



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

**AS
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 3
AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION AND ETHICS
B120U30-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 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 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><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 | <p style="text-align: center;">21-25 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. • 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"> • 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 | <p style="text-align: center;">11-15 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. • 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"> • 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 | <p style="text-align: center;">1-5 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. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary. |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation. |

EDUQAS GCE AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES
COMPONENT 3: AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION AND ETHICS
SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

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

Section A

1. (a) **Apply Aquinas' Natural Law to the issue of voluntary euthanasia.**

[AO1 25]

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

- Natural Law states that a good action is one that fulfils the purpose of the agent. Therefore, in order to apply Natural Law to ethical issues, it is important to consider the purpose of a human being.
- Aquinas claimed that the ultimate purpose of a human being was to develop into the image of God and achieve fellowship with God. This could only be done in heaven, but could be worked towards while on Earth.
- The purpose of human beings on Earth are expressed in the primary precepts: preservation of life, ordered society, worship God, educate the young and reproduce. A good action works towards these precepts.
- When applying Natural Law it is necessary to decide whether an action works to support the primary precepts (a real good) or whether it takes humans away from their purpose (an apparent good.)
- Voluntary euthanasia refers to the taking of life for compassionate reasons at the request of the recipient.
- This would go against the primary precept of 'preservation of life' or 'defend the innocent' as it is sometimes translated. This is often described as the sanctity of life argument – that there is something particularly holy or sacred about human life and therefore it should be preserved.
- This means that, using casuistry, a secondary precept of 'voluntary euthanasia is wrong' could be drawn from the primary precept.
- Although euthanasia could be supported on compassionate grounds, Natural Law would argue that this would be pursuit of an apparent good rather than a real good.
- Also, although the intention (interior act) of voluntary euthanasia may be good, the action itself (exterior act) would be killing, which is bad and so voluntary euthanasia is wrong.
- It could be argued that, while intentionally giving a lethal drug to kill someone is wrong, giving a high dose of a painkiller such as morphine with the intention of relieving suffering may be acceptable, even if the unintended side effect is to shorten the person's life. Here the intention (interior act) is to relieve pain, the action of giving the morphine (exterior act) relieves the pain, the known but unintended side effect is that it shortens life. This would be acceptable under the principle of double effect.

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

(b) 'Applying Natural Law promotes justice.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Supporters of Natural Law may argue that it is based on God's eternal law, which cannot be unjust. The secondary precepts derived through Natural Law should lead automatically to justice as they are based on God's plan for the universe and can be checked against Divine Law to establish correct reasoning.
- However, Natural Law could be seen to lead to unjust moral decisions as the application of absolute rules without exception can sometimes appear to lead to an unfair situation.
- For example, applying Natural Law to the issue of same sex marriage leads to what many would argue is an unjust situation and, indeed, the law in the UK now reaches a very different conclusion.
- Here it could be argued that the biological basis of Natural Law is outdated and therefore its strict application leads to injustice in the modern world.
- Another example could be related to the issue of voluntary euthanasia. In extreme situations in which illness causes extreme mental and physical suffering it can often appear unjust to keep someone alive against their will.
- In favour of Natural Law, it can be seen to promote basic human rights, such as the right to life, to education and to a justice system. These are the basis of justice in the world today.
- Natural Law applies equally to all and its universal and unbiased nature can be seen as promoting justice where other more relativist theories may not.
- Alternatively, it could be argued that Natural Law is based on human reasoning, which can be faulty, and so may lead to injustice in its application, if not in its origin.
- Aquinas' original precepts may be questioned as to whether these are truly the correct basis for human behaviour. For example, the precept to live in an ordered society may be interpreted differently depending on the culture you live in and could be used to discriminate against and oppress women, leading to injustice.
- The theory could promote justice in that the principle of double effect could be seen as a way to mitigate the overly legalistic response of Natural Law, giving a way to add more flexibility to its application.

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

2. (a) Apply Aquinas' Natural Law to the issue of abortion.

