



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

**A LEVEL
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 3
RELIGION AND ETHICS
A120U30-1**

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 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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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.

GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES – COMPONENT 3

RELIGION AND ETHICS

SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

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

Section A

1. (a) Explain the theory of Emotivism.

[AO1 20]

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

- Emotivism is the name given to the meta-ethical approach which states that moral terms are equivalent to expressions of emotion.
- The theory was influenced by Logical Positivism and one of the main proponents was A. J. Ayer who claimed that moral terms are 'pseudo-concepts' which do not express cognitive, objective facts.
- Emotivism states that moral terms are not empirical, i.e. do not express propositions that can be verified or falsified. This means that morality cannot be seen as objective.
- Instead, ethical statements are seen as an expression of the approval or disapproval of the agent, similar to facial expressions or tones of voice.
- For example, when a person expresses a moral statement such as 'abortion is wrong', what they are doing is expressing their attitude towards abortion. This attitude or feeling could also be expressed as saying 'boo to abortion' and the term 'wrong' has no more factual content than the noise 'boo' which expresses disapproval.
- Emotivists such as Ayer would therefore state that although moral terms are meaningless **in a factual sense** as defined by Logical Positivists (as they are neither analytic nor verifiable using sense-experience) they do have a purpose and serve to express an emotional response to a situation. However, this purpose Ayer considered was not for philosophy to explore, but instead was a matter for the social sciences such as psychology, sociology and anthropology.
- Ethical statements are used to persuade others to agree with the approval or disapproval expressed by the agent, but moral debates are not disagreements about facts and cannot be seen as rational arguments.
- Stevenson saw moral judgements as having two elements: an expression of the attitude of the agent, based on the agent's beliefs, and a persuasive element designed to influence others.
- The statement 'abortion is wrong' is therefore saying 'I disapprove of abortion and you should also disapprove.'
- Stevenson claims that our moral attitudes are based on fundamental beliefs and therefore a moral disagreement is more than just a shouting match and can inform us about a person's core beliefs and world view. However, he would still agree with Ayer that such disagreements have no factual content.

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

(b) 'Emotivism fails to encourage moral debate.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- **Candidates can approach this question in a number of different ways: they might view it as a discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of Emotivism or more broadly about the meta-ethical debate concerning the nature of morality.**
- Emotivism does not seem to encourage moral debate in a rational sense as it claims that moral terms are meaningless.
- Ayer would argue that any moral disagreement is little more than a shouting match designed to persuade others to agree with our attitudes towards a particular issue rather than an actual debate about facts. He says they are 'just so much hot air and nothing else.' This clearly does not encourage moral debate in the ordinary sense.
- However, it could be argued that Emotivism does not remove all facts from moral debate. There are substantive matters of fact which underpin moral debates such as the extent to which a foetus can feel pain at different stages of development. A moral disagreement could relate to such facts and debate over the accuracy and relevance of facts could be encouraged.
- This would still leave moral statements themselves as expressions of approval or disapproval and MacIntyre saw this approach as a degeneration of human culture. He argued that is not useful as, without some degree of moral absolutes, everyone's opinion becomes equally valid and there is no grounds to say that one attitude towards an ethical issue is better than another.
- Many people would want to say that moral statements about atrocities such as genocide are universal and more than simply an expression of subjective feelings. The fact that humans have common reactions to moral atrocities suggests that there is a more rational or objective basis to morality than the Emotivists will allow, and therefore moral debate is based on more than emotions and Emotivism fails to encourage this wider debate.
- Moral statements express attitudes that go beyond a personal reaction to individual circumstances and can relate to universal principles which are surely established through some reference to reason.
- The type of moral debate encouraged by Emotivism could also be challenged. If moral debate is useful in the sense it can persuade others to act in a particular way without factual evidence, then it could be compared with other forms of non-cognitive persuasion such as bribery or blackmail. If the only value of moral debate is to persuade others to agree with a different view, how is it different from more negative forms of persuasion.
- However, Emotivism is useful in that it has raised the debate about the nature of moral statements. It does not encourage rational debate about normative approaches to particular moral issues, but it does encourage debate about the appropriate meta-ethical approach to understand the nature of morality itself.

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

2. (a) Explain the theory of Intuitionism.

