



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

AUTUMN 2021

**A LEVEL
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 2
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF
RELIGION
A120U20-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2021 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- “Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.”
- “This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.”

Rules for Marking

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.
2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.
3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

Banded mark schemes

Banded mark schemes are divided so that each band has a relevant descriptor. The descriptor provides a description of the performance level for that band. Each band contains marks. Examiners should first read and annotate a candidate's answer to pick out the evidence that is being assessed in that question. Once the annotation is complete, the mark scheme can be applied. This is done as a two-stage process.

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

When deciding on a band, the answer should be viewed holistically. Beginning at the lowest band, examiners should look at the candidate's answer and check whether it matches the descriptor for that band. Examiners should look at the descriptor for that band and see if it matches the qualities shown in the candidate's answer. If the descriptor at the lowest band is satisfied, examiners should move up to the next band and repeat this process for each band until the descriptor matches the answer.

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a 'best fit' approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content. Examiners should not seek to mark candidates down as a result of small omissions in minor areas of an answer.

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

Once the band has been decided, examiners can then assign a mark. During standardising (at the Examiners' marking conference), detailed advice from the Principal Examiner on the qualities of each mark band will be given. Examiners will then receive examples of answers in each mark band that have been awarded a mark by the Principal Examiner. Examiners should mark the examples and compare their marks with those of the Principal Examiner.

When marking, examiners can use these examples to decide whether a candidate's response is of a superior, inferior or comparable standard to the example. Examiners are reminded of the need to revisit the answer as they apply the mark scheme in order to confirm that the band and the mark allocated is appropriate to the response provided. Indicative content is also provided for banded mark schemes. Indicative content is not exhaustive, and any other valid points must be credited. In order to reach the highest bands of the mark scheme a learner need not cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content, but must meet the requirements of the highest mark band.

Awarding no marks to a response

Where a response is not creditworthy, that is it contains nothing of any relevance to the question, or where no response has been provided, no marks should be awarded.

A Level Generic Band Descriptors

Band	Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions [20 marks] <i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i> - <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> - <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> - <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> - <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i>
5	17-20 marks • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied. • An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	13-16 marks • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied. • A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	9-12 marks • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied. • A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	5-8 marks • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied. • A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Some accurate use of some specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	1-4 marks • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought. • Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'
0	• No relevant information.

Band	Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions [30 marks] <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5	25-30 marks • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context. • Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	19-24 marks • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context. • Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	13-18 marks • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context. • Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	7-12 marks • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Basic use of the views of scholars/schools of thought appropriately and in context. • Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	1-6 marks • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought. • Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	• No relevant analysis or evaluation.

A LEVEL COMPONENT 2: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

AUTUMN 2021 MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic level descriptors provided.

Section A

1. (a) Examine different inherent problems of religious language.

[AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates should examine a variety of things particular to religious language which may be deemed to be problematic.
- Religious language often deals with metaphysical words which are hard to understand or rationalise, for example an 'infinite' and 'timeless' God. Our human words are very limited when trying to describe things of a religious nature.
- This may mean that sacred texts and religious pronouncements are unintelligible. In addition, words we use in religious language may have a completely different meaning in a different context, for example, spirit. This leads to a partial image or a distorted, anthropomorphic view of God. If a religious experience is ineffable then this would suggest that no form of language can do the experience justice and therefore is ultimately meaningless.
- Some words or phrases defy logic, such as omnipotent or Virgin Birth. In today's world we do demand sense and ask for empirical data. The problem here is that religious language may need to be given 'special' and some would say unwarranted consideration which would not be accepted for any other language.
- Also, as religious language discusses terms such as the afterlife and concepts such as a variety of rituals. These may be unintelligible to those who are not religious. Not only could one say that the afterlife cannot be verified but also when rituals are accompanied by words, these words may make no sense to many people.
- A further problem is that there is no common shared base and experience within religions. All may claim 'the truth' but how can they all be true? How do we discern the truth from amongst them? For some, there is no possibility of verification of any religious claim.
- Some say that religious language cannot be verified or falsified and is therefore meaningless. Reference could be made to Hume's fork. Hume said that those sentences that are neither of these are nothing but 'sophistry and illusion.'
- The Vienna Circle followed Hume and caused serious problems for religious language. The Verification Principle said that only meaningful sentences are tautologies or those which can be verified.
- Another problem would be to consider whether religious language should be used literally or non-literally, cognitively or non-cognitively.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

