an intelligent mind that (a) intended the design and (b) is distinct from what is designed
- C2: Therefore an intelligent designer (God) exists.

- Students may also make the point that the works of nature are so much more complex than the works of humanity that the designer of nature must be much greater and therefore possess some (or all) of the attributes of the God of classical theism.

Paley's design argument: argument from spatial order/purpose

- Students may interpret Paley's argument as a deductive argument, as follows:
 - P1: Anything that has parts organised to serve a purpose is designed
 - P2: Nature contains things which have parts that are organised to serve a purpose
 - C1: Therefore, nature contains things which are designed (from premises 1 and 2)
 - P3: Design can only be explained in terms of a designer
 - P4: A designer must (a) be or have a mind and (b) be distinct from what is designed
 - C2: Therefore, nature was designed by a mind that is distinct from nature. (from 3, 4 and 5)
 - C3: Therefore, such a mind (God) exists

- Alternatively, students may take this as an inductive argument, whereby ‘parts organised for a purpose’ are most likely explained by intelligent agency. This is likely to be explained in conjunction with the ‘watch maker’ analogy.
- Some students will also take Paley to be advancing a more straight forward argument from analogy, comparing with world with machines, much like Hume’s. This should be credited, but consider whether they are actually saying anything different from any account of Hume they may have given.

Swinburne’s design argument: argument from temporal order/regularity

- Swinburne presents an inductive design argument. This features analogy, but its 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.
 - 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 explanatory hypotheses: (H1) temporal order has a scientific explanation; or (H2) temporal order has a personal explanation (eg explaining the singing of a 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.
 - C1: Therefore, an agent probably exists (God) with immense power and intelligence, who is free and disembodied.
- Students may add that Swinburne sees several main advantages to this approach over arguments from spatial order:
 - temporal order cannot be explained in terms of evolution in the way that spatial order can;
 - there is no temporal disorder to account for (the laws of nature are unchanging) as there is spatial disorder (eg blindness)
 - spatial order presupposes temporal order: evolution requires there to be laws of nature.
- Students may add that God is the simplest hypothesis with reference to:
- God’s uniqueness - it is simpler to suppose one God than many;
- God’s infinitude - it is simpler for God to have unlimited (eg) power: any finite degree of power would require an explanation (why that value?);
- God’s uncreated nature because - there would otherwise be an infinite regress.

Issues that may arise for the arguments above, including:

Hume's objections to the design argument from analogy, including:

- the analogy made is weak – the universe is more like a vegetable than a ‘watch or knitting-loom’;
- regress argument: if order in the universe is explained by order in the ideas of a mind that order itself needs explaining, and so a regress of “universes of ideas” threatens the supposed simplicity of invoking God as an explanation;
- there is a ‘great disproportion’ between a part of the universe and the whole universe that undermines the inference that something similar to human intelligence caused the universe;
- even if we could infer from part to whole, there is no good reason to choose design by an intelligent mind as the explanation of the whole universe;
- if the analogy is followed faithfully, it would result in many non-theistic conclusions; for example:
 - as the universe is finite we cannot infer an infinite cause;

- the existence of spatial disorder (see below) would support an inference to a cause that was not omnipotent and omniscient but one that makes mistakes;
- designers are not always creators (e.g. architects), and they work with pre-existing materials: the God of classic theism is associated with the doctrine of creation ex nihilo, and the design argument does not demonstrate that;
- just as human objects are created by many individuals, it would be rational to infer that the universe was made by a pantheon of gods;
- we always find minds connected to bodies, but God is meant to be incorporeal;
- human designers often die whilst their creations continue – thus God might not be eternal.

The problem of spatial disorder (as posed by Hume and Paley):

- the universe contains vast areas of space in which there exists ‘spatial disorder’ – i.e. no organisation of parts/no purpose or organisation that serves a purpose ineffectively. As the design argument is meant to explain the whole universe, it is not clear why spatial order should be prioritised over spatial disorder in the arguments that focus on this type of order.

The design argument fails as it is an argument from a unique case (Hume):

- our inferences from effects to causes are based on repeated observations (Hume – ‘constant conjunctions’) between two events. However, in the case of the universe, we only have experience of one universe and therefore cannot legitimately make any inference to a purposeful cause (unlike human creations, which we have so much experience of). We can never tell, from a single instance of an event, what the cause is, let alone that it is an intelligent, purposeful agency. To make an inference about the production of universes we would need to have experience of many universes, which we lack.

Whether God is the best or only explanation:

- In order to infer that there is a designer of nature, we have to rule out other possible explanations of the organisation of parts for a purpose, and these other possible explanations may be no less (or more) plausible/probable; for example:
 - if we assume that matter is finite and time infinite then, over enough time all possible combinations of matter would occur by chance;
 - the theory of evolution by natural selection has the benefit of being a simple explanation as it does not ‘multiply entities beyond necessity’ (Ockham’s Razor), working as it does with natural processes alone
 - the existence of the universe (including instances of both spatial and temporal order) is a brute fact that requires no further explanation.
- On the other hand, students may reject these naturalistic explanations and appeal to the fine-tuning argument: the many other ways the universe could have been and which would not have led to intelligent life, so there is something special about ours (Swinburne’s card-shuffling machine example may be deployed here).