

My Revision Notes: OCR AS Religious Studies: Philosophy of Religion

Exam practice questions © OCR G571 2007–2012. Answer guidance has not been written or approved by OCR.

These are guidelines of what might be included but are by no means exhaustive or even the only way to answer the question.

Chapter 1

1 (a) Explain the Platonic concept of 'Forms'. [25]

- You could explain what is meant by the Forms and how they are unchanging.
- You could explain the difference between the physical world and the world of the Forms.
- You could explain how the mind or soul belongs to the world of the Forms.
- You may show that the Analogy of the Cave shows the sun, which represents the Form of the Good which is the highest Form and the source and origin of all the other Forms.

(b) To what extent is it true to say that the Forms teach us nothing about the physical world? [10]

- You could argue that we get knowledge from the physical world.
- You could say that the existence of the Forms cannot be shown or proved whereas the physical world can be studied through science.
- On the other hand you could argue that Plato's suggestion of the existence of the Forms shows there is more to reality than just what is visible.

2 (a) Explain the concept of Ideals in Plato's writings. [25]

- You could say that for Plato the Forms are perfect Ideals which never change.
- You need to explain that the world of the Ideals is different from the physical world which is always changing.
- You could explain how the mind or soul belongs to the world of the Ideals.

(b) 'Ideals are an illusion; we can only experience what is real.' Discuss. [10]

- You could assess the extent to which Plato's world of Ideals really exists or whether it is something that only philosophers can understand.
- Or you could use the ideas of Aristotle to support the view that there is no evidence for 'Ideals'.
- You could discuss the extent to which we only have knowledge of the physical world.

3 (a) Explain the relationship between the Form of the Good and the other Forms. [25]

- You need to explain what was meant by the Forms, and Plato's understanding of the two worlds: reality and appearances.
- You could explain how in the physical world everything changes and dies but souls are unchanging and eternal.

- You could explain the importance of the sun in this world and how in the unchanging world of the Forms there is a supreme Form – the Form of the Good that gives life to the other Forms.
- You need to also explain that the Form of the Good enables us to have knowledge of the Forms.
- You could explain briefly the Analogy of the Cave.
- You could explain that for Plato the highest knowledge is knowledge of the Form of the Good.

(b) 'The Forms teach us nothing about the physical world.' Discuss. [10]

- You could argue that Plato limits knowledge to the few who understand the Forms clearly, but that we get knowledge from the physical world all the time.
- You could use Aristotle's ideas to discuss whether the Forms can teach us anything about the real world.
- Or you could argue that the idea of the Forms shows that there is more than just what we see in the physical world.

4 (a) Explain Plato's Analogy of the Cave. [25]

- You need to explain the analogy not just tell the story.
- You could explain the role of the prisoners and why they believe the shadows they see to be reality.
- You could also explain the roles of the fire, the puppeteers and the prisoner who escapes and sees the sun and his possible return.

(b) 'Plato does not value experience enough.' Discuss. [10]

- You could assess the extent to which Plato's world of the Forms really exists or whether it is something that only philosophers can understand.
- Or you could use the ideas of Aristotle to support the view that there is no evidence for the world of the Forms.
- You could discuss the extent to which we only have knowledge of the physical world.
- You could use Aristotle's ideas to discuss whether the Forms can teach us anything about the real world and how we gain knowledge through experience.

Chapter 2**1 (a) Explain Aristotle's Theory of the Four Causes. [25]**

- You need to begin by explaining what is meant by the Four Causes (Material, Formal, Efficient and Final).
- You could use an example to illustrate this.
- You could link the Final Cause and the Prime Mover.

(b) 'Aristotle's Theory of the Four Causes is convincing.' Discuss. [10]

- You could say that Aristotle's theory comes from his studies of the natural world.
- You could contrast this with Plato's Theory of the Forms which are observed in the physical world.
- Or you could argue that there is no evidence for a Prime Mover.

2 (a) Explain Aristotle's Theory of Causality. [25]

- You could outline the theory of causality by describing Aristotle's understanding of material, efficient and formal cause. You could use an example such as:
 - Material Cause – the object is made of wood.
 - Formal Cause – it has the shape of a chair.
 - Efficient Cause – it was made by a carpenter.
 - Final Cause – it was made so that I could sit down.
- You could then explain how Aristotle's Theory of Causality fits in with his general understanding of reality and its purpose.