[AO1 20]

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

- Intuitionism is the meta-ethical theory that moral truths are known through intuition.
- Intuitionism argues that objective moral laws exist independently of human beings and can be discovered through intuition.
- Intuitive ability is believed to be innate to all moral agents, however it requires a mature mind and therefore is not infallible.
- Proponents of Intuitionism state that 'goodness' cannot be defined or analysed, it is simply self-evident. Attempts to define 'goodness' in other natural terms commit the 'naturalistic fallacy.'
- 'Good' is seen as a simple idea which cannot be broken down into other concepts. Moore compares 'good' with the colour 'yellow' to illustrate this idea.
- Moore's 'open question' argument may also be used to illustrate the reasons to reject Naturalism – if good can be defined as X, it should make no sense to ask whether X is really good.
- Moral judgements cannot be proved empirically according to Intuitionism but must be recognised as good, or as actions we ought to do, intuitively.
- Prichard states that our moral obligations are very clear through intuition in the same way that mathematical truths can be clearly apprehended.
- Prichard states that the role of general reason in morality is to establish the facts and data about a given situation needed in order to make a decision. However, the facts alone cannot tell people what ought to be done. The actual 'moral thinking' is based on intuition, which shows what people's moral obligations are. The facts (general reasoning) are there to shore up – through a process of testing and doubting – the original intuition provided by moral reasoning.
- In the case of conflicting moral obligations, intuition would allow people to see which obligation was greater. No reasons can be given why one obligation is greater than another, as moral duty cannot be proved.
- Prichard does recognise that people have different views of morality. He states that this is because some people's moral thinking has developed further than others. He does not, however, explain why this is or give a means to differentiate whose moral thinking is the most developed.
- Prichard does not establish any hierarchy of moral obligations or duties and has been criticised for offering no clear way to decide in cases of moral stalemate. Ross offers a way out of this dilemma with the idea of prima facie duties. These are based on intuition but combine this with experience to draw out moral principles which are not absolute, but give some general guidance.

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

(b) 'Intuitionism is the most convincing meta-ethical theory.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Intuitionists such as Moore would agree with this statement as they believe that there are non-natural 'moral facts' evident in the world which are perceived through intuition and that all other meta-ethical theories offer explanations that are either false or unhelpful in assessing ethical statements.
- Intuitionists would point to the problems of other theories such as Naturalism, which commits the 'naturalistic fallacy' of defining goodness in other terms such as 'pleasure'. 'Good' is a simple idea which cannot be broken down, nor can it be observed in an empirical way, it can only be understood through intuition.
- However, if good cannot be defined, there is no real ground on which to resolve moral disagreements. Some people's 'intuitions' appear reprehensible to others and this makes intuitionism appear less convincing than naturalism, which appeals to objective which can be established.
- Intuitionists would argue, however, that any apparently reprehensible intuitions are the result of under-developed moral thinking rather than a failure in the theory itself.
- Prichard's analogy of moral obligations being self-evident in the same way as mathematical principles could be used to support the claim that Intuitionism is convincing.
- However, this analogy could be seen as weak as mathematical principles can be checked and verified, whereas the self-evidence of our duties cannot be checked against external standards. Also, in maths we never have to decide between two conflicting principles, whereas ethics is different.
- Many would argue that the very idea of non-natural 'moral facts' evident in the world is a nonsensical concept and cannot be convincing. They are seen as a way to avoid justifying moral judgements and to avoid the hard discussions about the meaning of moral terms.
- Ayer would agree with this perspective, claiming that all moral statements are meaningless as they cannot be verified, whereas Naturalists would also agree with the criticism, but would look to define morality in natural terms.
- Another line of argument is to question the self-evident nature of moral intuitions. If moral truths are genuinely known intuitively, then there would be no doubt about what 'goodness' is as, even if some people had a less-developed intuitive sense, the majority would surely agree. As there is clearly disagreement about moral truths, this suggests that the Intuitionist approach is not convincing.
- Also, there is no clear explanation about where these 'moral intuitions' come from or how moral intuitionism works. If reason cannot be used to investigate morality, then this devalues the quality which separates humans from animals.
- Candidates may argue that any of the other meta-ethical approaches is more convincing.

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

Section B

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

[AO1 20]

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 re-establish a right relationship 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, living in an 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.
- Some may consider Kainz' view 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 the right to have children in a way that conforms to social norms and may take away the right to make decisions about reproduction.
- He also points out that there may be two innocent lives at stake in the case of abortion, and that proponents of natural law often make exceptions to the first precept in the case of the foetus in order to preserve the life of the mother.
- The only other 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.
- Candidates could include reference to the virtues in applying natural law – Kainz points out that a mother who brings up a child after rape, or chooses to continue with a problem pregnancy rather than aborting could be seen to show fortitude: 'such decisions would belong in the category of heroic virtue.'

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

(b) 'Human law should always be based on Natural Law.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- From a Natural Law perspective it could be argued that human law should be based on natural law as this fits into the hierarchy of laws established by Aquinas: human law should be derived from natural and divine law in order to create a just society that seeks good and avoids evil.
- As natural law is seen to derive from God's eternal law, and is seen as universal, it would form a clear and objective basis for human law.
- Natural Law theory is deontological – it judges the morality of the action itself rather than the consequence – and this makes it a good basis for human law as our laws need to clearly indicate which actions are permissible and which are not.
- However, many would argue that, in a modern, secular society, laws should be based on human reason rather than the eternal law of a Creator God. They would question the basis of Natural Law and argue that any perceived order and purpose in the universe is an assumption made by believers rather than a scientific fact.
- Candidates could consider different presentations of Natural Law here in order to counter this objection. Aristotle's contribution to natural law thinking does not require belief in the Christian God and Finnis' version of Natural Law shows that, while the theory is compatible with religious faith, it does not require belief in a God in order to make moral decisions; human reason is sufficient.
- In fact, Finnis argues that 'the best description of natural law is that it provides a name for the point of intersection between law and morals.' Suggesting that basing human law on natural law is a sensible thing to do.
- It could be argued that human law is already based on natural law as many of our key legal prohibitions such as murder and theft are also condemned by natural law, and many of the principles in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, such as the right to life, to education, to freedom of religion are supported by natural law.
- However, candidates could point to examples in which a Natural Law approach seems to undermine certain human rights. For example, in the case of abortion, the rights of the unborn foetus are often prioritised by Natural Law thinkers over the rights of the mother. Scholars from within the Roman Catholic tradition, such as Kainz, have found this approach problematic.
- Candidates may also argue that basing human law on natural law could lead to inequality and persecution of minorities. For example, the Natural Law approach to homosexuality could be seen as discriminatory and to base human law on these principles could well be seen as a retrograde step when it comes to equalities legislation. Even modern presentations of Natural Law such as Finnis' version would not support the legalisation of same-sex marriage.

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

4. (a) **Examine J. S. Mill's development of Utilitarianism with reference to:**
(i) higher and lower pleasures
(ii) the Harm Principle.

[AO1 20]

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

- Mill's development of utilitarianism attempts to address the criticisms levelled at Bentham's Act Utilitarianism, for example that pleasure cannot be measured in quantitative terms and that not all pleasures are equal.
- Mill's version of Utilitarianism seems to equate pleasure with well-being and living in a good society, ideas derived from Aristotle's concept of eudaimonia.
- Therefore in his theory he shifts the emphasis from quantity of pleasure to quality. Higher pleasures associated with the intellect are worth more than lower pleasures associated with the body as only human beings can access these higher pleasures.
- Therefore, while lower pleasures are sometimes necessary for survival, the principle of utility should be fulfilled through a greater balance of higher pleasures looking in the broadest sense at the 'interests of man as a progressive being' rather than focusing on the particular pleasures of individuals.
- Mill argues that it is easy to satisfy those who have never experienced the higher pleasures, but anyone who has experience of both, will find the higher pleasures more satisfying in the long term. Focusing on higher pleasures when considering morality will aid the intellectual development of all people and therefore lead to greater happiness for society as a whole.
- Mill's 'harm principle' works towards securing the principle of utility in its broadest sense as it prevents people from seeking pleasure through the pain of others, while allowing maximum individual freedom to pursue happiness – 'the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others' (On Liberty).
- The principle of utility can be fulfilled through creating 'rules' based on past experience rather than judging each action individually. For example, the rule 'do not murder' would create the greatest overall happiness in society, even if it may not create happiness in an individual case. This means that each action does not have to be judged using the hedonic calculus and makes utilitarianism easier to apply in practice.
- Mill is seen by many scholars as a 'weak' Rule Utilitarian, in that the rules offer good general guidelines but may be broken in extreme circumstances to better serve utility. This makes Mill's version of Utilitarianism a teleological and deontological hybrid.

