



edexcel

Exemplars

A Level Religious Studies: Paper 1 - Philosophy

A Level Religious Studies Exemplars: Paper 1 – Philosophy

Contents

Introduction	Page 1
Question 1	Page 2
Question 2	Page 8
Question 3a	Page 18
Question 3b	Page 25
Question 4	Page 34

Introduction

- The purpose of this pack is to provide teachers and students with some examples of responses to A Level Religious Studies Paper 1: Philosophy
- The sample assessment materials which these responses are based on can be found on the Pearson website
- In this pack, you will find a small sample of responses, an examiner commentary and the mark scheme for each question.
- The responses are all from students and we have retained their original responses where possible. In some cases, the student scripts have been typed to ensure that they are clear to read.
- We will add to these exemplar packs throughout the year.
- If you have any enquiries regarding these materials or have any other questions about the course, please contact our subject advisor team on teachingreligiousstudies@pearson.com

Question 1

Question and Mark Scheme

- 1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

Question number	Indicative content
1	<p>8 marks AO1</p> <p>AO1 will be used by candidates to demonstrate knowledge, understanding and specialist language and terminology when responding to the question.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaning of the term 'analogy'. • There are analogies (similarities) between order in the world and man-made machines such as a watch. • There is evidence of analogies (parallels) between order in the human body such as the eye and order in the world. • The experience of order over time as in laws of nature and analogically between man-made machines. • Analogical reasoning leads to links between experience of man-made machines and the origin of order in nature, namely God.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs with some inaccuracies (AO1). • Provides a superficial understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1).
Level 2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1). • Develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).
Level 3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs (AO1). • Comprehensively develops key religious ideas and beliefs to show a depth of understanding (AO1).

Script A

1 Explore ideas about analogy in the design argument for the existence of God.

Analogies tell you what something is like. In the design argument it says the world is like a watch so there must be a God to make it work because it is so complicated.

It also says it is like an arrow going in the right direction so there must be a God who designed the world.

Examiner Comment:

Marks Awarded: Level 1 - 2 marks

This is a rather thin response. The candidate is aware of the meaning of the term and the connection with complexity in the design argument but there is little here to allow it to proceed beyond level 1 as it presents a narrow range with superficial understanding.

Script B

There are analogies in the design argument from Aquinas and from William Paley. Aquinas says arrows reach their target if there is an archer and as the world is moving forward there must be God like an archer.

Paley talked about a watch and how because it has lots of parts to make it work it probably has someone that made it like that. He says the world is like that too - lots of complicated parts (like an eye) so it needs a God to explain it. Complicated things are often made by machines that are designed so the world is like this and likely to be designed too.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 2 - 4 marks

This response shows awareness of some scholarship from the argument and there are parallels made between eye and world although these are under-developed. The candidate attempts to broaden their reference to include notions of machines but does not develop this enough to reach beyond Level 2.

Script C

In the teleological argument, William Paley uses a watch as an analogy for the world. He says that if you came across a watch, you would know that it had been designed, due to its intricate complexity. Paley says that the same can be said for the world, it is so detailed and well ordered that it cannot have come about purely through chance. If you came across a stone, you would not think that it had been designed, because it is simple, and serves no purpose. In this way, it is not comparable to the universe, because it seems to have a purpose, like a watch does. This means that the world must have been created by God.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 2 – 5 marks

A range of knowledge is presented about the complexity including reference to purpose, but the material is underdeveloped and the idea of analogy is limited.

Script D

William Paley used ~~the~~ ^{an} analogy of a pocket watch to propose an argument for the existence of God. The analogy was as follows; if one saw a pocket watch, they would ~~is~~ conclude that the watch was designed and created. This is because of its complexity, and the fact that it was created for a purpose. Likewise, the universe is very complex. For example biological processes in living organisms. Paley would argue that due to the complexity of the ~~world~~ universe, the universe must have had a creator and designer, like the pocketwatch. Hume would disagree with the analogy, as he states "we have no experience of world making"; in order to know something we have to have direct or indirect experience of something - need empirical evidence for the statement ~~was~~ proposed. Furthermore Hume expresses his views that "Design is mind imposed, not God imposed."

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 3 – 6

A level exemplars

Scripts	Commentary
Q1 – script 10	This is at the beginning of Level 3. The candidate focuses on Paley and analogy. This is developed by reference to the ideas of complexity and purpose together with the link between complexity in living organisms. There is a selection of key ideas with some understanding. However, it lacks the range and depth of higher marks within level 3. Level 3 – 6 marks

SCRIPT E:

Analogy is a comparison between two different things, in order to highlight a similarity. If things agree in some respects they probably agree in others.

Analogy is a key theme throughout the design argument used by philosophers to simplify complex arguments. Paley (1743-1805) uses a watch to show that objects with intricate features must be designed. The universe is even more complicated, therefore it too must have a designer who must be God. Through comparing the universe to a designed object it makes it much easier for us to understand.

Paley also argues from the point of *qua* purpose and *qua* regularity, where he uses analogy to show that everything is too complicated to have come about by chance.

Analogy is very important within explaining the design argument. Analogy is a way of comparing the universe to man-made objects so that we can comprehend. Analogies can be easily adapted to suit one's argument too e.g. comparing the universe to a potato.

(Total for Question 1 = 8 marks)

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 3 – 8 marks

There is good range of terminology used alongside a good range of ideas including order, complexity, regularity and purpose. The response loses a bit of focus in the very last line but the response as a whole comprehensively develops the key religious ideas and beliefs required for the question.

