

GCE

Religious Studies

Unit **G571**: Philosophy of Religion

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2014

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 2014

Annotations

| Annotation | Meaning |
|---|---|
|  | Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response. |
|  | 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. |

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Handling of unexpected answers

If you are not sure how to apply the mark scheme to an answer, you should contact your Team Leader.

NOTE: AO2 material in AO1 answers must not be cross-credited and vice-versa.

| Question | | Indicative Content | | Guidance |
|----------|-----|---|----|---|
| 1 | (a) | <p>Candidates may begin their responses by looking at the views of Augustine who in attempting to explain the existence of evil in a world, itself made good, looks at two events – the Fall of Angels and the Fall of Man. In the first, certain angels, led by Lucifer, chose to reject God. In their choice – which was not the choice of God – they introduced the evil of denial and fell into Hell. Subsequently, Adam and Eve, in the Garden of Eden, chose to reject God’s command. For their act of defiance they were punished by expulsion from the place of bliss.</p> <p>For Augustine, the punishment continues to our own day. All evil, for Augustine, is either the result of sin or punishment for sin. Mankind is punished because all mankind was seminally present in the loins of Adam. Natural evil flows from the disorder brought into the fabric of the universe by the original sin of our ancestors, both human and angelic.</p> <p>Free will is seen to be important as had Adam and Eve chosen differently evil might not have come into our world. Moral evil continues today because of free choices of humans to do evil (part of original sin: ‘result of sin’)</p> <p>Candidates should address both parts of the question to achieve Level 4.</p> | 25 | Some candidates may choose other theodicies such as those of Aquinas, Irenaeus or Hick which would be equally acceptable. Others may describe some of the views of Process theologians. |
| 1 | (b) | <p>Candidates may or may not agree with this statement. Credit should be given for the justification of their view. Some, for example, may argue that while Augustine's</p> | 10 | Credit should be given for evaluation and analysis, rather than for further description of theodicies. |

| Question | | Indicative Content | | Guidance |
|----------|-----|---|----|--|
| | | <p>argument is basically flawed, Irenaeus may not fail if one held that God while giving us free will is looking for us to develop to our full potential.</p> <p>Others may simply hold the view that there is so much evil in our world that no benevolent God could possibly exist. Views express by thinkers such as Richard Swinburne, Peter Vardy, Michael Ruse, J.L. Mackie, D.Z. Phillips, John Hick, Dostoevsky or Richard Dawkins may be put to good use in these responses.</p> | | |
| 2 | (a) | <p>Candidates are likely to recognise that there are a number of views which can come under the umbrella of 'Creationist'. Flat Earth creationists, for example, would take a very literal view of the Genesis description of the world; namely that the earth is flat and covered with a firmament or solid dome. The way the writers of Genesis explain the waters in the vault above and below, for example, leads to a belief in the upper vault being the source of the Flood faced by Noah.</p> <p>Candidates may also explore the Young-Earth creationists, who hold that the age of the earth is between 6,000 and 10,000 years and that all life was created in six days, and by day they mean twenty-four hours. The way of working the date of creation out could be to count the generations from Adam and Eve. Archbishop Ussher in fact tied it down to a particular date; he thought that creation began at nightfall preceding Sunday October 23rd 4004 BC.</p> | 25 | There are other acceptable ways to answer the question. Candidates may choose to use scientific, philosophical, biblical or theological approaches. Such answers should be appropriately credited. |

| Question | | Indicative Content | | Guidance |
|----------|-----|--|----|--|
| | | <p>Others may explain the Omphalos argument which argues that the appearance of age was put in the world by God despite the earth actually being young.</p> <p>Finally candidates may explain that among Creationists it is generally accepted that Progressive Creationism, a form of Old Earth creationism, is the most popular view. A great deal of modern science can be incorporated into this position where the Big Bang can be seen as evidence of the creative power of God. However they would not hold with progressive evolution, believing rather that God created 'kinds' of organisms in the order seen in the fossil record and that newer 'kinds' were specially created, not mutated from earlier forms. Some Progressivists believe in evolution within species, but not in new species.</p> | | |
| 2 | (b) | <p>Those who hold with the Progressive Creationist view may start by assessing the way the Big Bang theory could be included within their views.</p> <p>Alternatively candidates may simply explore the differences in general between those who think that no explanation beyond God is necessary and those who would argue for a more empirical position that only accepts scientific evidence when it comes to explaining the universe.</p> <p>Some may point out that the Big Bang theory is still just a theory which some scientists have recently doubted.</p> | 10 | Credit should be given for evaluation and analysis which moves beyond mere listing of views. |

