

Examiners' Report
June 2016

GCE Religious Studies 6RS04 1B

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.

ResultsPlus

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 6RS04_1B_1606_ER

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

Introduction

There are two fundamental principles for examining this paper and these are based on the assessment objectives:

- One is that in AO1 it is essential to examine the text, noting there are various ways of achieving this.
- Two is that in AO2 it is essential to answer the full demands of this evaluative objective. This includes: 'do you agree with the idea(s); justify your point of view and discuss its implications for understanding religion and human experience'.

At Standardisation meetings examiners considered three important documents for assessment and marking. First, the General Marking Guidance document sets out the policy of positive marking. Secondly, the Generic Mark Scheme divides each level across both AO1 and AO2 into 3 sublevels and this is helpful to achieve precise marking. Finally, the indicative mark scheme is not intended to be prescriptive but to indicate possible legitimate ways of answering a question. The teams of examiners, by adopting these policies, have a broad and detailed understanding of the assessment process.

There has been a pattern over several years that candidates have produced excellent and outstanding answers and this continued this year.

Question 1

Good practice re AO1:

- Candidates showed evidence of a systematic focus on the passage, noting that this may be achieved via a variety of methods.
- Engagement with the ethical issues, including accurate analysis of the debates in Schneewind's passage.
- Candidates were proficient in their use of terms such as 'autonomy' and 'virtue'.
- Candidates presented synoptic links to the source as a whole, to the related anthologies of LaFollette and Jamieson and to links in other units such as 6RS03.
- There was good use of various ethical theories together with an ability to focus on significant features such as the primary precepts of Aquinas and ideas about the mean in Virtue Ethics.
- There was wide ranging scholarship to unpack key issues such as the respective roles of benevolence and self-interest. Candidates included some of the following used across both AOs:

Aristotle

Ayer

Bentham

Fletcher

Hobbes

Hume

Kant

Moore

Rawls

Ross

Rousseau.

Good practice in AO2:

- The best answers in part (b) struck a balance between insightful personal engagement with a critical analysis of the implications for understanding religion and human experience.
- There were interesting debates arising from Hobbes and issues about self-interest and the view that we naturally desire the good of others.
- This included thoughtful debates about 'freedom'.
- Some developed implications by way of a discussion about ethical language and also from anthropology with cultural relativism plus sociology and psychology and their ethical significance.

Areas for improvement for AO1:

- A comparatively small number of candidates disregarded the passage. An examination of the passage is essential, noting that there are various different methods of achieving this. However, to ignore the passage is very poor practice.

- Some presented a mere comprehension of the passage with little analysis or comment on significant points.
- Some mentioned a few scholars but at this level there was limited understanding of their contributions.

Areas for improvements for AO2:

- Some answers did little more than express an opinion, making sweeping claims, without supporting justifications with the ideas of scholars.
- More attention could have been given to alternative views of a topic and this is one of the criteria for Level 4.
- There was a limited ability to comprehend the implications for religion and human experience.

There are three scripts below all of which gained full marks:-

- the first one displayed excellent analysis of the passage, together with a full answer to AO2 with its arguments and debates about implications;
- the second displayed very good conceptual analysis, including the use of 'autonomy' across both AO1 and AO2;
- the third showed detailed scholarly analysis in AO1 and range of relevant topics in AO2 including Virtue Ethics.

a) In this passage, Schneewind addresses the debate that preoccupied 18th Century philosophy, surrounding the source of morality; how does it stem from human nature, rather than an external divine authority, scholars debated whether this nature was fundamentally benevolent, or self-interested, and how this distinction impacted morality. Assuming the autonomy of the moral agent, debates also addressed the source of morality in terms of it being from 'feeling' or 'reason'. This discussion exists as part of Schneewind's attempt in this essay to chronicle the development of modern moral philosophy after ideas of the highest good were rejected on a pragmatic level.

