



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2018**

**A LEVEL  
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 2  
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION  
A120U20-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2018 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

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

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

## **Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:**

### **Positive marking**

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme. Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

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

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

### **Rules for Marking**

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

### **Banded mark schemes**

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

#### **Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band**

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

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

### **Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark**

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

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

### **Awarding no marks to a response**

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

## A Level Generic Band Descriptors

<b>Band</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions</b>    20 marks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i></li> <li>- <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i></li> <li>- <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i></li> <li>- <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i></li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>17-20 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>• An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied.</li> <li>• An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively.</li> <li>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-16 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>• A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied.</li> <li>• A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively.</li> <li>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-12 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>• A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied.</li> <li>• A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used.</li> <li>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-8 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance.</li> <li>• A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied.</li> <li>• A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used.</li> <li>• Some accurate use of some specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1-4 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance.</li> <li>• A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought.</li> <li>• Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied.</li> <li>• Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</b></p>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant information.</li> </ul>

<b>Band</b>	<p align="center"><b>Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions 30 marks</b>  <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i></p>
5	<p align="center"><b>25-30 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied.</li> <li>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
4	<p align="center"><b>19-24 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed.</li> <li>• The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied.</li> <li>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
3	<p align="center"><b>13-18 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed.</li> <li>• Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied.</li> <li>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
2	<p align="center"><b>7-12 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed.</li> <li>• A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Basic use of the views of scholars/schools of thought appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied.</li> <li>• Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> </ul>
1	<p align="center"><b>1-6 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence.</li> <li>• Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought.</li> <li>• Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied.</li> <li>• Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.</li> </ul>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant analysis or evaluation.</li> </ul>

## GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES

### SUMMER 2018 MARK SCHEME

#### COMPONENT 2 – PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

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

#### Section A

1. (a) Examine different versions of the teleological argument for the existence of God as presented by Paley and Tennant. [AO1 20]

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

- Both arguments use an ‘a posteriori’ argument which is inductive and based on empirical experience. It relies on the notion that certain aspects of the universe display evidence of being deliberately designed.
- Both infer the existence of God from a particular aspect or character of the world. For Paley it is focused on order, regularity and purpose. Order, regularity and purpose are seen as marks of design. Beneficial order could not have happened by chance. Therefore, we must be directed to something that has intelligence, which we call God. God exists as the explanation of beneficial order.
- Paley argues by analogy - Paley’s watch – the universe is like a complex machine which requires intelligent design. The working of watch is analogous to workings of universe, natural phenomena – structure of eyes, wings, are additional proof that universe is intelligently designed.
- Tennant focuses on the idea of beauty and develops an aesthetic argument. The beauty of the world, art, music, literature, suggests intelligent designer who wants creation to be enjoyed. The ‘Anthropic Principle’ also highlights intelligent design because of the universe’s suitability for human life.
- Nature seems to plan in advance for the needs of animals and humans. This cannot be accounted for by physical laws alone.
- Intricate relationships found in science relating to the development of living organisms show that things cannot have just happened – it looks like the presence of overall direction, working together for our benefit, just as if the universe knows that we are coming.

