GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

AS (NEW)
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 3
AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION AND ETHICS
B120U30-1

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 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.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:

Positive marking

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

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

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

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

Rules for Marking

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.

2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.

3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

Banded mark schemes

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

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

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.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

AS Generic Band Descriptors

Band	**Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions** 25 marks *Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:* - *religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching* - *influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies* - *cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice* - *approaches to the study of religion and belief.*
5	**21-25 marks** • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	**16-20 marks** • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	**11-15 marks** • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	**6-10 marks** • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	**1-5 marks** • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. **N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'**
0	• No relevant information.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Band	**Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions** *25 marks* *Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.*
5	**21-25 marks** • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	**16-20 marks** • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	**11-15 marks** • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	**6-10 marks** • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	**1-5 marks** • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	• No relevant analysis or evaluation.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Component 3: An Introduction to Religion and Ethics

MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic band provided.

Section A

1. (a) Explain Mill's development of Bentham's Utilitarianism.

[AO1 25]

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

- Candidates may well start with a brief overview of Bentham's classical version of Utilitarianism.
- Mill developed Bentham's Act Utilitarianism in several important ways.

Higher and Lower Pleasures

- Bentham's Act Utilitarianism measured the quantity of happiness, therefore he made no reference to the type of happiness created. However, Mill argued that happiness should be measured by the quality of happiness created.
- Mill broke types of happiness/pleasures into two general categories:
- Higher Pleasures = pleasures of the mind e.g. having friends, aesthetic appreciation, forgiveness etc.
- Lower Pleasures = pleasures of the body e.g. violence, indulgence of food or drink etc.
- Mill argued that the higher pleasures were superior to the lower pleasures. Therefore, in any calculation of the happiness created pleasures of the mind (higher pleasures) would out score pleasures of the body (lower pleasures).

Harm Principle

- Mill believed that individuals should have the liberty/freedom to do what they like, particularly when trying to create pleasure/happiness. However, Mill made an exception: individual freedom could be limited when it prevents an individual harming another individual.

Rules in Utilitarianism

- Mill believed that there were general rules that society could follow that would bring about the maximum happiness for the maximum amount of people.
- Mill believed that the rules that would create the most happiness would be relatively obvious i.e. we generally already know what rules would bring about the maximum happiness for society.
  - Morally Good/Right = Following a rule that creates the maximum amount of happiness for the maximum number of people in society
  - Morally Bad/Wrong = Breaking a rule that creates the maximum amount of happiness for the maximum number of people in society.
- Candidates may well illustrate their answers with relevant examples.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

1. (b) 'Act Utilitarianism is not relevant in modern society.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

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

- One line of thinking could be that happiness (and thus Act Utilitarianism) should not be the criteria to judge morality, in modern society, because happiness is not the most important emotion in our lives. Philosopher's, like Robert Nozick, argued that if we had the chance to be hooked up to a virtual reality machine that would guarantee happiness for the rest of our lives we would turn it down. This is because things like relationships with family and friends are much more important to us.
- However, this line of thinking could be countered by arguments that happiness is a good thing in modern society. For example, contemporary psychologist Sonja Lyubomirsky supports the idea that happiness is the most important thing for us. She states: "Happy people are more likely to have fulfilling relationships, high incomes, superior work performance, community involvement, robust health and even a long life." Moreover, scientist Stefan Klein states: "people are genetically programmed for positive feelings." i.e. our brains are wired up to want happiness.
- Another line of argument is that modern society is in moral decline e.g. Lord Devlin argued that a society's existence depends on the maintenance of strong deontological rule based moral values not unclear guidelines about happiness (like Act Utilitarianism). Therefore, what society needs, to improve morality, is decisive and clear deontological moral ethic that everyone can clearly follow.
- However, this could be countered by arguments to suggest that Act Utilitarianism would work well in modern society. For example, philosopher Gareth Moore claims people are different, they are affected by their culture, upbringing etc. Act Utilitarianism allows for these differences because happiness is different in each culture. Because Utilitarianism allows for these differences it is more likely to work in modern society. Or that Post-Modern Society (society has rejected fixed values like the deontological rules) is going to support Act Utilitarianism. This is because Act Utilitarianism is not based on fixed deontological rules.
- Another line of thinking could be that Act Utilitarianism's teleological approach means we have to predict the potential happiness outcomes of our actions. However, this is easier said than done because moral agents are not good at predicting consequences; particularly in today's complex society. Therefore, moral agents could do a bad action with the hope that it creates happiness consequences. However, it is almost impossible for us to predict consequences accurately and therefore our bad action could also create unhappy consequences.
- However, this line of reasoning could be rejected because some Sociologists would argue we live in a secular society (a society where there is declining interest in religion). Therefore, Act Utilitarianism approach would work in modern society with its atheist approach.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2. (a) Compare Act **and** Rule Utilitarianism. **[AO1 25]**

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

- Act Utilitarianism is associated with Jeremy Bentham, whereas Rule Utilitarianism is associated with John Stuart Mill.
- Act Utilitarianism is based on the 'Principle of Utility'. Bentham defined the 'Principle of Utility' as that we should create 'the maximum happiness for the maximum number of people.' More specifically an action should only be carried out if the consequences of that action bring about the maximum happiness, for the maximum number of people, affected by the action.
  - Good = doing actions whose consequences create the maximum amount of happiness for the maximum number of people.
  - Bad = doing actions whose consequences DO NOT create the maximum amount of happiness for the maximum number of people.
- Bentham created a way to measure happiness consequences in each moral situation. He called it the 'Hedonic Calculus'.
- Whereas Mill's Rule Utilitarianism states that there were general rules that society could follow that would bring about the maximum happiness for the maximum number of people.
- Rule Utilitarianism states that the rules that would create the most happiness would be relatively obvious i.e. we generally already know what rules would bring about the maximum happiness for society. For example, following the general rule that 'stealing is wrong' would bring the maximum happiness for society.
  - Morally Good/Right = Following a rule that creates the maximum amount of happiness for the maximum number of people in society
  - Morally Bad/Wrong = Breaking a rule that creates the maximum amount of happiness for the maximum number of people in society.
- Bentham's Act Utilitarianism is therefore relativist, teleological and consequentialist; whereas Mill's Rule Utilitarianism could be seen as an absolutist and deontological ethic.
- Mill favoured a mix of Act and Rule Utilitarianism, now known as Weak Rule Utilitarianism. Weak Rule Utilitarianism believes that the rule (that is known to create the most happiness) should be followed most of the time. However, the rule can be ignored in exceptional circumstances. In these exceptional circumstances the person can switch back to using Act Utilitarianism.
- Candidates may well illustrate their answers with relevant examples.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2. (b) 'Following Act Utilitarianism leads to immoral behaviour.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

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

- One line of thinking is that it can be dangerous to judge complex and important moral decisions on something as emotionally unstable as happiness/Act Utilitarianism. Many horrific/immoral actions have been carried out for the justification of creating happiness e.g. Hitler's treatment of the Jews.
- This line of thinking could be supported because Act Utilitarianism does not offer specific moral rules. Instead it just offers unclear guidelines related to happiness. Therefore, moral agents could start committing immoral acts as they are unaware of any deontological moral rules.
- However, this could be countered because Act Utilitarianisms teleological approach allows for the right action to be done in each moral situation. This is because Act Utilitarianism is not limited by deontological rules. Therefore, it will not say that an action is always wrong or always right; therefore, allowing the right action to occur in each unique moral situation.
- Another line of reasoning is that Act Utilitarianism's teleological approach means moral agents have to predict the potential happiness outcomes of their actions. However, this is not easy because moral agents are not good at predicting the consequences of their actions. Therefore, moral agents could do a bad action with the expectation that it creates happiness consequences. However, their immoral behaviour could also create unhappy consequences.
- This line of reasoning could be supported by the fact that Act Utilitarianism encourages immoral behaviour because some actions are just wrong and should not become morally justifiable because they are done to create happiness e.g. stealing.
- However, this line of reasoning can be countered because Act Utilitarianism teleological approach allows for cultural differences to be considered. Therefore, reducing any potential immoral behaviour associated with cultural relativism.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Section B

3. (a) Apply Fletcher's Situation Ethics to the issue of homosexual relationships. **[AO1 25]**

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

- Homosexual Relationships (a term from Ancient Greek meaning 'same' and the Latin sexus meaning 'sex') is a romantic attraction, sexual attraction or sexual behaviour between members of the same sex or gender.
- Fletcher is not saying that we should completely ignore every ethic principle or law in our community. However, the Situationalist is prepared to set aside those rules in a specific situation if love/agape seems better served by doing so.
- Religious laws tend to suggest homosexual relationships are wrong: for example, in the Bible (Book of Leviticus) it states: "You shall not lie with a man as with a woman; that is an abomination." (This became commandment 157 of the 613 commandments). However, Joseph Fletcher's Situation Ethics offers a potentially opposing view because fundamental principle two states 'love is the ruling norm of Christianity.' Therefore, if loving consequences occur the above commandment from Leviticus can be ignored.
- Situation Ethics would never say homosexual relationships are always wrong or always right. This is because it is relativist ethic and therefore does not believe actions are right and wrong in themselves. Instead it will judge each homosexual relationship on a 'case by case' basis (Fundamental Principle six: Love Decides Situationally).
- Morally Good = Fletcher argues Situation Ethics would say homosexual relationships could be ethically good if the consequences of the relationship led to agape consequences. In practical terms this means that if the homosexual relationship is based around loving commitment then Situation Ethics would say ignore the religious rules against homosexuality (such as in Leviticus). This is because agape is better served by allowing the relationship.
- Morally Bad = However, if the homosexual relationship was based just around lust (the selfish desire for self-satisfaction – such as casual sex) then Situation Ethics would say it was morally wrong. This is because the homosexual relationship is creating selfish consequences and not loving ones. Therefore, Situation Ethics would say stick to the religious rules on homosexuality (such as in Leviticus) because love is not best served by breaking the rule.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

3. (b) 'Religious believers must reject Situation Ethics as a basis for making moral decisions.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

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

- One line of thinking is that Situation Ethics ignores all 613 commandments in the Hebrew Bible. Therefore, it ignores what many consider the fundamental Judeo-Christian ethical guide. Therefore, some religious believers could not accept the use of Situation Ethics.
- This line of thinking could be supported by the fact many religious ethics are legalist based e.g. in Islam many see the ethical aspects of Sharia Law to be legalistic. However, Fletcher deliberately made Situation Ethics a non-legalistic ethic. Therefore, some religious believers would reject the use of Situation Ethics.
- However, this line of thinking could be criticised because Fletcher claimed Situation Ethics would be supported by influential religious figures. For example, Fletcher claimed Situation Ethics is modelled on the Biblical teachings of Jesus e.g. in Luke 10, Jesus states 'Love your neighbour as yourself.' Therefore, Situation Ethics is agreeing with this important principle. Moreover, Buddhism could be seen as supporting the principles of Situation Ethics. For example, in Buddhism love is unconditional and requires courage and acceptance; the opposite of this is conditional love (selfish love); this is very similar to Situation Ethics 'boss principle'.
- Another line of thinking is that many important church leaders have criticised Situation Ethics. Particularly recent Roman Catholic Popes. For example, Pope Pius XII said that Situation Ethics was merely a kind of excuse to get away with bad behaviour. He said Situation Ethics is "an individualistic ethic designed to justify actions opposed by God."
- However, this line of thinking could be countered because some modern theologians have supported the principles of Situation Ethics. For example, theologian Rudolf Bultmann stated: "Jesus had no ethics apart from "love thy neighbour as thyself." And the former Archbishop of Canterbury William Temple stated "There is one ultimate … duty and its formula is: "love thy neighbour as thyself."

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

4. **(a)** Outline Virtue Theory with reference to Aristotle. **[AO1 25]**

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

- Virtue Theory is a very different type of ethical theory. Most ethical theories try to work out 'right' and 'wrong' based on our actions. Instead of concentrating on the action, it is interested in defining what are good people and the virtues that make them good. Therefore, this theory has more to do with looking at the flourishing of the human character rather than with the rights and wrongs of specific actions.
- A moral agent's character is made up of virtues and vices. Virtues = good characteristics we have such as kindness, patient, friendly etc.; vices = bad characteristics we have such as greed, selfishness, jealousy etc.
- Virtue Theory concentrates on developing a person's virtues and reducing their vices. This, according to, Virtue Theorists, would automatically make the person become a 'good' person. This is because a person of good character would automatically do good actions.
- Virtue Theory seeks to determine whether there are any key virtues that underpin the life of admirable human beings e.g. what virtues did Martin Luther King have? Once we have discovered the virtues of Martin Luther King (such as compassion) we could develop (through practice) those virtues in our own life.
- A supporter of Virtue Theory was Aristotle. Aristotle reasoned out a set of virtues that he claimed will help a moral agent to be a successful member of their community (which Aristotle believed would bring them happiness / Eudaimonia).
- Aristotle created the moral virtues for us to follow. According to Aristotle there are 12 moral virtues (or qualities of character). They can only be cultivated (developed) through habit/practice.
- Aristotle created the 'Doctrine of the Mean' to guide moral agents on the use of the moral virtues. According to Aristotle we have the potential to develop these moral virtues. The way we do this is to ensure that we keep away from either the excess or deficiency of the virtue; so, we hit the 'mean' or midway point. He argued the good virtues were a matter of balance between the extremes.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

4. (b) 'Virtue Theory is impractical when faced with a moral dilemma.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

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

- One line of thinking is that ethical theories ought to give us a clear system for making moral choices. An ethic should enable moral agents to clearly know what actions are right and which ones are wrong. However, Virtue Theory gives no specific moral guidance about how we are to act. Moral agents have to decide for themselves whether to genetically modify animals, clone humans, go to war, abort etc. William Frankena argues: "virtues without principles are blind".
- This line of thinking can be supported because virtues, like courage, can lead to immoral behaviour. This is because criminals can use these virtues to become powerful and/or rich e.g. a bank robber needs courage to rob a bank. Therefore, virtues are impractical because they offer no clear guidelines on right or wrong actions
- However, this line of thinking can be countered because virtue theory, unlike any other ethical approach, concentrates on the inner person (are character). This is a better way to approach ethics because anybody can pretend to act ethically good but still have an evil character. Virtue Theory works the other way round and concentrates on the inner person (character) first i.e. if I am virtuous from the inside I am likely to then be outwardly ethical as well. Therefore, Virtue Theory offers a genuinely practical guide to developing inwardly ethical moral agents.
- Another line of thought could be Virtue Theory is impractical because key virtues differ from culture to culture e.g. certain religious fundamentalist groups could interpret sacrificing one's life in violent manner (such as a suicide bomber) as a virtue but others would see this as a vice. Therefore, virtues are an impractical guide to moral behaviour because there is no universal agreement on the virtues.
- However, this point can be countered because Virtue Theory is straight forward approach to ethics and is therefore practical. This is because virtues can easily be drawn from observing people individually and collectively and coming to a reasoned judgement about the best virtues to follow e.g. modern day virtues could be generated by studying contemporary icons like Mother Theresa, Martin Luther King or Nelson Mandela. We can study their virtues and simply copy them.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

5. (a) Examine the precepts and goods within Aquinas' Natural Law. **[AO1 25]**

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

The Precepts

- There are three types of precepts (key, primary and secondary):
- Aquinas reasoned that the best way to achieve our Highest Good can be summed up by the following phrase: 'do good and avoid evil'. Aquinas called this the Key Precept.
- If God created moral goodness (the Eternal Laws) then to become more like God we need to follow God's eternal laws and avoid the opposite (which must be evil) i.e. In the same way you would please your parents by following their rules, so you can please God by following his rules (the eternal laws).
- Aquinas reasoned because humanity was created by God then He must have created all aspects of humanity, including humanity's purposes in life. He said that humanity has five permanent purposes in our life, set by God. Aquinas called these the Primary Precepts: preservation of life, ordered society, worship God, education and reproduction of the human species. Aquinas believed that these Primary Precepts never change.
- Aquinas reasoned from the above Primary Precepts you can create specific ethical rules. These rules are known as the Secondary Precepts. Any action that breaks a Primary Precept is wrong (evil) and any action that supports/upholds a Primary Precept is good.
- Aquinas believed that by following the Secondary Precept rules will ultimately get us to heaven. This is because if we follow the Secondary Precepts we are following the Key Precept of 'Do Good and Avoid Evil'. If we follow the key precept we are achieving our highest good. By following our highest good we are re-establishing a right relationship with God. And if we do this we will gain eternal life in heaven, with God, when we die.

The Goods

- Aquinas believed that all humans were created with the ability to reason by God, therefore everyone has within them the ability to reason out Natural Law and thus achieve their Highest Good. Aquinas even argued that humans were naturally orientated towards the achievement of their Highest Good.
- **Real Good** = this is where a person reasons out Natural Law perfectly, so that they follow their highest good. You are achieving your highest good.
- **Apparent Good** = anyone who does not follow Natural Law correctly is not deliberately being bad (they are not evil as such) they are just using their God given reason incorrectly. Therefore, moral agents are not deliberately sinful they are just using their reason wrongly.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

5. (b) 'Following Natural Law results in injustice.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

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

- One line of thinking could be that Natural Law results in injustices because it ignores any potential bad consequences of our actions. For example, a Natural Law secondary precept is that 'contraception is wrong' because it breaks the primary precept of Reproduction of the Human Species. However, the consequences of this is that poor families, particularly in third world countries, are having children they can ill afford to bring up. Therefore, creating greater poverty and suffering.
- However, the above could be countered because Natural Law is objective. Natural Law gives us rules that are independent of our individual thoughts and desires. Therefore, Natural Law is completely objective (it is not biased by our own feelings and desires).
- Another line of thinking is that Natural Law can create injustices because it is out-dated. Natural Law is enforcing centuries old views that are out of touch with 21st century ethical valves e.g. the purpose of sex is to procreate, this can lead to homophobia etc.
- This point can be countered because Natural Law is reliable and consistent. Ethics that rely on moral agents predicting consequences, like Situation Ethics or Utilitarianism, are not reliable because human reactions are often unpredictable. Natural Law gives us set rules that do not rely on unpredictable consequences.
- Another line of thinking is that Natural Law has an inflexible approach that can lead to immoral outcomes e.g. not allowing contraception has led to the spread of AIDS in Africa.
- However, this line of reasoning can be countered because Natural Law does have a certain amount of flexibility. Natural Law allows for secondary precepts to vary if an extreme situation arises (it has a teleological aspect to it).
- Another line of thinking is that Natural Law can create injustice because religious scripture is a more reliable approach to ethics than Aquinas' use of reason. This is because reason (as Aquinas admits in his 'apparent good' theory) can be used wrongly.
- However, this line of thinking could be countered because Natural Law is all-encompassing. Natural Law can be applied to all ethical issues including modern ethical issues that are not covered in the religious texts e.g. genetics. Therefore, Natural Law can be applied to all ethical issues in contemporary (modern) society making it just.

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

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.