Question 2

Question and Mark Scheme

- 2 Assess the debate between Copleston and Russell on religious experience as an argument for the existence of God.

{12}

Question number	Indicative content
2	<p>4 marks AO1, 8 marks AO2</p> <p>AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis and evaluation. Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding when responding to the question, and in meeting AO2 descriptors described below.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaning of religious experience, including mysticism. • A feature of the argument is arguing from mental states to something outside of us. • Best explanation is that there is an objective cause of religious experience. <p>AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question. Such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems of the interpretation of experience and therefore may be unreliable. • Religious experiences may have a good effect on a person's life with a presumption of its truth and therefore a test of its veracity. • Evidence of fictional cases that influence people for the better, hence this does not provide evidence of an objective source. • Tensions between competing explanations, therefore with little common ground of testing the various options. <p>Candidates who show achievement only against AO1 will not be able to gain marks beyond the top of Level 1.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1). • Information/issues are identified (AO2). • Judgements are supported by generalised arguments (AO2).
Level 2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected, most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1). • Deconstructs religious information/issues which lead to a simplistic chain of reasoning (AO2). • Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made (AO2).
Level 3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1). • Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2). • Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question (AO2).

Script A

Coplestone and Russell do not agree on religious experience and they argued about it on the radio in 1946.

Coplestone says the best explanation for religious experiences is that God causes them but Russell thinks we can't move from the mind out to reality to get any proof. He thinks it is like loving a fictional character and so it does not prove God as it could just be in the mind and not real.

Coplestone argues that it can be useful in an argument for God's existence because it makes people do good moral things and so it points to God this way. Russell says that is still not proof though because some hear demons so that could prove them and they just can't agree on the evidence and whether religious experience can prove God or be the 'best explanation' or if it is just in the mind.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 1 – 4 marks

This response is fairly thin and gives an overview or thin summary of the positions of Coplestone and Russell but there is no detail, explanation or rationale for these views, or an assessment of them.

Religious experience can be defined as a feeling of something otherworldly. In the famous radio debate with Copleston and Russell, Copleston set out his view that the 'best explanation' for religious experience is that there is an objective cause for it and that this cause is God. He believes, about mysticism and mystical experiences (not visions) that it's ineffability and the certainty it brings of something beyond the normal convincingly points to God.

He also thinks that because these experiences (if pure ones) often lead to people doing good things or bearing good fruits, then this is further evidence that they come from God, a force for good, or that this is the 'best explanation' for them.

Russell is not convinced though (he is an atheist) for a number of reasons. He thinks if it shows God then experiences of demons prove demons exist too. Also, it is hard to accept things as true unless lots of people agree but religious experience is mainly only private and in the mind.

Just because people do good acts it doesn't mean it was caused by God. People confuse fiction with reality and might be doing this with God and these experiences

For these reasons they do not agree on religious experience as evidence for the existence of God.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 2 – 8 marks

This candidate attempts to set out the terms of religious experience and uses some good terminology. There is some detail on the positions of both Copleston and Russell but these are presented as summaries with little concrete assessment of each position or clarification of the reasons for their views – although this is touched on. This response sits in level 2, at the top end.

Script C:

Copleston and Russel debate Religious experience as proof of the existence of God in their debate in 1948.

Copleston begins by stating that he does not "regard religious experience as a strict proof of the existence of God" which I think weakens the argument because it cannot be proved however this does not disregard the idea that it ~~is~~ could be evidence to some extent. This agrees with what Copleston argues because he says "The actual basic experience at any rate is most easily explained on the hypothesis that there is actually some objective cause of that experience" ~~say~~ for example God.

To counter argue this Russel argues that there is nothing to prove that these experiences ~~are~~ could be an effect of our mental state and as they are always internal and private it is not solid evidence. "these religious experiences do tend to be very private." I cannot deny that the experiences are private and could be a hallucination however as religious experiences are universal and occur to so many people I think at least some of them must

be genuine.

Copleston agrees with me here highlighting the idea that some people are not "deluded" or hallucinating and he calls this "the pure type" comparing it to "St Francis of Assisi". He also makes the point that these experiences must have some purpose because they result "in an overflow of dynamic and creative love" and the best explanation of this is the actual existence of God. Russell does not deny this ^{suggestion} ~~theory~~ "Well, I'm not contending in a dogmatic way that there is not a God".

Therefore Religious experience is successful as evidence for the existence of God because it affects ^{many} people on a personal level.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 3 – 9 marks

Q2 - script 13	The candidate presents a clear outline of some of the key ideas of Copleston and Russell on religious experience as an argument for the existence of God. Comparative judgements are made with logical chains of reasoning. The standard of this answer comes into the beginning of level 3. Level 3 - 9 marks
----------------	---

tel exp *ult* *hdb* *R* *fact*

Script D:

The debate between Copleston and Russell; ~~not~~ ^{believer} believers in God, and Russell, an ~~atheist~~ ^{atheist} covers the topic of religious experience.