1. (b) **‘Religious philosophers have solved the inherent problems of religious language.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may answer this question from a variety of perspectives which will be outlined below. The examiner should not look for all of these approaches and the higher bands can be awarded to a candidate who adopts a selection of the possible types of material.
- One line of reasoning is to suggest that religious philosophers have solved the problems of religious language and candidates may use material relating to concepts of religious language such as analogy, myth, and symbol (e.g. Aquinas, Tillich, etc.).
- Within this approach candidates should be evaluating the relative successes of these concepts in terms of maintain religious language’s meaning. This emphasis on the non-cognitive approach of religious language is one particular means of response.
- To counter this, candidates may suggest weaknesses inherent in the concepts of religious language. For example, they may suggest that analogy does not give us a clearer ‘picture’ as it does not allow us to understand what God really is like, only by analogy.
- Another issue raised could be problems attached to language game theory. This could include the point that religion and games are so dissimilar that any point of contact between them is an illusion.
- A different approach could be that religious philosophers have failed to solve the inherent problems of religious language due to the success of Logical Positivism. Candidates may show how successful either or both Ayer and Flew were in illustrating that religious language is in fact meaningless. This means that the inherent problems of religious language most certainly remain.
- On the contrary though, those who challenge Logical Positivism may be included as part of the response. Candidates may refer to numerous scholars and evaluate their proposed rebuttal of Logical Positivism.
- This could include R.M. Hare’s bliks, that religion is a way of seeing life, not falsifiable but entirely meaningful. Alternatively perhaps reference could be made to Hick’s eschatological verification; that is that religious language may not be verifiable now but it can, in theory be in the future.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

2. (a) Examine understandings of religious language as mythical.

[AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may explain that religious language as non-cognitive means that it should not be interpreted in a literal sense. A mythical interpretation gives insight into the purpose of existence and aids humans in the need to confront life's fears. It is used widely in religion to impart values of a religious, ethical and social nature.
- There is considerable overlap between myth, symbol, metaphor, allegory and analogy, all of which are found within religion. As Tillich said 'the language of faith is the language of symbols.'
- Myths are products of the society in which they were created. They have to be understood as such in order to give them their true value. As all human cultures have myths, their function is universal and can be interpreted differently; however, this is part of the beauty of myths. Their functions lend themselves perfectly to their use within religion.
- Some cultures have myths which are found only in that culture. However, there are innumerable common themes, which relate to religious issues, which permeate most cultures. Some of these include creation myths, myths about good vs. evil and heroic myths. In addition to this, many myths display a similar literary structure.
- Myths try to respond to different ultimate questions such as 'why am I here?' or 'how did the universe come into being?' and these abound within religious texts.
- Creation myths may be used as a case study in order to show the non-cognitive use of language in religions. For example, candidates may refer to the deeply mythical language used in Genesis 1 such as the earth being a 'formless void' with primordial waters. A comparison may be drawn between this and other myths that start in the waters. Explanations may refer to the God of the myths, one who has power over chaos.
- A common theme of all creation myths is the answer that it gives to the question of 'what is the purpose of humans?' Human superiority is the answer, with humans being stewards of the earth. These Creation myths, despite having common themes can also express different understandings of how Creation occurred. This can also produce different messages as a result.
- Another key theme may be heroic myths which may also incorporate the theme of good vs. evil. There are hundreds that candidates could draw upon in order to show the use of mythical language. They may use stories that have their bases in historical events but may contain mythical and symbolic elements.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

