

Example KS5 Work – Philosophy

The following gives some examples of the level of work covered in Philosophy at KS5 including details of how we expect students to set out their work and engage with feedback received. Students who follow these steps and responds to the individual feedback they have been given, will make the best progress.

Classwork and homework

All engagement with feedback, whether that is individual or whole class, has been engaged with in green pen. This level of detail in green pen engagement with feedback will ensure students make secure progress against A Level assessment objectives as all forms of feedback are specifically targeted to these.

All work, both classwork and homework, has a title and date. All work is presented neatly, and the folder is kept in an orderly & logical manner. This student clearly takes pride in their work.

Quick Review 05.10.24

1. Omniscience - A being that knows all ^{possible} logically true propositions and does not believe anything logically impossible → False propositions
2. Understanding of Supreme Goodness:
 - ① Moral Goodness
 - ② Biblical → God loves us all
 - ③ Aristotelian
3. 2 horns:
 - If something good because it is inherently good beyond God's power?
 - If something good because God wills it to be good?
4. Can do everything that is logically possible ✓ and which does not limit God's power.
5. Can God create a stone that he cannot lift?
 - If yes, he cannot be all powerful as he cannot lift the stone.
 - If no, there is a task that he cannot do (create the stone).
6. All logically possible true propositions.
 - Possible: Many things that could happen so does God know them all.
 - True: Picking the correct proposition of being possible
 - Logical:

~~God can do anything that is not logically impossible~~
All logical possible true propositions: cannot believe things that defy the nature of the world.

6. Aquinas' view on God being atemporal:
 - This view does not align with the characteristics of God in the Bible ✓
 - Rejected God's timeless (eternal) due to loving God. → outside time
eternal (timeless)
7. Scriptural → existing through time without beginning or end.
 - Same as everlasting. → Personal relationships
8. Wolterstorff argues that an eternal God ~~is not possible~~ contradicts the account of God in the Bible - if ~~eternal~~ eternal, how can God act within the world, so cannot be the Redeemer.
 - Everlasting for at least a period of time.
9. God of Abraham - God loves the world, interacts with it so everlasting eternal
God of philosophers - God is immutible and changeless ~~to everlasting~~
 - There is tension between these:
 - P1: God is atemporal (timeless)
 - P2: God interacts with the world.
 - P3: The world is temporal.
 - IC: God has a relationship with the temporal world.
 - P4: Any being with this relationship is temporal.
 - IC: God is temporal ✓
 - C: P1 is false.
 - God is immutible → Atemporal God.
10. Deism → God created the world and removed himself from it.
 - Theists reject this due to God's loving nature means he's involved.

Scriptural support for everlasting: Psalm 90:2 - without beginning, without end and active in the world.

 - Everlasting God is a personal God.
 - An everlasting God loves his creation.
 - Everlasting God is closer to God in the Bible.

Genesis 21:11
Women giving birth
at age 90 +
= = = = =

Teacher assessed work

As with classwork and homework all teacher marked work has been thoroughly engaged with in green pen by the student. This will ensure the student reflects on their progress to ensure improvements are made.

Explain what omniscience means and then explain Kretzmann's Argument against omniscience on the grounds God cannot be omniscient and immutable.

Omniscience means that a being knows all ~~logically~~ possible true propositions and does not believe any false propositions. For example, ~~God~~ an omniscient being knows that all triangles have 3 sides but would not believe that all triangles have 4 sides because that is ~~logically~~ impossible and false. *It's not as you write it later. (1)*

Kretzmann argues that God (a perfect being) cannot be both omniscient and immutable and would hence not be perfect. He outlines this argument in the following way =

P1: A perfect being is not subject to change.
P2: A perfect being knows everything.
P3: A perfect being would know which time it is.
P4: A being who knows ^{always} what time it is, is subject to change.
IC1 P5: A perfect being is hence subject to change. *not the exact wording of Kretzmann's argument*
IC2 P6: A perfect being is not perfect (P1 + P5)
C P7: Perfect beings do not exist. *Ac. it's where the 1st is*

The core of this reductio ad absurdum argument lies in *is where the 1st is* premise 4. ~~This is~~ because that the object of knowledge that God has is subject to change. ~~that is~~ for example, if at one moment, God ~~knows~~ that the time is 11:59 am, this is a form of knowledge. However, one minute later, God knows that the time is 12:00 pm, though God used to ~~know~~ know a proposition which is now false. *red.* This example outlines that God's object of knowledge is constantly adjusting to uphold this perfect characteristic of omniscience. If at 12:00 pm, God tells "knew" that the time was 11:59 am, God ~~knows~~ believe in a false proposition and hence could not be omniscient. Instead, God's

knowledge is changing, ~~but~~ but this means God cannot be immutable. *why? (1)*

Both omniscience and immutability are necessary characteristics of a perfect being but they are ~~incompatible~~ incompatible with each other. God cannot be both omniscient and immutable simultaneously because the consequences of being omniscient leads to ~~be~~ jeopardy for God's immutability. As God's knowledge is subject to change, God is subject to change, and to God cannot be immutable if God is omniscient. According to Kretzmann, God therefore cannot be perfect. ~~as proposed~~

(1) A perfect being must be immutable because the previous version of God must not have been perfect to begin with, leading to change.
→ Use omniscience to demonstrate this
→ Could also use moral problems

Immutable: Unchanging.

(2) Reductio Ad Absurdum: Assumes being premises, draws out logical consequences to prove incompatibility of premise.

In addition to the teacher providing targeted and diagnostic individual feedback, students are also directed to reflect on their progress throughout the term to determine what area or areas they need to improve on and how they are going to achieve this. The teacher ensures that these reflections are relevant to the student alongside completing a file check to determine whether their folder is revision ready.

Autumn Term			
E	G	M	P
Optional Comment: <i>revision ready folder!</i>			

Spring Term			
E	G	M	P
Optional Comment:			

Summer Term			
E	G	M	P
Optional Comment:			

What do I need to do to improve?
<i>Autumn Term: Attention to detail and accuracy in AO1 questions and more quality weighting in AO2. → How are you going to achieve Practice writing under timed conditions?</i>