Copleston ^{states that} ~~defines~~ a religious experience isn't just a "good feeling". This is positive as it is easy for critics to argue against those that state religious experiences are just a "good feeling". These critics state that a good feeling ~~can~~ ^{can} be caused by natural reactions in the brain, ~~not~~ ^{possibly} possibly caused by dance or music, and not by divine ~~interaction~~ ^{interaction}. Copleston defines a religious experience as the "awareness of a loving object... something that cannot be pictured or conceptualized, ~~but~~ and doubt of its existence is impossible". Some would say that Copleston's definition is too vague and can be ~~applied to~~ ^{applied to} non-relig interpreted in a non-religious way. However the vagueness ~~can be a strength in his argument.~~ ^{can be} applied to ~~different types~~ ^{different types} for example Russell states later on in the argument that ~~the~~ it would be a "purely mental experience". This ~~is~~ ^{is} idea ~~is~~ ^{is} was supported by John Hick who ~~showed that~~ ^{had} created the "God Helmet". ~~For example,~~ ^{Hick} Hick stated that this device could stimulate a "religious experience" through electromagnetic waves. ~~showing religious experiences~~ ^{can be interpreted at a mental level}

Copleston states in his definition that "doubt is impossible" and later on that an experience has a good effect on one's life. This ^{creates a strength for the} supports the ~~idea about~~ religious experience argument. If an experience ~~is~~ has such a strong impact on one's life, it cannot be disregarded.

Coplestone starts the argument with a line similar to the views of Richard Swinburne. Copleston states that he 'doesn't regard religious experience as strict proof of the existence of God... but ~~that~~ God is the best explanation.' This means that Copleston recognizes the fact that religious experiences cannot directly prove God. However uses the idea of probability. Swinburne stated that ~~these~~ the arguments like the theological, cosmological and ontological, count towards to probability that God exists.

(Total for Question 2 = 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 20 MARKS

~~loosely~~

To conclude Copleston ~~states~~ ~~attempts to~~ argues for ~~the~~ ~~existence of God~~, for the reality of religious experience as a divine interaction. He ~~attempts~~ to define religious experience, but ends up stating that it is "indefinable". Through the argument it is clear to see that there are different interpretations of religious experiences.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 3 – 10 marks

Q2 - script 12

Candidate presents a range of ideas including key views of Copleston and Russell. Most of the material is on Copleston including a number of his important views including conceptual links with Swinburne. There are arguments including the view that religious experience cannot prove the existence of God but that this evidence may add to the probability of the existence of God.

Level 3 – 10 marks

12 - script 12

SCRIPT E:

The issue at stake is whether religious experiences, specifically the mystical rather than visions, can be used as an argument for the existence of God. Copleston concedes they may not count as strict proof but contends that the best explanation of these experiences is in fact the existence of an object that transcends the self and is their cause, God. The nature of a mystical experience adds weight to his claim. They are ineffable and convey great love and ^(insight) certainty, in that moment at least, of the existence of an external, transcendent, objective cause. They often lead to an overflow of creative/dynamic love and impact on the life of the experiencer - Copleston sees this as adding weight to the claim they can only be caused by an external being, God, not simply a subjective explanation although he does allow for this possibility in some cases of visions where people may be deluded or hallucinating or alternative physiological explanations account for them. Copleston ^{accepts} ~~argues~~ the impact of these events in the life of the experiencer - and their long-lasting nature adds evidence to the veracity and sanity of them rather than proof of the truth of the claim but this cumulative evidence adds weight

to the argument for the existence of God from religious experience.

The reasons for Russell's objections are concerned with the lack of empirical evidence. He asserts he is agnostic about

God there is no evidence. His initial objection is that moving from mental states to external objects is "a tricky affair" - it is usually managed by consensus of people (many can see the clock in the room but RE is often private) and despite corporate experiences, Copleston is focusing on mystical here which means Russell has a point. He also argues if evidence of reports of encounter with God are to be taken as true then surely so should reports of experiences of negative realities (forces e.g. devils) and yet Copleston would not argue for this. Just because there are accounts of experiences we cannot know they are true and if we are to believe some shouldn't we believe all? Copleston points to the different, positive, nature of mystical experiences and their lasting positive impact on the lives of those who have them to support their value but Russell suggests one can have these (Total for Question 2 = 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 20 MARKS

extra page

→ responses to fictional characters, or even if you don't know they are fictional and think they are real which leads to this positive impact in your view, it does not mean that they are real or can be the cause of the impact.

In the absence of further evidence and because it is 'tricky' to move from mental states to objective beings and because positive effects do not ^{prove} conviction of the existence of objective beings Russell is not at all persuaded by Copleston's view that the best explanation for mystical experiences is God.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 3 – 12 marks

This answer covers a wide range of material revealing good knowledge and uses terminology well throughout. It critically deconstructs information and presents reasoned judgments about key issues and reasons for the positions adopted by the key thinkers. It is very well informed and it constructs a coherent discussion across the full range of elements in the question. As with other candidates, this student has written outside the allocated space. Additional space will be provided in future.

Question 3

Question and Mark Scheme

A fine brass hypothesis may be killed by inches, the death by a thousand qualifications...

It seems to people who are not religious as if there was no conceivable event the occurrence of which would be admitted by religious people to be a reason for conceding 'There wasn't a God after all! Someone tells us that God loves us as a father loves his children. But then we see a child dying of inoperable cancer of the throat. His earthly father is driven frantic in his efforts to help, but his heavenly Father reveals no signs of concern. Some qualification is made – God's love is 'not merely human love'. But then we ask: Just what would have to happen to entitle us to say 'God does not exist'?

A believer's statement has been so eroded that it is no longer an assertion at all.

(Source: Quote from 'The Philosophy of Religion', Flew, A, Editor: Mitchell B, By permission of Oxford University Press)

3 (a) Clarify the ideas illustrated in this passage about falsification in religious language.

You must refer to the passage in your response.

