



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2018

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

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2018 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.

COMPONENT 3 – Religion and Ethics: Mark 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.

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 style="text-align: center;">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	<p align="center">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></p>
5	<p 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 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 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 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 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

SUMMER 2018 MARK SCHEME

COMPONENT 3 – RELIGION AND ETHICS

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

Section A

1. (a) **Explain hard determinism with reference to philosophical, scientific and psychological concepts.** [AO1 20]

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

Philosophical concept of hard determinism:

- John Locke coined the phrase 'free will is just an illusion'. This is because people who believe they have free will think they do because they can pause and reflect before making a choice. However, Locke believed that all such thoughts were just people's ignorance; most people do not have the intelligence to see that actually there are no choices at all to be made.
- Locke gave the example of a man who wakes up in a room that, unknown to him, is locked from the outside. He chooses to stay in the room believing he has chosen freely to stay there. In reality he has no option but to stay there, it is only his ignorance on the status of the door, that has given him the illusion of free will.

Scientific concept of hard determinism:

- Scientific concepts of hard determinism are often known as biological determinism.
- Charles Darwin argued every living organism that determined by the process of evolution. The above argument was furthered by the discovery of genetics / DNA. Scientists argue that genetics/DNA determine how we act/respond in all situations – including moral situations.

Psychological concept of hard determinism:

- The psychological school of thought on hard determinism is called behaviourism.
- Behaviourism is the theory which has been encouraged by the work of early psychologist Ivan Pavlov: whose experimentation is often referred to as 'Pavlov's Dogs' or classical conditioning.
- Pavlov found that the normal reaction of a dog to food (producing saliva) could be conditioned to be triggered by the sound of a bell. Pavlov rang a bell every time food was ready for the dogs. After a while Pavlov rang the bell but did not produce food, however, the dogs still produced saliva. Pavlov argued the dogs had been conditioned.
- From this Pavlov postulated that human reactions are the same as the dogs e.g. most actions moral agents do are just conditioned (sub-consciously repeating behaviour) reactions to our environment.

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

- (b) **‘The philosophical concept of hard determinism clearly illustrates humanity has no free will.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

Some candidates may answer from within the discipline of philosophical determinism alone, whereas others may draw upon other disciplines, e.g. science, philosophy or religion. All approaches are acceptable.

- Locke argued that moral agents believe they have the free will to make decisions because they can pause and reflect before making a choice. However, Locke believed that all such thoughts were just people’s ignorance; most agents do not have the intelligence to see that actually there are no choices at all to be made.
- A counter to this could be that Locke does not, with the above argument, prove the concept of determinism. What Locke is actually arguing is that libertarianism is just an ignorant illusion and then merely speculating that therefore determinism must be correct.
- Locke’s philosophical argument could be further weakened by Sartre, who argued that there is no God, therefore man is condemned to freedom. Man’s freedom is obvious because of the way moral agents go about trying to deny it. Therefore, moral agents create a self-deception of determinism (‘bad faith’); however, for Sartre these attempts by moral agents to escape freedom are an absolute sign we have free will.
- Behaviourist Ivan Pavlov carried out experiments on dogs and found that they could be conditioned. From this Pavlov postulated that human reactions are the same as the dogs i.e. all our actions are just conditioned reactions to our environment.
- A challenge to this is that psychology does not illustrate humanity has no free will. This is because some psychologists would argue free will is still possible. Rogers accepts children can be conditioned. However, moral agents do have the ability to achieve freewill; through the process of ‘self-actualisation’. Self-actualisation involves getting in touch with our real feelings and acting on them.
- Scientists claim that DNA illustrates all humans have a fixed scientific formula. Therefore, moral agents are no more than genetic robots; programmed (and thus determined) by their DNA.
- Recent developments in neuroscience open up a debate regards Sirigu’s research on the parietal cortex of the human brain has created for some the possibility of there being free will.

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

2. (a) **Explain libertarianism with reference to philosophical, scientific and psychological concepts.** [AO1 20]

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

Philosophical concept of libertarianism:

- John-Paul Sartre believed there was no God. Because there is no God, there is no higher power controlling moral agents. Therefore, Sartre believed that man is condemned to freedom.
- According to Sartre, humanity's freedom is obvious because of the way moral agents go about trying to deny it. He believed freedom can bring pain and therefore we try to avoid the reality of our own freedom. Therefore, we create a self-deception called 'bad faith'.
- Bad faith is the attempt, by moral agents, to escape the pain of life by pretending they are not free. They convince themselves their attitudes and actions are determined by their character, situation etc.
- Sartre argues that these attempts to escape the reality of human freedom are in fact an absolute sign moral agents have free will.

Scientific concept of libertarianism:

- Recent developments in neuroscience could suggest that moral agents have free will.
- Sirigu's research on the parietal cortex of the human brain has created for some the possibility of there being 'free will'. The parietal cortex of the human brain communicating with the pre-motor cortex to act out choices.

Psychological concept of libertarianism:

- The psychological approach to libertarianism is known as Humanism. A supporter of this theory is Carl Rogers. Rogers believed that our lives can become determined but we all have the ability to achieve freewill; through the process of 'self-actualisation'.
- Rogers said that children feel it's bad to have ideas and thoughts of their own. When their parents disapprove of their thoughts they think their feelings were wrong. If they want to achieve acceptance, they may have to forget about their real feelings and forget about themselves.
- According to Rogers the path to self-actualisation involves getting in touch with our real feelings and acting on them. Rogers believed that if we can act on them we are breaking the chains of determinism and expressing our freewill.

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

- (b) **‘The libertarian concept of psychology inevitably leads to the belief that we are totally free.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

Some candidates may answer from within the discipline of psychology alone, whereas others may draw upon other disciplines, e.g. science, philosophy. Both approaches are acceptable.

- Psychologist Carl Rogers argues moral agents have the ability to achieve freewill; through the process of ‘self-actualisation’. Self-actualisation involves getting in touch with our real feelings and acting on them.
- A counter to this could be that Rogers does not prove the concept of libertarianism. This is because Rogers admits that humanity is conditioned from an early age. Therefore, moral agents that do not self-actualise, will remain in a psychological determined condition. Moreover, behaviourist psychologists, like Ivan Pavlov, would argue that the determining effects of conditioning cannot be broken.
- Alternatively it could be argued that the scientific approach is a stronger and more convincing argument that we are totally free. Candidates could also refer to the work of Sirigu to support this line of reasoning.
- A counter to this could be that the scientific concept of libertarianism does not lead moral agents to accept libertarianism. This is because many scientists would argue that DNA gives humanity a permanently fixed scientific formula. Therefore, just like every other living organism the fixed scientific formula DNA makes humanity no more than genetic robots; programmed (and thus determined) by their DNA.
- Another line of argument could be that the philosophical concept of libertarianism inevitably leads moral agents to accept libertarianism rather than the psychological school of thought. This is illustrated by the work of 20th century philosopher John-Paul Sartre. Sartre argued that there is no God, therefore man is condemned to freedom. Sartre supported his argument by claiming man’s freedom is obvious because of the way moral agents go about trying to deny it. Therefore, moral agents create a self-deception of determinism (Sartre called this ‘bad faith’); however, for Sartre these attempts be moral agents to escape freedom are an absolute sign we have free will.
- A counter to this could be that the above the philosophical concept of libertarianism does not lead moral agents to accept libertarianism. This could be illustrated from the work of respected 17th century philosopher John Locke. Locke argued that moral agents believe they have the free will to make decisions because they can pause and reflect before making a choice. However, Locke believed that all such thoughts were just people’s ignorance; most agents do not have the intelligence to see that actually there are no choices at all to be made.
- Another line of argument is that soft determinism does lead moral agents to accept libertarianism. This is because philosophers like Hobbes and Ayer illustrate that some aspects of moral agent’s lives are libertarian, but others are not.

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

Section B

3. (a) Explain the meta-ethical approach of Emotivism, including reference to A.J. Ayer. [AO1 20]

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

- Emotivism is a meta-ethical theory that explores the nature of moral values and terms.
- A. J Ayer, is seen as one of the greatest contributors to Emotivism.
- Emotivism was influenced by Logical Positivism.
- Ayer created Emotivism (also called 'Ethical Non-Cognitivism') because he claimed that moral terms like 'good' and 'bad' do not express objective cognitive facts in anyway, in his 1935 book on language 'Truth and Logic'.
- Emotivism theorists argue that moral terms like 'right' and 'wrong' are not empirical terms i.e. they do not express propositions that can be verified or falsified. Therefore, the nature of morality is that it is not objective.
- Emotivism theorists, like Ayer, also claim that moral language cannot be seen as intuitive either. This is because intuitive meta-ethical ideas imply that moral agents have some kind of universal, innate sense of 'good' or 'bad'.
- Emotivism argues ethical statements are simply expressions of a moral agent's personal emotions.
- When a moral agent expresses a moral statement such as, 'stealing is bad', all a moral agent is doing is stating that they personally do not approve of stealing or stealing brings the moral agent pain. This can be expressed as 'boo to stealing'.
- Conversely, if a moral agent expresses the moral statement 'giving to charity is good' they mean they personally approve of giving to charity i.e. giving to charity brings them joy. This can be expressed as: 'hurrah to giving to charity'.
- Therefore, ethical terms are no more than expressions of a moral agent's individual feelings / emotions of approval and disapproval for a certain action. They do not attempt to define what a moral term means, they are just a moral agent's emotionally response to an ethical situation.
- Ayer claimed that one use of ethical language is to try to persuade other moral agents to their moral beliefs. Therefore, emotivism accepts that moral disagreements can and will occur because emotional responses to moral actions are not universal or innate. Therefore, it is only natural that moral disagreements will occur.
- Ayer furthered his theory by arguing that ethical terms do not only serve to express feelings. They are calculated to also arouse feeling, and so to stimulate action.

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

- (b) **'Moral terms, like right and wrong, are no more than expressions of our emotions.'**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Ayer developed the meta-ethical theory of Emotivism/Ethical Non-Cognitivism. Ayer claims that moral terms do not express cognitive facts, but they are expressions of our own personal emotions. Therefore, moral terms do not attempt to define what terms like 'right' or 'wrong' mean they are just the emotional response of moral agents to moral situations.
- A counter to the above argument could be that Emotivism is mistaken because it does not allow for moral debate. This is because this argument is stating that if two moral agents have different emotions about whether a person/an action is good or bad then both moral agent must be correct. However, this cannot be right because why do we engage in moral debate if it is not to challenge other moral agent's moral beliefs?
- Another line of argument could be that the assertion in that moral terms are not expressions of emotion but instead are moral facts. Ethical Naturalism argues that moral propositions can be seen as true or false by considering objective features of the world. Therefore, moral terms are not just expressions of our emotions but can be seen in the same way as scientific terms.
- However, a counter to the above point could be that two moral agents could consider the 'facts' associated with a moral statement and interpret it completely differentially. Moreover, as G.E. Moore argued moral terms cannot be used as factual statements because they cannot be defined i.e. any attempt to define moral terms will reduce or limit them.
- Another line of argument could be that the assertion in the question is wrong because moral terms are not expressions of emotion but instead are intuitive facts. Moore argued moral agents use moral terms to express a universal moral intuition. All moral agents possess this innate moral intuition. Therefore, moral terms are useful for expressing our intuition about certain moral situations.
- However, a counter to the above point could be that moral agents clearly do not recognise morality intuitively in a universal way i.e. moral debate occurs because two or more moral agents interpret moral scenarios differently.

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

4. (a) **Examine both the deontological and teleological features of Aquinas' Natural Law.** [AO1 20]

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

Deontological Features:

- The moral term deontological means that the morality of the action should come from the nature of the action itself e.g. murder will be morally judged on the action of murder only.
- There are several deontological features of Natural Law:
- Four levels of law: Aquinas explanation of eternal, divine, natural and human law
- The Primary Precepts: the primary precepts act as a universal and permanent set of deontological rules. The five deontological primary precepts are: preservation of life, orderly living in society, worship God, education and reproduction.
- The primary precepts act as a universal and permanent set of deontological rules.
- The Secondary Precepts: are created by judging whether an action either upholds or breaks one of the primary precepts. Though it can be argued that the secondary precepts do not always have to be upheld (double effect).

Teleological Features:

- The term teleological means right and wrong should be judged by the end outcome / ultimate purpose / telos of an action rather than the actual action itself.
- There are several teleological features of Natural Law:
- The purpose of Natural Law: Natural Law is based on the idea that the universe was created by God with an end purpose (telos). Human beings are part of God's universe and therefore moral agents must too have an ultimate end purpose (telos) set by God. Natural Law was designed, by Aquinas, to illustrate what that end purpose (telos).
- Rational Thought: Using our God-given reason, Aquinas argued, a moral agent can reason out God's ultimate end purpose (telos) for humanity:
- The Highest Good: Aquinas believed the highest good was to 'become more like God' i.e. moral agents are born with the purpose (telos) to develop as closely as we can into the image of God.
- The Primary Precepts: Aquinas reasoned out humanities God given purposes (telos) by considering humanities natural inclinations. Aquinas generalised five human purposes (telos) based on these natural inclinations; called the five primary precepts.
- Getting to heaven: by achieving their highest good, by following Natural Law, moral agents will re-establish a right relationship with God. If moral agents can do this they will achieve their ultimate telos of gaining eternal life in heaven, with God.
- The Secondary Precepts: are created by judging whether an action either upholds or breaks one of the primary precepts. Though it can be argued that the secondary precepts do not always have to be upheld (double effect).

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

(b) 'Natural Law is meaningless without belief in a creator God.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- One line of argument could be that Natural Law is meaningless if the moral agent does not have a belief in a creator God. This is because Natural Law is fundamentally based on a belief in a creator God. This could be illustrated in several ways:
- Aquinas stated that Natural Law is based on moral agents using their universal God given reason, that a creator God created within humanity.
- According to Aquinas Natural Law is one of two ways to help moral agents understand a reflection of God's eternal law. The other been divine law.
- The five primary precepts, of Natural Law, are based on the idea that a creator God created, within humanity, five fixed purposes in live. Moreover, one of these purposes is worship God.
- Three of the seven virtues Aquinas states help moral agents achieve the precepts are based on the belief in a creator God. Aquinas called them the revealed virtues, which are: faith, hope and charity.
- Aquinas argued every moral agent's highest good was to re-establish a 'right' relationship with God, in order to gain eternal life in heaven. Following Natural Law was one way to help achieve this.
- However, the above could be countered because the fundamentals of Natural Law can be accepted without a belief in a creator God. This is because Natural Law developed fundamental, universal ethical principles that are applicable to all moral agent's regardless of belief:
- The 'Human Rights Charter of the United Nations' signed in 1947 is based heavily upon the primary precepts of Natural Law e.g. 'The right to life', 'The right to an education' etc.
- Peter Vardy links human rights and Natural Law when he stated: "At the end of World War 2, Nazi war criminals were tried according to universal moral laws modelled on Natural Law thinking."
- Lord Devlin, in his 1965 government report, suggested society was in moral decline because it lacked a decisive and clear absolutist moral ethic. Natural Law, could provide society with such an ethic.
- Another line of argument could be that Natural Law does not need a belief in a creator God because John Finnis was able to create a twentieth century development of Natural Law that does not pre-suppose a creator divine being. Instead Finnis concentrated on reasoning a set of 'goods' from which a good life can be generated.
- However, there are modern developments of Natural Law e.g. Proportionalism, that are still fundamentally based on a creator God.

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

5. (a) **Examine both the deontological and teleological features of Rule Utilitarianism.** [AO1 20]

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

- John Stuart Mill created what is now known as Rule Utilitarianism.
- Mill believed that there were deontological rules that society could follow that would bring about the maximum happiness for the maximum amount of people.
- Mill stated that the deontological rules that would create the most happiness would be relatively obvious i.e. moral agents know what deontological rules would bring about the maximum happiness for society.
- For example, following the deontological rule that 'stealing is wrong' would bring the maximum happiness for society. Therefore, Mill's Rule Utilitarianism would have a deontological rule stating, 'stealing is morally wrong' because this rule would create the maximum happiness for society as a whole.
- However, the rules (rules to follow in all moral situations) that society could follow were still designed to bring about the maximum telos of happiness for the maximum amount of people (this is a teleological feature).
- If moral agents were to always follow the deontological rules of Rule Utilitarianism, they would be mostly following a deontological ethic. This deontological form of Rule Utilitarianism became known as 'Strong Rule Utilitarianism'.
- However, it is believed the Mill favoured what is now known as 'Weak Rule Utilitarianism'.
- Weak Rule Utilitarianism states that the deontological rule (that is known to create the most happiness) should be followed most of the time.
- However, these deontological rules, which are based on the telos of achieving happiness, can be ignored in exceptional circumstances i.e. where the rule will not create the most happiness in that situation. In these exceptional circumstances the moral agent can switch back to using the teleological Act Utilitarianism i.e. considering the outcome of the action, in terms of happiness, rather than just the action itself.
- For example, the deontological Rule Utilitarian rule of 'do not to steal' could be broken if that unique moral situation of stealing were to generate more happiness than unhappiness.
- Weak Rule Utilitarianism therefore ends up as a teleological/deontological hybrid. This is because when following the rule that creates the most happiness the moral agent is following a deontological based principle. However, in extreme circumstances the moral agents are following a teleological based principle.

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

(b) 'Act Utilitarianism provides a better basis for making moral decisions than Rule Utilitarianism.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- The hedonic calculus is a very thorough calculation using seven specific criteria. This allows each specific moral dilemma to be judged thoroughly on its own terms. This is unlike Rule Utilitarianism that works on generic rules based on happiness.
- This point could be countered because the seven criteria used in the hedonic calculus make Act Utilitarianism ineffective. This is because the seven criteria are too complex to calculate, especially when quick moral decisions are needed. Rule Utilitarianism has no such issues because it is based on a set of happiness derived rules that are mostly intuitively known.
- Act Utilitarianism considers each moral situation uniquely. This is a more compassionate approach to ethics because moral situations often have their own unique circumstances. Act Utilitarianism considers these unlike Rule Utilitarianism which only applies a deontological rule to the situation.
- Weak Rule Utilitarianism does consider unique moral circumstances in certain situations i.e. where the rule would bring about more unhappiness, the moral agent switches back to a teleological form of Utilitarianism.
- Rule Utilitarianism does not rely on predicting moral outcomes. Act Utilitarianism as a teleological ethic asks moral agents to judge unpredictable consequences to form moral judgements. This is a poor approach to ethics because human nature is not predictable. Rule Utilitarianism's deontological nature does not rely on such unreliable predictions.
- Act Utilitarianism provides a better basis for making moral decisions than Rule Utilitarianism in that it mimics societies' values. Sociologists claim we live in a post-modern society; a society that has rejected traditional fixed values like ethical deontological rules. Act Utilitarianism would potentially work well in a post-modern society because it does not have a fixed set of rules, unlike Rule Utilitarianism.
- The above could be countered because it can be argued society is in moral decline i.e. Lord Devlin highlighted societies' moral decline in his 1965 report. He argued that a society's existence depends on the maintenance of strong deontological rule based moral values. Rule Utilitarianism is one such deontological guide.
- Act Utilitarianism provides a better basis for making moral decisions in that deontological ethics such as Rule Utilitarianism are often applied universally. However, moral agents are different because they are affected by their culture etc. The teleological Act Utilitarianism allows for these differences.
- The above can be countered because it can be argued some actions are just wrong and should not become morally acceptable just because they are done for to create happiness.

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