

GCE

Religious Studies

Unit **G571**: Philosophy of Religion

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.








All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Level one – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level two – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level three – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level four – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level five – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Highlighting a section of the response that is irrelevant to the awarding of the mark.
	Point has been seen and noted, e.g. where part of an answer is at the end of the script.

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
1	a	<p>Explain why some philosophers believe that God is responsible for everything that happens in the universe.</p> <p>There are a number of different approaches which candidates might take to this question. They could for example look at the implications that God is omniscient and omnipotent and therefore fully responsible for the state of the universe and all the good and bad that it contains. This would entail explaining what these beliefs say about believers' understanding of God. Candidates might use appropriate evidence from the Bible to illustrate this.</p> <p>They may for example say that having created the particular universe we live in he would have been aware of the issues, such as suffering and evil, that it is perceived to contain and therefore takes responsibility for the consequences of this creation.</p> <p>Some candidates might decide to use their knowledge of the Cosmological Argument from Aquinas to build their discussion of God's nature and responsibility. Others might use Aristotle's views on the nature of God as a comparison to the description of God found in the Jewish Scriptures.</p> <p>Given the openness of this question it is important that examiners credit any relevant approach, whether the candidate has gone for depth or breadth.</p>	25	Candidates who make evaluative points to argue that God is not responsible for everything that happens in the universe cannot be credited for this approach.

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
1	b	<p>'It is not possible for something to have come out of nothing.' Discuss</p> <p>Candidates may use just their Biblical knowledge and focus their evaluation on the reliability of the Genesis myth. They could, for example, say that, as science has never been able to demonstrate that something can be brought out of nothing, then this story is just a primitive people trying to understand a complex and frightening universe. They could consider Biblical images of a potter to suggest that <i>creatio ex nihilo</i> is not in line with the portrayal of God in the Bible.</p> <p>Others may evaluate the view that this teaching is drawn from the Gnostic views that all material is evil and that therefore God could not have used pre-existent mater to create a universe.</p> <p>Credit should be given for any valid evaluation but not for more description of the issues.</p>	10	<p>Candidates may approach this question through the Cosmological Argument and discuss Aquinas' view where he argues that there cannot be an infinite regression or they may discuss Leibniz' principle of sufficient reason.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
2	a	<p>Explain the teleological argument for the existence of God.</p> <p>This formulation of the question should allow candidates to use any of the teleological arguments they have learned in their explanation or a combination of them. Some may use Aquinas and explain through his analogies, such as the archer, why it might be possible to say that the universe not only shows evidence of design but also of purpose.</p> <p>Many are likely to use Paley's watch argument as a way into explaining the search for God through evidence of organisation in the universe and a sense that it has a purpose. It is important that these candidates go beyond just a description of the rock and the watch to how Paley was using analogy to form his argument. Credit should be given to Paley's other examples, such as the eye, as well as his consideration of the regularity of the universe.</p> <p>Others may use more modern attempts to use this kind of argument. It is even possible if they want to use the idea of irreducible complexity to demonstrate belief in the idea of design and purpose at the molecular level, provided they point towards design and not just creationism.</p>	25	

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
2	b	<p>To what extent is believing the universe has a purpose just an illusion?</p> <p>Again candidates can approach their responses from a number of angles depending, possibly, on the particular version of the teleological argument they have explained in part a.</p> <p>However, the use of the word illusion may lead some candidates to another approach. For example, they may use the ideas of Freud and explore the idea that all religion is an illusion as it is based on wish fulfilment and fear of death. If they do however they should demonstrate why they believe his ideas undermine the design argument and not just point to his criticisms of religion in general.</p> <p>Some may suggest, from their Platonic studies, that all this world is an illusion and therefore the idea that it has a design is also an illusion and therefore it is not possible to use what we 'see' as evidence of order and purpose.</p>	10	

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
3	a	<p>Explain the philosophical problems caused by believing that human beings are morally aware.</p> <p>Many candidates are likely to approach this question as an explanation of the significance of human moral awareness in the writings of either Kant or Freud or both.</p> <p>They might for example explore the constituent parts of Kant's moral argument which depends at its root on a belief in the common moral awareness in all human beings. They may discuss the importance of the categorical imperative in Kant's thinking and the significance of being able to universalise the maxim which underlies all morality to lead to the postulation of the existence of God. Following this, candidates might explain some problems of this approach.</p> <p>For example, this may lead to an exploration of the problems raised for this position by Freud's views of the source of human moral awareness. They might discuss his beliefs about the Oedipus Complex and the effects of guilt on the human mind. These views clearly raise issues for the existence of God as well as universalisability.</p>	25	<p>Candidates who merely explain the moral argument or some other aspect of Kantian ethics but without moving on to discuss the philosophical problems that arise from this cannot be credited beyond level 2.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
3	b	<p>'Kant's understanding of morality is the best explanation for the existence of moral awareness.' Discuss.</p> <p>Kant's understanding of morality might be described as the antithesis of Freud's. While a little explanation may be needed in this response, candidates should focus on whether or not Kant has the best explanation and use any new material they introduce to help them to form their argument. For example, is Kant justified in his view that there is an unconditional moral law that applies to all moral beings and is independent of any personal motive or desire?</p> <p>Others may explore his thoughts on the categorical imperative and assess the idea that maxims being universalised leads to the correct moral decisions and whether or not our moral awareness comes from a sense of duty.</p> <p>Others may examine his ideas that all should be treated at all times as ends and not as means and the extent to which this demonstrates an objective moral law, understandable through reason but seen in practice in daily life.</p>	10	