(10)

Question number	Indicative content
3(a)	<p>10 marks AO1</p> <p>AO1 will be used by candidates to demonstrate knowledge and understanding and specialist language and terminology when responding to the question.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The believer in the passage qualifies his views because of the absence of evidence. • The sceptic tries to build up a cumulative case. • The sceptic sets up various tests and these do not produce evidence to support a belief in God. • The process of qualification by the believer dissipates the original assertion about the existence God. • The end result is that the original hypothesis becomes so qualified that it dies as a meaningful claim, 'the death of a thousand qualifications'. • The argument of Flew is that the religious believer will not allow anything to falsify the religious claim.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs is superficial (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs with some inaccuracies that are not directly linked to the extract (AO1).
Level 2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs is detailed, however it is not fully developed (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding addresses a narrow range of key religious ideas and beliefs and are linked in most cases to reference from the extract (AO1).
Level 3	7–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding of key religious ideas and beliefs is detailed and fully developed (AO1). • Knowledge and understanding addresses a broad range of key religious ideas and beliefs and are fully linked to references from the extract (AO1).

Script A

This passage shows us that believers can't explain why God lets people suffer as a father would be 'divine father' but believers still think God is loving even though he does nothing.

The extract also says that nothing stops believers believing there is a God but it is not an assertion as it means nothing. It also says God's love is not human love but

that does not explain it, so it is not saying anything at all as they never say God does not exist and admit belief in God is false.

They won't let it be shown to be false so it stops meaning anything. This links to the falsification principle that unless you can say what would make it false it does not really mean anything.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 2 – 4 marks

This is a short response that focuses on the idea of explaining why God does not act in the face of suffering rather than directly on the issue of falsification. Whilst a bit repetitious it does make some useful points about not allowing belief to be shown to be wrong but these points are rather superficial and on a narrow range of ideas in the topic. The final sentence is stronger meaning it might just reach into the bottom of L:2.

Script B

Falsification is the idea that for something to have meaning it must be able to be wrong

Some people like Anthony Flew think religious believers do not allow religious language to ever be wrong, instead they would say things like 'God moves in mysterious ways' because they believe God is love, no matter what ever is the problem of evil. This is shown above when it says about

the father of the child being driven
frantic but 'God's love is not merely
human love'. This shows how they try
to explain it another way rather than
admit it might be false that God is love,
or exists. However, because they won't say
it could be wrong it stops having much
meaning at all. ^{It's like the death of a thousand qualifications} All religious believers do
is try to come up with other explanations
for suffering to show how their view of God
could still be right but it can't be proved.
It can't be proved wrong either if they won't
accept the evidence and some think
this means it is just meaningless
and 'no longer an assertion at all'.
This is the view of Flew and falsification
groups based on the Veina Circle ideas.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 2 – 6 marks

This response is fuller and has more reference to the context of falsification. It attempts to develop the idea of not allowing anything to count against an idea and how this undermines it but is not developed enough to reach past the top of Level 2.

Script C

(10)

In this passage Flew argues that religious believers will not admit to anything being able to change their view/belief. They say God is love and do not allow anything to be able to prove that wrong and make them change their position - even the suffering of children which surely is incongruous with the idea of an all loving God. He says they constantly 'qualify' their assertions, or hedging it around with sayings like 'God is mystery' or 'God's love is not like human love' as a way to try to protect their belief in God.

even in the face of evidence that to many others seem to directly contradict and challenge it. As there is nothing (it seems) that is agreed by believers that would make their statement about God false, it cannot be falsified, then it cannot be a meaningful statement according to Flew. Hick first observed that 'in order to say something is possible we must say something which may possibly be false', but if believers are not doing this, as it cannot possibly be false, then their statements 'die the death of a thousand qualifications' and are meaningless. If nothing can count against it the falsification principle would agree the statement is saying nothing of any meaning - as anything is consistent with the claim eg 'God is love' even great atrocities as illustrated in the problem of evil, the statement becomes vacuous. If it is meaningless to talk of God's love then it is also meaningless to say 'God exists' if nothing (even great suffering) can be allowed to falsify that view. It is like the parable of the gardener - one person qualifies his belief so much - 'he is invisible, intangible' etc. that in reality it is little different from no gardener at all - at what point, suggests Flew, will the believer concede this? If he will not give a point/condition for this it is all meaningless.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 3 – 10 marks

This response outlines the ideas in the text and explains their context using a wide range of knowledge of religious ideas. This is fully developed; ideas are linked to references from the extract and specialist language is used well throughout. The candidate displays a rigorous understanding of the key concepts and implications in this passage.

3 b)

