



A-level
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7062/1

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final



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

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

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

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

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Methods of Marking

It is essential that, in fairness to students, all examiners use the same methods of marking. The advice given here may seem very obvious, but it is important that all examiners follow it as exactly as possible.

1. If you have any doubts about the mark to award, consult your Team Leader.
2. Refer constantly to the mark scheme throughout marking. It is extremely important that it is strictly adhered to.
3. Remember, you must **always** credit **accurate, relevant and appropriate** answers which are not given in the mark scheme.
4. Do **not** credit material that is irrelevant to the question or to the stated target, however impressive that material might be.
5. If a one-word answer is required and a list is given, take the first answer (unless this has been crossed out).
6. If you are wavering as to whether or not to award a mark, the criterion should be, 'Is the student nearer those who have given a correct answer or those who have little idea?'
7. Read the information on the following page about using Levels of Response mark schemes.
8. Be prepared to award the full range of marks. Do not hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits full marks or to give no marks where there is nothing creditable in an answer.
9. No half marks or bonus marks are to be used under any circumstances.
10. Remember, the key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Do **not** change the standard of your marking once you have started.

Levels of Response Marking

In A-level Religious Studies, differentiation is largely achieved by outcome on the basis of students' responses. To facilitate this, levels of response marking has been devised for many questions.

Levels of response marking requires a quite different approach from the examiner than the traditional 'point for point' marking. It is essential that the **whole response is read** and then **allocated to the level** it best fits.

If a student demonstrates knowledge, understanding and/or evaluation at a certain level, he/she must be credited at that level. **Length** of response or **literary ability** should **not be confused with genuine religious studies skills**. For example, a short answer which shows a high level of conceptual ability must be credited at that level. (If there is a band of marks allocated to a level, discrimination should be made with reference to the development of the answer.)

Levels are tied to specific skills. Examiners should **refer to the stated assessment target** objective of a question (see mark scheme) when there is any doubt as to the relevance of a student's response.

Levels of response mark schemes include either **examples** of possible students' responses or **material** which they might use. These are intended as a **guide** only. It is anticipated that students will produce a wide range of responses to each question.

It is a feature of levels of response mark schemes that examiners are prepared to reward fully, responses which are obviously valid and of high ability but do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level. This should only be necessary occasionally and where this occurs examiners must indicate, by a brief written explanation, why their assessment does not conform to the levels of response laid down in the mark scheme. Such scripts should be referred to the Lead Examiner.

Assessment of Quality of Written Communication

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all components and in relation to all assessment objectives. Where students are required to produce extended written material in English, they will be assessed on the quality of written communication. The quality of written communication skills of the student will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark awarded within the level of response. In reading an extended response, the examiner will therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, ie decide whether the answer:

- presents relevant information in a form that suits its purposes
- is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate, so that meaning is clear
- is suitably structured and that the style of writing is appropriate.

| Levels of Response: 10 marks A-Level – AO1 | |
|---|---|
| Level 5 9–10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate, relevant and fully developed in breadth and depth with very good use of detailed and relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, good knowledge and understanding of the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion is demonstrated • Clear and coherent presentation of ideas with precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary |
| Level 4 7–8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate and mostly relevant with good development in breadth and depth shown through good use of relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, alternative views and/or scholarly opinion are explained • Mostly clear and coherent presentation of ideas with good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary |
| Level 3 5–6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is generally accurate and relevant with development in breadth and/or depth shown through some use of evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, there is some familiarity with the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion • Some organisation of ideas and coherence with reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary |
| Level 2 3–4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is limited, with limited development in breadth and/or depth shown through limited use of evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, limited reference may be made to alternative views and/or scholarly opinion • Limited organisation of ideas and coherence and use of subject vocabulary |
| Level 1 1–2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and critical understanding is basic with little or no development • There may be a basic awareness of alternative views and/or scholarly opinion • Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accurate or relevant material to credit |

| Levels of Response: 15 marks A-Level – AO2 | |
|---|---|
| Level 5 13–15 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very well-focused response to the issue(s) raised • Perceptive discussion of different views, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought with critical analysis • There is an appropriate evaluation fully supported by the reasoning • Precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary |
| Level 4 10–12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A well-focused response to the issue(s) raised • Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought, with some critical analysis • There is an appropriate evaluation supported by the reasoning • Good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary |
| Level 3 7–9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general response to the issue(s) raised • Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought • An evaluation is made that is consistent with some of the reasoning • Reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary |
| Level 2 4–6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited response to the issue(s) raised • Presentation of a point of view relevant to the issue with some supporting evidence and argument • Limited attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary |
| Level 1 1–3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic response to the issue(s) raised • A point of view is stated, with some evidence or reason(s) in support • Some attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accurate or relevant material to credit |

0 1 . 1

Examine criticisms of the cosmological argument made by Hume and Russell.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that references to the cosmological argument may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: Aquinas' Way 3. The argument from contingency and necessity.