In earlier sections of his essay, Schneewind identifies 17th Century philosophy prior to this as derivative of natural law tradition developed from Aquinas. This saw humans as acting within the purpose + social order prescribed by God, accessed through human reason (so universal) and for the benefit of all. Modern "developments" of this adapted this idea of morality coming "from reason" (as Schneewind points out in this passage) through the notion of a social contract. Grotius firstly proposed that societies could be formed through mutual acceptance of laws, while Hobbes took a more cynical view of humans, not as reasonable, but fundamentally self-interested - a view this passage draws upon. He believed the natural state of man was chaotic - a life "nasty, brutish + short" - and morally resulted as a social contract, sacrificing individual rights for the

collective protection of the government or supreme ruler. Locke, subsequently, advocated the idea of inalienable human rights (to life, health, liberty + property) that cannot be challenged by any ruler, though still believing morality to be imposed to a larger extent in political societies. These natural lawyers, then, proposed that morality is the product of rational agreement + reason to pursue our best interests.

A challenge to this, (Schneewind ^{arguer} ~~arguer~~), came from Shafterbury + others arguing that morality is rather a result of 'feelings'. Shafterbury believed we possess moral faculties that distinguish us from animals for moral action, and believed we act only on those we approve, which are predominantly those benevolent + social. Thus, as Schneewind has pointed out, this debate between feeling + reason also draws on ideas of human nature: as ^{inclined towards} ~~intrinsically~~ benevolence or self-interest.

Shafterbury's ideas of motivation to do the right thing are echoed by theories such as Natural Moral Law, which emphasises the internal act as greatly important (+ must coincide with the cardinal virtues). Kant's Deontology also believed motivation/intention to be fundamental to morality (as Schneewind later

discusses); Kant saw the good will (or duty for duty's sake) as the only moral motivation for action (e.g. Frances Inglis - who ~~loved~~^{enthralled} her son out of love & mercy for him - would not be acting morally, as she was not acting out of duty).

Nevertheless, this debate addressed a question central to Schopenhauer's essay, and indeed to the development of Modern Moral Philosophy, as to how far human beings are autonomous. Rejecting ideas of an external source of morality (e.g. as Divine Command Theory proposes), this period of ethics proposed that morality could be centred around human nature itself & the autonomous individual. Kant emphasised this idea (the categorical imperative demanding we formulate our own moral duties through reason), though later it was challenged by Hegel & sociologists of structural or macro approaches (like Comte & Marx) who believed that the individual is shaped by forces beyond his control - the moral community. Nevertheless, in this passage, Schopenhauer points to the debate as being centrally based on autonomy at this stage, whether coming from our "moral feelings of approval or disapproval" or our

intuitive faculties (as Whorrell & Sidgwick later draw on). Such a debate perhaps links to meta-ethical debates in contemporary philosophy, which address whether ethical language is simply an expression of feelings, as Emotivists like Ayer suggest - or whether it can be said to express objects moral truth, evident to the intuition of the mature mind (Intuitionists like Moore & Rawls argue for this view). Either way, LaFollette points out, morality is something universally accessible (as we all have feelings & intuitions in this way). Jameson, similarly, draws upon this idea by arguing that moral theorising is a universal & everyday process, not confined to the "domains of professional".

Questions over human nature remain relevant. Schreier also addresses these, as in this debate, Schreier points out, and while some believe in a natural inclination to the good, others also affirmed self-interest or something that may nevertheless help others ultimately. For example, some pointed to the pleasure being virtuous may give us. Arguably, such a position is reflected in Virtue Ethics, as fulfilling our telos and being virtuous, were said by Aristotle to result in eudaimonia -

happiness or human flourishing. Others, in contrast, point out that in helping others, they will be inclined to help us back, thus benefiting ourselves. ^(e.g. 'pay it forward' schemes) Thus, overall, this key debate of human nature highlighted that "even a selfish human nature could then be seen as expressing itself through morality." It is in this way that morality centred on ideas not of an external source imposing morality on human nature, but morality as an expression of this human nature, allowing us to be self-governing.

b) With the discussion of human nature Schreier draws upon here, I agree that there is evidence to suggest humans "naturally desire the good of others" as challengers to Hobbes proposed. Such a position receives support from Natural Moral Law - Aquinas viewed humans as inherently good, and so any immorality is simply the result of being mistaken in following an apparent good. Moreover, to say otherwise would have implications for religion, as it would challenge the

idea we are made in the image of God.
Psychological evidence from ^{Prof. Paul} Bloom also supports
this idea, with 70% of ~~babies~~ ^{babies} in his study
choosing the 'good' puppet in the morality play
he employed. De Waal also reinforces this idea of
inclination to the good: he views empathy as an
"automated response" against the 'machiavellian
might' of human nature seen in Hobbes.

