



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

AUTUMN 2020

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

A120U30-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2020 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

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

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

Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

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

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

Rules for Marking

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

Banded mark schemes

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

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

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

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

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

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

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

Awarding no marks to a response

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

Eduqas A Level Generic Band Descriptors

Band	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 20 marks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <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;">17-20 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. • Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied. • An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">13-16 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. • Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied. • A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">9-12 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. • Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied. • A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">5-8 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. • Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied. • A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-4 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. • Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought. • Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied. • 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 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5	<p>25-30 marks</p> <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. • The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context. • Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p>19-24 marks</p> <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. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context. • Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p>13-18 marks</p> <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. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context. • Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p>7-12 marks</p> <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. • Basic use of the views of scholars / schools of thought appropriately and in context. • Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p>1-6 marks</p> <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. • Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought. • Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

A Level 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 Situation Ethics to the issue of polyamorous relationships. [AO1 20]**

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

- Candidates can make legitimate use of Biblical teachings beyond agape to support the application of Situation Ethics.
- Polyamorous relationships are difficult to define in simple terms without the definition becoming reductive and unhelpfully simplistic. Those engaged in polyamorous relationships tend to emphasise gender equality, fidelity (in terms of keeping promises in a relationship rather than sexual exclusivity), communication, respect, trust and an avoidance of possessive jealousy.
- In terms of Situation Ethics, Fletcher rejected legalistic approaches and instead applied the principle of agape (unconditional love) to all ethical decisions. Therefore, each polyamorous relationship would be considered as a separate case, in the same way as monogamous relationships, and agape should be applied in line with the working and fundamental principles.
- Each case would be assessed on its merits, relative to the law of love (relativism) and would be based on pragmatism (whether the action would lead to a loving outcome) and personalism (considering the needs of those involved) rather than judgements being made on any prior legal or moral claims.
- The basis of agape outlined in the fundamental principles would also be considered. Particularly the idea that a loving end justifies the means, that love and justice are the same, and the consideration that love applies equally to all.
- In terms of polyamorous relationships, if all those involved are fully aware of the agreements made within a relationship and this has been communicated openly and honestly in an atmosphere of trust and respect, then this would appear to meet the criteria laid down by Situation ethics for a good action.
- As with all relationships, if there is dishonesty and lack of respect, or a focus purely on the sexual aspects of the relationship, then Situation Ethics is unlikely to see engaging in such a relationship as a good act.
- The degree to which the law prohibits such relationships may be considered as it is unlikely to be pragmatic to engage in actions which could result in serious danger for those involved should they be discovered by others.
- As Situation Ethics is a relativist approach with no fixed rules about polyamorous relationships, credit any reasonable application.

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

(b) 'Situation Ethics can only lead to immoral behaviour.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Situation Ethics could be seen to lead to immoral behaviour as agape is not a clear enough guideline about how to act. In spite of the working and fundamental principles, it gives no clear guidelines about how to act and so could lead to actions which go against perceived moral rules.
- For example, it is clear from Fletcher's own examples that Situation Ethics would permit both adultery and infanticide if the situation demands it, yet many would argue that these are both immoral actions in any circumstance.
- It may be better to follow a theory which has clear cut moral rules such as Natural Law to avoid the abandonment of traditional moral guidelines caused by the situational approach.
- However, counter-examples could be given to show that adherence to fixed moral rules regardless of the situation also leads to immoral behaviour at times. Agape allows consideration for the people involved in a situation rather than the rigid application of rules and this could be more 'moral' at times.
- Another line of argument would be to consider the difficulty of giving people moral autonomy through Situation Ethics. People interpret situations according to their own point of view and the love applied is rarely unconditional in practice.
- Also, people may claim to be acting out of love when, in fact, their intentions are quite selfish. This is often the case when Situation Ethics is applied to relationships.
- However, this is not necessarily a criticism of the theory itself, but the inappropriate way in which it has been applied. If Situation Ethics is used properly then these criticisms could be dismissed.
- On the other hand, it could be argued that a theory which is difficult for humans to apply is not useful and will inevitably lead to immoral behaviour. While Jesus appeared able to apply the principle of agape effectively, other humans are less capable of living up to this standard and perhaps should not try to do so.
- Situation Ethics also asks people to consider the consequences of actions. As these are unpredictable, it may be seen to lead to immoral behaviour because its basis is unreliable. The loving consequences can never be guaranteed and may not be worth breaking an established moral principle.