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

(b) 'The teleological arguments for God's existence are not effective.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- There are a number of teleological arguments so expect more than one to be referred to.
- One focus to support the statement may be the concept of proof. The teleological arguments are inductive and so can only lead to probabilities. It is valid deductive arguments that offer proof.
- A line of argument is to show that the arguments are flawed. For instance if Paley's argument is considered reference to Hume's criticisms and others, may be given. There is the issue of the use of an unsound analogy – our world is not like a machine, it is more organic than mechanical. Similar effects do not necessarily imply similar causes. The analogy leads to a non-moral God because of the existence of natural evil. It suggests that the designer is evil or weak.
- Further support for the statement may focus on other explanations for apparent order, especially Darwin and the theory of evolution. This could be seen to explain the mechanism for order.
- However, the theory that evolution alone can explain human life can be shown to be an ineffective challenge. The anthropic principle suggests that the universe provides us with what we need to survive and is capable of being rationally analysed by humans. This is due to a designer God working within the evolutionary process in order for life to be sustained. Thus, evolution alone cannot explain life.
- In addition, if survival of the fittest were true then we would have no need for the appreciation of beauty, art, music and so on. However, we clearly do appreciate these things so an omnibenevolent God designed humans in such a way that we would appreciate beauty. God wants humans to not only survive but also to enjoy the world (the aesthetic argument).
- There is much contemporary support for design. There is intelligent design incorporating irreducible complexity. Many support the anthropic principle such as Polkinghorne who argues that God continues to create and to sustain. P. Davies says that the universe being as it is without divine intelligence behind it is virtually impossible.
- In response, it could be said that design is something that our mind imposes on the universe and actually the universe is completely chaotic. Therefore, with no design there is no need to infer a designer.
- It could be argued that cosmological or ontological arguments are more or less effective than the teleological arguments.

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



2. (a) Examine different versions of the ontological argument for the existence of God as presented by Anselm and Malcolm. [AO1 20]

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

- Candidates may make mention of the concept of deductive proof which is 'a priori'. This relies on the analysis of a definition or an idea in order to come to a logically necessary conclusion. It may be contrasted with the concept of inductive proof, which is 'a posteriori'.
- Ontology is the study of being. So the ontological argument analyses the being of God in order to conclude that God exists or to show how self-evident the existence of God is once we have accepted the definition.
- Anselm set out to show how absurd it is to reject the existence of God once one has accepted God's definition.
- Anselm's first form is found in the form of a prayer in Proslogion 2. Anselm defines God as 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived.' Existence is a great making quality, something that we can have or lack. Greatness ought to add to our description of something. Anselm declares, using Psalm 14 that even the fool has an idea of God in their mind. It is greater to have existence in reality (in re) than in mind alone (in intellectu.) Thus, in order to be 'a being...' God must have existence in reality. This is a proof by contradiction, by ruling out God existing in mind alone.
- Malcolm makes no reference to the Bible but like Anselm does use a definition of God as an unlimited being as the basis of his argument. However Malcolm rejects this part of Anselm's argument accepting that existence adds nothing to the concept.
- In Anselm's second form in Proslogion 3 he compares two modes of existence. These are contingent existence, and necessary existence, Clearly the latter is greater than the former. So in order for God to be 'a being...' then God must have necessary existence. Again, proof by contradiction. Malcolm develops this part of Anselm's argument as he sees necessary existence as a predicate.
- Malcolm develops his argument by claiming that God's existence is either impossible or necessary. If God did not exist then God could not come into existence or cease to exist otherwise he would be limited, and so not be God. But by definition he is not limited. God is an unlimited being and therefore necessarily exists. Like Anselm, Malcolm uses the method of proof by contradiction.

