

Examiners' Report
June 2016

GCE Religious Studies 6RS02 1C

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2016

Publications Code 6RS02_1C_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

The 2016 examination season is a testimony to the high level of engagement with selected studies drawn from a very wide range of academic fields. Over the life of this specification there has been consistent evidence of superb research on topics that are clearly of great interest to candidates. This legacy of academic achievement has been inspirational for examiners whose privilege it is to see what can be achieved by our candidates. The new specification will provide a different assessment experience and centres will find that their excellent resources can be integrated into future schemes of work.

The high standard of work evidenced in June 2016 was no exception to historical high standards as candidates demonstrated a very high level of independent enquiry which clearly demonstrated what their chosen area of investigation had meant to them as a learning experience. Candidates showcased their knowledge of a particular academic field in the way they identified a line of enquiry, clearly expressed their view, analysed key concepts and deployed evidence with coherent understanding of their task whilst fluently evaluating a wide range of source material that they had at their disposal. The enthusiasm for and knowledge of the chosen topic was clearly conveyed in many answers that were truly academic in their approach. A few centres continue to focus on the same or similar topics for all their candidates, whereas other centres permitted considerable choice for individual candidates. Candidates were mostly very well prepared for the examination and it was evident that centres used their specialist resources and interests to encourage candidates to research in depth a particular area of study. The 'Investigations' unit has a definite academic purpose and aims to involve students as active participants pursuing open-ended enquiries with an emphasis on independent learning. Questions were designed to be inclusive of all possible approaches to various topics and all valid answers were considered. At this stage in the life of the specification it is difficult to find new things to report because, in the main, centres possess a very high degree of expertise and this is clearly evidenced in the work that is produced on the day of the examination.

There are still a few areas for development that are reported similarly each year and once again 2016 showed evidence of a small minority of centres that need to take this on board. Centres are encouraged to review their performance in 2016 against all or some of the following points:

- Whilst most centres had entered their candidates for the correct option there were still a few entries for particular Areas of Study where consideration regarding entry for a different Area of Study may have been beneficial to the candidate. It is important to ensure candidates know which area of their investigation is the best fit for the question they answer on the paper.
- A small number of candidates were not entered by the centre for the correct paper.
- There was evidence of candidates choosing a different question on the paper to the question they had clearly prepared for before the examination. In some of these cases the candidate was using material suitable for Question 1 to answer Question 3 (or vice versa) and not really grappling fully with the demands of the question.
- This practice does not always work to the best effect as the candidate might end up answering neither question as fully as possible. It must be noted that each question was written for ONE of three topics within each particular Area of Study.
- Candidates were not penalised if correct entries were not made or a cross was put in a box that did not match the answer or if no box was ticked at all. However, evidence shows that candidates have decided that the question for a topic that they clearly had not prepared for looked more inviting and selected that question but that did not necessarily mean they were best prepared to answer that question. Whilst it is good to note that fewer candidates than 2015 attempted this approach there were still some candidates in this session who answered a question they had not prepared for and may need to be reminded which question their material is best directed at and be advised to answer that question.

- Candidates using a pre-prepared essay inclusive of centre selected quotes often ignored the question.

Examiners were encouraged to mark positively and to credit all valid material according to the mark scheme and question paper. Centres should ensure that candidates are entered for the option that matches their Area of Study and that candidates are clear about which question they have been prepared for on the paper. There is still evidence of Centres studying Papers 1B and 1F being entered for 1A. This might be an oversight regarding filling out the form – Centres must choose 6RS02 and then identify which of the seven papers from 1A to 1G is the specific entry.

Variation in achievement was related to the two assessment objectives. These objectives should receive prominent attention in the process of the investigation. Importantly there must be explicit attention to both objectives in the examination answer and also to the question that is intended to focus the answer. Each question consistently referred to the assessment objectives with the trigger word 'Examine' for AO1 and 'Comment on' for AO2. These dictated the structure of the question and helped candidates to plan their answers. It would be advisable for candidates to pay regular attention to the level descriptors for these assessment objectives as a way of monitoring their development and progress during their investigations. The phrase 'with reference to the topic you have investigated' will always appear in the question to ensure that the generic question can be answered with material from any appropriate investigation. The mark scheme itself is generic to all questions but the answer itself is not necessarily generic as candidates are *expected* to use their material to *answer the question*. The purpose of the question is to challenge candidates to adapt their material so that at the highest levels they may demonstrate a coherent understanding of the task based on the selection of their material. Widely deployed evidence/arguments/sources were evident in well structured responses to the task whereby a clearly expressed viewpoint was supported by well-deployed evidence and reasoned argument. There was skilful deployment of religious language in many answers and the fluency of good essays showed command over the material; such command makes for high outcomes and rewards the amount of hard work done by the candidate. Many candidates had clearly learned much in the process and their overall grasp of the issues involved and command over their material was highly commendable.

Candidates at the lower end of achievement struggled with the demands of the question.

These candidates were insecure with their management of material and did not know how to best structure their content to answer the specific question. Success can be undermined by writing up a rote-learned answer which was not adapted to the question set or by answering a question that has been written for a topic they have not studied. In 2016 there was still far too much evidence of rote learned answers using the same structure and material inclusive of quotes; whilst much information was relevant to the topic and consequently was awarded in terms of AO1, there was a significant lack of engagement with the specific demands of the question and consequently marks for AO2 were low, with only generic evaluation provided. This approach is contrasted with excellent praxis whereby candidates were trained to answer the question; arguably, this is evidence of good practice but at the lower end some candidates thought it was sufficient to simply use the question stimulus at the end of each paragraph. The best answers were those which were guided by the statement as opposed to simply *'tagging it on'* to anticipated content. A balanced approach to the question that meets the highest levels of achievement according to both assessment objectives is obviously desirable and the generic question accommodates many possible routes to success whereby any valid approach to the question was credited.

Finally, there is increasing evidence of poorly written scripts that are almost illegible – scripts are scanned onto software for marking and even though the examiner can enlarge the screen many scripts were still very difficult to read. Candidates are strongly advised to develop their practical handwriting skills and then practice writing under timed conditions. Examiners understand the time constraints that candidates are writing under but this problem regarding illegible handwriting seems to be on the increase. Centres need to address this issue because the current format for examinations requires candidates' ability

to sustain handwriting and academic standards under examination pressure.

That said, the excellent work of centres and candidates in 6RS02 bears testimony to the academic potential of candidates that is a joy to behold when it is fully realised.

Question 1

MEDICAL ETHICS

This question attracts the largest number of responses across the entire 6RS02 Unit. The best answers to medical ethics were attempted with an eye to scholarship and candidates had a very wide ranging understanding of the topic and included an in-depth knowledge of a wide range of religious and ethical teachings.

Most candidates who attempted to answer this question did so with a good degree of success. The best responses married breadth with depth to produce an effective argument. The best candidates were those who were able to apply their knowledge to the question and actually answer it, although other responses only gave a vague indication that the question was there. The best responses demonstrated an understanding that religious and secular perspectives are not strictly polarised and were able to address, with some sophistication, the different interpretations of these concepts. These candidates successfully recognised and made relevant comparisons across a range of perspectives.

This question is by far the most popular and candidates seemed to be well-prepared for the requirements of AO1 with the majority investigating issues related to abortion and euthanasia. The most memorable answers debated issues related to organ transplants and stem cell research/embryology and candidates adapted their material to the question with a decisive view about the question. The best answers had a long and highly discursive conclusion, making it clear that the candidates recognised they were dealing with an issue.

The points made in last year's report still apply to this question in their entirety and need to be taken on board by candidates whose achievement has been disappointing. Examiners are reporting similar success stories and similar problems with weaker scripts – mostly revolving around whether or not recent and appropriate scholarship has been employed and whether or not the question has been addressed or ignored.

For those who responded on the topic of abortion a shift in emphasis continued whereby candidates sought to explore the rights of the father in relation to the abortion debate, whereas formerly the emphasis for debating abortion focussed solely on the rights of the woman. With the increased visibility of groups like Fathers for Justice it is pleasing to see that teaching on this subject is adapting, even though in reality there is little scope for anything else 'off piste'. Many candidates' responses were thorough and well balanced with a good range of relevant scholars. There was a solid performance around the mid-upper level 4 mark. Some candidates were knowledgeable but found it difficult to find their own flair or voice – as is often the case with well-rehearsed medical ethics answers.

A point made each year needs to be stressed again: the range of scholarship for Medical Ethics is predictable and it would be more in the spirit of the Investigations Paper for candidates to move away from the well-worn identikit approach clearly evident in abortion answers to a more independent approach embedded in contemporary scholarship. That said, the best candidates explored the important religious and ethical issues with reference to well-deployed, appropriate scholarship coupled with modern day examples. There is a large majority of candidates that would benefit from adopting a fresh approach to what is now a very well-worn path to success. Centres are encouraged to go beyond the predictable range of material and candidates are urged to resist unloading pre-prepared answers with little regard for the question. Answers can be improved by taking decisive views, based on the evidence and also by paying close attention to the demands of the question. There was some evidence of fresh approaches in some answers but clearly there are more candidates that would benefit from treading new waters.

Candidates were not marked down for using legitimate material that presumably reflects the bulk of resources available from centres; however, recent scholarship within medical ethics continually responds to ethical dilemmas emerging from any form of development and the challenge for independent investigation is to find a way of keeping up with this pace. Studies that reflect the less travelled path often stand out from the crowd in terms of achievement if the material is substantive, up to date and deployed effectively to argue a viewpoint.

Where candidates chose another issue such as Organ Donation, Stem Cell Research, IVF or Eugenics, this provided scope for greater creativity and analysis. These newer topics gave candidates a chance to research independently and to read contemporary ethics books and journals.

Some of the best responses came from candidates who had studied aspects of genetic engineering. These candidates really seemed to be able to grasp the meaning of the application of ethics in the real world and produced interesting academic studies. It makes such a difference to the quality of any essay when candidates clearly have their own view on the material they have studied. Some candidates also applied Aristotle's virtue ethics and Aquinas' natural law convincingly as they argued a case for/against the view in the question.

Candidates as a whole had worked very hard to remember quotes and details of case studies but there are a few problems in essay structure that are worth pointing out again as they still persist.

- Weaker pedestrian scripts devoted too much time with long introductions to the topic, sometimes as much as two pages followed by descriptions of the various methods of abortion.
- Digression through over reliance on case studies rather than clear focus on the question
- Lack of scholarship in a topic that clearly has a very wide range of relevant scholarship
- Forgetting to point out the significance of material discussed at length
- Answering the question by tacking on a few words at the end of a paragraph but not integrating it in a way that showed understanding of why this might answer the question
- Writing out the question in full at the end of the essay and leaving the examiner to work out why it was there.

There was evidence of answers where personal choice was often assumed to be the self-evident guiding principle, when of course in ethics personal choice is usually under the guiding scrutiny of a secular or religious principle that is being adhered to. A significant minority came across as hostile to the Church and indeed to non-Christians faiths. Some candidates argued that religions ought to move with the times. Far too many candidates either said or implied this, and of course when they took this line they demonstrated a complete misunderstanding of both the nature of deontological/absolutist ethics, and indeed of the problems associated with teleological/consequentialist ethics. Strong opinions in the matter of personal choice destroyed many candidates' objectivity in writing, and many candidates were arguing that religion is a problem simply because it gets in our way or adds to the confusion. Answers on euthanasia were better in that candidates used their research more effectively.

Everyone discussed the sanctity of life and nearly everyone hit on the value of life/quality of life dichotomy. There was better use of examples when Euthanasia was discussed; evidence of case studies linked to the discussion that did not dominate the thrust of the essay were more effectively deployed. All of this needs to be noted again in the hope of positive impact on achievement if candidates can take this academic challenge on board.

This candidate presents an outstanding study on Genetic Engineering. The candidate engaged immediately with the question and selected from a wide range of material to discuss the view suggested in the question. The first paragraph is comprehensive and sets out very clearly the argument that directs the thrust of the entire essay. The essay sustains a very high standard of precise discussion and elegantly argues the ethical implications of genetic engineering.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Remember answer ONLY ONE question.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3

Genetic engineering is defined as a number of medical procedures ranging from preimplantation genetic screening, non therapeutic genetic enhancement. &

The subject of genetic engineering remains a topical and controversial issue because of the religious and ethical implications of such practices as the discarding of unwanted embryos following IVF. In light of this the topic I have chosen to research is preimplantation genetic screening, the process of creating multiple embryos using IVF and screening them for hereditary genetic diseases, before discarding the affected embryos. From a religious perspective this and other such genetic engineering practices create divisions and debates. & as a result of the move in recent years away from traditional sanctity of life arguments to generally more secular

quality of life arguments. The principle of the sanctity of life is based on the doctrine of 'image dei' as interpreted from the Bible. This is the idea that we are made in God's image but are separate from him, as in Genesis 1:24 it is written 'so God made man in his own image, in the image of God he created man'. The implications of this are that while we are a reflection of God, only in Christ was this image made perfect, and as Bonhoeffer said 'man is bound to the depths of his own knowledge of God, of good and evil'. The doctrine of image dei is set in contrast to that of sicut deus, or 'like God', and it is upon this that quality of life arguments are based. However some Christians may argue that in rejecting the sanctity of life we are forgetting that our lives are on loan from God and we must not interfere with his creation.

A perspective that supports the idea that issues within medical ethics are

best solved by accepting guidance from religious or ethical principles is that of the Roman Catholic view of the Natural Moral Law. The Catholic Church is itself not opposed to progress within medicine and does not reject all practices involved in genetic engineering. However, they are of the opinion that all practices involving IVF are wrong, as in the process embryos are discarded. The reasoning behind this is based on the Catholic ideas of ensoulment and vitalism.

Vitalism is the idea that to be a person a body must be animated with a soul, and as the official teaching is that ensoulment occurs at conception the termination of pregnancy at any point is tantamount to murder and inherently immoral. Natural Moral Law is associated with Catholic scholar Aquinas who maintained that all life has a purpose which it strives to achieve. In regards to human purpose he divided primary and secondary precepts with which we

can decide what is moral and what is not. As one of the primary purposes for human life is to reproduce it could be argued that natural moral law ~~is~~ goes against the ~~present~~ practice of preimplantation genetic screening. This view is based on the sanctity of life and allows embryos the status of personhood in order to support this as Bellarmine wrote, 'a person is an individual substance of rational thought... an embryo is a potential person.' However this argument for using religious principles has weaknesses in that its primary premise is belief in God, which not everyone has. The Catholic teaching also puts obedience to God before the treatment of disease and ~~the~~ reduction of suffering, and ~~so~~ could be considered uncompassionate.

In contrast to this there are secular views of personhood that suggest medical ethics should not be guided by religious principles. Peter Singer is one such scholar who would argue that the definition of a person is more complex than this.

biology, stating that a person is defined as 'a rational, thinking being'. Embryos are not sentient beings capable of reason and ^{as} such it is difficult to justify representing medical progress on the basis that they are potential people. Further support of this view is the official UK Fertilisation and Embryology Act which states that before 14 days an embryo is not an independent substance and cannot be classified as a person. As such before the law there are no ethical dilemmas surrounding preimplantation genetic screening.

An ethical system which would support the argument for using ~~religious~~ ethical if not religious principles is that of utilitarianism. Using the principle of utility that an action is morally good if it creates the 'greatest good for the greatest number', where good is taken to mean happiness or pleasure. preimplantation genetic engineering is acceptable on the grounds of the

positive consequences. If using rule utilitarianism there is further justification in that the amount of pain experienced by the child and its family are greatly reduced. Such positive consequences include the prevention of genetic disease for future generations and the happiness of the parents. There is also a scientific aspect in Bentham's hedonic calculus, which would allow for screening on the basis of what is desirable for people but outlaw the practice of non-therapeutic genetic enhancement. So such an argument could be considered a strong argument for using an ethical principle to make decisions.

A secular sanctity of life argument against genetic engineering is that of Kant's categorical imperative. In this deontological argument he argues that all moral law is based on reason and put into practice via good will. As such we should not discard and treat embryos as we would not want

short for ourselves. The ethical part of Kant's argument is that of the Kingdom of Ends which states that all people have equal dignity as law makers and law doers. In this way discarding potential persons is wrong because every being must be treated with equal respect and life regarded as precious, as is the view of most sensibility of life arguments. *

~~Another~~ An argument

Another argument in favour of using religious and ethical principles is that of the case against eugenics. Eugenic practices have been developing in our society of over history but the term was first coined by Francis Galton, a cousin of Darwin & whose view on selective breeding fits well with the latter theory of evolution as based on natural selection.

Galton was in favour of 'improving' nature by its manipulation, stating that 'what ~~man~~ nature does blindly, slowly and ruthlessly, man may do providently, quickly, and kindly.'

Human eugenics has very negative connotations in today's society as a result of enforced state programmes such as that of the Nazis. Despite this Sutton argues that 'there is an inherently eugenic attitude in our society. shown in that although screening for disabilities and genetic diseases is not compulsory there is 'subtle pressure to do so: and if a hereditary disease is passed on to a child, women are often feelings of guilt and shame. This is more apparent in societies where boys are favoured over girls and prenatal screening combined with selective termination ensures the birth of a son. Now Sutton argues, 'shouldn't a child be welcomed irrespective of its sex? Indeed, shouldn't it not be unconditionally welcomed?' The same logic applies to disability, and the question must be asked of what message we are sending to disabled people in the process. This is

a strong case for guiding medical ethics by religious principles or without careful consideration of the sanctity of life where is an alarming tendency to become 'carried ~~out~~ away.'

The liberal pro-treatment and situation ethics view is that pre-implantation genetic screening is acceptable if the embryos could not survive outside the womb because of the positive consequences of choosing the healthiest possible child. Based on the principle of egoism this view suggests that we must always do the most thing and in some cases it is more loving to spare a family and future generations the burden of genetic disease. This is a religious quality of ^{life} argument and supports using both ethical and religious principles.

In conclusion, I would argue that based on the evidence above issues within medical ethics are best

solved by a combination of ethical and religious principles, neither wholly religious nor wholly scientific. As seen with both the Roman Catholic view and utilitarianism, both sanctity and quality of life arguments alone lead to extremes and become unrepresentative.

In my opinion the best example of an ethical system which could be both in guiding medical ethics is that of the liberal Protestant or situation ethics view. Situation ethics has been described as a 'truly Christian ethic' based on ~~agape~~ using the principle of agape as based on Jesus' two greatest commandments, but still maintains relativism as an ethical system.

* As part of the kingdom of ends Kant argues that people have intrinsic rather than instrumental value. An example of controversy caused when people are treated as a

means to an end is that of 'saviour siblings' when the embryo chosen is used only as a means to save another child. In regards to this Sutton argues that this is *could* be considered wrong as all people have intrinsic worth, and the same argument would be applied by Kantian principles.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The mature and analytical style of this essay shows off a competent piece of research. This standard of writing is sustained throughout the essay.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Investing time reading relevant scholars will always improve the quality of your argument and substantiate any valid comment on the question.

This essay covered a wide range of material on the topic of abortion. The candidate expressed cogently a thorough understanding of the task.

The essay reads as a coherent piece with clear structure; the selection of material demonstrates emphasis and clarity of ideas and the argument is supported by widely deployed evidence/arguments/sources. The candidate responds consistently to the question and lays out a solid range of material that clearly shows the level of engagement and interest in the topic.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Remember answer ONLY ONE question.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3

The medical ethics topic I am examining is abortion, the forced termination of a pregnancy usually before the foetus is 24 weeks and viable as it is against the law to abort afterwards with US law stating 'the state has a legitimate interest in protecting potential life.' unless in serious cases. Abortion itself is controversial as it is a matter of life and death for a foetus, which many consider to be person, and therefore there is a lot of emphasis placed on human rights. Pro choice arguments would believe that the mother has a right to her own body while pro life arguments believe we should consider the rights of the foetus. However the problem won't be solved unless we can look to guidance from religious principles such as sanctity of life and natural theology while also considering the ethical implications of arguments regarding personhood, deontology and utilitarianism. These principles all seem to have solutions to this controversy however they may not hold up when faced with criticism.

one ethical principle that we can look to for guidance is personhood, the idea that we should not kill other persons which raises the question of whether the foetus is a person. Jack Mahoney sets out the criteria needed to be a person as having rationality, sentience, emotions, free-will and

continuity' meaning we need to make rational decisions, experience a wide range of emotions, be aware of our surroundings, have a past present and future and be free to make our own choices. The problem with this is that if we use this criteria for deciding if the foetus is a person then we must apply it to everyone. Therefore the elderly and disabled would be considered persons, making guidance from the criteria of personhood very weak as an ethical principle that we can follow.