However, there is also evidence suggesting
humans are fundamentally self-interested.
LaFollette indeed discusses how people often
demonstrate partiality to their loved ones, rather
than equally distributing attention to others.
Dawkins, in addition, points to morality's origins
as reciprocal altruism + evolution, aiding our
own survival to cooperate. Therefore, self-interest
may be inherent to human nature to a
greater extent than benevolence. Nevertheless, I
think it remains evident that both may lead
to moral outcomes in terms of helping others
(and, as Ayn Rand proposes, even selfishness may
result in morality.)

However, this idea has implications for religious
ethics: morality is not seen to come from a
divine law giver, but from ^{autonomous} human nature itself.

Such a new master God - as the external authority previously imposing moral laws - is greatly redundant. Divine Command Theory (where to do good we must follow God's commands) is proven false. However, in terms of human experience, morality becomes a universal process all can take part in, and we are given moral autonomy. I think this autonomy is greatly important + beneficial for morality; rather than being slaves to moral laws, we may decide for ourselves what is right. As Ruckliff states "one shouldn't simply obey religious books. To be a moral agent is to be an autonomous + self-directed agent." Theories like Deontology + Utilitarianism support this (offering rational means like the Hedonic Calculus for all to reach our morality), as well as Situation Ethics, in the principle of particularism - the decision to act in Christian love must be freely chosen says Fletcher. The importance of autonomy is also highlighted by modern emphases ^{on} ~~in~~ democracy, condemning places like North Korea for their totalitarianism, as well as the rise in subjectivism + relativism (as Schaeffner and later points out) - we believe today that people are entitled to make their own decisions + have

their own beliefs. However, McIntyre does
criticise this culture of relativism and the
moral decay it has lead to; D. Janer Kennedy
even writes, "the idea is now widespread that
each individual has a sovereignty right to
create, develop & express whatever moral values
he or she wishes. Therefore, it is arguable that
autonomy has been stretched too far today,
and we should return to common ways of
living. This is something Schreier and draws on in
concluding his essay, suggesting that recently we
have ~~increased~~ ^{shifted} from the emphasis on autonomy,
the ideas of communal or public morality;
with issues such as global warming, Zika
virus, or gender inequality becoming widespread
in awareness & importance, this idea is
something I also agree with, as these issues
and their consequences on human experience
become more crucial.

© This is a suggestion Home, subsequently argues that
we believed we are motivated not by reason,
but by sentiment or moral feeling.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The above script displays excellent analysis of the passage, together with a full answer to AO2 with its arguments and debates about implications.

A) This passage is when Schreier discusses about autonomy. Shafferburg is arguing that we may have a moral sense to tell us what's right and wrong and everything may not come from God and we can choose. However we're still left with the problem of how do we know what's right and wrong. Schreier believed that we look to others to see if they approve or disapprove with our acts which relates to virtue ethics that concentrates morality should concentrate on the person and the choices they make, Aristotle's idea of Eudaimonia. However it may be due to intuition we know right and wrong and we should look to Ross's or Prichard's view. However to fully understand this we need to go to the start of Schreier's essay.

Schreier opens his essay by discussing where we get the idea of good from, before we looked to God however more and more people don't believe in God so where does good come from? He concludes by saying moral philosophers look at issues concerning public morality rather than problems of autonomous individuals.

Firstly he discusses divine command (DC) and that Montague argued that Christianity is

an imperative religion to live by, the standard of the Bible is too strict for anyone to live by and to reach heaven. We should follow the laws of our country instead. Christianity is no longer helpful in issues within society such as murder since the Bible has examples of death and the Church allowed the crusades despite the 6th commandment 'Do not kill'. There are also different types of Christianity that follow different rules, the Catholics recognise authority of the Pope whereas protestants do not. Even to this day these two denominations fight one another in Ireland.

Schreier then discusses natural moral law (NML) which is the first push away from Autonomy. We should look to Aquinas's idea ~~that~~ ~~what~~ ~~aspect~~ of NML, that his theory was absolutist and deontological and focused on the efficacy of acts. NML helps humans to reach eternal destiny with God. Strengths of this theory include that it supports that humans have instincts of right and wrong. However a weakness is that the idea that we all have a common purpose. eg is Mother Theresa wrong to devote her life to the poor. God has created it's natural to protect what's ours, we base it on different reasons but it's natural to do so. We want the best for ourselves so need a government

for peace and order so we can achieve our goals. Hobbes argued "we seek power after power to protect ourselves from death" he is saying we need a government since there'll be constant conflict which will lead to death since its human nature to survive.

Schrawind then discusses a social contract, which is a minimalist theory of rights where the individual is to be morally bound only by the 'I won't harm you and you won't harm me doctrine' this was expressed by Vardy. We all enter social contracts eg in a school we wear uniform for the betterment of the school. Hobbes believed we base right and wrong on a social contract and not God. Locke's idea of NML was that humans are unruly and we need punishment and morality imposed on us. This is the end of NML, it's made it's point. People look at morality from a different view from the 18th century.

Bayle argued "Atheists could form a decent society". This shocked most people since they believed we get morality from God. We now reach the passage where Shakesbury is arguing that we may have a moral sense and everything may not come from God and maybe we can choose? This led to debates in the 18th century of how much we do out of love and self

interest. Socrates still ~~is~~ questioned how do we know what's right and wrong? He believed we look at others to see if they approve or disapprove of our acts. This relates to virtue ethics (VE) since it believed morality should concentrate on the person not the choices they make. We should look to Aristotle's idea that we should develop and use qualities that'll benefit society and achieve Eudaimonia. Since we're looking at the move from DC to autonomy we can also look at Taylor's idea of VE and that reason is essential for the use of ethics and religion steps us from using this. He concluded VE has more to offer the individual than Christianity. Strengths of VE include that it's flexible, the Golden mean allows for extreme courage or restraint in certain situations - do what we feel is necessary. However a weakness is that the Golden mean doesn't work for every virtue, some virtues aren't a midpoint but just inherently good.

On the other hand is it because of intuition we know right and wrong. Pritchard's idea that we have two forms of thinking - moral and general. Then we should always use our intuition to give an idea of right and wrong. There's also Ross's idea that moral principles can't be absolute since they conflict and we have prima facie duties which we don't need to experience to understand.

understand. Strengths included that it allows for everyone to have a specific set of beliefs. However a weakness is that intuitions can be seen as meaningless since its non-verifiable. Are we generally moral or does it come from being selfish - this is what VE dictates we choose acts that benefit us. Does it even matter if we're selfish? ~~Yes~~ For religion yes but we can still be selfish and moral at the same time.

He likes the ~~the~~ idea of VE and we do acts we gain nothing out of eg being being a parent. He believed his principle governs ~~morally~~ morality - we value qualities that are useful to us and qualities that aren't aren't virtues. When it ~~comes~~ comes to the question ^{does it matter if} ~~are~~ we selfish? He concludes what benefits society is following the ~~rules~~ ^{rules} of justice.

Finally we reach the end of Schreier's discussion on autonomy where he discusses Kant. Kant believed we should act out of strict duty to the moral law and choose maxims that can be universalised. He believed we should use reason and not look towards God. He concluded we shouldn't depend on external motivation to be good but because we want to and have the ability to. We are now fully autonomous.

Schreier then discusses strengths and weaknesses of autonomy. He looks to Bentham

and we should make calculations and use the Hedonic calculus however we don't have the time for this. Mill argued we should use our ~~self~~ common sense and only use the Hedonic calculus in ~~the~~ unusual cases. Whell and Sidwick believed we should use our intuition and then use utilitarianism to test our intuition - then we get the idea of right and wrong. Hartman believed we use our emotion to give money to the beggar since we have sympathy for him. Moore also agreed with Hartman, we trust our gut feeling.

Schreierman believes the community is more important than the individual and that Kant was wrong. Hegel believed that what's right and wrong depends if the community likes our acts. Comte and Marx also agreed that the individual isn't important. Comte used a scientific approach whereas Marx used an economic approach and argued society is corrupt as long as we have different social classes - we need to get rid of these so everyone can be treated equally.

Finally he Schreierman discusses Nihilism that's the idea God is dead. Nietzsche argued "God is dead" and we should have our own morals and be who you want to be not who ought to be. Anthropology encouraged Westermarck to ask if moral knowledge even exists. Sartre had his own religious existentialist argument that nothing makes

you, you apart from you. Schlick believed all beliefs should pass a scientific test otherwise they're meaningless. He concluded religious language is meaningless.

Schreier finally concludes that modern philosophy is going three ways, firstly we write about ethics of something eg abortion, secondly we make a return to modern VE and look to Anscombe, Foot and Taylor and thirdly that we work together in a group to solve world problems.

Bi) Schreier discusses the transition from ~~autonomy~~^{to} autonomy and gives us three ways ethics/philosophy is heading.

Firstly he believed we got the moral principles from absolute values from God eg Abraham and Isaac, God tells Abraham to kill his son and just before this God stops him, God was just seeing Abraham's dedication to him.

We can use a modern example of the Pope who Catholics believe is God's messenger. Schreier believed in ancient times we're like this however society is changing.

The period of enlightenment was a period where people were sceptical to teachings of the church, and resorted to science and experimental methods. It was also the period of Kant who was influenced by rationalism and empiricism. Schreier believed that Kant ~~was~~ encouraged people to think ~~about~~ for themselves and not ~~to~~ resort to God.

However are we even fully autonomous?

According to Nietzsche we are, he says 'God is dead. God remains dead, we have killed him' he's arguing society doesn't need God we should have our values.

If God is dead then religion is dead especially Christian morality. He wanted humans to be responsible for our acts and make our decisions and not ~~be~~ look to faith.

He was against objective moral values however he didn't know where these values come from if not God.

He believed morals have a history development rather than just being there. He wanted people to have our values and be a 'superman' which is one who ~~not~~ realises the potential of being a human being and not consoled by a belief of life after death. He concluded Christianity is the cause of slave morality.

Like Sartre argued ~~we~~ for humans to live ~~we~~ ~~we~~ shouldn't be ~~b~~ should be aware of our situation and not look to myths/lies. He would've said 'Christianity is a delusion that rises from people's needs' he's arguing Christianity thrives through people's needs and only turn to it because they're scared. Nietzsche and Sartre wanted humans to be responsible for their act and face realities of life.

~~The~~ Their ideas link to Anscombe idea of VE that moral obligation is flawed. Ethical systems that establish rules after idea of God has been abandoned are incoherent. The law 'can't smoke

in a car with under 18's present' is difficult to enforce however VE agrees we should obey the law because want to achieve Eudaimonia. We should be educated on why smoking is wrong. This ground up approach worked for society's attitude to her, people lived on animal rights changed and the ~~fer-~~ demand of her fell.

~~the~~ However the problem with Anscombe is that it relies on public opinion - morality is due to upbringing. The Eddington brothers were found guilty of GBH, grew up in a unhealthy environment. This is a major downfall for Anscombe since if we're fully autonomous is it okay for us to act like this? If there was a DC theory maybe this would've been prevented.

Even though there are criticisms she's ~~right~~ right to base ~~glo eth~~ morality on global ethics and ground up ethics. Individual justice can't work since it presumes we use people as means to and end - it's based on social ~~contract~~ contract. However for Anscombe we ~~to~~ help one another and try to achieve eudaimonia.