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

(b) 'The ontological arguments for God's existence fail.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- Candidates may refer to any ontological argument as well as to deductive arguments. They could consider the relative successes of ontological arguments when compared to others.
- Gaunilo's 'perfect island' example suggests that existence is not a predicate. A predicate adds to our description of something. To say that something exists does not. So we cannot give a long list of predicates, add 'exists' to the end of it and thereby define it into existence.
- However, existence can be used as a predicate which goes against the main challenge to the effectiveness of the argument. The real (money) does have a property which money in the mind doesn't have which is the property of purchasing power.
- Aquinas said that God's existence is synthetic (has to be shown to be true) rather than analytic. If God's existence were analytically true, then everyone would see how self-evident God's existence is. They do not; hence the logic of the ontological argument is not effective.
- But, Anselm would say that the ontological argument applies to God only and not to such things as islands. Islands have no intrinsic maximum; they can always be added to so challenging the ontological argument in this way is not effective.
- Kant would say that all arguments for God's existence are doomed to failure as such proofs belong to the noumenal world which we cannot access. He also rejected the basic premise that existence is a predicate. Moreover, Kant said that Anselm's claim that it is greater to exist in reality than in mind alone is not effective. He commented that 100 real thalers contained no more thalers than 100 thalers in the mind. Specifically addressing Descartes' ontological argument Kant also noted that if a triangle exists, it must have the property of 3 sides and 3 angles. However, there is no contradiction in rejecting the triangle altogether. Similarly, if God exists God must have necessary existence but there is no contradiction in rejecting God in the first place.
- If the premises of a deductive argument are incorrect then so will the conclusion be. This can show that a premise such as 'existence is a perfection' if it is not true, makes the conclusion false.
- However, if the premises are true in a deductive argument then the conclusion follows of necessity. Supporters of the argument would claim that 'God exists' serves the same function as 'a bachelor is an unmarried man.'
- Many would argue that it is effective to say that it is greater to exist in reality than in mind alone. We would rather have a real holiday than one which just exists in our minds.

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

## Section B

3. (a) Examine the Augustinian type theodicy. [AO1 20]

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

- Augustine type theodicy argues that human nature had been completely corrupted at 'The Fall.' Augustine painted a very bleak picture of the human condition.
- This is in complete contrast to the world that God created which was good and completely free from evil. Augustine type theodicy refers to Genesis which states that 'God saw that it was good.' It then explains evil as the result of the sin of angels and human beings. As evil was not created by God then God cannot be blamed for it, nor should God eliminate it. For Augustine evil is a privation of good, just as blindness is a privation of sight.
- The theodicy argues that the reason for sin is down to angels and humans having free will and through concupiscence (desire, specifically sexual desire). They turn from God and the sinful nature is passed down through the sexual act which perpetuates the sinning. Natural evil is also seen as caused by the Fall.
- As we are all descendants of Adam, the first man, we are also guilty of Adam's sin. We were with Adam when he ate the apple, so his sin is our sin, his guilt is our guilt and likewise we deserve to be punished. 'All evil is either sin or the punishment for sin.' We fully deserve all evil that befalls us whether that has been inflicted by humans or nature as we were 'seminally present' in Adam.
- Augustine says that it is better to bring good out of evil than to not permit evil. Human understanding of evil is partial as we cannot see the whole picture, which God can. God knows that there is a purpose for evil in the world. In fact, Adam's sin was a *felix culpa*, a happy mistake, as without it then Jesus would not have been sent to redeem humanity.
- Jesus' sacrifice allowed for atonement. The relationship which was ruined at 'The Fall' was put right again by his death. This allows for humans to choose to accept Jesus and reach heaven. We are all guilty so we should all be punished. God is a fair God but also a forgiving one.
- Reference could be made to other scholars who discuss the free-will defence, such as Swinburne who champions the idea that it is vital that God gives humans free-will in order for the world we live in to be a real one.

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

(b) 'Augustinian type theodicies are irrelevant in the 21st century.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- One line of argument that supports the statement is that Augustinian-type theodicies are based upon outdated biology. It is widely accepted that we are not biologically related to Adam. It may be debated therefore whether it is justifiable that humans are punished for Adam's sin. The theodicy runs contrary to our current scientific worldview which has humanity evolving to an improved state (the opposite of the Augustinian type view.)
- Another area supporting the statement might focus on the basis of the theodicy – i.e. the fact that it is based on a literal interpretation of the stories of Creation and The Fall. Today these accounts are generally deemed to be myths and so due to an incorrect interpretation of scripture these stories are not factual accounts. But, the literal truth of Creation and the Fall may be accepted by some believers today, making such theodicies consistent with tradition.
- A line of argument could argue that our logical, empirical world cannot accept the many inconsistencies inherent in the theodicy. The idea that evil came from perfection makes no sense whatsoever. Also, the idea that Hell was part of the created order is inconsistent with a perfect world. This lack of rational thought means the theodicy is irrelevant today.
- The concepts of Hell and fallen angels are not accepted concepts in today's world. The theodicy is reliant on a number of things that we reject today for its credibility. Indeed, the concepts of Hell and the existence of an omnibenevolent God are contradictory concepts.
- However, many would argue that Augustine's theodicy, with its emphasis on an omnibenevolent God, is wholly relevant today as this is clearly a concept that would be accepted by Christians as being compatible with the traditional view of the God of Classical Theism. The same applies to the concepts of God as a just God and to God as a merciful God.
- The idea of humans being depraved could be seen to be personified in many humans throughout history and in today's world. Today humans carry out the most atrocious acts which would lead many to say that they are in bondage to sin.
- It also makes logical sense (hence fits with today's worldview) that evil is not a substance, it is not 'a thing' in itself; it is merely the absence of good. It is a most relevant concept to say that there is a gap between what there is and what there ought to be in the behaviour of humans and in acts of nature. Hence the theodicy is relevant
- The theodicy is relevant when it gives humans responsibility for sinning as we see this at work in our justice system today. Hence the 'workings' of the theodicy tally with modern expectations.

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

4. (a) Examine Jung's explanation of religious belief.

[AO1 20]

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

- Jung discovered ideas and images in patient's dreams whose origins could not be traced to the individual's past experiences. He saw links to these images to mythical and religious themes. This led Jung to refer to primordial images or archetypes.
- Archetypes are not created but discovered in the collective unconscious. They are limitless but some are very common. Archetypes cannot be known directly but they generate images in the conscious mind. Jung saw these images as the dominant laws and principles responsible for the quality of human life. They possess emotional force.
- Expect examples of some of the key archetypes and Jung's interpretation of them. The persona (the mask we wear), the shadow (the suppressed unconscious part of our personality), anima and animus (our inner attitudes that take on the characteristics of the opposite sex), the self (midway between consciousness and the unconscious).
- Jung saw God as an expression of the collective unconscious. An encounter with the Self, is a religious experience with God. The Self is the God within us. Hence the Self archetype produced the same symbolism that has always expressed the deity.
- Jung argued that the Self archetype works collectively with all other aspects of a person's psyche to integrate them and become whole. It is a form of self-realisation or a discovery of the true self.
- The process by which a person moves toward the achievement of the Self is called individuation. The aim of individuation is to divest the Self of the false wrappings of the persona and the suggestive powers of the primordial images. The symbols of the archetypes are the means by which the archetypes are brought into our consciousness from the collective unconscious. These images are the images that make up religious traditions.
- Individuation is the journey towards becoming a full individual. It is the quest to find the 'God within'. It is a religious quest because it is through the religious images that the personality achieves its goal of integration.
- The religious images are merely images of the deeper self. Possible reference might be made to Buddhist meditation as an example of the process of individuation.

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

(b) 'Jung was more positive than Freud about the idea of God.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- It could be argued that Jung did not rule out the existence of an external being. He said we could never know whether God exists. Indeed, religion is a reality at the unconscious level.
- However, it could also be argued that for Jung God was 'in the mind.' God as merely an inner psychological experience rejects the traditional view of God as an external being. The God image can be explained by archetypes but God is still only the God within. Religion would claim to have evidence for an external God with whom one can have a relationship.
- Jung sees religion in a most positive fashion. Religion promotes a positive mindset and good psychological health. This is because of the balance of archetypes which is vital for psychological maturity, 'individuation.' Religion can be of great comfort to people.
- God as an inner psychological truth may not fit the traditional image of God but it does relate to mystical belief. Indeed many would claim that Jung has explained what 'God' means.
- For Freud, religion is a neurosis that is bad for one's psychological health. He pointed out the similarity between neurotic behaviour, such as repeated hand-washing and religious rituals. These unnecessary actions are accompanied by feelings of fear and guilt.
- Religion is the product of the unconscious mind trying to come to terms with repressed memories and pressures. These ought to be faced. But religion is an attempt to control unconscious feelings and is merely wish-fulfilment.
- God is a projection of the inadequate father figure whom we fear but are in awe of. Belief in God is an illusion preventing autonomy and full mental maturity.
- However, religion does provide that comfort that one is searching for so it does perform a positive function with regard to mental health.
- In addition to this religious ritual can add to a person's spiritual growth. This could be exemplified by referring to, for example, repeated Eucharistic rituals. Freud has admitted that religious belief may help people to become more balanced. It has also been noted that he said that religion could stimulate creativity and imagination.

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

5. (a) Explain how Logical Positivism challenges the meaningfulness of religious language. [AO1 20]

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

- Logical Positivism is concerned with whether a statement made sense, not whether it was true or false.
- Influence of empiricism with view that knowledge is based on experience of our senses. Apparent knowledge which is not gained from experience is not real knowledge since it tells us nothing about the world itself.
- The scientific methodology of trying to verify by experiment suggested the key to testing for meaningfulness was verification. Logical Positivists developed the verification principle – for a statement to be meaningful it had to be able to be verified by the sense experience, in practice and conclusively.
- This form of the verification principle eliminated historical statements and general laws of science so A.J. Ayer developed a weaker form. He said that religious statements to be meaningful should be – (i) verifiable in principle ( i.e. if you knew how to show it could be true) and (ii) verifiable in terms of probable (i.e. if you knew how to show it was probably true)
- However, religious statements such as ‘God is timeless’ fails the verification test and so is deemed meaningless. Indeed, all talk of God must be nonsensical since God’s essential attributes are non-empirical and therefore meaningless. People wrongly assumed that because a word existed there must be a corresponding reality. It was misuse of language.
- Further challenge by falsification principle –realisation that methodology of science was concerned with falsification rather than verification since theories are considered true until some evidence counts against them. The parable of the gardener illustrated the problem with religious language. An invisible, intangible, eternally elusive God is no different from an imaginary God or no God at all. Religious statements are deemed meaningless because the believer does not allow anything to count against them.
- One approach might discuss the nature of religious language in that it is often related to the metaphysical and the mysterious, yet the claims seem to be making statements about the real world. Religious language describes things that are over and beyond our world. This would lead to why Logical Positivism approach concludes religious language is meaningless.
- Candidates may give examples of religious statements and show how they can be neither verified nor falsified.

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

5. (b) 'Logical Positivism successfully shows that religious language is meaningless.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- One line of argument is to support the statement. This could include arguing that religious language is cognitive and so by the two principles it shows that it is meaningless. Religious language does claim to illustrate information and is taken to be referring as accurately as possible to the external reality of God. Religious believers are using the language to express beliefs about the real world.
- Another line of argument is to oppose the statement by challenging the Logical Positivists approach to language. This could include arguing that the verification principle is flawed. For instance, it cannot itself be verified. There is no sense experience that can count in its favour.
- Another approach might be to show that even if the verification principle is accepted it does not follow that religious language is meaningless – eschatological verification is possible; historical statements are meaningful e.g. Jesus was raised from the dead. It could be argued that God is able to verify his own existence.
- Another line of argument is to challenge the falsification principle. Some non-falsifiable statements are clearly meaningful e.g. toys that come out at night only when they cannot be detected.
- A further approach might be to argue that religious language is non-cognitive and therefore the verification and falsification principles are irrelevant since they apply to cognitive language.
- Further discussion could include reference to the University debate illustrating that religious language is non-cognitive.
- The non-cognitive approach to religious language might be challenged. Although it may remove the challenge raised by Logical Positivism it has its own problems. Religious claims are claims that are believed to be true for everyone. However, non-cognitive language develops its own unique criteria of meaning and truth.

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