Both Hume and Russell argue that the cosmological argument commits the fallacy of composition (that of inferring that something is true of the whole from the fact that it is true of part of the whole or of every part of the whole). One version of the argument suggests that every thing in the universe is contingent, so the universe as a whole is contingent. For Russell this is a fallacy, because we can argue that every thing in the universe is contingent but the universe as a whole is necessary.

Both Hume and Russell reject the claim that any being can be necessary. Russell argues any being that exists can also not exist; there is no contradiction in thinking that any being does not exist; equally, there is no contradiction in saying that God does not exist; so the cosmological argument's claim that the existence of the universe requires the existence of a necessary being is false.

Hume asks why we should have to assume that there is something about God that makes his non-existence impossible: would it not be simpler to suggest that there is something about matter that makes its non-existence impossible? Russell argues that the simplest explanation for the existence of the universe is that there is no explanation. The universe exists as an unexplainable 'brute fact'. The universe is simply 'there', and that is all there is to say about it.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only examine criticisms from one of the two.

0 1 . 2

‘The problem of evil cannot be solved.’

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: the concepts of natural and moral evil; the logical and evidential problem of evil; responses to the problem of evil and suffering; Hick’s soul-making theodicy; the free will defence; Process theodicy as presented by Griffin; the strengths and weaknesses of each response.

Some will argue that the free will defence solves the problem of evil by showing that freedom is a ‘higher-order’ good than pleasure or than goods such as sympathy, and compassion. Freedom allows people to choose between good and evil and to become morally responsible beings. However, some argue that the price of freedom is too much: there is simply too much evil in the world, for example, the suffering endured by innocent children, and the amount of natural evil in the world.

Some might suggest John Hick’s soul-making theodicy as a solution to the problem of evil, arguing that evil is a necessary part of soul-making. Humans must live at an epistemic distance from God, since knowledge of God would not allow humans to choose God / the good freely. However, there are several gaps in Hick’s argument, such as his appeal to our epistemic distance from God to justify animal suffering, an explanation that is of no benefit to animals themselves throughout history.

Process Theodicy solves the problem of evil by arguing that God is not omnipotent and exists panentheistically with the universe. Evil, then, is unavoidable and is not God’s fault: he seeks to overcome it by persuading the universe into greater order. However, there is no guarantee that God will succeed in bringing greater order to the world, and evil may grow to even greater levels than we experience now. Also, many argue that the Process God is not omnipotent, so is not worthy of worship.

0 2 . 1

Examine Descartes' argument for the existence of the soul.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Descartes' Argument from Doubt supposes that there might be a malicious demon who makes him doubt the existence of the world outside him and the existence of other minds. Descartes argues: I can doubt that my body exists; but I cannot doubt that I exist as a thinking thing (because doubt is a form of thinking); therefore, because I am a thinking thing, I am not identical with my body; therefore my mind and body are distinct substances with different essential properties: mind / soul exists separately from the body as a separate substance.

Descartes' Argument from Divisibility and Non-Divisibility: All bodies are extended in space (having length, breadth and depth), and are therefore divisible; minds are not extended in space, so they are indivisible; one cannot divide a state of mind: if I cut off a part of the body nothing has been taken away from the mind; minds / souls are therefore radically different from bodies.

Descartes' Argument from Clear and Distinct Perception: Whatever I clearly and distinctly perceive as two different things can be created by God as two different things; I have a clear and distinct idea of myself as a non-extended thinking thing; I have a clear and distinct idea of my body as an extended thinking thing; so I and my body can exist apart from each other; so I am distinct from my body.

Note: There is no requirement to produce Descartes' arguments as set out above. Answers might conflate two or more arguments. Arguments might be given in general terms to convey the sense of Descartes' arguments. Any general/clear/accurate examination of Descartes' argument for the existence of the soul is fully creditable.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 2 | . | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|

‘Descartes fails to prove the existence of the soul.’

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Descartes’ substance dualism fails as a proof of the existence of the soul in that he fails to show how a non-physical brain can interact with a physical body. His suggestion that interaction takes place in the pineal gland is dismissed by most as pseudo-science. However, the fact that Descartes was probably wrong about the pineal gland does not mean that he was wrong about the existence of the soul, and for many people the idea of the soul is still the best explanation of personal identity.

Most modern neuroscience rejects Descartes’ view of souls by arguing that the mind and brain are identical, so there is no non-physical soul which might survive the death of its body. However, there are many problems with physicalist theories: in particular they do not account for qualia: for example brain scans can show the physical processes in the brain of someone eating chocolate, but they cannot account for what the ‘I’ experiences: a soul is needed to do this, so souls exist.

Descartes’ proof of the reliability of clear and distinct perceptions assumes that God must exist; but his proofs of God’s existence presuppose the reliability of clear and distinct perceptions, so his argument is circular. However, the existence of souls does not depend only on belief in God: for example, some physicists think that consciousness is the main fact of existence, and souls are conscious. Some think that out-of-body experiences are a proof of Cartesian souls.

