



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

Religious Studies

RST3B

Philosophy of Religion

A2 Unit 3B

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the school or college.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Examination Levels of Response

Religious Studies (Advanced) A2 Level Descriptors

Level	A2 Descriptor AO1	Marks <i>Unit 4 italics</i>	A2 Descriptor AO2	Marks <i>Unit 4 italics</i>	A2 Descriptors for Quality of Written Communication in AO1 and AO2
7	A thorough treatment of the topic, which may be in depth or breadth. Information is accurate and relevant. A thorough understanding is shown through good use of relevant evidence and examples. Where appropriate good knowledge and understanding of diversity of views and / or scholarly opinion is demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding of connections with other elements of the course of study are demonstrated convincingly.	28-30 41-45	A very well-focused response to the issue(s) raised. Different views, including where appropriate those of scholars or schools of thought, are discussed and evaluated perceptively. Effective use is made of evidence to sustain an argument. Systematic analysis and reasoning leads to appropriate conclusions. There may be evidence of independent thought. The argument is related perceptively and maturely to the broader context and to human experience.	19-20 28-30	Appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of information; appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; good legibility and high level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
6	A generally thorough treatment of the topic which may be in depth or breadth. Information is almost all accurate and mainly relevant. Clear understanding is demonstrated through use of relevant evidence and examples. Where appropriate, alternative views and / or scholarly opinion are satisfactorily explained. Knowledge and understanding of connections with other elements of the course of study are clearly demonstrated.	24-27 36-40	A well-focused response to the issue(s) raised. Different views, including where appropriate those of scholars or schools of thought, are discussed. A process of reasoning leads to an appropriate evaluation. There may be evidence of independent thought. The argument is related clearly to the broader context and to human experience.	16-18 24-27	
5	A satisfactory treatment of the topic. Information is mostly accurate and mainly relevant. A reasonable understanding is demonstrated through use of some evidence and examples. Where appropriate, some familiarity with diversity of views and / or scholarly opinion is shown. Some knowledge and understanding of connections with other elements of the course of study are demonstrated.	20-23 29-35	A satisfactory response to the issue(s) raised. Views are explained with some supporting evidence and arguments, and some critical analysis. A conclusion is drawn that follows from some of the reasoning. Some of the response is related satisfactorily to the broader context and to human experience.	13-15 20-23	Mainly appropriate form and style of writing; generally clear and coherent organisation of information; mainly appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; good legibility and fairly high level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4	Key ideas and facts are included; demonstrates some understanding and coherence using some evidence and examples. Where appropriate, brief reference may be made to alternative views and / or scholarly opinion. Limited knowledge and understanding of connections with other elements of the course of study are demonstrated.	15-19 22-28	The main issue is addressed with some supporting evidence or argument, but the reasoning is faulty, or the analysis superficial or only one view is adequately considered. Little of the response is related to the broader context and to human experience.	10-12 15-19	Form and style of writing appropriate in some respects; some of the information is organised clearly and coherently; some appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; satisfactory legibility and level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3	A summary of key points. Limited in depth or breadth. Answer may show limited understanding and limited relevance. Some coherence.	10-14 15-21	A basic attempt to justify a point of view relevant to the question. Some explanation of ideas and coherence.	7-9 10-14	
2	A superficial outline account, with little relevant material and slight signs of partial understanding, or an informed answer that misses the point of the question.	5-9 8-14	A superficial response to the question with some attempt at reasoning.	4-6 5-9	
1	Isolated elements of partly accurate information little related to the question.	1-4 1-7	A few basic points, with no supporting argument or justification.	1-3 1-4	Little clarity and organisation; little appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; legibility and level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar barely adequate to make meaning clear.
0	Nothing of relevance.	0	No attempt to engage with the question or nothing of relevance	0	

RST3B: *Philosophy of Religion*

Question 1 Ontological argument and the relationship between reason and faith

0	1
---	---

Outline Anselm’s ontological argument and examine the relationship between faith and reason in the ontological argument.

Anselm’s ontological argument: God is ‘that than which a greater cannot be thought’. Either God exists just in imagination or in reality as well. If God exists only in imagination, he cannot be ‘that than which a greater cannot be thought’ as a real thing is greater than an imaginary thing. Therefore God must be thought of as existing. Therefore God exists.