(b) 'Aristotle's ideas about cause do not help us understand the universe.' Discuss. [10]

- You could discuss whether there is purpose in the universe and whether Aristotle's views make sense.
- You could argue that this is just how we see things and that the universe may not be ordered at all.
- You could question whether everything in nature does have a purpose such as the appendix in the human body, or the mosquito that spreads fatal diseases.

3 (a) Explain Aristotle's understanding of the Four Causes. [25]

- You could outline the theory of causality by describing Aristotle's understanding of material, efficient and formal cause. You could use an example such as:
 - Material Cause – the object is made of wood.
 - Formal Cause – it has the shape of a chair.
 - Efficient Cause – it was made by a carpenter.
 - Final Cause – it was made so that I could sit down.
- You could then explain how Aristotle's Theory of Causality fits in with his general understanding of reality and its purpose.

(b) 'Aristotle's Four Causes fail as a description of the real world.' Discuss. [10]

- You could discuss whether there is purpose in the universe and whether Aristotle's views make sense.
- You could argue that this is just how we see things and that the universe may not be ordered at all.
- You could question whether everything in nature does have a purpose such as the appendix in the human body, or the mosquito that spreads fatal diseases.

4 (a) Explain Aristotle's concept of the Prime Mover. [25]

- You could explain that for Aristotle, movement also means change, as for example when a piece of wood becomes hot – it moves from potential (it is capable of being hot) to actuality (it has become the hot thing it was capable of becoming). The wood is changed by something outside of it which heats it.
- You could explain that the beginning of the chain of changes is actual, not potential.
- You need to say that the conclusion of this is that there must be an unmoved mover.

(b) 'An accidental universe is as likely as a created one.' Discuss. [10]

- You discuss whether there is any evidence for a Prime Mover or whether it makes sense to say that everything was just caused accidentally.
- Or you could use the design argument to argue for and against an accidental universe.
- You could also use the science and religion debate.
- But you need to justify everything you say.

Chapter 3**1 (a) Explain the concept of *creatio ex nihilo*. [25]**

- Start by explaining the concept: 'creation out of nothing'.
- You could explain that although this is a key Christian belief it is not clear that this concept is in the Old Testament, as it seems that God created the universe from pre-existent material.
- You could explain that belief probably originated with Augustine and became part of official Christian teaching in the 12th century, or about Christian ideas in general.

(b) 'Nothing comes from nothing.' Discuss. [10]

- Build your response to this question on your answer for part (a): you may agree with the quotation say that the Bible points to pre-existent material with which God created the universe.
- You could link this to the big bang theory.
- Or you could discuss the strong tradition in Christianity which argues that creation is something coming from nothing.

2 (a) Compare the concept of a Prime Mover with the idea of God as a craftsman. [25]

- You could explain what Aristotle meant by the concept of a Prime Mover and the concept of infinite regress.
- Then, you could say that God is involved at a deep, microscopic level – unlike a Prime Mover, who cannot do this.
- You could explain the beliefs behind the different approaches.

(b) 'Only philosophers can explain creation.' Discuss. [10]

- You need to build on your answer to part (a).
- You could argue that the question is basically a religious one and disagree with the statement, but you would need to support your answer.
- Or you could argue that philosophy is the best way to question our existence and understanding of the universe. You would need to assess whether this approach is successful.
- Alternatively you could argue that scientists explain creation better than either philosophy or religion.

3 (a) Explain how the Bible shows God as creator. [25]

- You need to explain how God is understood as creator in the Bible such as in Genesis 1-3 and Job 38.
- You need to explain what is learnt about God from these passages and you could explain some of the beliefs that come from the biblical texts:
 - *Creatio ex nihilo* (creation from nothing). (Genesis 1–2 and Job 38)
 - God's omniscience. (Genesis 2:4–3:1)
 - God's omnipotence. (Genesis 1–3 and Job 38)
 - God as an omnipresent craftsman. (Job 38)
 - God being the ruler of the world. (Genesis 1–3)
 - God being the creator involves God sustaining the world. (Job 38)

(b) 'God is responsible for everything that happens in the universe.' Discuss. [10]

- You could discuss that if God is omnipotent he is responsible for everything in the universe.
- You could discuss the problem of evil and some of the theodicies.

Chapter 4**1 (a) Explain what it means to say that God is good. [25]**

- You could describe the Judeo-Christian beliefs about the goodness of God from the Bible.
- You could explain how the Jewish writers saw all goodness as coming from God.
- You could use the ideas of Aquinas and discuss the idea that God's goodness is different from that of humans.

(b) To what extent are things only good because God commands them? [10]

- You could discuss the Euthyphro Dilemma.
- You could discuss the Divine Command Theory and the questions that brings up.
- You could question the possible limitation on the power of God.

2 (a) Explain what is meant in the Bible by the phrase 'God is good'. [25]

- You could describe the Judeo-Christian beliefs about the goodness of God as found in the Bible.
- You could explain how the Jewish writers saw all goodness as coming from God.
- You could use the ideas of Aquinas and discuss the idea that God's goodness is different from that of humans.

(b) 'It is difficult to believe in a God who is perfectly good.' Discuss. [10]

- You could use examples of inconsistent teaching to evaluate the extent to which the statement is true.
- You could contrast the vengeful God found in the Old Testament with the God of compassion shown in the New Testament.
- Or you could discuss how the Bible must be understood in the context of the time it was written.
- You could discuss the evil in the world and if this is a reason to doubt God's goodness.

Chapter 5**1 (a) Explain Anselm's Ontological argument. [25]**

- You explain that this argument is an *a priori* proof for the existence of God.
- You could outline the first version of the argument: moving from the idea of a being greater than which nothing can be conceived, to the conclusion that God must exist in reality as well as the mind.
- You could also explain Anselm's second version of the argument, which centres on the idea of necessary existence.

(b) 'Logic cannot prove the existence of God.' Discuss. [10]

- Here you need to prove whether the existence of God is an analytic claim that can be shown to be true by deductive argument.
- You need to assess whether the existence of God is an analytic statement.
- You can use Kant to criticise the idea.
- You could use Descartes to defend the idea that the existence of God is an analytic statement.

2 (a) Explain the concept of 'necessary existence' as applied to a divine creator. [25]

- You could explain that the concept of necessary existence comes from Anselm's second argument.
- Explain the first argument briefly and then the second in more detail, focussing on the idea of necessary existence.
- You could discuss Anselm's motivation: faith seeking understanding, as opposed to proving to himself that God existed.

(b) 'All existence is contingent.' Discuss. [10]

- You could use Hume's argument that you cannot prove that any being is necessary, so all existence must be contingent.
- You could say that everything within the universe has a cause and so even the universe is contingent.
- You could use Anselm's second argument to argue that God's existence is not contingent but necessary.

3 (a) Explain how Kant challenged the Ontological argument. [25]

- Explain how Kant develops two criticisms of Descartes.
- Kant's second objection says that 'existence' is not a predicate at all, and therefore cannot be defining. Kant uses the example of the conceptual difference between a hundred real and a hundred imaginary thalers.

(b) To what extent was Kant successful in his critique of the Ontological argument? [10]

- You may for example argue that Kant dismisses the validity of the argument.
- Or you could examine the success or otherwise of Kant's argument that 'existence is not a predicate'.
- Or you could discuss the ways in which Anselm still has a valid argument.

4 (a) Explain the Ontological argument from Anselm and Gaunilo's objection to it. [25]

- You could explain that this argument is an *a priori* proof for God's existence.
- You could outline the first version of the argument.
- You could also explain Anselm's second version of the argument, which focuses on the idea of necessary existence.
- You need to explain that Gaunilo argued against Anselm's conclusion that God cannot fail to exist.
- You could say that Gaunilo argued that having an idea about something does not mean it shows its existence.

(b) 'The Ontological argument can never overcome Kant's objection that existence is not a predicate.' Discuss. [10]

- You could talk about how Kant dismisses the argument.
- Or you could discuss the ways in which Anselm still has a valid argument.

5 (a) Explain the challenges of Gaunilo and Kant to the Ontological argument. [25]

- You need to explain that Gaunilo argued against Anselm's conclusion that God cannot fail to exist.
- You need to explain Gaunilo's perfect island to show that Anselm cannot prove the idea of God as the greatest possible being.
- Then explain Kant's argument that existence is not a predicate – existence may be part of the concept of God but that does not mean that God exists in reality. God's existence, like that of everything else, needs to be verified.

(b) 'The Ontological argument is a convincing argument.' Discuss. [10]

- Assess the different criticisms of the Ontological Argument from Gaunilo and Kant.
- Discuss whether they are successful in refuting the different versions of the Ontological Argument from Anselm and from Descartes.

Chapter 6**1 (a) Explain Aquinas' Cosmological argument. [25]**

- You could explain that Aquinas' Cosmological argument is formed of the first three of his Five Ways: motion or change; cause and contingency.
- You could explain the concept of infinite regress and its usefulness within the context of this argument.

(b) 'No convincing explanation for the existence of the universe has yet been found.'**Discuss. [10]**

- You could criticise what Aquinas was doing when he used this argument as a proof for the existence of God and assess whether or not Hume has succeeded in his attempts to criticise the argument.
- You could compare the religious belief in a creator with the ideas of science.

2 (a) Explain Hume's challenge to Aquinas' Cosmological argument. [25]

- Explain what the Cosmological argument is.
- Explain that Hume had problems with the idea of causation.
- You could explain Hume's argument that you cannot move from a thing within the universe existing to the universe itself existing – the universe may not even have a cause and God need not necessarily be the cause.
- You could say that Hume argued that what we term cause and effect may be just the way we see it; though others may say this is just common sense.

(b) 'The Cosmological argument cannot prove God exists.' Discuss. [10]

- You could assess whether Hume was successful in his criticisms and whether they undermine any belief in a creator God.
- You need to discuss and compare the different points of view.

3 (a) Explain Russell's objections to the Cosmological argument. [25]

- Explain briefly the Cosmological argument and the ideas of contingency and necessity and what might count as a sufficient reason for anything to exist.
- You could use Leibniz to explain this principle.
- You could explain why Russell rejected Copleston's arguments.

(b) 'Copleston proved Russell wrong during their radio debate.' Discuss. [10]

- You could use Copleston's argument that the universe was only explainable with reference to God and that God is not contingent.
- You could then talk about Russell's argument involving the idea of the human race and mothers.
- You could compare the ideas of Copleston with those of Russell.

4 (a) Explain the strengths of the Cosmological argument. [25]

- Explain that the Cosmological Argument is Ways 1–3 of Aquinas’ Five Ways and that it argues from the existence of the universe, asking why there is a universe at all.
- You could explain that the argument from the unmoved mover and uncaused causer says that you cannot have an infinite chain of movers and causes.
- You could explain the argument from contingency – there must be a necessary being.
- You could explain why the argument remains credible as it argues from the world to God.

(b) ‘Hume successfully criticised the Cosmological argument.’ Discuss. [10]

- You could discuss Hume’s argument that you cannot move from something within the universe existing to the universe itself existing.
- You could discuss how Hume argued that what we term cause and effect may be just the way we see it.
- You need to discuss whether Hume was successful in his attempt and whether his ideas would undermine belief in a creator God.

5 (a) Explain Aquinas’ Cosmological argument. [25]

- You could explain that Aquinas’ Cosmological argument is formed of the first three of his Five Ways: motion or change; cause and contingency.
- You could explain the concept of infinite regress and its usefulness within the context of this argument.
- You could explain the focus is on the issue of necessity and contingency and what counts as a sufficient reason for anything to exist.

(b) To what extent were Russell’s criticisms of the Cosmological argument successful? [10]

- You could talk about Hume’s rejection, or you could start by exploring the ‘principle of sufficient reason’.
- Or you could discuss the radio debate between Russell and Copleston and the successes and/or failures of Russell’s objections.

6 (a) Explain the arguments put forward by Copleston in his radio debate with Russell. [25]

- You could use the writings of Leibniz as a way to explain the premise of the debate.
- Or you could start with Copleston’s use of the Third Way of Thomas Aquinas, and Copleston’s belief that God is different from contingent beings.
- You could explain Copleston’s belief that it is important for philosophers to be able to explain the existence of the universe.

(b) How far was Russell successful in countering Copleston’s arguments in the radio debate? [10]

- Move on from your answer to part (a).
- You could discuss Russell’s argument about the human race and mothers.
- You could assess Russell’s conclusion: ‘I should say that the universe is just there and that is all.’

Chapter 7**1 (a) Explain Hume's objections to the Teleological arguments. [25]**

- Briefly explaining the Teleological arguments from Aquinas and Paley.
- Explain how Hume rejected the analogy of the watch and explain his objections in detail.

(b) 'God is the most likely explanation of the design in the universe.' Discuss. [10]

- You could agree with Mill, Dawkins and others that the evidence of so much cruelty in nature does not give weight to the idea of a benevolent God.
- You could use the argument of natural selection and the work of Darwin to dismiss God as a likely explanation.
- You could argue that the variety in the universe points to a designer God and that everything must have a purpose.

2 (a) Explain how the Teleological argument attempts to prove the existence of God. [25]

- You could explain that Aquinas' Fifth Argument is a design argument.
- You could explain the ideas of Paley.
- You could explain Paley's distinction between design qua regularity and design qua purpose, which point to a designer.

(b) 'Mill proved that the Teleological argument cannot prove the existence of God.' Discuss. [10]

- You could for example agree with Mill, Dawkins and others that the evidence of so much cruelty in nature does not give weight to the idea of a benevolent God.
- You could use the theodicies and apply them to the question of design.

3 (a) Explain Paley's version of the Teleological argument and Mill's objections to it. [25]

- Explain the watch analogy and Paley's other examples of the human eye, the fin of a fish, etc.
- You could explain Paley's distinction between design qua regularity and design qua purpose.
- You could point to Mill's work, *The Nature and the Utility of Religion*.
- You could discuss the evidence for this view using examples such as the female digger wasp.

(b) 'Evolution leaves no room for a designer of the universe.' Discuss. [10]

- In this answer you need to stick to Darwin and Paley.
- Discuss the significance of Darwin's theory of natural selection.
- You could discuss the fact that evolution can be defended scientifically whereas Paley's ideas cannot.
- On the other hand you could argue that Paley's idea that the natural world shows signs of design are valid.

4 (a) Explain why some philosophers argue that evidence of design in the universe proves the existence of God. [25]

- In your answer you could use the work of both Aquinas and Paley.
- You could explain that Aquinas' Fifth Argument is a design argument.
- You could then consider the ideas of Paley.
- You could go on to explain Paley's distinction between design qua regularity and design qua purpose, which point to a designer.

(b) 'Mill's discussion of evil successfully undermines the argument from design.'

Discuss. [10]

- You may agree with Mill, Dawkins and others that the evidence of so much cruelty in nature does not give weight to the idea of a benevolent God.
- Or you could use the theodicies and apply them to the question of design.

5 (a) Explain Mill's challenge to the Teleological argument. [25]

- You could start by talking about the Teleological argument.
- You could then explain Mill's viewpoint.
- You could discuss the evidence for this view using examples such as the female digger wasp.

(b) Evaluate the claim that the universe has too many flaws for it to be designed. [10]

- You could example agree with Mill, Dawkins and others that the evidence of so much cruelty in nature does not give weight to the idea of a benevolent God.
- Or you could use the theodicies and apply them to the question of design.

6 (a) Explain Paley's argument for the existence of God. [25]

- Use Paley's watch analogy and his further developments such as the human eye, the fin of a fish etc.
- You could go on to explain Paley's distinction between design qua regularity and design qua purpose.

(b) 'The universe has no purpose.' Discuss. [10]

- Assess some of the views of philosophers such as Paley who argue for purpose in the universe, or you could discuss the views of Darwin.

Chapter 8**1 (a) Explain Kant's Moral argument for the existence of God. [25]**

- You could begin by explaining Kant's beliefs about good will and duty.
- You could explain that morality is found through reason and the role of the *summum bonum*.
- You explain Kant's ethical belief (the categorical imperative).
- You could then go on to explain the importance of Kant's idea of innate moral awareness to support this argument.

(b) 'Moral awareness has nothing to do with God.' Discuss. [10]

- Build on your explanations in part (a) in your evaluation of God's involvement in humanity's alleged moral awareness.
- You could argue that morality is a result of genetics, environmental factors, or even guilt, but not the existence of God, using the work of Freud or Dawkins.

2 (a) Explain Freud's view that moral awareness comes from sources other than God. [25]

- You could explain Freud's concept of the Oedipus complex.
- Or you could talk about Freud's ideas about the id, ego and superego.

(b) 'God is the only explanation of moral awareness.' Discuss. [10]

- You could assess how and what Freud used to come to his conclusions.
- Or you could focus more on evidence which points to moral awareness involving divinity, and assess the evidence of this.

3 (a) Explain what Kant means by *summum bonum*. [25]

- You could use Kant's discussion of Hypothetical and Categorical Imperatives, or talk about his beliefs about perfect happiness.
- You could discuss whether the existence of the idea of a *summum bonum* leads naturally to the conclusion that there is a God to make sure it happens.

(b) 'The existence of morality is not evidence for the existence of God.' Discuss. [10]

- You could disagree with the statement and say that morality is merely social conventions for getting along with each other and so cannot be used to postulate the existence of God.
- You could use the work of Dawkins to say it is just a result of evolution.
- You could counteract this by arguing that morality does indeed come from an innate sense of duty which comes from God.

4 (a) Explain Freud's challenge to Kant's Moral argument for the existence of God. [25]

- You could explain Freud's concept of the Oedipus complex.
- Or you could talk about Freud's ideas about the id, ego and superego.

(b) 'Kant's understanding of morality leads convincingly to God.' Discuss. [10]

- You need to assess whether Kant's moral argument is successful; the idea of the *summum bonum* and if the argument is clear.
- You could argue that morality is the product of society, education and upbringing.
- Or you could argue that morality comes not just from people but also from God.

Chapter 9**1 (a) Show how the theodicies of Irenaeus and Augustine account for natural evil. [25]**

- You could begin by explaining that the existence of natural evil challenges belief in a good God.
- You could then explain about Irenaeus and immature beings.
- You could talk about Augustine and free will.

(b) 'The existence of natural evil destroys any argument that God is good.' Discuss. [10]

- You may agree with this statement and argue that there is no such being as a good God.
- You could use Dawkins here, but remember to evaluate his arguments.
- Alternatively you could use the theodicies and build on your response to part (a).

2 (a) Explain how Irenaeus accounts for the existence of evil. [25]

- You could explain the problem of evil, possibly using Epicurus.
- Then explain the theodicy of Irenaeus.
- You could explain how human beings could appear to grow from the image of God into the likeness of God and explain the idea of free will.

(b) 'God is the cause of all evil.' Discuss. [10]

- You could discuss the ideas of Augustine and free will.
- You could discuss Augustine's idea that evil is a privation of goodness, but that it does come from God.
- You could argue that if God is omniscient he must have known that humans would misuse free will.
- You could also discuss the ideas of Irenaeus that God creates evil for a purpose so that people can grow into his likeness.

3 (a) Explain how Irenaeus and Augustine account for the existence of moral evil. [25]

- You could explain the problem of evil, possibly using the version put forward by Epicurus.
- Explain the theodicy of Irenaeus, and the extent to which human beings could appear to grow from the image of God into the likeness of God.
- Explain the theodicy of Augustine and soul deciding, including Adam and his sin.
- For both theodicies you need to explain the idea of free will.

(b) 'The sufferings of innocent people destroy any attempt to explain why God allows moral evil.' Discuss. [10]

- You could argue that the theodicies intend to defend belief in God even though evil exists and are not intended to help someone who is suffering.
- You could discuss the idea that God knows what humans will do but does not prevent the evil that they do.
- You could consider whether either of the theodicies can justify the amount of suffering in the world.

4 (a) Explain Augustine's response to the existence of natural evil. [25]

- Only explain natural evil not moral evil.
- Explain how Augustine's theodicy applies to natural evil:
 - The link between the Fall and natural evil.
 - The misuse of free will by angels and humans disordered creation.
 - Suffering is a consequence of the Fall.

(b) 'There is no problem of evil because God does not exist.' Discuss. [10]

- You may argue that there is no God.
- You could discuss the writings of Richard Dawkins to support this view.
- Alternatively you could use the theodicies and build on your response to part (a).

5 (a) Describe how Augustine and Irenaeus explain the origin of evil. [25]

- You could begin by explaining the problem of evil, possibly using the version put forward by Epicurus.
- You could explain the problem of evil, possibly using the version put forward by Epicurus.
- Explain the theodicy of Irenaeus and free will.
- You could then discuss the extent to which human beings could appear to grow from the image of God into the likeness of God.
- Explain the theodicy of Augustine and soul deciding, and Adam and his sin.
- For both theodicies you need to explain the idea of free will.

(b) 'There is no problem of evil because God is not all powerful.' Discuss. [10]

- You could begin by talking about the inconsistent triad, and then use Mackie to talk about God's power.
- You could argue against this using the idea of free will.

6 (a) Explain why Irenaeus argues that the existence of evil is a necessary part of the universe. [25]

- You could explain the problem of evil, possibly using Epicurus.
- Then explain the theodicy of Irenaeus.
- You could explain how human beings could appear to grow from the image of God into the likeness of God and explain the idea of free will.

(b) 'Irenaeus is wrong: evil disproves the existence of God.' Discuss. [10]

- You could argue that the theodicies provide a rational defence of belief in God even though evil exists.
- You could discuss the problem of believing in a good, omnipotent and omniscient God in the light of all the evil in the world.
- You could consider whether either of the theodicies can justify the amount of evil in the world.

7 (a) Explain the nature of the problem of evil. [25]

- You could explain some form of the inconsistent triad as expressed by philosophers such as Epicurus or David Hume.
- You could explain moral evil and then natural evil.
- You could use the theodicies to explore the nature of evil.

(b) 'Moral evil may be the fault of humanity but natural evil is God's fault.' Discuss. [10]

- You could discuss whether we should blame God for either natural or moral evil.
- You could discuss Augustine's interpretation of the Fall.
- You could use the theodicies to evaluate different ways of responding to this statement.

8 (a) Explain the Irenaean theodicy. [25]

- You could explain the problem of evil, possibly using Epicurus.
- Then explain the theodicy of Irenaeus.
- You could explain how human beings could appear to grow from the image of God into the likeness of God and explain the idea of free will.

(b) To what extent can evil be said to be simply a test? [10]

- You could discuss the idea that, while some may believe that this life is simply a test to achieve eternal life, this is not what the theodicies are actually saying.
- You could evaluate whether or not there is any justification for suffering such as the abduction of a child that would help a parent to 'mature'.
- You could discuss whether there is simply too much evil present in the world, both moral and natural, for any argument to justify its existence.

Chapter 10**1 (a) Explain the debate between Creationism and the Big Bang theory. [25]**

- Explain what Creationism is and the various types of it.
- Describe the Big Bang theory and explain how the universe began according to this theory.
- You could explain that the Big Bang theory is not necessarily saying that God did not create the universe – it is still a matter of interpretation.

(b) 'The Big Bang theory is more believable than Creationism.' Discuss. [10]

- You evaluate the empirical evidence available to support the Big Bang theory, exploring which data is reliable and which needs further research.
- Or you evaluate the kind of alleged scientific evidence used in support of Creationism.

2 (a) Explain Darwinism and evolutionary theory. [25]

- You could explain how Darwinism was probably influenced by the writings of Charles Lyell.
- You could explain about Darwin's work and his journey on the HMS Beagle.
- Explain the theory of natural selection.
- You could use the work of Richard Dawkins in explaining and developing Darwinism.

(b) 'The universe is too complex for evolutionary theory to explain it.' Discuss. [10]

- You could discuss the anthropic principle here.
- Or you could discuss the work of Richard Dawkins and assess the view that Darwin's theories are backed up by the evidence.

3 (a) Explain the concept of Irreducible Complexity. [25]

- You need to explain Intelligent Design.
- You could explain that Intelligent Design challenges Darwinism.
- You could explain Michael Behe's ideas of irreducible complexity.
- You could use the example of the mousetrap that Behe himself uses.

(b) 'There is no evidence of Intelligent Design in the universe.' Discuss. [10]

- You could use the ideas of Hume or Dawkins to judge the idea of design.
- Or could use the work of Paul Davies and his Goldilocks Enigma. You could argue that there is evidence in the universe to support Intelligent Design.

4 (a) Explain why some Creationists do not believe in the Big Bang theory. [25]

- You need to explain the different types of Creationists as they do not all hold the same beliefs.
- Explain why some approaches reject the Big Bang.
- You could explain the idea of Progressive Creationism, which can incorporate the ideas of the Big Bang as a manifestation of the power of God.
- You could explain the Big Bang by exploring the idea that before this event there was nothing, no time and no space.
- Explain that the theory believes that the universe sprang into existence from a singularity somewhere between 12 and 15 billion years ago.

(b) 'Scientists are the only ones who can explain why the universe is here.' Discuss. [10]

- You can argue that a scientific approach to the question is not enough.
- You could support the view held by Professor Peter Atkins and others that finding God in the Big Bang is the last refuge of the desperate, and put forward arguments in support of the statement.
- You could suggest that given the limitations of human knowledge, both scientific and religious, that both positions have value.

5 (a) Compare scientific and philosophical views on the creation of the universe. [25]

- You can choose from any of the scientific or philosophical theories you have studied.
- You could describe Creationist views on the beginnings of the universe.
- Or you could explain views of Aristotle or Aquinas, discussing for example the ideas of design or prime mover.

(b) Evaluate the view that science can only explain how and not why the universe exists. [10]

- You could discuss the empirical nature of science and give examples in support of your argument, and the limitations of science.