| Question | | Indicative Content | | Guidance |
|----------|-----|--|----|--|
| 3 | (a) | <p>Candidates may begin with a summary of St. Thomas Aquinas' first 3 ways: First Way - The Argument From Motion; Second Way - Causation of Existence and the Third Way - Contingent and Necessary Objects. Alternatively they may simply summarise the idea of the Cosmological argument as expressed by Aquinas.</p> <p>Candidates may then explore the way that Copleston builds on part of Aquinas' argument, drawing heavily on Leibniz' Principle of Sufficient Reason: see quotation opposite. Candidates are likely to describe a simpler form of the contingency argument than that of Leibniz.</p> | 25 | <p>'I'll divide the argument into distinct stages. First of all, I should say, we know that there are at least some beings in the world which do not contain in themselves the reason for their existence. For example, I depend on my parents, and now on the air, and on food, and so on. Now, secondly, the world is simply the real or imagined totality or aggregate of individual objects, none of which contain in themselves alone the reason for their existence. There isn't any world distinct from the objects which form it, any more than the human race is something apart from the members. Therefore, I should say, since objects or events exist, and since no object of experience contains within itself reason of its existence, this reason, the totality of objects, must have a reason external to itself. That reason must be an existent being. Well, this being is either itself the reason for its own existence, or it is not. If it is, well and good. If it is not, then we must proceed farther. But if we proceed to infinity in that sense, then there's no explanation of existence at all. So, I should say, in order to explain existence, we must come to a being which contains within itself the reason for its own existence, that is to say, which cannot not exist.' (F.C.Copleston).</p> <p>Candidates should explain distinctive features of both Aquinas and Copleston to achieve Level 4.</p> |
| 3 | (b) | <p>Candidates may begin by analysing why Hume says that Aquinas has made a mistake in the way this argument was put together. He argues from the Fallacy of Composition that just because there is a common property to a group doesn't mean that property must apply to the group as a</p> | 10 | <p>It is important that credit should be given for discussion of Hume and the Cosmological Argument. There may be irrelevant material on other arguments.</p> |

| Question | | Indicative Content | | Guidance |
|----------|-----|---|----|---|
| | | <p>whole. Just because every event in a series has a cause, doesn't mean the series itself has a cause.</p> <p>Hume also said that we have no experience of a universe being created and so we cannot talk meaningfully about it.</p> <p>Hume also rejected the idea of necessary existence – every being, according to Hume is contingent. Hume questions why motion needs to have a starting point - in other words why infinite regression is impossible. Surely if there can be an understanding of a prime mover there can be an understanding of perpetual motion?</p> <p>It is important that candidates assess and analyse Hume's views in relation to the Cosmological Argument and that they do not just summarise them.</p> | | |
| 4 | (a) | <p>Candidates may begin by explaining that Aristotle was a Greek philosopher who arrived at the concept of the Prime Mover through his observations of cause and effect. They may explain his idea of the four causes or they may simply discuss the Prime Mover itself using something like the cat and milk analogy. It important that candidates recognise that Aristotle's Prime Mover acts as Final Cause, by attraction, not as the Creator/Mover of Aquinas' First Way.</p> <p>Some may then explore the links between the Prime Mover and the Judaeo-Christian concept of the creator God as presented in the Old Testament, such as that they are transcendent, eternal and seen as perfectly good, but the Biblical God also has the qualities of interaction and</p> | 25 | The question does require comparison of the two views, pointing out similarities and differences. |

| Question | | Indicative Content | | Guidance |
|----------|-----|--|----|----------|
| | | <p>involvement with creation.</p> <p>Some candidates may spend some time exploring this difference between a god who is only interested in contemplating himself and a God who is intimately involved with each part of his creation.</p> | | |
| 4 | (b) | <p>Candidates are clearly free to support or critique either or both views expressed in this statement in any relevant way. Some may, for example, analyse the idea that there is so little evidence of a God in the universe that the idea that there is a God at all is more believable if he is distant and uninterested in his creation.</p> <p>Alternatively others may assess the way that religious believers over the centuries have found evidence of a God who appears not only to have all the attributes of the God of classical theism but who is intimately involved in the lives of those he created.</p> | 10 | |

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 2014