We should ~~to~~ look at ethics from a global view and look to ~~St~~ Singer's idea of ~~global~~ global ethics, that we're ~~not~~ responsible for the starving child and we have a right to universal morality. Children in third world countries who make our western designer clothes have horrible working conditions and sometimes even die. Even if we aren't buying these clothes or involved

with what's happening we should still be responsible. Once we've accepted we have global justice we can have a theory that benefits the less fortunate since we live in a society where acts benefit the rich and powerful and the poor and vulnerable are ~~shared~~ ignored by society.

Overall I do believe that we're better off as autonomous individuals, Anscombe, Nietzsche and Sartre are right. However ~~this~~ it may be difficult for everyone to be autonomous since society are going back to DC of ~~IS who punish~~ IS who punish people if they don't conform to their idea of God. Also the Western Baptist Church who believe that God is punishing us since we've allowed ~~gangs~~ homosexuals into our society. Nietzsche would just argue that these society should be their own superman and have our values. A superman is one who has mastered himself and is a law unto himself. We should look to Anscombe's idea of VE and ignore moral obligations and only choose acts since because we want to do them and achieve Eudaimonia. We should incorporate this idea to Singer's idea of ~~God~~ global justice where everyone can be treated fairly and we all have responsibility and are equal. This relates to Marx who argued society is corrupt since we have different social classes and get rid of them so we can all be equal.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This script displays very good conceptual analysis, including the use of 'autonomy' across both AO1 and AO2.

This passage is at the start of Schreier and when he is discussing the movement away from ~~divine command~~ Divine Command ~~to~~ towards autonomy. In order for there to be a full understanding of this passage we must first look back at the start of Schreier's argument.

In Schreier's introduction he states that ancient ~~personal~~ philosophy was on virtue and the highest good. Christianity was the highest good and following God's commands. However, now there is less emphasis on God and there are many ways to live. Moral philosophy attempted to answer the question how can we know good without God or nature. Morality went from an external source to an internal basis, morality was based upon autonomy and there was emphasis on moral philosophy on public morality.

The first movement ~~away~~ away from ~~the~~ Divine Command towards autonomy was Montaigne. He stated that it was impossible to live to Christian standards. He rejected Christianity and ~~put~~ preferred laws in society and our moral laws. In the light of ~~the~~ Protestantism splitting Europe at the time he suggested that we look beyond religious

principles. The most durable tradition was Aquinas's natural law because it was human reason without God. Classic natural law was about living in God's society and morality showed God's glory whilst modern natural law was you choose your purpose and morality tells you how to do it. Hugo Grotius stated that rights are a natural attribute of an individual and we are social by nature.

Hobbes in the book of Leviathan stated we are not social but self-interested: We seek power to protect us from death and need a sovereign powerful enough to enforce peace. He stated that social morality was from a social contract, so man and not God are the law makers. John Locke stated that there are limits to government but we need the threat of punishment so people behave. ~~John~~ Peter Bayle made a shocking claim that a group of atheists can form a decently ordered society.

This leads into the passage. Earl of Shaftesbury firstly states that we have a moral faculty which enables us to judge our own motives. The first paragraph of the passage is discussing the debate of self-interest or benevolence. This is

whether we just care about ourselves or others also. Hobbes is the main advocate of us being self-interested in order for us to achieve our goals. Benevolence on the other hand is in most ethical theories ~~not~~

~~Shakespeare~~ There is also a debate of whether morality comes from reason or from feelings. Morality coming from reason is consistent with Kant and deontology. Deontology is actions are right or wrong independent of consequences. Kant believes reason is ~~the~~ man's defining quality and this is why humans can never be used as means or exploited etc. He states that humans are the most important ^{feature} ~~equation~~ in a moral ~~equation~~ equation and that we can reason out what is right ~~or~~ or wrong.

~~In~~ In contrast, David Hume believes that morality is based upon feelings. He believes that feelings ^{move} ~~move~~ us to action and reason alone would never do so. Hume believes that we see ~~more~~ ^{more} towards things that we approve of and ~~disapprove~~ ^{disapprove} and things that we disapprove of or that cause us harm.