Maximum level 4 if only the ontological argument presented.

For the relationship between faith and reason, valid points might include: Anselm’s version of the Ontological argument was in the form of a prayer. It is addressed to God, not seeking a proof of God’s existence but simply trying to use human wisdom and understanding (reason) to make sense of the nature of God. He stresses the need to believe in order to understand, using the definition of “that than which a greater cannot be thought” to show the logic of the greatest being having to have existence, otherwise it is not the greatest being. Anselm tries to show the lack of reason in the fool who talks about a God (who must exist according to the logic of Anselm’s definition) that the fool then rejects by saying that God does not exist.

(30 marks) AO1

0	2
---	---

**‘The ontological argument does not prove anything.’
To what extent do you agree?**

Expect the student to continue ideas about faith and reason from the previous question and to analyse if there is anything of value in this argument.

In support: (e.g.)

There is no agreement about the argument, which would be expected if there were any real proof offered by it. Thinkers do not reject everything about an argument just because they disagree with a small part of the argument. However, there is total rejection of the ontological argument by many thinkers. Even Russell who acknowledged “the ontological argument is sound” did not accept the existence of God because of the argument. Many thinkers reject the basic premises which underlie the argument. Most thinkers take the view that you cannot move from a definition to a statement that the thing defined exists. The fact that the argument has been used by Gasking to prove the opposite of what it was originally used for raises serious questions about the validity of it as a sound argument.

Contrary to claim: (e.g.)

At least the definitions of Anselm and Descartes show that if there is a God, then God exists necessarily. Human logic can follow Descartes’ parallels of triangles and mountains-valleys. These statements can lead some people to acknowledging the reality of what is defined, thereby proving the value of the argument. For some people the fact that they accept the validity of the ontological argument proves that they have faith in God, without whom there is no argument.

(20 marks) AO2

Question 2 Religious language

0	3
----------	----------

Examine the problems raised by religious language.

Students will need to present some of the problems of religious language.

E.g. Can religious language be cognitive? How can people refer to an unlimited God using words and verbal images that are limited simply because they are made up by the human mind and express the limited human imagination. How valid are the use of anthropomorphisms about God?

Is religious language meaningful? Can anything expressed through religious language be proven in a verifiable way? Can another person be sure that the words are being spoken and understood in the same way of there if nothing that can be proven or related to by the senses?

Are religious statements analogical, metaphorical or symbolic? If so, does it make sense to everybody or do people have their own interpretations of analogies, symbols etc?

Can God be talked about through myths? If so, why do myths get twisted by people from other cultures?

Expect a presentation of a range of problems but work on the basis of breadth versus depth. Maximum Level 5 for only one problem examined.

(30 marks) AO1

0	4
----------	----------

'The theory of language games does not solve the problems of religious language.' How far do you agree?
In support: (e.g.)

Expect an explanation of Wittgenstein's approach. Central issues about language games: people use specific words in specialised contexts; to understand the meaning of the words, you have to appreciate the context and share in the approach. However, this approach does not actually help people to understand what others are saying. A person has to accept that people are using language in a specific context that they may or may not share. How can a person be confident that they understand the use of the words in exactly the way that the speaker intends the words to be understood? At most the listener has to acknowledge the sounds without any guarantees of what is being said.

Contrary to claim: (e.g.)

People who do not understand the language cannot dismiss the concept as wrong / meaningless etc. Language games accept the fact that language is usually not used in a way that would be acceptable to logical positivists. Most communication is about feelings, ideas etc that have only elements that can be verified or falsified. Religious language is about faith issues that at best can be verified eschatologically. Language games accept the fact that people can talk meaningfully to each other about metaphysical matters without needing to be able to prove anything. Analogies depend on allowing comparisons to be made between things that are separated by a huge gulf in quality etc. Language games will not worry about this gulf as it is an understood element in the communication as both parties will appreciate that the words are not being used in a standard way/context.

(20 marks) AO2

Question 3 Body, soul and personal identity

0	5	Explain different ideas about the existence of the soul and its relationship with the body.
----------	----------	--

Expect a detailed study of materialism and dualism.