2. (b) 'Understanding religious language as mythical solves the problems of religious language.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- The use of myth suggests that religious language is meaningful as myth performs important functions. These include the communication of values and insights into the purpose of existence. In addition, myths help humans to overcome fears inherent in life as well as transmitting religious, social and ethical values. This can solve the problems of religious language as it gives religious language meaning.
- The fact that myths abound across cultures with meaning being attached to them, the use of myths in religion can be seen to be valid. The use of metaphysical entities in no way presents a problem for religious language. Indeed, such entities are exactly what gives the language its meaning. Myths involve symbolic elements, all of which have meanings attached, such as the triumph of good over evil.
- However, some may argue that the fact that different myths exist presents a problem in itself. Different religions may present different myths, for example, regarding Creation. Claims are made in the myths relating to truth. Competing claims may invalidate faith-based truth claims in all religions.
- Jung however states the importance of mythological language in conveying meaning. He says that myth is part of the collective unconscious and gives humans an understanding of what it means to be human.
- However, different interpretations of myths can suggest that their meaning is unclear. This creates more problems than it solves, with many taking the view that myth is no more than fake or fairy-story.
- Meaning of a myth may change as society changes. In a positive sense, myths can be seen as being always relevant, constantly adapting. However, in a negative sense the problem arises that there is no objective truth, with myths becoming permeable and subjective.
- Bultmann's demythologising of religious language is a way of deconstructing religious texts in order to 'strip away' myths. Bultmann says that myths are unscientific and unhelpful today. Examples of outdated aspects of New Testament cosmology (evil spirits, angels, last judgement) can consolidate this view.
- Bultmann's approach, which seeks to discover 'the literal', is akin to Logical Positivism and shows that the problems of religious language remain.
- In defence of myths though the archetypal themes that exist within myths across cultures and throughout history have inspired humans and given meaning to human existence.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

Section B

3. (a) Explain Teresa of Avila's types and stages of prayer.

[AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may place St. Teresa in the wider context of mysticism and may briefly describe mysticism in its own right. St. Teresa's accounts are classical examples of how prayer re-energises a person on their spiritual path.
- Prayer is at the heart of St. Teresa's life and teachings. Much of the types of prayer she refers to mention the importance of silence, humility and serenity but most importantly to love.
- She deemed God's grace to be essential in order to assist a person to perform meaningful prayer. Her metaphors used aspects that people could relate to, making them easier to understand. She tracks the spiritual progress of a person from their first attempts at prayer, as a novice, through to those who through effort and God's grace have become more competent.
- St. Teresa referred to four stages/types of prayer using metaphors from gardening. One metaphor shows God as the one who roots out 'weeds' or obstacles from the soil and plants good plants instead. As a person's soul develops they can then practise prayer as obstacles have been removed. God's grace has facilitated a person's development towards Union with God through prayer.
- Another metaphor shows prayer in four stages/types by referring to how a garden is watered: (1) is to get water from a well and is the active nature of prayer at this point, but it is extremely hard work as there are obstacles for the person praying; (2) to use a water-wheel. At this point prayer brings greater clarity; (3) when the water comes from a stream or a brook. This is Christ's input; and, (4) when the garden is watered by heavy rain; it requires no human effort as God is in total control.
- In 'The Interior Castle' St. Teresa describes the soul as a diamond in the shape of a castle with seven mansions. She shows the progress of the soul through these seven mansions with increasing intensity.
- The stages of prayer through from stage one to three do not give supreme union. They represent prayers which are useful and valid but there is so much more to come. The fourth mansion is The Prayer of Quiet. This begins the mystical stages. In this stage faculties are dormant. The fifth mansion is The Prayer of Union. God has touched the soul and this is assured and certain. The sixth mansion is spiritual marriage and represents the longing for the divine. The seventh mansion is mystical marriage where an individual has experienced ultimate unity with the divine. The mystic knows the divine.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

3. (b) 'There is no valid evidence for religious experiences.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Challenges to religious experience may include reference to the lack of authenticity as it may be said that the criteria for truth is almost impossible to establish. This is because some experiences are deemed to be subjective and therefore not without dispute with regard to their credibility.
- However, rejection of the truth of an individual's religious experience just because it cannot be verified or falsified is potentially offensive, as it assumes that the individual's testimony cannot be trusted. Swinburne's Principles of Testimony and/or Credulity could be employed here.
- Caroline Franks Davis summarised the three challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience. (1) Description-related. There is no proof that the claim that 'God' or 'the Divine' has been experienced. The description is therefore to be refuted. (2) Subject-related. The subject is the person who receives the claimed experience. S/he is considered unreliable. They may suffer from episodes of hallucinations or from mental illness (described further under 'naturalistic explanations.')
- (3) Object-related. If someone claimed to have experienced something preposterous, we would be unlikely to believe her or him. This should also be the case with a religious experience.
- Candidates may focus some of their answer on refuting these claims, possibly using Franks Davis own critique of the challenges.
- For example, religious experiences provide comfort and support to individuals and groups. Challenges to these experiences do not always take account of the positive psychological effects that recipients claim. As William James would say, this shows that the experience has produced 'fruits' thus suggesting that the experience did happen and because of this has resulted in a change in a person's behaviour.
- Many of the challenges only take into account an empirical and rational view of the universe and therefore may be too reductionist to account for an experience which may come from beyond this.
- Religious experiences can increase individual and, sometimes, corporate spiritual understanding and should therefore not be dismissed out of hand because of the challenges to them.
- The widely reported effects of substance misuse as having very similar effects to those of individuals claiming religious experiences suggest that the experiences are not what the individual believes them to be. This could show that the challenge to the truth of the experience is valid. Scientific processes, such as those induced by Persinger's Helmet, demonstrate that religious experiences can be created by reactions in the brain and so support the challenges to the truth of religious experience as valid.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