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

2. (a) Apply Act Utilitarianism to the issue of animal experimentation for medical research. [AO1 20]

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

- As Utilitarianism is a relativist theory with no absolute position on animal experimentation, accept all reasonable applications by candidates.
- In order to apply Utilitarianism to this issue correctly, in terms of Act Utilitarianism, each example of animal experimentation must be judged in terms of the Hedonic Calculus. The criteria of intensity, duration, certainty, richness, remoteness, purity and extent must be considered, with a clear focus on the long-term effects for humans and animals as well as the short term.
- The Utilitarian response to this issue, as with all other moral issues, is centred around the idea that a good action will promote 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number.' When asked to whom this principle should apply, Bentham's response was to consider 'not, can they reason...But can they suffer?' and, as such, it is clear that it should also apply to animals.
- Animal experimentation, however, relies upon the suffering of a few animals for the benefit of a larger number of humans and therefore, in quantitative terms, could lead to the greatest happiness for the greatest number.
- However, the benefits of animal experimentation are not guaranteed, as animals are not exactly like humans and some argue that alternative research methods such as computer modelling, and human tissue research are more effective and would lead to greatest happiness.
- This view must be balanced against the number of positive advances in medicine which have been possible as a result of animal experimentation and the number of scientists who still wish to use such experiments.
- In many situations, this may well lead to the acceptance of animal experimentation, in spite of the uncertainty of the outcomes.

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

- (b) **‘Utilitarianism is an effective way to make moral decisions in the 21st century.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Utilitarianism could be seen as an effective way to make decisions in the 21st century as it is already a widely accepted and practised basis of morality used in modern democracies when making decisions about, for example, distribution of healthcare and other social resources.
- It is based on achieving happiness for the majority and, as happiness is a common goal in the 21st century, it will work as it is based on a natural human need which has not changed over time.
- However, it could be argued that happiness is not a good enough goal for morality, and that other demands such as duty or obedience to religious rules are more appropriate.
- The selfish pursuit of happiness could be seen as one of the problems of 21st Century society and the flexibility of Act Utilitarianism could be seen as a weakness as it gives too much autonomy to act according to supposed ‘greatest happiness’ as assessed by an individual.
- Also, the pursuit of greatest happiness could lead to injustice to minorities or acts which are regarded by other moral codes as reprehensible.
- However, it could be argued that such injustices result from inappropriate application of the hedonic calculus and that when applied properly this becomes less of an issue. A modern, flexible approach to ethical decision making which considers the situation and the consequences is surely more appropriate for the 21st century than a set of fixed rules which may lead to injustice.
- Alternatively, a form of Rule Utilitarianism may be seen as more appropriate for the 21st century. This could mitigate some of the problems found in Act Utilitarianism while still holding to the greatest happiness principle. The approach could be exemplified using the issues discussed in part a) or alternative moral dilemmas.
- However, this form of Utilitarianism may be seen to dilute the essential flexibility of the original form and therefore to be less useful.
- Another line of argument would be to consider the consequentialist nature of the theory. Although it may be viewed as essential to weigh up potential consequences when making moral decisions, it is also very difficult in the 21st century to predict all the possible ramifications of an action. Although effective in theory, Act Utilitarianism may not prove as useful when put into practice.
- It may be that Rule Utilitarianism is more effective as it is less reliant on the consequences of a particular circumstances, rather it draws on past experience of consequences of similar actions to draw general moral principles. This would make it more effective in some ways, but more restrictive in others and candidates should weigh up the merits of this adaptation.

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

Section B

3. (a) **Explain religious concepts of predestination with reference to St. Augustine and John Calvin.** [AO1 20]

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

- Predestination can be defined in theistic religious terms as the belief that God determines all that humans do. Candidates may also refer to religions which see predestination in the form of karma or 'fate' and these should be credited where appropriate.
- Theistic concepts of predestination are related to God's omniscience and omnipotence – God knows in advance what actions humans will take and is aware of each individual's ultimate destination when they die.
- The scriptural basis for belief in predestination may be discussed, for example, passages such as Job 14:5 and Romans 8:28-30 seem to clearly indicate God's role in predetermining human destiny.
- Predestination is also one of the Articles of Faith in the Church of England.
- St. Augustine's concept of predestination is related to the doctrine of original sin, whereby concupiscence and the actions of Adam and Eve led to all humanity being predestined to sin. This overrides the essentially free nature (*liberum arbitrium*) of all humans when it comes to moral actions and sin cannot be helped.
- Through God's grace and Christ's atonement, not all people remain in a state of sin, and some receive salvation and eternal life in heaven. Only God knows who will be saved, and this is characteristic of his mercy, as Augustine believes that all are born guilty and deserve punishment.
- John Calvin was a Protestant reformer who built on the work of Augustine. He focuses on God's omnipotence, arguing that human destiny must be in God's hands for him to be possessed of ultimate power.
- Calvin's Doctrine of Election or 'Doctrine of the living saints' states that humans are preordained for eternal life in heaven (the Elect or 'living saints') or for eternal damnation (the Reprobates) and that human actions can make no difference to this fate.
- Those God has chosen receive God's grace and thus are able to choose the good whereas the rest are incapable of making good choices.
- Followers of Calvin gave 'Five Points' of belief: total depravity; unconditional election; limited atonement; irresistible grace and perseverance of the saints.

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

(b) 'All human life is predestined by God.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates may choose to argue in support of the statement using Calvin's teachings about unconditional election. They may link this to God's omnipotence and omniscience.
- This position is supported by biblical teachings such as Romans 8: 28-30, however, it could be argued that this text, and others used to support predestination, have different, more valid interpretations.
- While the implications of his view appear unjust, Calvin argued that, as the roots of this doctrine are biblical, it should be taught so that humans can understand the need for humility. Again, it could be argued that the interpretation of scripture can be contested and therefore Calvin's defence of predestination is not strong.
- Some, such as Russell, would argue that God appears tyrannical according to Calvin's conception and would reject his claims that God's justice is simply unknown to us and we should not question this.
- Alternatively, candidates may follow Augustine's line of argument, that essential human nature is free, but that the doctrine of original sin means that we are born predestined to be a sinner as this overrides our 'liberum arbitrium' (free nature/will). Therefore, the belief that 'all' human life is predestined could be questioned.
- It could be claimed that, if all human life is totally predestined, then many Christian concepts such as sin would need to be re-evaluated. This point could be developed with reference to moral attitudes and the criminal justice system.
- Another line of argument would be to consider a Buddhist perspective, arguing that our current existence is predestined not by God, but by karma from a previous existence. This would allow an evaluation of the extent to which an individual can influence their karma through, for example, adherence to the Noble Eightfold Path.
- The views of Pelagius and Arminius could be used to argue against the view in the question, making the case for free will rather than predestination, and possibly linking this to moral responsibility.
- This point could be developed through considering the extent to which belief in free will and predestination can be reconciled.
- Alternatively, Muslim perspectives may be explored. Belief in Qadr (divine destiny) entails belief in predestination, yet humans are held accountable for their actions on the day of judgement. Again, candidates may explore the debate surrounding God's justice and may evaluate responses that attempt to reconcile belief in Qadr and free will.

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

4. (a) Explain Ethical Egoism with reference to Max Stirner.

[AO1 20]

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

- Ethical Egoism is a normative theory (i.e. it directs / guides ethical action). It claims that an action is moral if it is based on the self-interest of the agent. It assumes that it is right for a person to pursue their own self-interests.
- This could be contrasted with altruism in order to make the definition clear.
- Psychological Egoism is non-normative but purely descriptive. It observes that human nature is such that all our actions are motivated by self-interest.
- Ethical Egoism suggests how humans *should* act; Psychological Egoism observes how humans do in fact act.
- Moral decisions should focus on the long-term rather than short-term interests of the agent, which may involve doing actions which appear altruistic but which ultimately benefit the agent. Candidates may offer a range of examples to illustrate this idea.
- Ethical Egoism may be contrasted with being purely selfish and egotistical – there is a clear difference between the character trait of selfishness and the ethical theory of egoism as the right way to act.
- Max Stirner rejects the concept of Ethical Egoism based purely on material gain (as defined by capitalism), as greed is only one part of the ego. An action is moral if it serves the interests of the individual in the broadest sense and does not restrict this to one aspect of the ego.
- Max Stirner rejects the notion that Psychological Egoism presents because he thinks that we are all slaves to some ideology or abstract social construct (spook).
- He sees each individual as unique and claims that, in order to develop one's unique nature as an adult, one must act purely out of self-interest rather than restricting self-development for the interests of others, as one must do during childhood. Ultimately the individual seeks 'ownness' (eigenheit) – in which a person becomes their own master rather than being slave to the will of others or the confines of conscience. A person can then appreciate their own uniqueness (einzig) and can be truly free to act.
- He sees concepts such as love as ultimately based on self-interest, as all relationships with other humans should only serve to benefit the moral agent.
- Stirner argues for a 'union of egoists' in which each would cooperate with others out of mutual self-interest. A moral action would therefore be one in which the individual cooperates freely with others because of their mutual interests.

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

(b) 'Following Ethical Egoism inevitably leads to moral evil.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Ethical Egoism may be seen to lead to moral evil as it gives autonomy to individuals who choose according to their own self-interest rather than being expected to follow any pre-established moral guidelines.
- In fact, being slave to the will of others in terms of morality is seen by Stirner as damaging to the individual and something to be avoided. Therefore, following Ethical Egoism will surely lead inevitably to moral evil as its adherents will reject traditional views about morality.
- However, it could be argued that many other ethical theories lead to 'moral evil', particularly those which require individuals to act against their own interests in favour of obedience to externally imposed guidelines. Such approaches could be argued to be psychologically damaging for individuals and, as such, could lead to greater 'evils' than those they supposedly prevent.
- In terms of religious belief, Stirner's approach would lead to moral evil as actions such as divorce and premarital sex would be permitted if they served the interests of the individual, whereas many religious guidelines would see these as immoral.
- However, followers of Ethical Egoism would again claim that these religious restrictions are a form of 'moral evil' in themselves as they lead to unnecessary restrictions to the development of human autonomy.
- Another line of argument would be to question the term 'inevitably' and to consider whether all humans would make 'immoral' decisions when faced with the freedom to act out of self-interest. It could be argued that all supposedly altruistic actions are ultimately self-interested and that Ethical Egoism is simply honest about this, rather than pretending otherwise. Ethical Egoism may allow some to commit acts which may be seen as 'evil' but would lead others to act in a way classed as 'morally good' by other accepted standards.
- The view in the question could be seen as very pessimistic about human nature and ethical egoism could be seen as having a more optimistic, positive approach to human behaviour.
- Alternatively, Ethical Egoism may be seen as a naïve approach that would lead to total moral chaos. Human nature, it could be argued, is such that clear, objective moral guidelines are necessary in order to maintain civilised societies.

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

5. (a) Examine the role of goods, acts and virtues in Aquinas' Natural Law.
[AO1 20]

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

- Aquinas distinguishes between real and apparent goods. A real good is one which aids a moral agent in achieving their ultimate purpose whereas an apparent good is one which, while appearing to be good to the individual at first sight, actually does not lead towards their ultimate God-given purpose. As human reasoning may be incorrectly applied, consideration of whether an action is a real or apparent good will help the individual to identify where morality lies.
- Primary precepts could be used as examples of 'real' goods.
- Aquinas argued that humans did not actively choose evil, but that our fallen nature leads humans to act according to desire rather than in accordance with our God-given purpose. For example, a person may have to choose between attending school and missing school to go to a music festival. A person may use their reason incorrectly and decide to go to the music festival, however a consideration of their purpose to seek knowledge and education would allow them to see this course of action as an apparent good.
- Likewise, Aquinas identifies internal and external acts. The internal act is the intention of the moral agent whereas the external act is the actual action carried out by that agent. It is possible to do a good act with a bad intention, likewise it is possible to have a good intention, but perform a bad action. In order for an act to be moral, both action and intention must be good according to Aquinas.
- For example, a surgeon who carries out heart surgery must have the intention to save live (internal act) as well as actually carrying out the surgery successfully (external act) in order for their action to be good.
- In order to reason correctly, Aquinas stated that humans should cultivate certain virtues. There are three revealed or theological virtues: faith, hope and love (charity) which are revealed in the Bible. The translation of 'agape' as 'love' or 'charity' may be discussed.
- Development of these virtues is only possible through God's grace and they cannot be fully achieved in this world as they are beyond the capacity of humans. However, they act as a standard towards which humans should strive, with the aim of achieving a state of perfect happiness; the beatific vision.
- Aquinas also identifies four cardinal virtues: prudence (the ability to rationally analyse moral situations), temperance (self-control or restraint), fortitude (courage) and justice (acting fairly and appropriately towards others). Development of these characteristics comes through habit and will allow humans to make correct moral decisions.
-

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

- (b) **‘Absolutist theories such as Natural Law have no place in 21st century moral decision making.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Natural Law can be either the ‘platform’ (use as a basis for evaluation) or the ‘springboard’ (use as a ‘launch’ into other lines of argument). Both are valid approaches.
- Natural Law’s absolutist approach could be seen as too rigid for the complexities of the 21st century. Examples could be given to show that following Natural Law may lead to injustices in certain situations.
- The lack of consideration for consequences could also be given as a reason for Natural Law having no place in modern decision making. People may prefer a more flexible theory such as Utilitarianism or Situation Ethics.
- It could be argued that having clear-cut rules makes it easier to make decisions in the complex modern world. For example, any sexual act which does not lead to the possibility of reproduction is wrong according to Natural Law. This takes away any grey areas and makes the correct action obvious. The rules are universal and apply to all people at all times.
- However, the rules are hundreds of years old and many would argue that society has changed considerably since their establishment. It could also be pointed out that the precepts of Natural Law are based on the reasoning of a medieval monk whose own cultural assumptions influenced the rules. A more modern approach to the purpose of humans, such as that offered by Finnis, might be more appropriate than that proposed by Aquinas.
- Absolutist rules could also be seen to take away from human autonomy. As these rules are based on God as the source of human purpose and therefore morality, many in the 21st century would reject these and argue instead for a form of morality rooted in human reason without some form of ultimate lawgiver.
- Alternatively, it could be argued that Natural Law has been used effectively for hundreds of years by the Roman Catholic church and, as such, has stood the test of time. It fits closely with scripture and is as useful for Christians in the 21st century as it was for Christians at the time of Aquinas.
- A counter-argument here could focus on the adaptations of Natural Law that have been made in modern times to address the issues with the absolutist nature of the theory. For example, Proportionalism offers many of the benefits of Natural Law while still allowing for some flexibility. This may be seen as a more constructive approach to morality in the modern world.

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