[AO1 25]

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

- Natural Law states that a good action is one that fulfils the purpose of the agent. Therefore, in order to apply Natural Law to ethical issues, it is important to consider the purpose of a human being.
- Aquinas claimed that the ultimate purpose of a human being was to develop into the image of God and achieve fellowship with God. This could only be done fully in heaven, but could be worked towards while on Earth.
- The purpose of human beings on Earth are expressed in the primary precepts: preservation of life, ordered society, worship God, educate the young and reproduce. A good action works towards these precepts.
- When applying Natural Law it is necessary to decide whether an action works to support the primary precepts (a real good) or whether it takes humans away from their purpose (an apparent good.)
- Abortion refers to the deliberate termination of a pregnancy, either for medical or social reasons. It is legal in the UK under the conditions of the 1967 Abortion Act.
- Natural Law would condemn abortion as inherently evil as it involves the direct killing of an innocent life, going against the primary precept of preservation of life. This applies to all abortions, regardless of circumstance.
- Obviously, this position depends on holding the view that a foetus counts as a person from the point of conception, which is a contested view. For some this is a crucial issue and candidates may explore different understandings of when life begins and relate these understandings to different possible positions in response to the issue of abortion.
- The only exceptions to the rule regarding abortion come under the principle of double effect. For example, it may be acceptable to perform a hysterectomy on a pregnant woman suffering from cancer of the uterus. The intention would be to save her life, the action may well save her life, the known but unintended side effect would be the death of the foetus. This is not the same as permitting abortion to save the life of the mother and candidates should be clear about the distinction.
- Some may argue that the precepts of order in society and reproduction may support abortion in the case of rape or incest, as these actions clearly go against social order and may take away the right to make decisions about reproduction, however this is not a common application of Natural Law.
- Some may raise Howard Kainz' point that abortion is also associated with the primary precept of reproduction and the 'right' or 'choice' to reproduce.

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

(b) 'Natural Law is not an effective way to make decisions about abortion.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Natural Law could be seen as an effective way to make decisions about abortion as it makes the decision very clear. Abortion goes against the primary precept of reproduction and therefore is wrong.
- This could be seen as effective as it does not rely on predicting the consequences of the abortion, which can be very difficult to do.
- The decisions made according to Natural Law are based on reason and keep emotion out of the decision-making process. This could be useful in making decisions about abortion where emotions can often run high.
- However, a blanket ban on abortion could be seen to lead to injustice in certain circumstances. For example, many would argue that abortion is justified in the case of rape, whereas Natural Law would not support this as, even though the rape was an evil action, the resulting foetus would be seen as an innocent whose life was regarded as important.
- This tension between the rights of the mother and the right to life of the unborn child, as a foetus would be described by Natural Law, is one of the reasons why many would argue that Natural Law is not effective in these cases.
- In other difficult cases, such as where the mother's health is at risk as a result of pregnancy, the principle of double effect could make the Natural Law response more effective. For example, in the case of ectopic pregnancy, it is possible to see the abortion as a known but unintended side effect of the removal of a fallopian tube, and therefore as acceptable. This makes Natural Law more effective as it has some flexibility.
- Another line of argument would be to argue that Natural Law is consistent and coherent as it is based on God's eternal law. Therefore, it must be effective as it makes a link between the creator and the purpose of his creation.
- However, it could be argued that Aquinas' interpretation of the purpose of creation as shown through the primary precepts can be contested. In an over-populated world, is it legitimate to argue that reproduction is the self-evident purpose of humans? The Natural Law response to abortion could be seen as ineffective in the modern world for this reason.

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

Section B

3. (a) Explain the six fundamental principles of Situation Ethics.

[AO1 25]

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

- Situation Ethics is a relativistic, teleological and consequentialist theory therefore moral decisions are assessed by considering the individual situation and the consequences of the particular action rather than by considering rules or moral norms to be of paramount importance.
- Fletcher believed that decisions should be made based on a single principle of agape, self-sacrificial love, as outlined in Jesus' commandment to love God through loving your neighbour.
- The idea of agape is explained more clearly through the six fundamental principles:
- Firstly, 'only one thing is intrinsically good; namely, love; nothing else at all.' Love here is seen as an activity not an emotion.
- Secondly, 'the ruling norm of Christian decisions is love: nothing else.' Religious and moral laws established by humans can be set aside in the name of love, as Jesus did when he broke the rules of the Sabbath. Fletcher sees this as completely in keeping with the moral teaching of Jesus and St Paul.
- Thirdly, 'love and justice are the same, for justice is love distributed, nothing else.' Agape entails an attitude of fairness to all, as all are entitled to love. For example, Situation Ethics may argue in favour of same sex marriage as this offers justice for all.
- Next, 'love wills the neighbour's good whether we like him or not.' This follows Jesus' teaching to love enemies and can be exemplified through the story of the Good Samaritan. To be truly unconditional, love must apply equally to all people.
- 'Only the end justifies the means, nothing else.' The end in this case must be a loving outcome. It is not acceptable to defend an action, such as capital punishment, if the outcome does not produce agape. This emphasises the fact that decision-making in Situation Ethics must be flexible and that certain actions, or 'means', are not intrinsically right or wrong.
- Finally, 'loves decisions are made situationally, not prescriptively.' All ethical decisions must be led by love and the specific situation, not by strict moral laws. In one situation, euthanasia may be the most loving course of action, in another similar situation it may not. Love must guide the decision.

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

(b) 'The strengths of Situation Ethics clearly outweigh its weaknesses.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- One of the main strengths of Situation Ethics for Christians is that it fits with the model of decision-making used by Jesus in the Bible. Jesus seems to set the rules aside in order to put people first.
- However, other Christians may argue that certain actions are intrinsically good or evil, and that Situation Ethics allows moral decisions that run contrary to the will of God.
- Another strength of Situation Ethics is its flexibility. In the modern world, life is not straightforward and 'one size fits all' moral thinking can be seen to lead to injustice and unfairness.
- Situation Ethics can be seen as more responsive to modern issues such as genetic engineering and climate change, whereas ethical approaches based on moral absolutes can struggle to accommodate new ethical challenges.
- Again, though, it could be argued that the flexibility of Situation Ethics is its weakness as this allows for immoral and biased decision-making to creep in. Without fixed rules, morality becomes inconsistent and often unfair.
- To extend this point it could be argued that moral rules work well in the majority of cases and Fletcher's own examples such as Mrs Bergmeier are very extreme situations. Maybe a weakness of Situation Ethics is that flexibility is not necessary most of the time.
- Another line of argument is that Situation Ethics gives moral autonomy. This is a strength as it is good for human individual development to be free to make moral choices. This leads to humans considering the needs of others and supports the development of communities. It also requires people to consider the consequences of their actions.
- However, this individuality could be seen as a weakness as it would lead to moral chaos, with no clear guidelines for humans as to how to act. Agape is a very open concept and could easily be interpreted very differently by different people.
- Also, humans are prone to making decisions based on personal gain, no matter how much they pretend to themselves and others that they are not. Situation Ethics fails to acknowledge this aspect of human nature.
- Finally, Situation Ethics could be seen as unrealistic, as it does not take into account natural emotional bonds which colour our decision making.
- However, it could be argued that it, in its use of agape, Situation Ethics offers an ideal for humans to aspire to in their decision-making and is no less valid for the fact that humans may fail to reach this ideal.

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

4. (a) Explain how the Hedonic Calculus is used in Act Utilitarianism.

[AO1 25]

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

- Act Utilitarianism is a form of moral relativism. It is a consequentialist and teleological theory which builds on the natural human tendency to pursue pleasure and avoid pain.
- Act Utilitarianism is based on the principle of utility, or the greatest happiness principle: a good action is one that aims to promote 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number.'
- In order to calculate the greatest quantity of happiness in a given situation, Jeremy Bentham proposed the hedonic calculus, a set of seven factors which must be considered in each situation:
 1. Intensity – the stronger the pleasure the more weight it carries
 2. Duration – longer lasting pleasures create greater happiness
 3. Certainty – a pleasure that is sure to happen carries more weight than a possibility of pleasure.
 4. Remoteness – pleasures that are closer in time carry more weight.
 5. Fecundity (Richness) – if the pleasure will lead to further pleasures in the future, this gives a greater overall quantity.
 6. Purity – a pleasure that does not contain any pain is better than one in which pleasure and pain are mixed.
 7. Extent – the greater the number of people affected by the pleasure, the better.
- Each factor is equally valid in the decision-making process and the hedonic calculus should be used to weigh up the quantity of pleasure that will result from each possible course of action before deciding on the best overall option.
- Bentham used the criteria 'can they suffer?' to decide whose happiness should be considered when weighing up the overall utility of an action.
- Candidates may choose to illustrate the use of the Hedonic Calculus by drawing on the issues of animal experimentation or nuclear deterrence to exemplify their points or, alternatively, they may choose examples from other areas of ethics to support their explanations.

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

- (b) **‘Utilitarianism is a practical way for religious believers to make moral decisions.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Candidates may answer this question based on Bentham's Utilitarianism only or may bring in Mill's Utilitarianism. Either approach is valid and should be credited accordingly.
- John Stuart Mill claimed that his form of Utilitarianism caught the spirit of the Golden Rule in Christianity (treat others as you would want to be treated) and therefore would have seen Utilitarianism as a practical way to 'love your neighbour'.
- It could also be argued that the principle of utility lay behind Jesus' death and resurrection. The self-sacrifice of Christ is believed by Christians to have given the humanity the possibility of eternal life in heaven with God, which could be seen as the greatest form of happiness.
- However, religions often teach absolute moral rules such as 'do not steal' whereas Act Utilitarianism would permit stealing if it led to greatest overall happiness. Religious believers would argue that these rules are based on the will of God and should therefore not be broken, regardless of consequences.
- Also, believers would argue that God is able to deliver perfect justice in a way that any human theory cannot. Humans only have a limited perspective whereas God is uniquely able to establish what is truly good.
- Religious believers could find Utilitarianism practical as it allows a way to navigate difficult situations while considering the needs of all involved. For example, divorce may be seen by Utilitarianism as the correct thing in a case where physical or emotional abuse is involved, and religious believers would argue that the happiness of the spouse and children in this case should take precedence over any teachings against divorce.
- However, many believers may choose this course of action on the basis of agape rather than pleasure. The outcome may be the same, but the religious grounds for the decision may be very different from the grounds used by Utilitarians. Christians may argue that happiness is not an acceptable ground for morality. There are many occasions in the Bible where people suffer for their faith and this is seen as a valuable means of spiritual development.
- Candidates may therefore suggest alternative ethical theories such as Situation Ethics or Natural Law as being more practical for religious believers than Utilitarianism.

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

5. (a) Explain Divine Command Theory, with reference to Robert Adams.

[AO1 25]

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

- Divine Command Theory is an absolutist theory which claims that some actions are always right and others are always wrong.
- Divine Command Theory sees God as the origin and regulator of morality – what is good is what God says is good.
- A moral action is therefore one which God commands – and these commands can be seen through revealed scriptures.
- Right and wrong are seen as eternal, objective truths based on God's will as the divine lawgiver, and stem from his omnipotence – since God is all-powerful, there can be no moral standard outside of God's control. Therefore, for example, murder is wrong, not as a result of the consequences of the action or the impact on human lives, but simply because God says that it is wrong.
- These objective truths based on God's will should form the foundation of any human system of morality as certain actions will always be right or wrong, regardless of what different human societies may argue to the contrary.
- The Euthyphro dilemma may be discussed to illustrate the theory and to explain why Adams offered a modified version of Divine Command Theory. The Euthyphro dilemma asks whether something is holy because it is approved by the gods (i.e. within God's control) or whether the gods only approve what is holy (that which is independent of God).
- Adams' version overcomes the criticism of arbitrariness (recognised by Augustine and William of Ockham.) If to be moral is to be approved by God, what is to stop morality being simply the whim of God at the time?
- Adams' version of Divine Command Theory states that morality is grounded in the character of God. As God is perfectly good (omnibenevolent), God's commands must be perfectly good.
- God's commands must reflect his omnibenevolence and therefore God would not make arbitrary or evil commands as this would go against his nature. This addresses the strand of the Euthyphro dilemma that leads to the arbitrariness challenge without having to accept a moral standard outside God's control.

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

- (b) **‘Divine Command Theory does not help religious believers to make moral decisions.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- On the one hand it could be argued that Divine Command Theory clearly helps religious believers to make moral decisions as they are obeying the direct commands of God, who is the source of all morality.
- There are plenty of stories in the Bible of humans acting according to God’s commands and these commands are seen by many Christians as eternally valid for humans.
- However, there are other examples in the Bible in which God commands actions which clearly go against what is considered to be moral according to other religious standards.
- For example, there are stories in the Old Testament in which God commands the killing of entire tribes or groups of people. William of Ockham states that these actions are not evil when they are done by the command of God.
- Critics would argue that it is precisely these types of commands in religious scriptures which have led to terrible atrocities being carried out by believers who claim to be acting morally.
- The difficulty for religious believers seems to be in deciding which of God’s commands are valid eternally, as some commands seem to be arbitrary.
- It could be argued that Adams’ modification of Divine Command Theory could help religious believers here as God would not command anything that goes against his loving nature. However, this does not really resolve the issue raised above about the nature of some of the actions apparently commanded by God in the scriptures.
- Another problem for religious believers is to decide which of God’s commands to follow. Different religions have some similarities, but there are distinct differences in some moral commands, even within the same religion. How do religious believers know which commands should form the basis of their decision-making?
- Within Christianity, the nature of moral decision making seems to change in the New Testament, with Jesus emphasising tolerance and forgiveness, for example in the story of the woman taken in adultery. Should the commandment to stone women who commit adultery be taken as the divine command or should Christians follow the example of Jesus?
- While on the surface it seems obvious that Divine Command Theory should help religious believers to make moral decisions, in practice it appears more difficult.

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