4. (a) Explain the cosmological arguments presented by St. Thomas Aquinas and William Lane Craig.

[AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Aquinas' three ways can be found in Summa Theologica. He uses inductive reasoning to point towards the existence of God who is responsible for the creation of the universe.
- His First Way is based on the concepts of motion or change. All things which are moved must be moved by something else, the 'efficient cause'. This efficient cause moves things from a state of potentiality into a state of actuality. Aquinas used the example of wood and fire to illustrate his point. It is important that candidates relate this to God and the universe, showing that God is in a state of actuality and is able to move the universe into a state of actuality. This is because there is no infinite regress. The universe must have a starting point. This starting point is the Prime Mover, God.
- His Second Way refers to the concepts of cause and effect. Cause and effect are universally observable within the universe. This also must be the case for the universe itself. Again, infinite regress is rejected because with no starting point there is no beginning. Clearly this is contrary to experience. So, the universe exists (is an effect) so it must have a cause, the Uncaused Causer, God. Dominoes are often used to illustrate this.
- The Third Way is based upon the concepts of contingency and necessity. In nature there are things which are possible to be and not to be. If this was the case for everything then there would be nothing today. As there is something then this needs an explanation. There must be something which is not contingent. This necessary being relies on nothing for existence. This necessary being which caused all contingency to be, is God.
- William Craig's Kalam argument is a modern up-date cosmological argument based on the classical Islamic argument. It is an '*a posteriori*', inductive argument, based upon the view that everything that begins to exist is caused by something else within time and space. This makes it 'cosmological.'
- Craig proposes that everything with a beginning has a cause. The universe had a beginning. The universe began to exist therefore it must have a beginning and a cause - the uncaused causer and this is God. God is a self-causing and necessary being who is not timeless and exists within the universe. He exists within time and space. The universe was caused at a point in time. That cause was God, therefore God exists in time – there is no infinite regress.
- William Lane Craig argued that as the laws of science did not exist before the universe did, then they cannot be responsible for the creation of the universe. Hence the alternative conclusion is given that God is responsible for the existence of the universe.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

4. (b) 'Cosmological arguments are ineffective in proving God's existence.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Cosmological arguments suffer various objections. One is that cause and effect may not be linked. This makes an inductive jump which is not warranted. There is an effect (universe) but we cannot say definitively what the cause is, even whether there is a cause at all. Also, the cosmological argument is inductive and so the conclusion may be possible, even probable, but it is not definitive proof.
- There may indeed be a plurality of causes thus the cosmological argument does not prove the God of Classical Theism. In this sense any conclusion based upon a cosmological argument would be ineffective as it may only prove a beginning to the universe as opposed to the God of Classical Theism as being the cause.
- Logically the argument makes no sense. If everything needs a cause, then what is the cause of God? Aquinas would argue that God is a 'special case' and the argument regarding causes does not apply to God. The cosmological argument only applies to contingent things within the universe.
- The universe could just be a brute fact, something that exists without the need of an explanation. Cosmological arguments rely on the asking of the question 'why?' there is a universe and 'how?' did it come about. If there is no question to ask then the cosmological arguments are not needed as an answer. Though it could be argued that simply avoiding the question is not a sound form of argument.
- Some, including those using the laws of science would argue that there is no need for a first mover as things are capable of moving themselves. Indeed, we of our own volition can choose to move ourselves. However, it could still be argued that initial movement would not have started without a Prime Mover.
- The Big Bang can account for the existence of the universe without the need for reference to God as the first cause. However, many would suggest that there must be a reason why the Big Bang occurred suggesting there is still a role for God.
- The concept of infinity is indeed illogical, as we cannot add to infinity. The present moment would not have arrived if infinity were true. There must therefore have been a starting point.
- Things can only achieve a different state via the intervention of a third party, the efficient cause. Only that which is in a state of actuality can effect a change from potentiality to actuality. Without the intervention of God then the universe would never have come into being.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

5. (a) Examine the problem of evil and suffering with reference to J.L. Mackie and William Rowe.

[AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may refer in general to types of evil but this needs to be linked to the particular approaches of Mackie and Rowe.
- With regard to Mackie's logical problem of evil, 'The Inconsistent Triad' suggests evil should not exist if God is all-loving and omnipotent. If God were all loving he would want to stop suffering. If he were omnipotent he would be able to. Evil clearly exists so all three statements cannot be held to be true simultaneously. The three statements held together would entail an inconsistency.
- His argument revolves around free will. Evil goes hand in hand with good. One cannot exist without the other. God cannot create the impossible. Evil is necessary to bring about goodness. Therefore, evil is necessary for free will. God did not create free humans who always chose what was right, that would be illogical. Mackie therefore deals with the logical problem of evil.
- He noted 'the paradox of omnipotence', it is illogical to say that God is omnipotent yet there are things that God cannot do. Whichever way we look at it, God's omnipotence is compromised.
- Evidential arguments from evil seek to show that the presence of evil in the world supports or makes likely the claim that the God of Classical Theism does not exist.
- Rowe focuses on a particular kind of evil that is found in our world in abundance. He selects intense human and animal suffering as this occurs on a daily basis, is in great plenty in our world, and is a clear case of evil. More precisely, it is a case of *intrinsic* evil: it is bad in and of itself, even though it sometimes is part of, or leads to, some good state of affairs. His argument for atheism is as follows:
 - It may be accepted that some amount of suffering may have some purpose. However, there exist instances of intense suffering which an omnipotent, omniscient being could have prevented without thereby losing some greater good or permitting some evil equally bad or worse. An omniscient, wholly good being would prevent the occurrence of any intense suffering it could, unless it could not do so without thereby losing some greater good or permitting some evil equally bad or worse. So there does not exist an omnipotent, omniscient, wholly good being.
 - Consider the lingering death of a fawn. Such suffering seems preventable and pointless. With respect to the fawn's suffering, Rowe asks: Is it reasonable to believe that there is some greater good so intimately connected to that suffering that even an omnipotent, omniscient being could not have obtained that good without permitting that suffering or some evil at least as bad? Rowe claims that it is not reasonable to believe this.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

5. (b) 'Epicurus' classical form of the problem of evil and suffering is not really a problem.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- It is assumed that Epicurus' argument is known; some candidates may start by briefly stating it.
- For those without a belief in God, there may well be no problem of evil. Yes, there is evil present in the world; that is undeniable. However, there is no 'problem' as such as there is no God to build into the equation, a God that one needs to justify the existence of. Indeed, perhaps for some members of Eastern religions there is no 'problem' as such evil can be explained by the workings of karma.
- However, for theists it is clear that there is a problem if they want to maintain the characteristics of the God of Classical Theism.
- Some would claim that we can diminish the characteristics traditionally ascribed to God. We can say that God is not all loving yet is all powerful. This eliminates the problem as God does not want to stop the suffering.
- However, for many, this would be an unacceptable compromise as God must love and for many this would simply not be responding to the problem, rather it is just an easy way out.
- Others would suggest that God is not all powerful. God did not have the power to create ex nihilo and does not have the power to stop evil now. Again, for many, this would be unacceptable if they are unwilling to give up their belief that God did create out of nothing. Equally it could be argued that a God with limited power is no God at all.
- It could be argued that the fact that God does not stop evil does not present us with a problem because we do not know the intentions of God. Suffering may all be part of a grand plan and is a necessary part of life. God's view of things is unchanging unlike the views of humans which succumb to changing times. Or it could be said that God not stopping evil does not make him wicked, rather simply 'not bothered' much like people who do not donate to charity are not wicked just apathetic.
- Some would contest that evil does not exist thus the 'problem' disappears. Evil is just a name for the manifestations of some malfunction or could all be to do with perceptions. What one person calls evil may not be the same as what another person calls evil.
- Although, for many this is belittling the presence of evil which is a real and living presence in the lives of many, in an emotional and/or physical sense. To simply deny its existence is ludicrous and is dodging the problem.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised