



# General Certificate of Education

## Philosophy 5171/6171

*PLY2 Moral Philosophy or Philosophy of Religion*

# Mark Scheme

*2005 examination – June series*

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 candidates' 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 candidates' 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 candidates' 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.

## Moral Philosophy or Philosophy of Religion PLY2

**NB** The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute ‘model answers’; they are intended as an ‘aide-memoire’ for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

1.

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a) Briefly explain what prescriptivism involves.

*(6 marks)*

### Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)

4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of what prescriptivism involves. Full marks should be awarded to accounts that recognise prescriptivism as a non-cognitive position in meta-ethics which focuses on the meaning of moral language which is seen as an attempt to guide action through commending; which places more emphasis on moral reasoning than emotivism and in which moral thinking is seen to involve a search for moral principles we can commit to and which we can universally prescribe. A brief illustration may be used to clarify points. Answers at the bottom of this band will be accurate but may not be expressed clearly.

1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge and partial understanding of what prescriptivism involves. At the top of this band answers will focus on prescriptivity but not universalisability (or vice versa). Answers at the bottom of this band will provide a confused explanation in which prescriptivism is barely distinguishable from, eg emotivism.

0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

(b) Explain and illustrate the emotivist view of moral language.

*(15 marks)*

### Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)

4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of the emotivist view of moral language. Moral language is not fact-stating language and moral statements are neither true nor false; moral statements are neither analytically true nor empirically verifiable. Emotivism is a non-cognitive position in which moral language is seen as having two functions: firstly, it is used to express emotions, feelings and sympathies; secondly it is used to influence and persuade others. Answers at the bottom of this band may explain one function of moral language well but neglect the second function.

1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge or partial understanding by offering a limited account of emotivism in which the expression of feeling is partially explained (‘boo-hurrah’) or a confused account of emotivism as a crude fact-stating subjectivism.

0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

**Selection and Application (9 marks)**

Candidates may take the opportunity to construct their own illustrative examples, draw from practical ethics or from the literature (eg Stevenson’s analogy with culture) in attempting to illustrate the functions of moral language. Brief illustrations (eg ‘stealing – yuk’) should be placed in the middle band if they provide an accurate illustration of the point being made.

- 7 – 9 Selects, or constructs, a relevant illustration to provide a clear account of the emotivist view of moral language.
- 4 – 6 Selects or constructs, an illustration to provide a partial account, poorly focused or lacking detail and precision, of the emotivist view of moral language. Brief, but accurate, illustrative points should be placed in this band in responses that are characterised by detailed exposition and brief illustration.
- 1 – 3 Selects an illustrative example to provide a basic, sketchy and vague account of the emotivist view of moral language. An illustration may be given but it does not help to clarify the emotivist view *or* the illustration is applied tangentially (eg an illustration of why a moral statement isn’t a moral truth) or exposition is relevant, but there is no attempt to illustrate.
- 0 No relevant philosophical points.

(c) Assess moral realism.	(24 marks)
---------------------------	------------

**Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

- 4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of moral realism *either* as the cognitivist view that we can know or sense moral facts *or* through answers rooted in virtue theory. Answers in this band will probably recognise that the question is meta-ethical and focus on cognitive positions: intuitionism, moral facts are intuited through a moral ‘sense’; realism or descriptivism, moral facts exist and can be sensed in virtue of non-moral facts. *However*, accounts of the virtues, flourishing and the good for man are also acceptable. The essential point is that there is an ‘objective’ moral reality (even if there aren’t any moral objects) that we can know (intuit or sense) and which can be described.
- 1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge or partial understanding of moral realism either through offering a very limited outline or through a confused account. Reward versions of utilitarianism and/or deontology at the top of this band if these positions are linked to moral empiricism or moral absolutes (eg ‘x’ is moral because ‘x’ maximises happiness).
- 0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

### **Selection and Application (9 marks)**

Support for moral realism could involve discussions of:

- The view that morality is ‘attached’ to facts connected to ‘wants that all men have’ and which contribute to human flourishing.
- Analogous examples concerning aesthetics.
- Specific attempts to deny the is-ought gap, eg Searle on promising.
- A critique of non-cognitive views, for example the failure to mark out a sphere of discourse as being moral discourse.
- There may be some reference to first order theories, utilitarianism, deontology, virtue theory and relevant ‘facts’ underpinning first principles.

Candidates are likely to consider positions which are critical of the view in which case candidates could draw from:

- A discussion of the is-ought gap including, for example, debates in practical ethics to show that, whatever the facts, a range of moral choices is possible.
- Discussions of the role of choice in creating value more generally, perhaps with reference to certain texts (eg Sartre) or of the role of sympathies and tastes in moral preferences (Hume).
- Accounts of why there are, allegedly, no moral facts (eg logical positivism) or the alleged failure of factual statements to guide action or explain moral weakness and/or accounts of the non-descriptive element of moral language (expressing, commending and prescribing).
- The view that there are no moral experts, that moral disputes remain unsettled, etc.

7 – 9 Selects, or constructs, relevant points and examples and applies these to provide a clear, detailed analysis of philosophical debates concerning moral realism.

4 – 6 Selects, or constructs, some relevant points and examples to provide a partial analysis, either narrowly focused (for example on intuitionism) or lacking detail and precision, of moral realism.

1 – 3 Selects and applies some relevant points to provide a basic, sketchy and vague explanation of moral realism or some relevant points feature among many irrelevant points in a tangential approach to moral realism.

0 No relevant philosophical points.

### **Interpretation and Evaluation (9 marks)**

Candidates are likely to adopt one of two approaches:

- Alternative positions are seriously lacking. We can’t value anything we like. Moral reasoning is constrained by moral facts or a moral reality external to us. If this is not so we are left with the difficulty of delineating the sphere of morality (as well as other difficulties). In virtue of the facts of the case, eg facts about flourishing, we can reach moral conclusions. Arguably, we can also be tutored in this and develop a moral sense. If this were not possible we could not speak of moral progress. There is not an unbridgeable gap between is and ought.
- Moral realism is unconvincing. There is no external moral reality, no ‘queer’ moral objects, facts or truths that can be discovered, sensed or known. Rather we are the source of value. Moral judgements include a subjective element, an evaluative add-on from us. Morality is rooted in our desires and attitudes rather than being entailed by whatever the facts of the case are taken to be. There are no moral experts.

- 7 – 9 Demonstrates a critical appreciation of arguments concerning moral realism and advances a clear position.
- 4 – 6 Evaluation is present within an exposition of arguments concerning moral realism but is either implicit in a juxtaposition of points/theoretical approaches or asserted with limited supportive explanation. Good but narrowly based discussions should be placed in this band.
- 1 – 3 Demonstrates a simple and basic appreciation of some arguments concerning moral realism in which a view is described, or points are listed or asserted without justification, or argument is confused.
- 0 No relevant philosophical insights.

**NB** The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute ‘model answers’; they are intended as an ‘aide-memoire’ for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

2.

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a) Briefly explain the difference between act and rule utilitarianism. <span style="float: right;">(6 marks)</span>
--

**Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of the difference between act and rule utilitarianism. Rule utilitarianism regards an act as right if it conforms to a rule which, if followed, has good consequences/maximises happiness; the consequences of following the rule, or of the rule being in place, are that people are happier and/or the outcomes are better than they would be without the rule. The rule covers all cases so that there is no need to calculate happiness/outcomes in each instance. This may be especially important if issues concerning general welfare are involved and others are, at least potentially, affected. This contrasts with act utilitarianism which is the view that whether an act is right or not, whether it maximises happiness/generates the best outcome, must be decided in each instance. The difference may be briefly illustrated, eg by taking an issue in practical ethics. The difference may also be stated in terms of extreme and restricted utilitarianism. Accurate but briefly stated definitions should be placed at the bottom of this band.

1 – 3 Demonstrates basic or partial knowledge and understanding of the difference between act and rule utilitarianism by providing a confused account, eg by giving an accurate account of act utilitarianism but not of rule utilitarianism, so that the difference is not clear.

0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

(b) Explain and illustrate <b>one</b> criticism of virtue theory. <span style="float: right;">(15 marks)</span>
---

It is not essential to the question to provide an explicit account of what virtue theory involves (although some candidates will) and knowledge and understanding of virtue theory may be implicit in the criticism selected. Possible criticisms include:

Allegations of elitism (at least in the origins of virtue ethics) and/or that circumstance makes it more difficult for some to develop moral character; it isn't clear whether we should interpret the theory as relativist or essentialist; whether it provides a complete theory of ethics (do we not need recourse to other moral concepts, what do we do when two possible courses of action are both virtuous, etc); whether it pays to be virtuous and/or whether virtue is its own reward; whether it is more virtuous to overcome temptation/vice or to not experience it at all, circularity, “what’s wrong with vice?”. Or any other reasonable point.

**Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of one criticism of virtue theory. Answers at the bottom of this band may provide more than one accurate criticism and it may be difficult to determine which critical point is being illustrated.

- 1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge or partial understanding either by asserting a critical point but not explaining why it is a critical point (eg ‘virtue ethics is relative’) or by providing a confused explanation, or exposition is relevant, but there is no attempt to illustrate.
- 0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

### **Selection and Application (9 marks)**

Illustrations of the criticism could draw from, eg practical ethics, examples taken from the literature or be constructed by the candidate. Many situations provide possible examples, eg if one is dissatisfied with the leader of a political party then speaking out would demonstrate courage but not speaking out would demonstrate loyalty: is loyalty more virtuous if one doesn’t experience dissatisfaction in the first place or if one does but resists it, etc?

- 7 – 9 Selects a relevant issue and applies this to provide a clear illustration of one criticism of virtue theory.
- 4 – 6 Selects, or constructs, points or examples to provide a partial illustration lacking detail and precision so that the critical point is only partially made or it isn’t clear which critical point is being illustrated. Responses in this band may be characterised by detailed exposition, focused more on explaining the criticism and/or listing criticisms, in which an illustration is briefly but accurately made.
- 1 – 3 Selects at least one point or example to provide a basic, sketchy and vague account of one criticism of virtue theory or a relevant illustration is given but application is tangential (eg it seems to apply to deontology or utilitarianism).
- 0 No relevant philosophical points.

(c) Assess utilitarianism.	<i>(24 marks)</i>
----------------------------	-------------------

### **Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

Accounts of utilitarianism will probably be rooted in the classical hedonistic view that happiness/pleasure, or the avoidance of pain/suffering, is the sole good and that we decide whether an action is good by calculating the consequences. There should, however, be some awareness of different utilitarian approaches and candidates may refer back to act and rule utilitarianism or to preference utilitarianism or to outcome and/or welfare utilitarianism. There may also be references to attempts to construct a more qualitative account of pleasure/happiness and/or to other ‘goods’ which generate positive consequences.

- 4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of utilitarianism. At the lower end of this band this will be limited in scope or depth (eg accurate accounts of Bentham only).
- 1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge or partial understanding of utilitarianism, eg by providing a very limited or confused account of the classical position.
- 0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

### **Selection and Application (9 marks)**

There should be a clear focus on, and understanding of, utilitarianism, its strengths and weaknesses (possibly with reference to the strengths and weaknesses of other first order theories). Material selected for discussion will probably raise the issue of how well utilitarian principles can be applied in practice and include:

- The consequences of actions are difficult to predict.
- The difficulties of measuring happiness and/or pain, and whose happiness and/or pain is to be included in the equation.
- Whether maximising happiness might undermine other socially useful values.
- Whether happiness should be replaced by preferences, outcomes, welfare or supplemented by other goods.
- Whether the morality of each act or of some rule is to be considered.
- Whether it is consistent with the moral integrity of the agent called upon to assist and support and/or whether it is useful as a guide to specific agents.

7 – 9 Selects, or constructs, relevant points and examples and applies these to provide a clear analysis of utilitarianism.

4 – 6 Selects, or constructs, some relevant points and examples to provide a partial analysis, narrowly focused or lacking detail and precision, of utilitarianism.

1 – 3 Selects and applies some points to provide a basic, sketchy and vague explanation of utilitarianism or some relevant points feature among many irrelevant points in a tangential approach to utilitarianism.

0 No relevant philosophical points.

### **Interpretation and Evaluation (9 marks)**

Evaluation is likely to follow from, and be present in, points selected for discussion. Beyond this:

- It may be argued that utilitarianism is a useful first principle from which difficult moral decisions can be made. (Some utilitarian positions may be seen as more promising than others.)
- Or that classical utilitarianism provides a ‘thin’ account of the good for man, or neglects other moral concepts like ‘right’ and, as such, is bettered by alternative theories.

7 – 9 Demonstrates a critical appreciation of arguments concerning utilitarianism and advances a clear position.

4 – 6 Evaluation is present within an exposition of arguments concerning utilitarianism but is either implicit in a juxtaposition of points/theoretical approaches or asserted with inadequate supportive explanation (because, for example, the argument is too narrowly based).

1 – 3 Demonstrates a simple and basic appreciation of at least one argument concerning utilitarianism in which a view is described, or points are listed or asserted without justification, or argument is confused.

0 No relevant philosophical insights.



**NB** The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute ‘model answers’; they are intended as an ‘aide-memoire’ for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

3.

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a)	Briefly outline Pascal’s Wager.	(6 marks)
-----	---------------------------------	-----------

**Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of Pascal’s Wager. This is intended to show that it is rational to place faith in God’s existence and/or to believe in God: either there is a Christian God or there isn’t; suppose you believe in His existence and lead a Christian life; then, if God exists, you will enjoy eternal bliss and will have lost very little if God does not exist; suppose you do not believe in God and do not lead a Christian life; then, if God exists, you will suffer eternal damnation but will have lost nothing if God does not exist; so, given these outcomes, it is rational to believe in God and lead a Christian life. Answers at the bottom of this mark band will demonstrate a broad understanding but neglect stages of the wager.

1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge and partial understanding either by providing a general account of gambling on God’s existence and ignoring the steps of the argument or by providing a confused account of what the wager is intended to show. Award one mark for tangential critiques of Pascal in which knowledge of the wager is implicit.

0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

(b)	Outline and illustrate <b>one</b> solution to the problem of why God does not prevent humans from performing evil acts.	(15 marks)
-----	---	------------

**Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

The problem of evil may be briefly stated as resulting from an (alleged) inconsistency between the characteristics of God as perfectly good, omniscient and omnipotent and the existence of moral evils such as vices, wickedness, etc so that, allegedly, the propositions that ‘the Christian God exists’ and ‘evil exists’ are logically inconsistent. **One** solution to the problem will probably be drawn from: we have an imperfect grasp of good and evil and are not in a position to judge God’s purposes; evil doesn’t exist, only the comparative absence of good; evil has to exist for a greater good to be achieved and/or goodness emerges from evil; evil makes us more virtuous, it contributes to soul-making; evil is a consequence of human freedom which is itself a consequence of God’s benevolent design; process theology, etc.

4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of **one** solution to the problem of why God does not prevent humans from performing evil acts. Answers at the bottom of this band may not express the solution clearly and may provide more than one accurate criticism so that it is difficult to see which is being illustrated.

- 1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge or partial understanding by offering a limited or confused account of **one** solution to the problem of why God does not prevent humans from performing evil acts. Answers at the bottom of this band may simply assert that either God or moral evil does not exist, or exposition is relevant, but there is no attempt to illustrate.
- 0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

**Selection and Application (9 marks)**

Illustrations of the solution selected can draw from any action/event which links moral evil to the achievement of a greater good, or in which goodness comes from evil and/or where evil contributes to the development of a virtuous character (eg warfare, heroism, etc). It is likely that the free will defence will be employed in which case any human vice or act of wickedness might be selected as an illustration.

- 7 – 9 Selects (or constructs) a relevant example which helps to provide a clear exposition of the selected solution and a clear illustration of how it is a response to the problem.
- 4 – 6 Selects (or constructs) an example to provide a partial illustration, lacking detail and precision, of **one** solution to the problem of why God does not prevent humans from performing evil acts. Responses in this band may be characterised by detailed exposition of the solution and brief but accurate illustration. At the bottom of this band, where more than one solution has been given it may be difficult to determine which is being illustrated.
- 1 – 3 Selects an example to provide a basic, sketchy and vague illustrative account of **one** solution to the problem **or** an illustration is given but application with regard to moral evil is spurious or tangential (eg focused on natural evil).
- 0 No relevant philosophical points.

(c) Assess whether God's existence is demonstrated by miracles. <span style="float: right;">(24 marks)</span>
---

**Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

A number of definitions of a miracle might be offered: an event which does not accord with the laws of nature; an event that cannot be explained in terms of known laws; an event that is not an instance of any law at all, known or unknown; an event that is not preceded by conditions which, if repeated, are sufficient to cause the event to happen again. Whichever definition is used it should be linked to an event which demonstrates divine intervention in the course of things. Definitions may be briefly illustrated by biblical and more modern examples (eg resurrection, weeping statues, etc).

- 4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of the concept of the miraculous.
- 1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge or partial understanding of the concept of the miraculous.
- 0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

### Selection and Application (9 marks)

Discussion could involve: the difficulty of showing that an event did occur and that it was miraculous; issues concerning credibility/testimony; the difficulty of showing that an event cannot be accommodated within known and unknown laws and/or that laws prohibit exceptions or the difficulty of showing that the event would not occur again if the same conditions applied; whether evidence in favour of a miracle could outweigh the evidence against; the difficulties of distinguishing the miraculous from the unusual or bizarre or vastly improbable; whether we could legitimately infer that a divine will was responsible for any event and why we might do so; the view that some alleged ‘miracles’ seem unworthy of an omnipotent, omniscient and benevolent Being; the question of why doesn’t He do something more worthy or of how and why does He intervene in His own creation?

- 7 – 9 Selects, or constructs, relevant points and examples and applies these to provide a clear, detailed analysis of whether miracles demonstrate the existence of God.
- 4 – 6 Selects, or constructs, some relevant points and examples to provide a partial analysis, either narrowly focused or lacking detail and precision, of whether miracles demonstrate the existence of God.
- 1 – 3 Selects and applies some relevant points to provide a basic, sketchy and vague explanation of whether miracles demonstrate the existence of God **or** some relevant points feature among many irrelevant points in a tangential approach to whether miracles demonstrate the existence of God.
- 0 No relevant philosophical points.

### Interpretation and Evaluation (9 marks)

Evaluation is likely to be present in issues selected for discussion; beyond this a range of positions might be argued:

- It may be argued that faith precedes ‘experience’ of the miraculous or of the Divine Will – negative versions of this may attempt to link faith to a ‘God of the gaps’ – or that the existence of random and improbable events neither requires nor legitimates an inference to God.
  - It may be questioned, if God can and has intervened to produce miraculous events, then why doesn’t He do so more frequently and with a more positive impact?
  - Some might argue that it is not a priori impossible for miracles to occur, or that they have occurred, and this supports religious belief *or* that faith in Christ’s ministry involves commitment to accepting miraculous works which are not, therefore, required to act as proof that God exists.
- 7 – 9 Demonstrates a critical appreciation of arguments concerning whether miracles demonstrate the existence of God and advances a clear position.
- 4 – 6 Evaluation is present within an exposition of arguments concerning whether miracles demonstrate the existence of God but is either implicit in a juxtaposition of points/theoretical approaches or asserted with limited supportive explanation.
- 1 – 3 Demonstrates a simple and basic appreciation of some arguments concerning miracles in which a view is described, or points are listed or asserted without justification, or argument is confused.
- 0 No relevant philosophical insights.

**NB** The following marking notes are not prescriptive and do not constitute ‘model answers’; they are intended as an ‘aide-memoire’ for Examiners. Marks should be awarded in accordance with the levels-of-response marking criteria.

4.

**Total for this question: 45 marks**

(a) Briefly explain how a religious experience differs from an ordinary experience. (6 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of the notion of religious experience as: an experience caused by God, possessing certain phenomenological properties and/or as a life-changing experience (it may also be claimed that, following a decision to view the world in a particular way *all* experience is religious), etc and uses this as a basis for distinguishing between religious and non-religious experiences. At the top of this band accounts of the characteristics of religious as opposed to non-religious experience will be very precise and may refer, for example, to aspects of the immediate and direct nature of religious experience (eg its felt quality, the feeling of awe, reverence, exhilaration, fascination, etc), or to the impact of religious experience (eg visible signs of changed behaviour). There may be references to biblical examples. At the bottom of this band answers will be accurate but narrow.

1 – 3 Demonstrates basic or partial knowledge and understanding of the difference(s) between religious and ordinary experience which either lacks detail or which is only partially correct (eg miracles). At the bottom of this band answers will be extremely vague or involve tangential/evaluative points claiming that no experience is religious.

0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

(b) Outline and illustrate **two** criticisms of the cosmological argument for the existence of God. (15 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)**

The cosmological argument will probably be briefly stated as an argument from the fact of the existence of the universe to the existence of God. Specifically: because there is motion there must be a prime mover; because everything which exists has a cause there must be a first cause; because the universe is contingent there must be a necessary Being responsible for this contingency. **Two** criticisms will be selected from: whether we require any explanation of the existence of the universe (brute fact); whether we require God to explain it (big bang); whether the argument demonstrates the existence of the Christian God; whether there are certain mistaken assumptions in the argument, eg that the natural state of things is rest or that something cannot be caused by nothing; whether the argument is contradictory; whether an infinite series stretching back into the past is inconceivable; whether a series of events has a cause; whether we can understand the causal interaction between God (outside of the universe) and the order of things (inside the universe) or any other reasonable point.

4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of **two** criticisms of the cosmological argument for the existence of God. Answers at the bottom of this band may not express one of the criticisms clearly or may list more than two criticisms.

- 1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge or partial understanding of two criticisms or narrow knowledge and understanding of only one criticism of the cosmological argument for the existence of God. At the top of this band accurate criticisms may be asserted but not outlined. At the bottom of this band the point(s) made will be partial and confused.
- 0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

### Selection and Application (9 marks)

Depending on the criticisms selected, illustrations might employ formal logic, or other arguments, to demonstrate inconsistency or the lack of validity; examples of the difficulty of explaining mind-body interaction to illustrate this difficulty; God as mathematician rather than a Being with whom we form personal relationships; examples of infinite series; all humans have a mother/the human race has a mother; examples from science to show that something can be generated from a vacuum, etc.

- 7 – 9 Selects, or constructs, relevant examples and clearly illustrates **two** criticisms of the cosmological argument for the existence of God.
- 4 – 6 Selects, or constructs, an example or examples to provide a partial account, lacking detail and precision, of at least **one** criticism of the cosmological argument for the existence of God. Responses in this band may be characterised by detailed exposition of the criticism and brief but accurate illustration. At the bottom of this band, where lists of criticisms have been given it may be difficult to determine which is being illustrated.
- 1 – 3 Selects at least one point or example to provide a basic sketchy and vague account of at least **one** criticism of the cosmological argument for the existence of God **or** at least one relevant illustration is given but application is tangential, or exposition is relevant, but there is no attempt to illustrate.
- 0 No relevant philosophical points.

(c)	Assess the teleological argument for the existence of God.	<i>(24 marks)</i>
-----	--	-------------------

### Knowledge and Understanding (6 marks)

At least one version of the teleological argument will be outlined and clarified as an a posteriori argument drawing from features of the world and particularly evidence of design to the purpose, goal or end of an intelligent designer. Expect most candidates to outline more traditional versions of the argument, drawing from analogous experiences of spatial order and design, but some may refer to wider versions of the argument including the anthropic principle, the evolution of intelligent observers and the normative basis of human rationality; the nature of religious experience, the demands of morality and/or the existence of beauty; causation, the existence of temporal order.

- 4 – 6 Demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of (at least one version of) the teleological argument.

- 1 – 3 Demonstrates basic knowledge or partial understanding of (at least one version of) the teleological argument.
- 0 No relevant philosophical knowledge and understanding.

### **Selection and Application (9 marks)**

It is likely that a range of issues will be selected for discussion. These might be drawn from: problems concerning the nature of the evidence – how much order, regularity, beauty, etc is there in the world and/or what about disorder, chaos, ugliness, etc. Even if there is order, regularity and beauty in the universe, what inference does this licence? An inference to God, many gods, trainee gods, etc. Whether cosmic design provides evidence for the existence of the God of classical theism. Whether it is correct to infer design from evidence of order or Hume’s point that, given the ‘entirely singular’ nature of the effect “I do not see that we could form any conjecture or inference at all concerning its cause”. Whether it is compatible with science and/or whether we require an explanation of order at all.

- 7 – 9 Selects, or constructs, relevant points and examples and applies these to provide a clear analysis of the teleological argument.
- 4 – 6 Selects, or constructs, some relevant points and examples to provide a partial analysis, narrowly focused or lacking detail and precision, of the teleological argument.
- 1 – 3 Selects and applies some points to provide a basic, sketchy and vague explanation of the teleological argument **or** some relevant points feature among many irrelevant points in a tangential approach to this argument.
- 0 No relevant philosophical points.

### **Interpretation and Evaluation (9 marks)**

Evaluation is likely to be present through the (critical) points selected for discussion, ie these will be presented as an evaluation of the quality of the argument and may lead candidates to reject the argument on the basis that, in the case of universes, we are not in a position to make inferences and/or if we were the inference we would make would not be to the God of theism.

Alternatively, it might be argued that science evidences fine-tuning of the universe and that the odds against this happening by chance are enormous. So, the best inference is to intelligent design. The argument, or at least modern versions of it, is compatible with science and with the evolution of intelligent observers. It may be used together with other arguments to support the existence of God.

- 7 – 9 Demonstrates a critical appreciation of the teleological argument and advances a clear position.
- 4 – 6 Evaluation is present within an exposition of the teleological argument and various criticisms but is either implicit in a juxtaposition of points or asserted with inadequate supportive explanation.
- 1 – 3 Demonstrates a simple and basic appreciation of the teleological argument by offering an account in which a view is described, or points are listed or asserted without justification, or argument is confused.
- 0 No relevant philosophical insights.