Question and Mark Scheme

(b) Analyse the implications for religious language from this passage.**(20)**

Question number	Indicative content
3(b)	<p>5 marks AO1, 15 marks AO2</p> <p>AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis and evaluation. Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding using specialist language and terminology when responding to the question, and in meeting AO2 descriptors described below.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Religious language has many uses with an assumption that it communicates sense. • However, religious language is so different from normal speech, such as speech used in discussion about God who is believed to be beyond space and time. • Religious language has been criticised in many ways, including logical positivism and its allied view of language – falsification. <p>AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question. Such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical positivism argues there are tests to determine whether or not claims are meaningful, including support from experience. When this is applied to religious language there seems to be no empirical evidence and therefore the claim is said to be meaningless. • A further test as to whether religious language is meaningful or meaningless is that it is not analytic and true by definition and therefore is meaningless. • Hare argues that religious language is like a 'blik' because people believe in them and act on them even though they are not readily supported by evidence and therefore this type of claim, including religious language can be argued to be meaningful. • Mitchell builds up a case for the use of evidence when claims may appear to be ambiguous and may therefore be meaningful. • There can be criticisms of the falsification stance on the grounds of its reliance on empirical evidence, this weakens the falsification technique because these are based on the limitations of the verification principle. • There are alternative models for assessing religious language claims, such as Wittgenstein's language games, and therefore these may limit the strength of falsification. <p>Candidates who show achievement only against AO1 will not be able to gain marks beyond the top of Level 1.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1). • Information/issues are selected (AO2). • Makes basic connections between a limited range of elements in the question (AO2). • Judgements are supported by generic arguments (AO2).
Level 2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected, some of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1). • Deconstructs religious information/issues (AO2). • Makes connections between a limited range of elements in the question (AO2). • Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made with little or no attempt to appraise evidence (AO2).
Level 3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected, most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1). • Deconstructs religious information/issues, which lead to a simple chain of reasoning (AO2). • Makes connections between many but not all of the elements in the question (AO2). • Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made, which are supported by an attempt to appraise evidence (AO2).
Level 4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected, most of which are used appropriately and accurately throughout (AO1). • Deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2). • Makes connections between a wide range of elements in the question (AO2). • Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of many but not all of elements in the question, which are supported by the appraisal of some evidence (AO2).
Level 5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1). • Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2). • Makes connections between the full range of elements in the question (AO2). • Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question, which are fully supported by the comprehensive appraisal of evidence (AO2).

Script A

If this passage is right and believers never accept there is no God and always have an explanation for why they are right to think that then it might mean the problem of evil is explained, but critics think those solutions are flawed.

If its right and religious language is 'not an assertion' then it should not be believed, if it is not saying things that match the evidence (or can be tested) so people might think the language is just made up as it is not based on any evidence that could be used.

However, some think it is not made up because lots of people believe in it and they can't all be wrong. It might be a test of faith to keep believing even if there is not much evidence, it can't be proved wrong either so perhaps it is just a test (like for Abraham with Isaac).

The problem with religious language though is if one group says it means something and another says it is meaningless (as Logical Positivists would here) as there's no proof is favour or against, that believers would allow, they are never going to agree or give in and so perhaps it does just end up being 'nonsense' after all. How can anyone know or do they just have to agree to disagree?

It might not matter to atheists like Dawkins but for religious believers in God this could be a problem if no-one believes them and thinks what they say about God is meaningless or 'not an assertion at all' when for them it clearly is.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 2 – 8 marks

This response gives a broad-brush overview of the issues about not allowing evidence to count against belief. It considers some implications of this and the idea of faith being a test. It lacks direct focus on the meaning or otherwise of religious language and stays instead with evidence and falsifying belief so it is rather narrow in its range. Connections are made between a limited range of the question and some judgements given but it needs more depth and breadth to reach into Level 3.

Script B

If Flew is right and religious language dies the death of a thousand qualifications then it starts to mean less in the world. Critics of religion could say if it won't allow anything to count against it then it does not use language properly (cognitively) and so it is meaningless.

The Verification Principle (A. Ayer) says things are only meaningful if they are analytical ($2+2=4$) or if you can test it, now or at some point. You cannot do this with religious language though because supposedly God is not something to experiment on so religious language is meaningless. Believers think there is some a posteriori evidence in the design argument in the world and cosmos but it is not proof that can be tested.

But, lots of people point out that you can't test the Verification Principle properly either so it is nonsense itself.

Science operates with falsification. It likes things to be known about what counts against it in order to be meaningful - this is like falsification in religious language but if Flew is right and religious beliefs and believers simply won't admit or allow this then it has to be useless and not an assertion at all (with any real meaning). One implication of this might be that people should or will stop believing in religion (and listen to Dawkins instead!).

Religious believers seem unlikely to just give up their faith though, even when bad things happen. They tend to try to understand what ~~the~~ God's reasons might be (like in explaining the problem of evil) so it clearly does still mean something to them even if it is hard to explain. They keep their conviction (like the Partisan).

Some views of religious language - like 'blik's' - say it has its own sort of meaning - you can't test it but it effects

what people think and do (like the boy who thought his teacher wanted to kill him) he acted differently because of this. This is like Christians going to church because they believe the words about God even though bad things happen. Philosophers like _____ say this is all being in the same 'game' All agree what it means to you even though atheists won't agree. Everyone carries on believing what they want and acting on it in their 'game' or group even though it isn't proved right or wrong (yet).

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 4 – 15 marks (14?)

There is a good range of ideas here, although some could be further developed and connections are made between meaning in a Logical Positivist context and in other possible ways. There are judgements made about interpretations of meaning and its impact and some conclusions drawn. This answer reaches into level 4 near the top end.

Script C

The falsification principle argues that 'God talk' about the nature or existence of God is meaningless, nothing but a set of vacuous formulae or ~~assertions~~ ^{statements} that nothing is permitted to count against rendering them devoid of any empirical meaning. If this is a correct assessment of how (religious) language works then any discipline or discussion using religious language is pointless, if it allows nothing to count against it, it cannot be a real assertion at all according to Flew. Theology, worship and scripture are all rendered meaningless and this has a significant implication for believers, educators and those engaged in the study of theology. There are also implications for undermining the cultural heritage of many nations in literature, language and so forth.