In terms of religious principles personhood in the foetus happens at 'ensoulment', when the foetus receives a soul and personality of a human being. This could be used as good guidance for finding a ~~time~~ time limit for abortion as we would know when it is a cluster of cells and then when it is human. However there are multiple views within different religions as Muslims believe ensoulment happens at 120 days but abortion can happen later as 'Yusuf Sane'i States' if there are serious problems God sometimes doesn't require his creatures to practise his law therefore it can be considered as a flexible approach. Traditional Judaism would however argue that ensoulment happens at conception therefore favouring the pro-life argument as the foetus will have become a human and therefore it is wrong to kill it. This shows that religious principles can give guidance however many ^{religious} people have different ideas.

as to when the fetus is given a soul therefore creating an ambiguous situation.

There have been critics to the idea that a fetus can become a person. Such as Mary Anne Warren who argues that we must have 'moral reciprocity', being able to recognise the rights of other humans, in order to become persons. As foetus's don't have this then they can't be considered people. Peter Singer also remarks that 'it is peculiar that we may ~~kill~~ not kill the premature infant but may kill the more developed foetus' highlighting that the fetus and baby are the same thing in or outside the room. However he provides guidance by establishing that just because a foetus is a human it is not a person as that requires rationality and self consciousness. Therefore he says 'we must accord the same value to the human foetus as we would a non-human animal as he believes that the foetus, while still a potential person has no value yet and therefore it is okay to terminate the pregnancy. Here Singer provides clear ^{ethical} guidance that we shouldn't treat the foetus as a person and therefore abortion can be considered okay.

Another principle is based in Catholic teachings, known as the sanctity of life, the idea that human life is sacred and of intrinsic value. This idea can come from Exodus 20 stating 'Thou shalt not murder' and follows that

as God has made us in his image we are of higher status than non-human animals and as such should be treated with respect. Albert Schweitzer develops this with the idea of 'reverence for life' that all living beings have an innate desire to live and so must be treated with respect and protected. This was challenged by Mary Anne Warren who argues that reverence for life doesn't provide good guidance as we are genetically built to promote our own survival and that is not deserving of reverence also she highlights that some abortions are 'compulsions of necessity' meaning sometimes abortion may have to happen and having such a strong opposition to it provides no guidance.

Aquinas attempted to ~~challenge~~ support sanctity of life as religious guidance ~~with~~ his idea of natural theology, which is favourable to many due to its roots in faith and reason. Aquinas acknowledges 'whoever uses the Church as an infallible guide will believe whatever the Church teaches'. He guides us by saying that through natural law we will find our purpose. This law highlights that ~~we~~ we must follow the primary precepts, the first of which is to preserve life therefore even if the fetus is not a person it is still a life we need to preserve meaning that abortion is wrong however ~~the~~ natural law also recognises that in some cases the mother's life is in danger and therefore abortion is the lesser of two evils due to the doctrine of double effect saying

that if good can come from it then it is a lesser evil. This shows that issues within abortion can be solved with a mix of religious and ethical principles.

Donat Glover then attempts to criticize the sanctity of life by saying that 'killing is not intrinsically wrong' and that 'consciousness is necessary vehicle for life' what this means is that ~~as~~ as we are conscious we do not have greater worth than many animals, such as chimpanzees, however he goes on to say that by ~~viewing~~ viewing life as worth living we give it value and therefore it is better to have a longer life than a short one. This allows us to view his argument as guidance as he acknowledges that sometimes killing is directly wrong while not intrinsically and that because we see no obvious value in a life, a fetus for example, doesn't mean we ascribe no value to life itself. This means that it is okay to give value to life sometimes and end it when we don't see what it could contribute, e.g. the life of a fetus, therefore providing strong ethical guidance on abortion.

~~we can see~~ that another ethical view taken is the consideration of the rights of the mother - Judith Jarvis Thomson, person who is an example of a woman being kidnapped by a musical society and ~~hooked~~ hooked up to a famous violinist who is dying and only her blood type is required. The woman should be allowed to leave at anytime as she would be forced to provide for

the violinist for nine months and shouldn't be morally obliged to do so. Mary Anne Warren develops this pro-choice view by saying that the rights of the fetus are lesser than that of the mother. Richard Dawkins also supports the argument basing his view on medical science that if the mother's life is in danger then the fetus is at the bottom of this hierarchy and therefore we are provided with ethical guidance on this matter by highlighting that it is within the rights of the mother to abort the child.

This is challenged by Roman Catholic views that abortion 'is an unspeakable crime' as the fetus also has a right to life and that even if the mother's life is in danger the child still needs to be considered as an innocent being that demands respect and protection. Don Marquis supports this view in his article 'abortion is immoral' in which he explains 'the loss of one's life deprives one of all ~~of~~ ~~one's~~ ~~experiences,~~ ~~activities,~~ ~~projects,~~ ~~and~~ ~~enjoyments~~ ~~which~~ ~~would~~ ~~have~~ ~~otherwise~~ ~~constituted~~ ~~one's~~ ~~future.'~~ He goes further by saying that we must not end a child's life as we are robbing them of their future and therefore even if the fetus has no obvious value we are still robbing it of its future through abortion therefore supporting the Catholic principle of treating fellow lives with respect as Pope Benedict ~~the~~ XIII stated 'no one man can, in any circumstance, claim himself the right to directly destroy an innocent human being.' This provides

Guidance as we are then obligated to consider that the foetus is a life even if it doesn't acknowledge that it has a future due to inability to be self-conscious, as in the future it will become a person, guiding us to the view that abortion is always wrong as it is killing a potential valuable life.

Guidance on this matter can also come from ^{ethical} principles. One such being utilitarianism in which ~~it highlights~~ J.S. Mill highlights that our decisions are of 'individual determination' ~~that~~ we will come to the right conclusion ourselves. There are different types of utilitarianism that can provide guidance on abortion, one is act utilitarianism which was created by Jeremy Bentham as being 'greatest good for the greatest number' this means that the best solution is relevant to the situation for example if a mother of three is pregnant and she has a serious health issue it would be best to abort the child so she can care for her other children. However rule utilitarianism would argue that while the death of the mother is unfortunate that all fixed moral rules that we must abide by in order to live an ethical life and abortion would be deemed wrong. Such an absolutist view in the situation isn't highly sought after by many pro-choice supporters as it doesn't allow for extenuating circumstances whereas act utilitarianism would provide strong guidance on multiple situations and is likely to offer a better solution.

