

CONFERENCE VERSION



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

AUTUMN 2020

**AS
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 3
AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION AND ETHICS**

B120U30-1

INTRODUCTION

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 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.

AS Generic Band Descriptors

Band	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 25 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"> - <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> - <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> - <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> - <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">21-25 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">16-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">11-15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">6-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. <p>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant information.

Band	Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions 25 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5	21-25 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	16-20 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	11-15 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	6-10 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	1-5 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

COMPONENT 3: AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION AND ETHICS

MARK SCHEME

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

Section A

1. (a) **Apply Rule Utilitarianism to the issue of animal experimentation for medical research.** [AO1 25]

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

- Rule Utilitarianism is generally associated with John Stuart Mill, particularly in its 'weak' form. The theory applies the principle of creating 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number' to general moral rules in order to determine which are in the best interests of humans. An action can then be deemed right or wrong depending upon whether it follows the rules.
- 'Weak' rule utilitarianism is the position that the general rules based on greatest happiness should normally be followed, but these may be broken in specific situations if it would promote greatest happiness to do so.
- Rule Utilitarianism would support the promotion of animal welfare in general terms and would agree with rules preventing cruelty to animals, as Bentham had originally argued that the scope of the principle of utility applied to anything that could suffer. However, as Mill argues that 'higher' pleasures take precedence in moral terms over 'lower' pleasures, it seems clear that avoiding human suffering is likely to be given a higher moral weighting than avoiding animal suffering as humans are capable of higher level pleasure.
- Again, the harm principle is mainly aimed at humans and so, while humans are permitted to interfere in the lives of individuals to prevent harm, and animal harm can be taken into account, it needs to be balanced against the benefit to humans.
- It seems clear, then, that Rule Utilitarianism would permit some animal experimentation for medical research, however it would be likely to insist on strict legislation to minimize the suffering involved.
- However, in terms of Weak Rule Utilitarianism, the 'intrinsic merits of the case' would have to be considered, therefore there would be no blanket acceptance of all forms of experimentation and the broader interests of humanity would have to be taken into account rather than the benefit to a few individuals in a specific case.
- In practical terms, this may well mean that Rule Utilitarianism would support the use of limited medical experiments using animals if no alternative methods were available and if the particular experiment could lead to a long-term benefit for humanity as a whole, but they would also support research into alternative approaches.
- All reasonable applications of Rule Utilitarian principles should be credited.

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

(b) 'Pleasure is the sole intrinsic good in life.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Utilitarianism is based on maximising pleasure and minimising pain, deriving this from the hedonist approach which values pleasure as the basis for morality.
- All humans ultimately value pleasure and therefore basing morality on pleasure means that a moral action is one that fulfils human nature.
- However, some may argue that this makes humans little better than swine and that love, reason, or obedience to the will of God may be the true basis for morality as these aspects distinguish humans from animals.
- This point could be developed using Mill's distinction between higher and lower forms of pleasure and argue that higher pleasures are a more appropriate basis for morality.
- Another line of argument is that pleasure is subjective and therefore an inadequate basis for morality. To develop this argument, alternative applications of the criteria of the hedonic calculus to a particular issue could be used.
- Along similar lines, it could be argued that it is impossible to quantify pleasure in any meaningful way, and that the hedonic calculus does not really help to objectively measure pleasure in real life situations.
- Alternatively, it could be claimed that the hedonic calculus does offer a meaningful way of weighing up which actions are moral and that the answers derived from this process fit in with our general moral intuitions, making it a genuine basis for morality.
- However, examples could be given in which the action which produces 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number' could produce injustice or immorality.
- It could be argued that basing morality on pleasure will always lead to a relativist approach to morality, and that actually humans require moral absolutes to form the true basis for morality.
- Candidates may choose to argue that 'pleasure' needs to be defined more clearly or qualified in order to form the basis for morality. They may argue for an alternative form of utilitarianism such as rule utilitarianism or preference utilitarianism in making their case.
- Candidates may also choose to argue in favour of one of the other ethical theories studied: natural law or situation ethics, as forming a better basis for morality.

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

2. (a) Apply Act Utilitarianism to the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent.
[AO1 25]

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

- Act Utilitarianism is a relativist theory that does not give definitive moral guidelines about the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent. This means that candidates may apply the theory in different ways to the issue and give different weightings to the quantity of pleasure and pain that results. All reasonable applications should be credited.
- Bentham's Act Utilitarianism is based on the principle of utility - a moral action is one that will maximise pleasure and minimise pain.
- The Hedonic Calculus is a set of criteria designed to measure which course of action will create the 'maximum pleasure and minimum pain' in a given moral situation.
- This can then be extended to the "greatest happiness principle which ensures the greatest happiness for the greatest number".
- In the case of the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent, the balance of pleasure and pain should be considered using the seven criteria of the calculus.
- Intensity – the strength of pleasure that comes from avoiding nuclear war and from the sense of security a deterrent provides may be considered.
- Duration – the possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent is seen to have contributed to the long-term peace and stability of much of the world following World War 2.
- Certainty – some may suggest that we cannot be certain whether peace in the latter half of the 20th Century stems from the possession of nuclear weapons or from other factors. The weapons may fall into the 'wrong' hands and we would not then be certain that they would be used as a deterrent alone.
- Remoteness – candidates may explain that the happiness that comes from a feeling of security is closer than the pain which may come from the eventual use of nuclear weapons.
- Fecundity – the possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent may lead to further pleasure as countries seek out alternative methods of conflict resolution. Alternatively, the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent may increase distrust globally and lead to international relations based on threats of violence rather than cooperation, which is unlikely to lead to further pleasure.
- Purity – the possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent is not a pure pleasure, as the knowledge of the destructive capabilities of such weapons, and the fear of misuse will cause some pain. Also, the cost of maintaining a nuclear deterrent means that some will experience pain through the choices that countries make in order to fund such weapons.
- Extent – if the deterrent works, then the pleasure extends, at least, to the populations of the countries which possess nuclear weapons. The extent may be greater if groups of allies are considered.

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

(b) 'Bentham offers a more practical form of Utilitarianism than Mill.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Bentham's Act Utilitarianism allows moral decisions to be made according to the specific situation, which often gives clearer guidance than trying to follow a more general moral rule.
- The Hedonic Calculus offers a practical method by which to judge different situations and to form a clear decision.
- However, Bentham's version may be seen as impractical owing to the difficulty of quantifying happiness, making the correct course of action unclear in many situations when following Act Utilitarianism.
- Also, individuals may judge the quantity of happiness according to their own preferences rather than taking into account the interests of all involved. It is unclear how to avoid this in Act Utilitarianism.
- Application of the Hedonic Calculus to all aspects of a situation could be seen as impractical and time-consuming therefore it cannot give practical guidance in real-life situations.
- Also, Bentham's Act Utilitarianism may allow injustice to a minority in order to create the greatest happiness for the greatest number. This may go against our moral intuition and therefore cannot be seen as practical or useful.
- Mill's version of Utilitarianism could be seen as more practical as it allows for clear rules to be created based on the principle of utility which make it less time-consuming and therefore easier to apply to moral decision-making.
- It is also practical as it allows for rules to be broken if this would create the greatest happiness, therefore not sticking to rules for the sake of it but acting in a pragmatic way in the circumstances.
- However, it could be argued that Mill's version of the theory makes the principle of utility even more difficult to apply as it is not always easy to distinguish higher and lower pleasures.
- Also, candidates could take the view that neither version can give clear guidance as both are based in some sense on predicting consequences, which is unreliable.

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

Section B

3. (a) Examine the laws and precepts found in Aquinas' Natural Law. [AO1 25]

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

- Aquinas' Natural Law is one of four inter-related sets of laws which he believed governed the universe:
- Eternal Law – these are the principles that lie behind the universe based on God's creation. Only God can fully understand these.
- Divine Law – God chooses to reveal parts of eternal law through sacred texts and the teachings of the Church.
- Natural Law – humans are able to use their God-given reason to work out elements of eternal law. Natural Law is likely to be in agreement with Divine Law as both come from the same source.
- Human Law – this is developed from Natural Law and Divine Law and forms the legal systems of our societies.
- Therefore, Natural Law involves the application of reason to work out the God-given purpose of humans and to create rules which will aid people in fulfilling that purpose.
- The ultimate purpose of humans is to establish a right relationship with God, and therefore to gain eternal life. From this ultimate purpose, it is possible to use reason to establish primary precepts – our God-given purposes in life which help to identify which actions are 'good'.
- The primary precepts are: to worship God, to live in ordered societies, to reproduce, to learn and seek knowledge and to preserve innocent life (both the life of the individual themselves and the life of others.)
- Secondary precepts are rules derived from the primary precepts which give more detailed guidance about which actions are 'good' in that they fulfil the purpose of a human.
- For example, from the primary precept 'to preserve innocent life', the secondary principle 'do not murder' could be deduced by reason. Again, from the primary principle 'live in ordered societies', the secondary precept 'do not steal' could be deduced. Candidates may offer a range of different secondary precepts based on their chosen primary precept.

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

(b) 'Aquinas' Natural Law is meaningless for atheists.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Aquinas' Natural Law is based on a hierarchical set of laws deriving from God as the ultimate Creator. Without a belief in such a God, there is no basis for the Eternal law which underpins natural law.
- Atheists are unlikely to believe in any ultimate purpose for human beings and therefore the belief that a good action fulfils the purpose of the agent is a non-sensical concept.
- However, with the exception of the primary precept 'worship God' the remaining precepts could be worked out using reason without a belief in God. A theory which works towards humans fulfilling a purpose gives meaning to life and a clear grounding for ethical behaviour.
- This point could be developed with reference to Aristotle, whose work forms the origin of Aquinas' theory without requiring belief in a creator God.
- Candidates could argue that Natural Law is based on reason rather than revelation and so is accessible to atheists. A reliance on reasoned argument rather than faith is often characteristic of the atheist position.
- However, the ultimate purpose of using reason in Aquinas' Natural Law is to achieve a right relationship with God, and this is not something atheists would see the need for.
- Natural Law may be seen as meaningless for atheists as it can be used to justify some rules which are fairly unpalatable in the modern secular world. For example, Natural Law would argue that abortion is wrong as it breaks the primary precept of preserving life. While a small number of cases may be justifiable under the principle of double effect, many atheists would see a far wider range of cases as morally acceptable.
- The cultural bias of Aquinas' primary precepts could also be questioned by atheists. His concept of an ordered society would be at odds with secular views about equality, which would lead to the rejection of fixed hierarchies.
- However, it could be argued that Natural Law offers clear structure and moral guidance which is lacking in modern society, and this clarity could be appealing for atheists even if they do not accept the divine origin of the eternal law upon which it is based.

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

4. (a) Examine Aristotle's Moral Virtues.

[AO1 25]

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

- Aristotle argued that humans should aim for eudaimonia, or 'well-being.' In order to achieve this, humans need to live a virtuous life, as eudaimonia is the outcome of being virtuous.
- Eudaimonia can be translated as happiness, but it is not an emotional state, but rather the application of reason to work out how to live a good life in order to achieve a state of human flourishing.
- Humans should therefore aim to cultivate virtues (arete) within a social context in order to lead a happy and fulfilled life. This is not something which can be done quickly, as virtues must be cultivated over time.
- Aristotle states that virtues fall into two categories, moral virtues and intellectual virtues; both of which are essential for human flourishing.
- While intellectual virtues require education to develop, moral virtues are developed through habit and practice.
- Aristotle identifies 12 moral virtues: courage, temperance, liberality, munificence, high-mindedness, right ambition, patience, truthfulness, wittiness, friendliness, modesty and righteous indignation. (Accept synonyms for these terms.)
- In order to develop the moral virtues, Aristotle states that humans must be aware that they fall between the two vices of excess and deficiency. Achieving moral virtue involves deciding where this mean lies in a given situation. This is where the intellectual virtue of prudence comes into play.
- Some people will be able to maintain the mean naturally and are therefore naturally virtuous. Others are tempted by the vices but strong-willed enough to live by the mean. Both of these are virtuous characters.
- To be effective, Virtue Theory cannot be practised in isolation, rather humans must develop as part of communities in which friendship is important and the opportunity to learn from each other as role models.
- All virtues can be improved by practice. If human beings practise being patient, this will become their normal response over time. A human seeking eudaimonia should practice the moral virtues until they become habits.

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

(b) 'Being a good person is more important than doing good actions.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- On one hand it is clearly difficult to separate what a person does from the sort of person that they are. It could be argued that good people are more likely to seek to do good actions and therefore moral character is the most important thing to focus on.
- An agent-centred approach also allows people to consider the situation and the context of their actions and to make sensible decisions in a specific situation without requiring a set of rules to manage their decision making.
- However, this approach also gives very little guidance to the moral agent and allows scope for arbitrary and individualistic decision making. There are many points in history in which 'good' people have made some very poor moral decisions.
- Being a good person can be seen as more important as there is little value in simply following rules. A person who recognises and understands the reasons for trying to choose good has a stronger character than a person who simply learns a set of external rules and acts in accordance with these.
- Therefore, Virtue Theory is more than a simple focus on action and is a holistic approach that aims to develop human beings into the best characters they can be. This results in independent, strong-minded, responsible and wise individuals who are capable of naturally doing good without the confines of rules, which are sometimes impractical and inflexible.
- However, it could be argued that this idea is naïve and overly trusting. It relies on the potential goodness of others, when even Aristotle admits that many people are too tempted by the vices. Aristotle seemed to believe that a fairly narrow range of people were capable of achieving virtue, so the theory cannot be applied universally.
- A counter argument is that virtue does not need to be achievable by all in order to be valuable. Virtuous people can serve as good role models for others and so guidance can be offered without the need for a set of rules through the example of such people.
- However, if a person never carries out good deeds, it is impossible to judge their virtue, suggesting that actions are important in giving a moral baseline.

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

5. (a) **Explain Divine Command Theory.**

[AO1 25]

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

- Divine Command Theory sees God as the origin and regulator of morality – what is good is what God says is good.
- The issue of the Euthyphro dilemma raised by Plato may be discussed: is something approved by God because it is good, or is it good because it is approved by God? In other words, does goodness exist separately from God's approval or is goodness a consequence of God's approval?
- Divine Command theory argues that God has established eternal principles of morality and shares these with humans, therefore, a moral action is one which is commanded by God.
- Right and wrong are seen as objective truths based on God's will as the divine lawgiver. These truths should form the foundation of any human system of morality.
- There is no standard of morality outside God as he is the origin of what is good. This is compatible with God's omnipotence.
- As Robinson points out, this means that some things must always be wrong and 'nothing can make them right.'
- Adams offers a modified version of Divine Command Theory and states that an action is moral if it obeys the commands of a loving God.
- This avoids some of the more obvious criticisms of the theory relating to whether God can command as good things which we would consider to be evil (the arbitrariness problem.)
- A God who is loving and perfectly good will command actions in keeping with God's nature – his commands will reflect his omnibenevolence and so he would not command anything arbitrary.
- This makes morality a feature of God's nature – God is the moral law therefore the moral law must be good as omnibenevolence is part of God's unchanging nature.

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

(b) 'Morality is clearly whatever God commands.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- This statement certainly fits in with the claims of Divine Command Theory. The question remains whether this is the best definition of a moral action.
- A line of argument in favour of the statement is that morality can only be based on God's commands as God is the creator of the universe and morality is built into the universe as part of God's plan.
- In addition, God is the only objective source of morality – to define moral actions in human terms is to invite subjective and biased decision-making.
- However, this line of argument leads to the Euthyphro dilemma – is an action good because it is loved by God or does God only love good actions?
- To develop this idea, God could command actions which we would regard as wrong, but these would have to be seen as moral according to this view. This makes morality completely arbitrary.
- Alternatively, there could be a moral standard higher than God, questioning God's omnipotence.
- It could be argued that Adam's modified divine command theory allows a solution to the Euthyphro dilemma as God's loving nature means that he will not command actions that we might see as immoral.
- On the other hand, different religions claim that different things are commanded by God. There is no way to judge which things are genuinely commanded by God.
- An alternative line of argument would be to consider the idea that morality must be based on something other than commands, as just because it is commanded, does not make it morally right (Ayer).
- Alternative theories about what defines morality including virtue theory and ethical egoism may be discussed, as it may be claimed that the definition of morality should be focused more on human qualities or needs than on the will of God.

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