However, there have been many attempts to rescue religious language from this challenge. RL can be understood differently and yet retain meaning, many would argue [e.g. it can be meaningful analogically perhaps]. R. M. Hare coined the term 'blik' and explained this refers to a way of regarding the world, a blik is in principle non-verifiable or falsifiable but can be veridical or 'illusory'. They express beliefs and concepts that are important to people and affect the behaviour of individuals and groups - which is empirically observable so these statements can be acknowledged as having

meaning because they affect how one lives or behaves. This means they are meaningful even if they refer to entities that cannot directly be verified empirically. Even the Verification Principle (which is of course flawed itself though) in its weak form allowed for things, in principle, to be verifiable e.g. after death and for many believers this is enough. Here argued beliefs are meaningful as they affect how people live.

Mitchell suggested that believers do acknowledge there is evidence to count against their belief or assertion but persist in their faith regardless. It is not burying their head in the sand or putting their fingers in their ears but steadfastly holding to the commitment made to that belief despite empirical evidence to challenge it. These are then 'significant articles of faith' that are rooted in relationship (like for the Partisan and the Stranger) of humans and God that provide the strength of commitment even in most challenging realities (e.g. suffering) and cannot be easily abandoned.

It is clear these beliefs are important then but can they be empirically true/false or cognitive as the V.P and F.P would want? If their meaning comes from assent to them and their use and the outcome is often (empirically observable) behaviour or commitment to a certain way of life then it

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Meaning because
could be said to be meaningful but is its own sphere
of assertions. If it is not empirically verifiable
(or falsifiable) as a statement then we have
a Language Game, where meaning is clear
for those in it but harder to engage with
from outside of that language game. This is
possibly the issue, and an important implication
for today, for those outside the game. Are they
willing to learn and accept the new rules
of non-cognitive meaning and engage in
dialogue across the spheres of meaning or
remain steadfastly committed to the
notion of meaningfulness only be derived
from cognitive statements that are
empirically verifiable or falsifiable.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 5 – 20 marks

This answer is clearly structured and covers a wide range of knowledge and uses specialist well throughout. It makes connections between a range of ideas and deconstructs issues; it also manages to present coherent and reasoned judgements with a full appraisal of evidence.

Question 4

Question and Mark Scheme

- 4 Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the belief in immortality of the soul and reincarnation.

In your response to this question, you must include how developments in Philosophy of Religion have been influenced by one of the following:

- Religion and Ethics
- New Testament Studies
- the study of a religion.

(10)

Question number	Indicative content
4	<p>5 marks AO1, 25 marks AO2</p> <p>AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis and evaluation. Candidates will be required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding using specialist language and terminology when responding to the question, and in meeting AO2 descriptors described below.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A belief in life after death may be the view that humans will survive death. • Some religious traditions give an account of immortality of the soul, linked to dualism. • In Hindu traditions, some religious believers link reincarnation to transmigration. <p>AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question. Such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following in relation to AO2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The belief in the immortality of the soul is a stronger stance than materialism because of the strengths of dualism. • Consciousness is no more than brain activity and when the brain dies so does any notion of consciousness and therefore the notion of the immortality of the soul becomes redundant. • The strength of reincarnation is related to a range of empirical evidence that accumulates to support this belief and therefore leads to a sound basis for belief in reincarnation. • A weakness of reincarnation includes problems about identity, especially if there are multiple types of future existences, and therefore this leads to a rejection of belief in reincarnation. Resurrection is an alternative to these beliefs about life after death and is a stronger system because of evidence to support it. • A belief in life after death may influence ethical principles, such as the sanctity of life, and this type of principle may therefore be associated with debates about abortion and euthanasia (this shows links with Religion and Ethics). • These belief systems can be compared to New Testament teachings about resurrection and therefore may be used to assess the distinctive nature of these respective beliefs (this shows links with New Testament Studies). • Many religious traditions believe in life after death, although there may be some similarities and some substantial differences between their beliefs. For example, Islam presents beliefs about resurrection related directly to the 'Day of Judgement' and the authority of Allah. Therefore this is significantly different from the belief in immortality of the soul (this shows links to Study of Religion). <p>Candidates who show achievement only against AO1 will not be able to gain marks beyond the top of Level 1.</p> <p>Candidates who do not show links with another area of their course of study will not be able to gain marks beyond the top of Level 4.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A narrow range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected but are unlikely to be used appropriately or accurately (AO1). • Information/issues are identified (AO2). • Makes basic connections between a limited range of elements in the question (AO2). • Judgements are supported by generic arguments (AO2). • Judgements made with no attempt to appraise evidence (AO2). • Conclusions are provided but are simplistic and/or generic (AO2).
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected, some of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1). • Deconstructs religious information/issues (AO2). • Makes connections between a limited range of elements in the question (AO2). • Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made (AO2). • Judgements made with little or no attempt to appraise evidence (AO2). • Conclusions are provided, which loosely draw together ideas but with little or no attempt to justify (AO2).
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are selected most of which are used appropriately with some inaccuracies (AO1). • Deconstructs religious information/issues, which lead to a simplistic chain of reasoning (AO2). • Makes connections between many but not all of the elements in the question (AO2). • Judgements of a limited range of elements in the question are made (AO2). • Judgements are supported by an attempt to appraise evidence (AO2). • Conclusions are provided, which logically draw together ideas and are partially justified (AO2).
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected, most of which are used appropriately and accurately throughout (AO1). • Deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2). • Makes connections between a wide range of elements in the question (AO2). • Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of many but not all of elements in the question (AO2). • Reasoned judgements are supported by the appraisal of some evidence (AO2). • Convincing conclusions are provided which fully and logically draw together ideas and are partially justified (AO2).

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of knowledge, specialist language and terminology are carefully selected and used appropriately, accurately and sustained throughout (AO1). • Critically deconstructs religious information/issues leading to coherent and logical chains of reasoning (AO2). • Makes connections between the full range of elements in the question (AO2). • Constructs coherent and reasoned judgements of the full range of elements in the question (AO2). • Reasoned judgements are fully supported by the comprehensive appraisal of evidence (AO2). • Convincing conclusions are provided which fully and logically draw together ideas and are fully justified (AO2).

Script A

Plato said the soul cannot be broken up and so it lives on after the body, it goes back to the Forms. Some Christians also think we have a soul that lives on after death, ^{with God.} This means we can defeat death like Jesus did (when the ghost leaves the machine).

A problem with this though is how would we recognise each other in heaven if we didn't have bodies?

Some people think immortality of the soul is strong because we are more than just our bodies but others would argue that that feeling is only the mind, which is just the brain which will die when we do.

There is not much evidence for immortality of the soul (although some

people believe in ghosts and the 'Spirit World'). There are reports of Out of Body Experiences when people are dying or in an operation and they say they were floating above their body watching the doctors and what tools they used. This might show it is possible to exist but not be in your body. Scientists can explain this though so not many find it convincing.

The main weakness of immortality is you have to be a dualist to accept it but science can explain everything in terms of matter and so it is not a strong theory.

Reincarnation is the idea that there is a soul that is in the body but leaves it when we die. Hindus think it leaves one body and goes into another and this is being born again. It happens over and over until it finally stops and you join God. It is like a circle to escape from. You do this by earning 'karma merit' so if you are good you come back in a better life and if you do bad things you might come back as an animal or insect and have to start again.

This is a good theory as you get lots of chances to progress and finally join God. It also makes people want to be good because it would not be fun to be a beetle. But it is weak because there is not much evidence. Some people say they used to be someone else before but this is hard to prove. It might be made up or remembered from books or TV and it is not convincing.

This is not as good as immortality because you can't know which soul is which in a body if it keeps coming back and there is not much evidence.

Both theories are not great on evidence but interesting about being able to survive death, but neither are convincing on how it is you.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 3 – 17 marks (18 might not be put down by a PE, for discussion)

This response covers a good range of ideas although it lacks scholarship and depth. It offers strengths and weakness and a view on each theory although again superficial in places. There is good effort to balance between the two theories (not essential but good for range) and there is an element of attempted comparison as a means of evaluation. Overall there is a range of knowledge, with some inaccuracies, it makes a simple chain of reasoning, and there is some attempt to appraise evidence. However, it lacks depth, detail, scholars and there are no links attempted. This would reach the top of Level 3.

Script B

Many religions assert that there is life after death and there are a range of theories about how this will happen, some think we ~~need~~^{need} or will have a body, others don't. The two in this question are dualist - they argue there is a separate soul that can survive the death of the body but disagree over what happens to it next. Each theory has its strengths and weaknesses as it tries to explain how the soul/self continues to exist.

Plato and Descartes (^{*}'I think therefore I am') both believed the soul is different to matter. It is indivisible (not made of parts) and rational (^{*}) and can survive without the body - this is immortality of the soul, it is indestructible. So the soul continues to exist, although it may not be clear where/how and Christians build on this is the belief that it is with God in heaven. There is evidence to support this in

NDEs where people report existing separate to their bodies for a short time, but also in ideas in the Bible e.g. where Jesus says 'today you will be with me in Paradise' before his body dies. Swinburne has defended the idea of the soul although Hick would argue that it makes more sense for a body to be 'replicated' by God as well as we are physical-psychic units. This might work better with evidence in the Bible that Jesus had a body after the resurrection when he appeared to the disciples.

A strength of immortality of the soul is that we are certainly more than our bodies, that change all the time yet 'we' continue, and also those who suffer loss of limbs or disability don't stop being who they are. This theory can be criticised though as some think this idea is a mistake and the soul is not real but a ghost in a machine. When the body dies all feeling (even if being more than a body) will die with it. This is a materialist view and has stronger evidence supporting it - people don't tend to come back from the dead and explain what it is like. It is hard to know how an individual would be identified without a body.

and if memory lasts without a brain to store it in so overall this is a limited theory. It might link to Ethics though because if there's a soul when it is joined to a body is important in deciding about abortion.

Reincarnation is a view associated with Hinduism and Buddhism. The atman (soul) has numerous lives in different bodies before escaping to be with God. This view suggests the soul is the true self and the body only its clothing. This also fits with the view that our bodies aren't the only way we are defined (although it is how we interact/recognise each other).

A problem with this view is how each incarnation of one soul can be identified as/matched to that soul. They don't look the same (soul is not body) but they also usually don't share knowledge or memory of other lives so how do they know who (what soul) they are and how to get better to escape? It does seem unfair that for the soul to progress and escape the process it has to earn good karma but in each life you don't get to know/keep what you learned before.

However there are reports that have been studied of people remembering past lives - things

they supposedly couldn't know which might support this idea although there may be other explanations for this and even if not, a few examples don't explain the whole system or make it 'fair'.

Both of these theories are dualist and they both struggle for evidence. They are comforting that death is not the end and our bodies aren't what really matters (which links to Ethics in sexual ethics too or also euthanasia) but actually Jesus had a body and Christianity teaches the body is a temple of the Holy Spirit but that we are our whole self in body and soul so neither of these theories have greater strengths than weaknesses.

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 4 – 24 marks

First thoughts but on reflection and from Chief: the quality of AO2 re strengths and weaknesses could push this into L 5

This response has a good level of detail and some scholars are referred to. It covers a wide range of knowledge and uses some specialist language. It has logical chains of reasoning about the self and identity and appraises evidence (although briefly in places) to form a judgement. There is clear evaluation of the views and convincing conclusions are drawn about their merits or otherwise. There is some effort to link this component to Ethics although more can be made of this, it feels like a name check rather than an exploration of the relationship. A solid, good and broad essay but it could be improved to reach safely into Level 5. Top level 4.

Script C

Immortality of the soul has had many advocates - notably Plato and Descartes, from a dualist perspective. This is the idea that the body and soul are distinct entities. Descartes argued that the body is spatial and not conscious, whereas the soul/mind is non-spatial and conscious; its essence is to think - and thinking/reasoning is the only place certainty can be found. The mind and body are believed to interact through the brain but when the physical body and brain die the soul, which is of a different nature and independent of the body (it is non-composed) lives on. Some believe the rationale for this is it is non-composite so indivisible and therefore indestructible and immortal. This is an attractive theory, and therefore strong, as it advocates the survival of a 'self' after physical death and is coherent with the sense that we are more than the sum of our physical parts. It is easier than the Christian belief in bodily resurrection as it overcomes problems of a physical place to exist in new bodies and not subject to the

challenges if how the physical can survive death in its many guises - disease, explosion - how do the parts re-assemble? how 'old' are we in heaven, will the body age and expire again etc, and how are we the same person if our bodies are re-created or replicas? ToS argues it is the soul that constitutes the self and this continues unscathed through physical death. However, it has related weaknesses. What evidence do we have for a soul? Near Death and Out of Body experiences provide some account of apparent existence separate to the body, but remain largely unconvincing with alternative explanations of lack of oxygen to the brain being possible. Also, how might we be identified as our self in post-physical existence? All previous experience of identity and action has been in physical form yet some (H. H. Price) say it is conceivable that memory can persist in some form & these disembodied souls might interact with each other & any surroundings via some form of telepathy. This involves a good deal of supposition and many feel that notions of the soul are in fact a misuse of language, a category mistake, and the soul doesn't exist we're simply material beings. Russell said 'when I die, I shall rot and nothing of me shall remain!'

Reincarnation shares some key ideas with ToS in that it holds that the true self is not the physical but the immortal soul or atman in Hinduism, that inhabits successive bodies in its quest to achieve moksha, or liberation from the cycle of samsara (life death & rebirth) and reunion with

Brahman. This is achieved by earning good karma - performing good moral actions that ensure progression. This theory too has its attractions/strengths - our physical form is less important than our moral character, we are required to be moral and do good to aid our progress (which is pertinent for ethical decision making linked to religion). Evidence for reincarnation has been assessed to include déjà vu, child prodigies and reabs remembered lives, notably in Stevenson's studies. However, these results are disputed - after alternative ^{possible} sources of this knowledge are identifiable and this undermines the strength of this evidence in support of the theory. There is also a philosophical challenge in the idea that we are supposed to learn and progress via karma, towards moksha and yet the majority have no access to accumulated moral knowledge, being unaware of previous existences. This seems unfair. It is also unjust if karma is visited on my karmic heir (e.g. Tom) who shares none of my physical identity - being a new body - nor my non-physical awareness/memory.

It could be argued that both of these theories are strong in that they emphasise that we as humans are not simply our bodies and can continue to exist without them, but they are both significantly challenged in explaining how this can be and yet still be a certain individual. Although they do not

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

suffer from the challenges to continuity that the Christian view of resurrection does these theories still lack sufficient evidence and philosophical coherence to be totally convincing. Developments in debates about these theories have been influenced by both religion - in comparison to Christian ideas of resurrection of the body in recent scholarship and historical debate but also by decision-making and debate in Religion and Ethics. The view of the importance of the soul as constituting the essence of a 'person' has been hugely influential in relation to Ethics regarding the beginning and end of life as well as being influenced by these debates too. If there exists a soul which is pre-existent and determined to continue to exist after the physical death of the body then the value, care and consideration given to a person when considering start (e.g. genetic engineering, or abortion) or end of life issues (e.g. euthanasia) take on greater significance. If it is believed the soul enters a body at a certain point there are implications for abortion, if humans are more than our physical components perhaps issues over 3 percent embryos are less significant. It could be argued that greater investment and emphasis on palliative care is required to ease the passing of the soul - or indeed the reverse - euthanasia should be permitted to release the soul from the decaying physical form. (Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

The influences are seen to operate both ways and ^{the influence} of great significance for debate in philosophy and Ethics.

TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 30 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 80 MARKS

Examiner Comments:

Marks Awarded: Level 5 – 30 marks

This answer gives a full account of the issues in the question using terminology competently and in a sustained manner. The candidate answers the full elements of the question in a balanced manner. There is effective use of scholarship coupled with a proficient use of key terms. The systematic analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of various points of view shows a very good level of understanding and a comprehensive appraisal of evidence. It moves towards conclusions that are convincingly advanced based on reasoned judgements and a careful marshalling of evidence concerning issues raised. It deconstructs ideas and considers challenges regarding identity and continuity well. There are good links made between this and other area of study as required by the question and there is a consideration of the impact from and upon other areas of studies with a good use of evidence.