Materialism = the body and soul form a single unit which is the individual. The soul works through the body and when the body dies, so does the soul. Hard materialism = no separation for any part of the person. Soft materialism = some characteristics go beyond simple physical activities but are all related to the combined body-soul unit. Expect reference to Ryle, Dawkins.

Reference could be made to Aristotle who sees the body and soul as a working unit. Aquinas sees the soul as indivisible but it retains the identity of the body.

Dualism = the soul is separate from the body and is freed from the body at death.

Expect reference to Plato with some mention of the soul and its relation to the Forms, Descartes and the pineal gland connection between the body and soul.

(30 marks) AO1

0	6	'I cannot survive death.' Assess this claim.
----------	----------	---

Students should show some understanding of the arguments about how the body and soul make up the individual and whether this combination means that the individual comes to an end at the moment of death.

In support: (e.g.)

The personality is totally dependent on the body; without a body, I cannot have emotions, feelings, drives etc. The body is left behind at death so, presumably, everything that makes me also is left behind. If I am reincarnated in another body it is no longer me, it is another person. If I am resurrected, it is not with the body I had, so it is not the true me. Expect some reference to Hick's replica theory.

Contrary to claim: (e.g.)

Christian idea of resurrection is that the person is perfected, even if the old body is left behind. The new creation is the true person. Belief in the resurrection of the body and life everlasting. The idea of reincarnation implies that something about me survives, even in a different body. If a person is the sum total of his actions, the actions could be thought of as affecting karma, so there must be some way in which I can be thought of as surviving death. How much is a person dependent on the body to be themselves and how much is the body just a vessel to shape the personality that is sloughed off at death while the person continues. Some students might make reference to the relationship between a caterpillar and a butterfly as an analogy in this context.

(20 marks) AO2

Question 4 The problem of evil

0	7	Examine different explanations for the existence of natural evil in a world created by God.
----------	----------	--

Expect at least two different explanations; obviously the fewer explanations done will require more depth. Be wary of the student who only superficially mentions a number of different explanations but who does not give any evidence of really understanding the different arguments. Examination implies that there is an attempt to include the strengths and weakness of the approaches studied but there does not have to be any explicit contrast made between the different arguments addressed.

Answers could include:

- the Augustinian idea of the Fall bringing in all evil into the world, including natural evil. God made the world to be perfect but the choices of humans interfered with this perfection.
- The John Hick / Irenaean tradition approach of humans needing an imperfect world to grow in the likeness of God. Natural evils allow for free choices to be made and for humans to learn to grow through suffering and responding to challenge.
- The Free Will defence – the importance of free will for human beings. Free will can only be exercised in a world that is random. If God controlled nature or the world was without any form of fault, then humans could not be free.
- Process Theology – God is developing what was already there. God is involved in the whole of creation and suffers when things go wrong. God started off the process of ordering creation without being able to control it fully.
- God is limited, either God is unable to control his creation, or unwilling to stop people suffering when things go wrong or unknowing about the consequences of what happens.
- Idea of Iblis or the fallen Angel who goes around creating all forms of evil to separate people from God.

Maximum Level 5 if only one explanation done in depth.

(30 marks) AO1

0	8	'The existence of moral evil is more difficult to justify than the existence of natural evil.' How far do you agree?
----------	----------	---

Expect some comment on the difficulty of justifying the existence of either form of evil and the questions each raises about the nature of God. There has to be some attempt to compare the two forms of evil, even if the final answer is non-committed.

Moral evil – the result of free will; actions done by humans simply because they wish to cause harm in some way. Is it possible to accept any action on this basis? Is God to blame for giving humans freedom? Does this make God responsible for the negative outcomes of human actions (possible reference to Dostoevsky)? Should God be blamed for the Holocaust as God failed to intervene? Some students might take the line that free will has to be unlimited so God is like loving parents who have to let their child learn from his mistakes, even though it hurts them to see their child do these actions and suffer like this.

Natural evil – the result of the way the world is made but which some people, can justify for allowing human freedom. God is to blame for not making the world a perfect place. Natural evils affect mostly the innocent and vulnerable. Is this fair? Should God have made the world such that all the natural events that currently cause damage happen where nobody would be hurt?

What do both forms of evil suggest about the nature of God? Is this acceptable for the believer or does the believer have to twist ideas just to appear to make God acceptable?

(20 marks) AO2

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion