



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

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

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 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	<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 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.

A Level Component 3: An Introduction to Religion and Ethics

MARK SCHEME

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

Section A

1. (a) **Explain how Robert Adams modified Divine Command Theory. [AO1 20]**

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

- Divine Command Theory, also known as theological voluntarism, 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.
- Adams' development of Divine Command Theory modifies the original theory and candidates are likely to clearly explain the theory in order to demonstrate Adams' development.
- A moral action is therefore one which God commands – and these commands can be seen through revealed scriptures such as the 10 Commandments.
- 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.
- The Euthyphro dilemma may be discussed to illustrate the theory and to explain why Adams offers a modified version of Divine Command Theory which overcomes the criticism of arbitrariness (recognised by Augustine and William of Ockham.) The Euthyphro dilemma asks whether something is holy because it is approved by the Gods or whether the Gods only approve what is holy. If only one of these two strands is referred to, it should be the first strand.
- 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. 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) **‘Morality is whatever God commands it to be.’
Evaluate this view.**

[AO2 30]

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

- The Euthyphro dilemma could be considered as a starting point – is an action good because it is loved by God or does God only love good actions?
- God could command actions which we would regard as wrong, but these would have to be seen as moral according to this view. This makes morality completely arbitrary.
- Alternatively there could be a moral standard higher than God, questioning God’s omnipotence.
- Adams’ modified divine command theory allows a solution to the Euthyphro dilemma as God’s loving nature means that he will not command actions that we might see as immoral. However, criticisms of this approach such as Baggini’s view may be considered.
- Another line of argument is that morality can only be based on God’s commands as God is the creator of the universe and morality is built into the universe as part of God’s plan.
- God is the only objective source of morality – to define moral actions in human terms is to invite subjective and biased decision-making. Reliance on God’s commands offers a secure and consistent guide for life.
- It could be argued, however that God’s commands are not entirely consistent. Different religions claim that different things are commanded by God. There is no way to judge which things are genuinely commanded by God. Even within one religion there is sometimes little agreement about precisely what is commanded, for example, when discussing issues such as homosexuality or abortion.
- William of Ockham and St Augustine both identify inconsistencies within the Old Testament which raise questions about God’s omnibenevolence. Candidates may draw on examples from the Old Testament that do not appear consistent with a loving God.
- Candidates may raise the idea that morality must be based on something other than commands, as just because it is commanded, does not make it morally right (Ayer).
- Alternative theories about what defines morality including virtue theory and ethical egoism may be discussed – candidates are free to discuss any of the ethical theories studied as alternative approaches to the origins of morality.

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

2. (a) Explain Virtue Theory with reference to Aristotle.

[AO1 20]

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

- Virtue theory is an ethical system based on defining which personal qualities make a person good. The focus is more on a person's moral character rather than on their specific actions
- Aristotle argued that the ultimate aim of human life was *eudaimonia*, commonly translated as 'happiness' or 'flourishing.' This ultimate good can only be achieved through the cultivation of the virtues as it is not a virtue in its own right but rather the outcome of being virtuous.
- Happiness is therefore the activity of cultivating a virtuous personality and thus acting in a virtuous way. This involves aspects of enjoyment, freedom and reflection and contemplation in order to make life full and complete.
- Aristotle distinguished between intellectual and moral virtues, stating that these must be combined in order to make good decisions. The intellectual virtues could be cultivated by instruction, but the moral virtues are cultivated through practice and habit.
- Aristotle included such qualities as courage, liberality, temperance, pride (high-mindedness), right ambition, patience, truthfulness, wittiness, friendliness, modesty, righteous indignation and generosity in his list of moral virtues.
- Intellectual virtues include intelligence, scientific knowledge, wisdom, artistic endeavour and prudence.
- Each moral virtue is seen to be the mean between excess and deficiency. For example, courage is the mean between cowardice and foolhardiness.
- In order to develop a virtuous character, the doctrine of the mean is important – one should avoid excess or deficiency in any area of behaviour. Aristotle argues that some find this easy, others find it a struggle and a third group are weak-willed and find it practically impossible to live in the mean.
- Friendship is important to Aristotle when cultivating the virtues as he explains that exercising the virtues must be done in community – it is hard to be friendly without others to be friendly towards. This shows that *eudaimonia* is a collective rather than an individual goal and the good of the community must override the good of an individual.
- Aristotle links virtue to justice, stating that justice is the outcome of virtuous behaviour and is 'virtue entire' rather than a separate virtue in its own right.
- Some commentators have drawn out four key virtues which appear to be particularly important to Aristotle: temperance, justice, courage and wisdom. These are seen as being at the heart of moral character, with wisdom being the finished form of all the virtues and the one quality which will lead to naturally moral and just behaviour.
- Candidates may refer to Jesus' teaching on virtue as found in the Beatitudes and, while this is not required in order to answer this question, it is relevant and may be credited.

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

- (b) **‘Virtue Theory offers little guidance when making moral decisions.’
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]**

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

- One line of argument is to agree with the statement in that Virtue Theory gives no clear guidelines for action and, in fact, gives no indication whatsoever how to act in particular circumstances or when faced with moral dilemmas.
- Aristotle indicates that a virtuous person will naturally make good moral decisions, but this means that in a given situation, there is no clear way to go about making the correct choice, either by following rules or by assessing consequences.
- Alternatively, it may be argued that this is a key strength of virtue theory. The fact that it does not focus on good or bad actions means that it avoids the pitfalls of both absolutist and relativist theories.
- Virtue theory allows for two equally virtuous actions to be correct in a particular circumstance and reflects the fact that there is no single fixed point of morality and that equally rational and virtuous individuals may advocate different responses to an issue depending on the weight they give to the different factors involved. This is good as it reflects decision making in the real world.
- However, the lack of guidance may be seen to encourage too much interpretation of what is seen as good which may lead to an ‘anything goes’ form of morality which many would frown upon.
- Some may consider Aristotle’s moral virtues to be culturally determined and more appropriate to a context in which physical prowess and bravery on the battlefield were essential. Therefore, these virtues may not offer sufficient guidance for decision making in the modern world.
- This line of argument could be developed by considering the work of philosophers such as MacIntyre, who argued that the virtues needed to be understood in their cultural context and may change to reflect social change.
- Virtue theory asks us to consider motives and to control our emotional responses when dealing with ethical dilemmas in order to take into account the needs of all involved. This may be seen as positive guidance.
- However, it could be argued that the doctrine of the mean leads to blind, uniform responses to situation which may not always be appropriate. Some candidates may challenge this understanding of the doctrine of the mean and argue that the ‘mean’ is not unchanging, but rather reflects the demands of the particular situation. For example, courage on the battlefield may mean different things depending on the odds you face (Willows).
- Candidates may choose to argue that a different ethical theory offers better guidance when faced with moral decisions. They may also highlight the close links between virtue theory and natural law.

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

Section B

3. (a) Apply Finnis' Natural Law to the issue of immigration. [AO1 20]

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

- In order to apply Finnis' Natural Law to the issue of immigration, candidates may choose to outline how the theory operates.
- Finnis' Natural Law includes a set of seven 'basic goods' for humankind. An action is good if it participates in one or more of the basic goods. There are also nine sub-requirements of practical reason which may be applied to immigration.
- When applied to immigration, the goods are not to be 'set against' each other as there is no hierarchy and each are of great importance. To argue one good is 'for' immigration and another is 'against' is not a coherent or appropriate application of Finnis' Natural Law theory.
- Finnis sees his theory as in full agreement with the Roman Catholic response and that of the Pope that friendship and sociability should be applied to all equally, not just to people from one's own country.
- Immigration broadens our cultural experience and so contributes towards our aesthetic experience and therefore the common good.
- Immigration opens up different avenues to fulfil our need for religion. It also permits people to express their religion freely, which may not have been the case in the country they are leaving therefore immigration permits the fulfilment of this good in different ways.
- When looking at the requirements of practical reason, basic goods should be applied equally to all, so we should not favour people in our own country over the needs of immigrants.
- Supporting those fleeing from war-torn countries or areas of famine and disease fulfils the basic goods and so asylum seekers from these particular circumstances are welcomed according to Christian teaching.
- Also, immigration can be seen to foster the common good of the global community as it helps to ease the burden on poorer countries.
- Finally, our conscience may well argue that supporting others through immigration is the right thing to do.
- However, whilst all this is true John Finnis himself has spoken out against uncontrolled immigration over a period of time that can damage the goods of a community. Finnis does not oppose immigration for the reasons above but as with anything, a lack of rational control can lead to inevitable social problems, according to Finnis. Finnis has written articles arguing for controlled immigration, saying that the benefits outweigh the problems.
- However, when immigration is not sensibly controlled it can work against the common good of the community.
- Candidates may give specific examples to illustrate the application.

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

- (b) **'Finnis' Natural Law is not an effective way to make moral decisions.'**
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

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

- Candidates may argue that Finnis' Natural Law is more effective in the modern, more secular world as it removes the requirement to believe in God from Natural Law without removing the idea that religion is a human good.
- This is more effective than Proportionalism, which still requires the acceptance of a more traditional natural law ethic in order to operate.
- This point could be developed by a consideration of Finnis' basic goods and the support these show for community values, equality and justice.
- However, candidates may question the nature of the basic goods – Finnis suggests that these are self-evident but offers no proof for this. The concept of the naturalistic fallacy may be used here to press the point.
- Another line of argument would be to consider the degree of guidance compared with the degree of moral autonomy permitted by each theory.
- Finnis' Natural Law theory gives people moral autonomy to make their own decisions within the framework of basic goods and removes the issue of absolutist rules which may appear outdated and unjust. It allows us to accept that two different moral decisions can both be correct, which is helpful in the modern pluralist world.
- However, candidates may argue that this lack of clarity makes the theory less effective. They may argue that Proportionalism's reliance on the clear-cut rules of Natural Law offers clearer guidance when making moral decisions while still allowing the degree of flexibility necessary to make fair decisions.
- Candidates could develop this point by considering whether Aquinas' application of his own Natural Law theory was proportionate to a degree and whether Proportionalism is simply continuing with this tradition.
- It may also be argued that both theories are ineffective in that both would allow people to justify almost any action. Both would permit believers to go against laws laid down in the Bible and neither offers clear enough guidance about how to act.
- Finnis' theory is overly complicated with too many factors to consider to give a clear response. It can be used to argue for both sides of certain moral dilemmas which does not really help us to decide.
- Proportionalism is too open to interpretation as it is unclear what would constitute a 'proportionate' reason to break the rules of natural law.
- On the other hand, it may be argued that they are equally effective for different audiences: Finnis appealing more to those of a secular nature while Proportionalism allows Christians to benefit from the advantages of a natural law approach to morality while avoiding some of its major pitfalls.

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

4. (a) **Examine why Fletcher used 'agape' as the basis for Situation Ethics.**
[AO1 20]

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

- The situational approach to ethics advocated by Fletcher is based on the Christian concept of agape.
- Agape is the 'middle way' between the two extremes of legalism and antinomianism.
- The concept of agape is supported by the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) in which Jesus demonstrates what the commandment to 'love your neighbour as yourself' means in practice.
- This parable influenced Fletcher's understanding of agape and is reflected in the six fundamental principles.
- Agape is also addressed in St Paul's letter to the Corinthians in which the high status of love in Christian approaches to life is clearly explained. Again, this teaching is clearly reflected in Fletcher's theory through the centrality of agape as the basic principle and through the fundamental principles.
- The key principles of Situation Ethics have a clear religious basis, for example:
- Personalism follows closely from Jesus' desire to put people before the law. For example, Jesus broke Sabbath laws to heal and did not enact the punishments required by strict law on the woman taken in adultery.
- Relativism also reflects the approach of Jesus when he rejected the Pharisees' insistence on sticking to the letter of the law.
- This is also seen in the fundamental principle 'Love's decisions are made situationally not prescriptively.'
- Positivism focuses on faith and the voluntary acceptance of a loving God, expressed through the person of Christ.
- The six fundamental principles serve to elucidate Fletcher's understanding of agape. These include: 'the ruling norm of Christian decision making in love: nothing else' which again reflects the teachings of Jesus that 'the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.' (Mark 2:27-28). The laws were there to serve people as a guide to show how to love, not to become rigid and fixed at the expense of love.
- 'Love and justice are the same' – in this principle Fletcher demonstrates the active nature of Christian love. Agape relates to doing rather than to feeling.
- 'Love wills the neighbour's good, whether we like him or not.' – again this relates back to Jesus' approach in the Parable of the Good Samaritan and in his approach to those considered to be outsiders in society.

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

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

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates may argue that Situation Ethics offers a more flexible response to moral issues which could be seen as more practical than being restricted by a single set of rigid rules and laws. In fact, pragmatism is one of the key principles of the theory.
- This point could be illustrated with examples of contemporary moral issues where application of the principles of Situation Ethics may give ‘good’ decisions. Alternatively, candidates may choose to offer any of Fletcher’s own examples to illustrate.
- Candidates may link this to the approach taken by Jesus in the New Testament where he broke religious rules in order to deal with people as individuals, based on their circumstances.
- This approach is practical in that it does not reject laws entirely, but sees these as useful guides which are not entirely binding if they do not serve love in a given circumstance.
- However, the difficulty of understanding and applying the laws of agape to different situations could be considered. It may be argued that humans are too morally corrupt to be able to apply the laws of agape consistently and fairly and, instead, would apply a form of love that is not truly unconditional.
- To develop this point, candidates may reflect on the fact that humans need clear moral guidance about how to act out of love as the individualistic nature of Situation Ethics may leave some vulnerable to sin inadvertently. The need to interpret each situation individually is therefore impractical.
- The New Testament provides some clear moral guidelines and following these might offer a clearer and more practical approach to decision making. For example, adultery and theft are clearly seen as wrong.
- Barclay argues that the examples used by Fletcher to justify a situational approach are too extreme and that moral law, based on experience, offers a far more practical guide for moral decision making.
- This approach has been supported by a range of religious leaders who often regard the individualist nature of situation ethics as dangerous and too easily manipulated.
- They may also argue that this approach removes the need for God as the source of all moral authority and replaces him with the individual.
- They would argue that moral rules based on the Bible and Church tradition give a far more practical basis for decision making as they are clear cut and unambiguous, and less open to bias as they derive from the ultimate source of all morality and goodness.
- This point may lead candidates back to the discussion of whether absolute or relative approaches to ethics are more practical.

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

5. (a) **Examine Arminius' concept of free will.**

[AO1 20]

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

- Arminius was a Dutch theologian who criticised Calvin's doctrine of predestination.
- Arminius accepted that original sin was damaging for humanity and limited human ability to make correct decisions using free will.
- He argues that humans corrupted by original sin would be unable to freely choose God, however he argues that God's grace, granted through the power of the Holy Spirit, was sufficient to remove the taint of original sin and permit the appropriate use of free will.
- He believed that God's prevenient grace was available to both believers and non-believers, permitting all moral agents to do good works, however he recognised that humans still had the impulse to sin and must freely choose to accept grace and follow God's guidance towards moral goodness.
- Arminius rejected Calvin's concept of unconditional election and argued that election is conditional on faith. This meant that some humans could reject the offer of salvation of their own free will.
- Arminius' arguments are summed up in the Five Articles of Remonstrance offered in protest against Calvin's doctrine of predestination. These are:
 1. Conditional election – that salvation is conditional on faith.
 2. Unlimited atonement – that Jesus died for the sins of all, not just for the 'elect.'
 3. Total depravity – that humans have not got the power to resist sin without the power of the Holy Spirit which aids them to resist temptation.
 4. Resistable grace – that God's grace is not an 'irresistible urge' as suggested by Calvin, but that, instead, humans can use their free will to reject God and to sin.
 5. Evil can be resisted – the idea that giving in to temptation is not inevitable nor are some elements in society eternally damned. It is possible to resist temptation through the grace of God and the power of the Holy Spirit.
- Arminius' ideas were rejected as heresy by the Synod of Dort but remained popular in certain branches of the church who pointed to the clear scriptural evidence that could be given in support.
- The Methodist Church in England, founded by the Wesley brothers, adopted Arminian beliefs about free will and about the role of faith in salvation.

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

- (b) **‘Arminius’ concept of free will is totally unconvincing.’
Evaluate this view.**

[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates could agree with the view in the question, citing scriptural evidence in favour of predestination such as Job 14:5 – ‘A person’s days are determined, you have decreed the number of his months...’ or Romans 8:29-30 – ‘For those God foreknew, he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son...’ Such scripture would appear to make Arminius’ concept unconvincing.
- However, candidates could question whether such scripture actually rules out free will and whether it simply serves to show God’s omniscience.
- Scriptural evidence in support of Arminius’ concept of free will may also be used, for example, in Joshua 24:15 it states: ‘But if serving the Lord seems undesirable to you, then choose for yourselves on this day whom you will choose to serve.’ This seems to suggest that Arminius’ concept that humans may choose whether to accept God’s grace is convincing.
- Candidates may engage with the issue of how far scriptural evidence can be convincing when, taken out of context, it appears to support both sides of an argument.
- Another line of argument is to consider the wider support Arminius’ concept of free will received within the religion when compared with Calvin’s doctrine of predestination. The Synod of Dort, clearly endorsed Calvin’s doctrine of predestination and rejected as heresy the ideas of Arminius. The extent to which this endorsement of Calvin shows that Arminius’ ideas were unconvincing could be discussed.
- To develop this idea, the influence of Arminianism on Methodism and other denominations could be considered.
- Alternatively, candidates could argue that Arminius’ concept of free will is essential to preserve God’s omnibenevolence, both in terms of being ‘the author of all sin’ if humanity were predestined, but also in terms of creating humans who were predestined for hell.
- To argue against this point, candidates could draw on Augustine’s view that evil is the result of original sin and that God’s benevolence permits the elect to be saved. Issues relating to the problem of evil could also be considered here.
- Candidates may choose to link the views of Arminius to the modern debate surrounding libertarianism and argue that scientific, psychological or philosophical approaches offer support to the concept of free will. Alternatively, they may argue that the evidence points more clearly towards determinism, which would support the view in the question.

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