0 3 . 1

Examine why followers of natural moral law and situation ethics might reach different decisions on moral issues.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.3: Causes and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: natural moral law and the principle of double effect with reference to Aquinas; situation ethics with reference to Fletcher.

Natural moral law is generally seen as a deontological theory of ethics, which means that those who follow the system will base their decisions on moral duty and moral law. The decisions of natural moral law are rules to be obeyed. Those who follow situation ethics are following a system that is generally teleological: so its moral decisions are based on the situation, where the correct action is to bring about the most loving consequences.

Natural moral law, as developed by Thomas Aquinas holds that there is a religious dimension to what is good / bad, right / wrong, so these are dependent upon the will of God, who establishes the natural moral order. Those who follow situation ethics can reach their moral decisions based on religious principles as laid down in the New Testament, but situation ethics can also be a secular ethical theory, where a moral issue can be decided simply by what brings about the most love, without reference to religious rules or ideas.

Natural moral law looks at primary and secondary precepts in order to decide what to do in different ethical situations. The principle of double effect may be used in order to resolve difficult or ambiguous moral issues. Situation ethics decides what to do in the situation, guided by the law of love, and this may lead to decisions / actions which according to natural moral law are immoral.

Maximum Level 2 if only one moral theory is considered.

0 3 . 2

‘Natural moral law solves the moral problems of abortion.’

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: natural moral law and the principle of double effect with reference to Aquinas; abortion.

Natural moral law (NML) solves the problem of abortion by forbidding it, since it goes against primary precepts such as reproduction and the preservation of innocent life. In so far as abortion murders innocent life, it also goes against the precept of worshipping God, the creator of life. However, some argue that not allowing abortion in situations such as rape, or where a child is likely to be born with a severe handicap, solves nothing, because whereas some mothers can cope with such situations, others cannot, particularly where their life is in danger.

NML maintains that we can avoid making mistakes in difficult moral situations by using the principle of double effect (DE), for example, if a pregnant woman has a cancerous uterus, DE allows her to have a hysterectomy to save her life, as the death of the foetus is an unintended side-effect of saving her life. However, some will argue that the principle of DE is unnecessary in such a case, because it is common sense that it is wrong to let both the foetus and the mother die.

NML’s solution to the problems of abortion is strengthened by support from the principle that human life is sacred: human life is created in God’s image, so abortion at any stage is immoral. However, many will argue that this does not solve the overall moral problem with abortion, which is that in specific situations such as pregnancy through rape, incest, or failure of contraception, abortion need not be seen as immoral even though it is regrettable.

Maximum Level 2 for answers that deal with natural moral law only, or abortion only.

0 4 . 1

Examine the strengths and weaknesses of Divine Command Theory.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

For those who believe in God, one strength of Divine Command Theory (DCT) is that it grounds their moral behaviour in a God who exists factually. For most believers, God is all-powerful and all-knowing, so God is seen as the source of morality, and his moral commands must be obeyed. It is not clear if there is a moral authority higher than God which God follows or whether God simply dictates what is right and wrong.

For those who accept that morality is commanded by God, one strength is that God's commands can be found in scripture. For example, many Christians, Jews and Muslims accept that God's laws are codified in scripture. One weakness of this is that scripture contains commands which many believe to be immoral, such as those concerning slavery, homosexuality and genocide. To know that these are immoral means judging from outside the system of DCT.

One strength of DCT is that it provides an answer to the question, 'Why be moral?' If humans are accountable to God for their moral actions, then accountability includes the idea of rewards and punishments, for example, heaven and hell. One obvious weakness of this is that it reduces morality to a kind of bargain and sale, whereas many people think that the moral action should be done for its own sake.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that consider only strengths or only weaknesses.

0 4 . 2

‘The ethical theories of Bentham and Kant are not consistent with religious moral decision making.’

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Bentham’s form of utilitarian morality is, on the face of it, inconsistent with religious moral decision making (RMDM). Bentham’s act-utility has no spiritual dimension to make it compatible with religion. For many religious people, immoral thoughts are as bad as immoral deeds, whereas Bentham would judge people by what they do. However, there is a degree of consistency with RMDM. For example, Jesus judged people by how they responded to the needy, and like a utilitarian, Jesus acted situationally.

Kant is emphatic that moral law must be autonomous: it has its own authority, so Kant excludes all consideration of divine command, since that means following the will of an external authority, for example, God. However, Kant’s ethical theory is compatible with RMDM to some extent, because his concept of the good will is compatible with religious ideas about virtue: the virtuous believer freely practises the good, and two of Kant’s postulates of practical reason are religious: God and immortality.

It can be argued that neither ethical theory is consistent with RMDM. Bentham was an atheist, and the whole point of Kant’s idea of the categorical imperative is that morality is autonomous. It does not depend on any religious belief system. However, it seems clear that Kant was more disposed to accept religious ideas than Bentham, since his concept of the highest good suggests that God exists in order to reward those who fulfil their moral duty.