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

(b) 'Pleasure is the only intrinsic good.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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, suggesting that pleasure is the only intrinsic good.
- However, some may argue that this makes humans little better than swine and is a reductionist view of morality.
- In order to counter this view, Mill's focus on the quality rather than the quantity of pleasure could be considered here. If 'pleasure' is understood in terms of higher, intellectual pleasures, then this could be seen as intrinsically good as it contributes towards the development of both the individual and of society along the lines of Aristotle's concept of eudaimonia.
- 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. It is hard to argue for something so subjective to be the only intrinsic good.
- 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 establishing what, if anything, can be considered as an intrinsic good.

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

5. (a) Explain soft determinism.

[AO1 20]

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

- Soft determinism is a term coined by William James to describe claims that all human actions are determined by external factors but that moral choice can still be genuine if humans have not been forced to act in a particular way.
- Humans are free to act in accordance with their nature, even though their nature is determined by other factors.
- This means that ethical discussions are still valuable and humans can be held responsible for their moral decisions in most circumstances.
- Hobbes makes the distinction between internal causes and external causes, arguing that actions determined solely by internal causes allow for free moral choice.
- Internal causes are individual wishes or desires which cause a person to act in a particular way and which may be determined by causation (or conditioning or heredity in modern presentations of the argument.)
- External causes are factors which may cause a person to act against their own wishes or desires through some form of compulsion.
- This means that humans can be seen as morally responsible when acts are determined solely by internal causes. Here soft determinism differs from hard determinism.
- A.J. Ayer looked at this issue in terms of the meaning of the language used to discuss moral decision making.
- He noted that, when a situation is determined by an internal cause, we would say that the behaviour has been caused. When it is determined by an external cause we use the word forced. He uses the example of a person walking across a room to illustrate the difference.
- This clearly illustrates the linguistic difference between classical soft determinism and hard determinism and indicates that people make this distinction when considering moral responsibility – humans are determined to act in certain ways by their nature but make free choices when they are not prevented from acting in accordance with their nature.
- Soft determinism therefore involves commitment to a particular view of freedom – that humans are free if they are not prevented from acting in the way they are determined to act.
- Modern versions of soft determinism focus on the feeling of freedom of choice and the importance to humans of moral responsibility. For example, Peter Strawson argues that, in practical terms, no matter how much proof we find of determinism, this will not stop humans believing that people are responsible for their moral actions. This makes moral responsibility a real fact of human life which should be taken seriously. If we have been determined, we have been determined to possess the feeling of free choice and moral responsibility.

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

(b) 'The strengths of soft determinism do not outweigh its weaknesses.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Soft determinism may be seen as convincing as it solves the issue of human moral responsibility without denying that all actions have causes.
- The idea that there are determining factors that influence our decisions, but ultimately we have still made free choices unless we have been forced to act in a certain way, seems more compatible with how humans understand the world. It allows us to separate internal and external causes in a logical way (Hobbes) and fits in with the way in which humans genuinely feel (P.F. Strawson).
- This is positive as the determinist position is strongly supported by scientific understanding of human development and by philosophical ideas of causation. The concept of metaphysical free will has increasingly little support, yet the feeling of freedom common to most humans is undeniable.
- However, many hard determinists would argue that this feeling is nothing more than an illusion. Soft determinism simply perpetuates the illusion of free will when it should be discarded and determinism fully accepted.
- The argument in favour of soft determinism could be developed using Ayer's observation that, even if we were to accept that we are not entirely free agents, through whichever version of determinism can be best proven, 'it would not follow that the idea of freedom would go by the board.' Instead, he argues, we need to view our unforced choices as free in some way so that conventional legal and moral frameworks continue to make sense. This is a key strength for soft determinism as it gives meaning to our understanding of morality.
- Candidates may, however, argue that the tenets of soft determinism constitute an unacceptable compromise of the 'facts' of hard determinism and, as such, are not more convincing. The soft-determinist insistence on moral responsibility is false as humans cannot be responsible for actions over which they have no control. The implications of this for human society may be discussed.
- One other weakness of soft determinism is that it insists on a particular view of freedom which is at odds with the common understanding of free will. Most people see free will as the ability to choose what they want without being influenced by other factors. Only then would humans be morally responsible for their actions.
- The view of free moral choice being confined to freedom to act in a determined way without being prevented from doing so is a strange notion of freedom and is seen as being at odds with moral responsibility.
- However, supporters of soft determinism would question whether this 'common understanding' of free will is in any way coherent. Scholars such as Vardy argue that there are so many complicated determining factors which govern human behaviour, that we can never convincingly state that actions are free. Soft determinism's strength lies in its ability to reconcile the facts of determinism with the feelings of freedom which give human life meaning.

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