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
4	a	<p>Explain how Augustine justified the existence of moral evil.</p> <p>Some candidates may begin by explaining the nature of the problem of evil in general, for example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If God is all powerful, he would be able to abolish evil. 2. If God is all-loving, then he would wish to abolish evil. 3. But evil exists. Therefore, God is not all-powerful, or not all-loving, or both. <p>Augustine saw moral evil specifically as being brought about by the free choices of human beings. So the evils of war, murder, sexual abuse and all sorts of moral weakness come under this understanding of suffering. His ideas about the effects of free choice go back to the story of Adam and Eve which Augustine would not have seen as a myth.</p> <p>Candidates may use his <i>City of God</i> where he speaks of the angelic battle in heaven and the fall to eternal darkness for those angels who side with Satan against God. Then Satan, the Father of Lies and the Tempter, seduces Eve into disobeying God and leading Adam into the same disobedience.</p> <p>The emphasis for Augustine is on the playing out of our free will. Candidates might contextualise Augustine's theodicy by mentioning natural evil but it is important that the focus of the answer remains on moral evil.</p>	25	

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
4	b	<p>To what extent does the existence of moral evil prove that God does not exist?</p> <p>Some may make the distinction that the existence of moral evil is only a problem for the God of classical theism and that there may be a God who is not, for example, omnipotent and therefore the problem is not an issue.</p> <p>Others may assess the extent to which Augustine's free will defence is successful. They may take the line that the sheer quantity of evil in the world is not justified by arguments of either free will or the opportunity to become the likeness of God. Alternatively, they may suggest that the exercise of free will is sufficient justification for God to allow moral evil to continue.</p> <p>If candidates do explore the Irenaean ideas of growing and maturing through suffering they may use the critiques put forward by DZ Phillips of the concept of a God who uses evil as a teaching method.</p> <p>Others may also use the ideas of John Hick that the existence of hell as a punishment for moral evil may be used as a proof that the God of classical theism does not exist.</p>	10	<p>It is important that candidates realise that the question is focused on whether evil is a disproof of God. Candidates merely giving strengths and weaknesses of theodicies are unlikely to access higher levels.</p>

AS Levels of Response

Level	Mark /25	AO1	Mark /10	AO2
0	0	absent/no relevant material	0	absent/no argument
1	1–5	almost completely ignores the question <input type="checkbox"/> little relevant material <input type="checkbox"/> some concepts inaccurate <input type="checkbox"/> shows little knowledge of technical terms L1	1–2	very little argument or justification of viewpoint <input type="checkbox"/> little or no successful analysis <input type="checkbox"/> views asserted with no justification L1
Communication: often unclear or disorganised; can be difficult to - understand; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
2	6–10	A basic attempt to address the question <input type="checkbox"/> knowledge limited and partially accurate <input type="checkbox"/> limited understanding <input type="checkbox"/> might address the general topic rather than the question directly <input type="checkbox"/> selection often inappropriate <input type="checkbox"/> limited use of technical terms L2	3–4	a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint <input type="checkbox"/> some analysis, but not successful <input type="checkbox"/> views asserted but little justification L2
Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts - spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
3	11–15	satisfactory attempt to address the question <input type="checkbox"/> some accurate knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> appropriate understanding <input type="checkbox"/> some successful selection of material <input type="checkbox"/> some accurate use of technical terms L3	5–6	the argument is sustained and justified <input type="checkbox"/> some successful analysis which may be implicit <input type="checkbox"/> views asserted but not fully justified L3
Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts - spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
4	16–20	a good attempt to address the question <input type="checkbox"/> accurate knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> good understanding <input type="checkbox"/> good selection of material <input type="checkbox"/> technical terms mostly accurate L4	7–8	a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument <input type="checkbox"/> some successful and clear analysis <input type="checkbox"/> some effective use of evidence <input type="checkbox"/> views analysed and developed L4
Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole - spelling, punctuation and grammar good				

5	21–25	<p>A very good/excellent attempt to address the question showing understanding and engagement with the material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information <input type="checkbox"/> accurate use of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;">L5</p>	9–10	<p>A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> comprehends the demands of the question <input type="checkbox"/> uses a range of evidence <input type="checkbox"/> shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints <p style="text-align: right;">L5</p>
Communication: answer is well constructed and organised - easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good				

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2017