Another ethical theory is Deontology. This is the idea that we must follow our duty and that the action itself is of intrinsic value. In terms of guidance on abortion, deontology would be pro-life as we must follow the categorical imperative meaning all actions must be able to become universal laws as Kant states 'act only on that Maxim wherever thou canst at the same time will that it should become moral law'. We know that abortion is not an option for everyone and if it were ~~more~~ taken to an extreme the human race would die out as the universal law would be to have an abortion. Also the mother has a duty to protect her child and preserve its life regardless of the circumstances and consequences. Therefore deontology, while being able to provide a strong argument for why abortion could be very harmful, it doesn't acknowledge the rights of the mother in cases such as rape or if the child will have a miserable future as it doesn't give insight into how to deal with the consequences of our actions. Therefore its guidance in solving this controversy is somewhat limited to the action of abortion itself.

Overall I strongly believe that issues within medical ethics are best solved by guidance from both religious and ethical principles. This is because there are many circumstances in which the mother can't have the child. So an absolute approach such as the Catholic Church's would be harmful to the mother. However I recognise that many

Ethical principles fail to see that we must respect human life wherever possible and that the foetus also has a right to life. Therefore a mix of faith and reason is needed, similar to Aquinas' natural moral law. We must use reason to make the right choice of the situation however we need to respect the foetus as a human being that if it can't be saved then we must still ascribe value to it otherwise views such as Peter Singer's idea that human beings are just of the species homo sapiens and have little value if they aren't rational and self-conscious may take precedence. Therefore a mix of both religious and ethical principles is the best guidance in solving this controversy.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is no doubt about the candidate's view as this is clearly set out throughout the essay.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Establish a position in relation to the question and then argue for or against it.
Work logically through your material to answer the question.

Question 2

THE NATURAL WORLD

This question attracts a very low take up each year despite the obvious accessibility of this topic and the clear engagement candidates who have studied the natural world appear to have. Most of the answers to this question demonstrated an understanding of the concept of stewardship, and most were able to link and contrast it with the concept of dominion, with reference to topical concerns, using examples such as 'battery hens' and global warming. Some candidates addressed the concept of stewardship in the light of recent international political initiatives. There was some awareness of the scientific debate surrounding the environmental crisis and its possible implications for stewardship. Some candidates appreciated how far a religious approach to life expected the concept of stewardship to be acted on. There were several religions cited for this and in the main, Christian principles were cited.

The low number of candidates who attempt this question is surprising especially since there is so much material to be found on a wide variety of topics related to the natural world. Ecotheology is highly relevant in a modern world that is conflicted between the need to progress and yet not overexploit natural resources to meet growing demand.

Many approaches to this topic are as yet unexplored.

The best candidates had a very focused understanding of the various views of stewardship and linked this to modern issues in relation to environmental and ecological issues.

Most answers did have useful things to say about stewardship and dominion in response to the AO1 assessment objective, but only a minority of this small group were able to score highly under AO2 by analysing the fundamental *opposition* between these two concepts. Good candidates expressed viewpoints clearly and with a consistent approach showing clear, in-depth research in a very specific area and incorporated it with a very good understanding of environmental ethics. Some candidates were able to apply a range of ethical approaches to the issue and a few candidates referred too much to the content of the environmental issue rather than applying and analysing ethical theories. The best candidates demonstrated clear use of scholarship with relevant examples in a range of very interesting answers; candidates expressed viewpoints clearly and with a consistent approach. These answers showed a certain passion about stewardship that was informed by Celia Deane-Drummond's call to address ecological issues through the lens of virtue ethics.

Mid-range answers did not go on to discuss how far exploitation was controlled or confined to environmental practices of preserving and maintaining ecosystems. Some of the responses talked of animals having souls and how this gives grounds for deserving respect to life, but the analysis was not developed towards a sustained conclusion.

Candidates at the lower-range tended to describe current trends in environmental issues with very little ethical/religious content at all. Such candidates talked in very general terms about issues but offered little scholarship to support their argument; animal rights essays suffered from this approach and limited the discussion by omitting useful scholarship about stewardship. The digression into violent and graphic mistreatment of animals missed the point of the question. All in all the approach to this topic has not really developed beyond the superficial and this can only be countered by accessing a much wider range of scholarship to develop the arguments presented.

This is an example of a very well-argued incisive piece that is full of relevant scholarship that is clearly presented throughout the essay. The candidate's choice of reading conveys clear interest in the topic - a range of approaches to stewardship are explained with enough depth to merit achieving High Level 5 A01 and Level 4 A02.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Remember answer ONLY ONE question.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒

In order to understand whether responsible stewardship must ~~and~~ reject the view that the natural world exists solely to serve humanity, we must first understand the concept of environmental ethics, the religious approaches to the natural environment as well as modern secular approaches. We must understand what environmental ethics entail, outline what stewardship is and how it is depicted by the secular stance of deep ecology and eco-holism. Additionally, we will seek to understand the religious stance of dominion and how it is similar to shallow ecology and Bentham's utilitarianism whilst judging cases that display these approaches. This will all be done so as to outline whether stewardship should reject the notion that the natural world exists solely to serve humanity in order to be seen as responsible.

Environmental ethics is a relatively new ethical field of concern. At its heart, it seeks to understand mankind's relationship

with the environment and how we can be a part of it without causing irreversible destruction that in turn will lead to humankind's destruction. Environment ethics look at various issues including deforestation, urbanization, over-fishing, the destruction of natural habitats, and the ethicality of mining for natural resources.

Stewardship originates from ~~the~~ the Genesis creation stories. ~~and from the interpretation of the~~
The view of stewardship sees mankind as God's caretaker of the world and agrees that man has an active responsibility to God. Genesis ^{1:27} states that God 'made man in his own image'. This is interpreted as ^{God} God giving man the faculty of reason and consequently, providing us with a moral duty to preserve the natural world for we are God's moral agents. Stewardship sees that the environment has intrinsic worth due to the fact that it is the creation of God and consequently has granted us a duty to look after it. Additionally, in the ^{sense} ~~text~~, ~~it~~ it can be argued that stewardship is anthropocentric as it centres around mankind. St. Francis of ^{Assisi} ~~Assisi~~ had stated in his work that ^{those} ~~those~~ who "exclude" any creature from

the "shelter^{shelter} of compassion and pity", then he too will deal likewise from his fellow men. As a result of God's testament, it is implicated that we are to follow through with taking care of the environment for & so again, it is our responsibility. ~~At its~~ At its heart, agape is the core responsibility principle of stewardship. Agape is when 'you love your neighbour as you love yourself'. This implies that although stewardship does centre around the man, it ~~seeks~~ ^{seeks} to preserve the environment for the sake of others, not one self. In other words, stewardship claims agape and protects the natural environment for this is one of the most loving things you could do for your fellow neighbour. In this sense, we can argue that responsible stewardship must not have to reject the view of that the natural world exists solely to serve man as it looks out for the ~~world's~~ benefits of others. The Stewardship can be exemplified through the campaign of 'What Would Jesus Drive?'. The United-States based campaign seeks to union carbon emissions through the principles of Stewardship. Reverend Jim Ball argued that pollution was the "opposite" of caring for one's neighbour.

and therefore implicated we must look after the environment as so as to help our fellow men.

However, the notion of Stewardship is disputed by the secular strands of deep ecology and eco-bolism. Both strands argue that Stewardship fails to provide the environment with due respect. This supports the claims that responsible stewardship must reject the view that the natural world exists solely for the to serve humanity as it has worth within itself.

Deep ecology was first presented by ~~Alfred~~ Alfred Leopold in his work, *The Sand Country Almanac* (1942). This was later developed in the 20th century by ^{Arne Naess} ~~Arne Naess~~ and George Sessions. Deep ecology argued that the natural environment has intrinsic worth within itself and should therefore be treated as so. Naess and Sessions stated we must "touch the earth lightly" before producing an deep-ecologist eight-fold platform that set a way in which mankind is to reverse its destruction so as to preserve and care for the environment. This include actions such as

reducing the Earth's population. However, to ^{commit} such radical changes is highly ~~practical~~ impractical and ~~costly~~ which rely on such destructive actions (at the expense of the natural environment) will further remain in poverty, leading to ~~no~~ ^{no} ~~Regardless~~ ^{Regardless}, modern secular thinkers such as deep ecology ~~power~~ ^{power} that the environment do have intrinsic value within itself. Therefore, the idea that, in order to be seen as responsible, stewardship must reject the view that the environment exist solely to serve humankind, can ~~can~~ ^{can} ~~not~~ ^{not} be supported through ~~force~~ ^{force} such as deep ecology.

Additionally, the stance of eco-holism further supports this claim. Eco-holism, ~~previously~~ ^{previously} associated with notably with James Lovelock, argue that the world is a living organism with the purpose to produce life. Lovelock, in the Gaia hypothesis, argued that humankind is not as special as initially perceived and that despite our extinction, Gaia (the earth) will continue to live on and flourish life. Therefore, responsible stewardship must reject the view that the natural

environment exist to solely benefit mankind as a consequence of the idea that life will continue despite despite our role.

Notable examples of nature starting wars include the example of the nuclear power plants of Fukushima which have been overcome with nature. Therefore, responsible stewardship must reject the idea that the environment exists solely to benefit mankind for it has purpose beyond humanity according to eco-theology.

The religious stance of dominion further supports the title claim and supports that in order to be deemed as responsible, stewardship must lose past the view that nature exists solely to serve mankind. Dominion is a traditional Christian approach and also originates from Genesis creation stories. The verse of Genesis 1:27 is interpreted as man being the pinnacle of creation and that we are held the faculty of reason unlike other creatures.

① The idea of man's superiority is further cemented by the verse of Genesis 1:28 where God states

"let them (humans) have dominion" over every creature that "creepeth over the earth". This argues that human beings have no moral duty over the natural world. In other words, it is implicated that we may use the environment however we wish. This further supports the claim that responsible stewardship must reject the view that ~~man~~ the environment exists solely for the ~~our~~ benefit service of mankind as, as like with dominion, it as will exploit the environment and hold no responsibility to it otherwise. The idea of man's superiority is further cemented where, in Genesis 2:7, God breathes life into the 'dust of man'. This is ~~then~~ or interpreted as man possessing God-like abilities and ~~possessing~~ possessing a soul and the faculty of reason. For Christians such as St. Thomas Aquinas, this would be seen that ~~human~~ man only has a duty to other beings who possess this faculty of reason. In order to ~~be~~ be deemed as responsible, stewardship must reject that the natural environment only exists to

serve mankind as the the view that it does exist for our work, need, and desire is supported by dominion. Dominion for the sake of short term pleasures, cause detrimental effects to the environment and Stewardship must reject this and dispute this.

Shallow ecology is similar to dominion as it places only instrumental value on the environment - (only having value if it benefits man). ~~Shallow~~ Shallow ecology states that mankind has no moral duty to limit his behaviour for the sake of the environment. Michael La Boviere in the Philosopher's Magazine argues on shallow ecologist stance. La Boviere states that ~~humans~~ humans are a natural ~~creature~~ ^{species} and therefore any species which become extinct as a result of an activity within the environment, is simply becoming extinct as a result of the natural process of evolution. In this sense, La Boviere argues a shallow-ecologist viewpoint as we do not have a moral duty to limit or

behaviour as extinction is a part of evolution. However, this is not to say we should have free-hand in ~~eradicating~~ eradicating whole species. In this sense, shallow ecology differs from ~~the~~ the dominion view of rapture and end of time theologians. They wish to further ~~the~~ the destruction of the environment so as to bring about the ~~arrival~~ Armageddon and the second coming of the Messiah and therefore involve destructive activities such as hunting animals for sport / entertainment. In this regard, shallow ecology focuses on the idea that the environment does exist *pro vs* to us. Therefore, in order to avoid upholding this wrong, responsible stewardship must reject the view that the natural environment exist ^{solely} solely to serve humanity.

Similarly, Bentham's utilitarianism is also fairly alike to the sources of dominion and ~~of~~ shallow ecology. Bentham's ~~utilitarianism~~ utilitarianism sees that an action is moral if it delivers the greatest amount of pleasure and the least amount of pain for the greatest number of people.

involved. Therefore, Utilitarianism would judge destruction to the environment as it will benefit mankind. ~~that~~ Utilitarianism see complete instrumental value within the natural environment and only believe the environment is ours to use to despite the loss. So as to avoid appropriating this detrimental source, ~~the~~ responsible Stewardship must ~~not~~ reject the view that the environment exist solely to serve mankind.

To hold any dominion, shallow ecology or Utilitarianism as an approach could prove severe consequences. This can be illustrated through the case of the Indonesian rain forest. Currently, fires are burning are the 5'000km square of the Indonesian rain forest. These fires are intentionally set ~~a~~ so as to make way for ~~the~~ the plantation of palm ~~to~~ trees. Palm trees produce palm oil which is a cash crop used in various ~~cases~~ a variety of products ranging from ~~cosmetics~~ ^{cosmetics} to an ingredient within peanut butter. It is cheap and quick to produce

and therefore there is a high demand from companies looking to increase their profit margins. The expansion of palm oil plantation encompasses many environmental issues.

The first issue is deforestation. Thus, those the established rainforests are being ~~the~~ burned down so as to make way ~~from the~~ for the palm trees.

Additionally, the ~~plant~~ fires are producing major carbon dioxide emission.

In just three weeks, CO₂ emission equivalent to that of Germany's annual emission were produced. Moreover,

the destruction of the rainforests have resulted in the elimination of natural habitats, most notably for endangered

species such as the orangutans and Sumatran leopards and rhinos. Consequently

such animals are significant to maintain the biodiversity of the rainforests and ~~are~~ as it is therefore essential they are protected. Moreover,

the expansion of plantation has led to many local people within Indonesia being forced to take up job at the plantation as it has become their only means of

income & natural resources have been
depleted & reduced largely. From

From a dominion point of view, the
palm oil plantation are justified as
we have no moral duty to the environment
and can exploit it however we wish.

From the stance of shallow ecology, the
extinction of the animals would be
justified to the ^{natural} as it is merely the
process of evolution. Utilitarianism would
also justify the fire and plantation
expansion as it is providing much pleasure
to a huge amount of people ~~despite~~
and justifies the ^{actions} ~~consequences~~ for the ends
justifying the means.

If we were to view the case study
of Indonesia from a stewardship point
of view, it can be stated that
in the plantation we wrong due to
the effect it is having on man
(the local people) and God's creation
(the animals). Both deep ecology and
eco-theology would dispute the actions
and agree that the environment should be

respected and should not be destroyed at all expense.

In conclusion, responsible stewardship must reject the view that ~~the~~ ^{the} environment exists solely for the to serve mankind. This is because such a view is ~~not~~ taken on by dominion, shallow ecology and utilitarianism, all of which have severe effects on the natural world. Henceforth, stewardship must reject this view and in order to be responsible, must understand, like with deep ecology and eco-holism, that the natural world has intrinsic worth within itself and goes beyond just serving mankind.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate settles into serious debate in the second paragraph. This debate continues throughout the essay.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

There is a wide range of scholarship out there to be explored. It is important to know classical scholarship and also to read additional lesser known works to expand your thinking.

Question 3

EQUALITY IN THE MODERN WORLD

There were some outstanding answers in this area which demonstrated ample evidence of contemporary scholarship. Candidates rose to the challenge and investigated the many different responses in the Christian Church and the underlying reasons for this. The strongest candidates discussed and analysed the contradictions within a religion in their view of equality: this discussion led to the conclusion that liberal schools of thought were theologically correct in their understanding of equality and were the most challenging.

The standard of answers has improved in this question as candidates accessed broader research. The historicity of equality legislation, and its relevance for current thinking was addressed, at varying levels, by most candidates. In many instances, attitudes and legislation in the UK was compared to attitudes elsewhere. Some candidates addressed the extent to which religious views have contributed to equality and inequality. Most candidates were able to identify reasons for differing religious responses to issues of inequality and opted to investigate homosexuality and race. There were some good detailed answers on this and basic terms such as gender and homosexuality were thoroughly expounded. The candidates that did well were able to examine and comment on the implications of this issue in terms of ethical teaching. Candidates that opted to write about gender did incredibly well as they could discuss at length the variety of ethical responses and particularly the recent issue of the ordination of Bishops in the Anglican Church. However, there were instances of very incomplete or opinionated understanding of Roman Catholic teaching on homosexuality that lost a certain objectivity regarding the issues under discussion. Responses that concentrated on the inequality caused by homophobia were either done very well or very badly. Better answers clearly supported a discussion on homophobia with ethical theory and scientific argument and weaker answers were self-limiting with a one-sided argument with limited support.

There is a persistent problem in that a significant number of responses for this question were actually responses more suited to question 1 on medical ethics. Several candidates decided to write about abortion or euthanasia from the position of equality because they did not recognise their question and most failed to make this link coherent or sensible. Candidates must be clear about attempting the question they have prepared for. As with question 1, the best answers tended to be more aware of contemporary religious, ethical, and political controversy. One danger inherent in question 3 is the possibility that emotional advocacy becomes a substitute for ethics scholarship and background information. It is important that candidates are concerned by gender, race, and sexuality, but the passion and interest needs to be tied to genuine knowledge content. Some candidates did not refer to ethical theories at all and gave an account of the problems of homosexuality with an apparent disregard for the question. Some candidates linked their answer on equality to abortion and this was not always well argued or developed.

There were some powerfully stated answers on women's rights. Rather like the abortion questions, answers on gay equality issues tended to follow well-worn paths. It is not that candidates are marked down but rather that there is an upward levelling of standard which reaches a mark ceiling given the approach.

There is still little evidence of responses that deal with equality as a principle in moral philosophy and more able candidates could be encouraged to explore this approach. Some candidates, when discussing changes in the law, missed out on exploring the theoretical motivations behind the law and would have scored more highly under both assessment objectives if they had grappled with religious and philosophical influences for proposed or actual changes to the law. This level of thinking applies also to an exploration of what we mean by equality and how this is related to freedoms, rights and duties and how far religious and moral obligation encourages challenging the existence of inequality in the modern world. Naturally, any coherent response was duly credited.

This essay is an example of a weak study on prejudice. Whilst it is painful to see a candidate achieve at the lower range, the extract from this essay shows a clear lack of scholarship

expected at this level. GCSE standard material is credited accordingly and generally is indicative of insufficient research and in depth understanding of the topic.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Remember answer ONLY ONE question.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3

I will be examining and commenting upon the significance of religious and ethical principles in regards to equality in the modern world; I will do so through the topic of prejudice.

Prejudice is a large problem in society, it has been for many years, and although measures have been put in place ~~to~~ in attempt to achieve modern day equality, prejudice still exists in society.

Prejudice is having the hate for a certain group of people based on what has been taught to a person. They have this hatred and dislike without having experienced any wrong doing by that type of person themselves, even if they had, judgement should not be passed upon ~~the~~ a whole group, just because of the acts of a few.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The extract is unconvincing and lacks scholarship. The first page covered three points and did not go beyond a basic definition of prejudice.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

There is no substitute for in depth reading and research of relevant scholarship.

This essay presents a wide ranging discussion on matters of equality exemplified by attitudes to gender issues and sexuality. Coverage of the religious themes associated with this is very detailed and the candidate's clear understanding of the task resulted in a balanced discussion of homosexuality, female genital mutilation and transgender issues. The candidate could have made a slightly fuller evaluation of the material but had sufficiently demonstrated a clear and thorough understanding of the topic. The candidate attempted to cover a breadth of issues and overall produced a solid piece of work.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Remember answer ONLY ONE question.

Chosen question number: **Question 1 Question 2 Question 3**

In investigating sexual equality in the modern world, with specific reference to gender and sexuality it can be argued that religious principles are and aren't significant for establishing equality in the modern world.

God loves all people irrespective of sexual orientation, and the Bible teaches that Jesus came into this world not to condemn it, but to save it [John 3:17]. The Christian community should show compassion and understanding to those who find their sexuality a daily struggle and some

derogations have.

Homosexually orientated people have been subjected to hostility and ridicule. When AIDS first became apparent in 1959, it was seen as God's punishment to homosexuals, and homosexual men and behaviour was scorned. This being said some Christians within and out of the church argue that

homosexuality is as natural as someone having red hair, and it has been scientifically proven that homosexuality is ^{closely} linked with genetics. There aren't many references in ~~the Bible~~ to homosexuality in the Bible, but those that are there are all negative. Thus in the Old Testament law homosexuality is condemned as detestable as [Leviticus 18:22] and [Leviticus 20:13], ~~as~~ as well as the sin for which Sodom was destroyed was homosexual practice [Genesis 19:5].

In the New Testament, St Paul teaches that homosexuality is a sin and is on his list of sins. His teachings are quite explicit [1 Cor. 6:9-10]. Paul believed that homosexuality would have been gotten rid of when someone became Christian [1 Cor. 6:9-10]. Paul believed that homosexuality ~~became~~ ~~supposed~~ was a result of the fall [Romans 1:24-27] and constantly refers to how homosexuality is unnatural, and goes against God's ^{best} creative order. ^{to control bad reproduction.} [Romans 1:32] ~~with all these~~ ^{with all these negative} religious views and influence religions has on people through

teaching, ~~and~~ and propaganda such as godhatesgay.com from the western baptist church, it is possible to argue that there is no sexual equality in the modern world. Emphasising on the word 'community' where people come together and welcome each other should be for all and not exclude homosexuals. ~~The~~ The church claims that it does not condemn homosexual preference but rather homosexual practice, yet this hasn't been the case. John Scott said that: "homosexual people want to express themselves and be accepted

by the 'church' and John Stott agreed that: "if a church can't accept this then it shouldn't be called a church at all". This is acceptance of homosexually orientated people into the ordination of Gay priests.

An example of the ordination of Gay as a priest is in 2009, Rev'd Scott Rennie, ~~who~~ openly gay bishop, who had once been married but then got divorced. The congregation ^{of Aberdeen}, knowing he was gay, still wanted him as their minister. However the ~~the~~ General assembly of the Church of Scotland were against this and disarmed him for his sexual orientation.

Again this highlights the inequality in the world today, and ~~then~~ makes people question whether ^{if} there will ever be equality?

The ordination of women has also been a 'hot topic' for a very long time. There are both ~~opinion~~ ^{people} ~~and~~ ~~opinion~~ who are in favour of women being priest and some who aren't. This being said things began to 'look up' for women who wanted to be ordained in 1975, when the Church of England's General Synod meeting, where the

Archbishop of Canterbury said: "there is no fundamental objection to the ordination of women". This led to the first ordained woman in Bristol in 1994, and other small Christian groups were in favour of this. However over 1000 congregations were against this and argued that it was wrong, especially the Roman Catholic Church and East Orthodox Church. People who follow the Bible literally are influenced by Paul's teaching that "women should remain silent in church" and "women should not rule or ^{be} authoritative over men". [1 Corinthians 14:34] + [1 Timothy 2:12] this has been interpreted as limiting women's ~~roles~~ ^{roles} in the church. There can however be an argument for

The ordination of women. In the Old Testament times there were women prophetesses as well as prophets sent by God, such as Huldah in the time of King Josiah. Furthermore Paul does speak about 8 women well ~~Deuteronomy~~ [Romans 16:1], and Jesus though Jesus' apostles were all men, he did first reveal himself to women rather than his apostles and did have women accompany him on his journeys.

whom he had healed and who helped him and gave him supplies on ~~the~~ his travels [Mark 15: 41].

The Qur'an also has similar views on the liberty of women in Muslim law, and it is not just Christianity that should be analysed. Women aren't allowed to divorce, re-marry or have custody over their children. Verse 4:34 of the Qur'an states that; "women should not have authority over men" and this has been an important verse in Muslim law for the view on women. Feminists have interpreted this verse as limiting women's autonomy

and has set a traditional role that a woman is lesser than a man and that the man should have authority over the woman. Again this shows inequality in the world in the 21st century as people are influenced by their religions and look to religions for guidance and teaching, and if some of the oldest most well known scriptures teach people to do ~~this~~ and follow these rules or verses then it

is going to be a long time before there is any inequality in the modern world. This being said religions should not just be blamed for inequality in the modern world.

Female Genital Mutilation [FGM] is a procedure within Christian and Muslim societies that is forced upon ~~6000~~⁶⁰⁰⁰ girls everyday between the age of 7 days and 30, and is done using anaesthetic in mainly Asia and Middle Eastern countries, but also in the UK. The procedure is done to ~~the~~^{the} preference of the male as it makes the female more attractive, and that the male can have more sexual pleasure. There are

ethical issues that are raised from this because it can be argued that a girl of 7 days old can't make the decision to have this done as it is being decided by someone else. This is a cultural rather than a religious practice but it adds to the view that upbringing and culture are also what causes inequality in the modern world today.

It should be pointed out that today there is slow progress in terms of equality in certain parts of the world. For example in January 2014, an act was passed in Scotland to allow homosexual couples to be legally married, a 'step up' from the Civil Partnership union. However today there are different attitudes to homosexuality. For example in Russia, it is illegal to promote and teach children that it is ok to be gay. Including Russia, there are 79 countries where homosexuality is illegal, that's almost $\frac{1}{3}$ of the world's countries. Furthermore there have been very recent issues to do with transgender laws and people.

In North Carolina, in March 2016, an ^{HB2 law} ~~act~~ was passed ~~to state~~ which destroyed the laws to protect LGBT people, and stated that ^{transgender have H} people ~~should~~ use toilets ^{according} to the gender they were born with, so if ~~a male~~ someone was born male but changed their gender to female, they wouldn't

be allowed to use a female toilet. This has caused issues for the transgender party and the ~~po~~ general public people as a toilet is a time for privacy, and if someone with the resemblance of the opposite gender walks in, it could be an invasion of privacy. ~~This~~ Also this can be hard on the transgender community as they could be trying to adapt to their new gender, but making them follow this law discriminates them and could humiliate them. An average of 50% of transgender people have depression, because they feel trapped in the wrong body, with 40% of them who commit suicide. The reasons for which people are against this is

1 John:4 "let us love one another"

Because the Bible teaches ~~two~~ different messages and different people interpret the messages differently.

1 John:4 has been interpreted to argue for transgender community and against the HB2 law, specifically emphasising the "let us love one another"

This approach is similar to a Situation Ethicists approach, using agape to root their decisions. Here the principle of agape links with "let us love one another" like "loving thy neighbour". Here then it is argued that people should love transgender citizens in this case like they would love someone who isn't transgender and shouldn't discriminate.

On the other hand a big argument for the HB2 law and against transgender people is the verse Deuteronomy 22:5 "women should not wear men's clothes and women should not wear women's clothes" this is very clear and strongly influenced Christians would use this to argue against transgender people.

To conclude, it is true ~~as~~ is still very much inequality in the world today, and this has been for a variety of reasons, for example is doing something such as homosexual acts it is seen as breaking God's heart of love by some. Because of ~~the~~ very different sides and opinions there will always be arguments for and against certain things.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This essay covers a wide range of gender and sexuality issues and the supportive scholarship for each issue is clearly presented.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Invest time reading widely around your topic – this will help you to achieve good outcomes.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Do not ignore the question.
- A generic question is not best answered with a generic answer. The question is made up of two parts. The question itself and the generic phrase 'Examine and comment with reference to the topic you have investigated.' Answer the question.
- Use appropriate sources and, if possible, include recent scholarship.
- Well deployed material will show how well you understand your topic and how you are using your material to answer the question.
- Do not forget to comment on your material in relation to the question.
- Use your evidence to substantiate your argument.
- Comment on alternative views if you know them.
- Express your viewpoint clearly.
- Practice writing under timed conditions as part of your preparation.
- Do not spend too much time on your essay plan to the detriment of the essay itself.
- Write legibly.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.