The next paragraph in the passage is stating that virtue is working for the good of others. Virtue ethics dates back to Aristotle who stated people want to be happy in like which is eudaimonia. He stated we want happiness as a free member in society ~~as~~ with ~~no~~ concern for our own and others interests. He believed that extremes of behaviour were unhelpful so we should strive for a golden mean. For example cowardice and rashness are two extremes of behaviour but courage is the golden mean. He then explained that we should practice our virtues like an ~~athlete~~ athlete ~~as~~ has a routine to develop his/her skills, 'we are what we ~~are~~ repeatedly do, excellence then is not a ~~best~~ act but a habit'. We should develop our ~~our~~ virtues so they become habitual. Finally we should follow the example of ~~a~~ virtuous people who have lived such as Martin Luther King, Jesus, ~~Gandhi~~ Gandhi.

In the paragraph it also explains intuitionism. This is direct moral insight. We can intuit things to know whether they are right or wrong and these are self evidently true. This paragraph is explaining that if we are virtuous and follow a virtuous way then we will act ~~to~~ for ~~the~~ the good of

ones as well as ourselves. This is consistent with situation ethics which is unconditional love. It is love without liking and wanting the best for everyone. An example of this in the Bible is the story of the good Samaritan. The Samaritan helped a Jew who was injured even though they were meant to be enemies.

Schneewind's argument he goes on to discuss Hume and that ~~we~~ feelings move us to action. Hume ~~also~~ also stated that we are sometimes ~~self~~ self-interested but also have desires to help others. Kant states that morality comes from human nature. We have to be free to be moral and morality is following absolute duties. We must act in a way in which everyone can act and we must know what is right because we know what is good. Kant believed that we should suppress our emotions in order to be moral while Hume stated that feelings dictate morality. Thomas Reid rejected Hume

and ~~is~~ believed in ~~some~~ common sense morality which is use of principles which we can all use and apply intuitively. Bentham rejected Reid's view because he also thought we are self-interested and believed one utilitarian principle was a rational way of decision making.

Even though Bentham thought his way was a good way to make decisions it made you do impossible calculations. Whewell stated that we all have intuitions of what morality requires. Sidgwick stated ~~some~~ intuitionism needs utilitarianism to solve moral disputes. G.E. Moore stated there is no value in facts but there is in intuitions of goodness of things such as beauty. Intuition is moral insight but doesn't help us solve moral disputes unlike Kant and utilitarianism which ~~is~~ are rational ways to solve disputes.

Hegel rejected Kant and believed that morality comes from society and is not an individual choice. Montaigne and Nietzsche rejected laws binding by all. Nietzsche stated there is no impersonal guide to action; one must decide what type of person they want to be and strive to do so. Schlick stated that theories should have to pass tests

otherwise they are meaningless. More and More started but morality should solve moral disputes and improve happiness which is consistent with virtue ethics.

Finally the new direction was Kant who believed that ~~act~~ ~~as~~ actions are right or wrong regardless of ~~the~~ consequences. There is also a move back to Aristotle ethics with Bernard Williams and Alasdair MacIntyre who believe morality is in virtue not abstract principles.

b) I do agree with the ideas expressed in the passage. Firstly we are fully autonomous because God is no longer our source of morality. When you examine God's morality it raises a few questions. The story of Abraham and Isaac, where God forced Abraham to sacrifice Isaac but at the last ~~moment~~ ~~minute~~ stopped him. ~~show~~ but this shows that God is more of a dictator than the all-loving God. Also the Euthyphro dilemma is another name for God. Socrates tells Euthyphro 'is something ~~god~~ right because the gods demand it or is something right because it is right'. Does God create morality or does he just enforce it. ~~to~~ ~~these~~ things such as homosexual marriage being

legal ~~and~~ which is forbidden in the Bible
it is clear we are moving away from God.

Nietzsche states 'God is ~~dead~~ dead, he
remains dead and ^{you} ~~we~~ have killed him'. This
means God is no longer relevant in society
and people should stand on their own two feet
and decide who may want to be.

So without God what type of ethics should
we follow. Kant's deontology states that we should
follow rules and good is doing our duty.
We should follow the categorical imperative which
is 'You ought to do X regardless'. # Consequences
of actions are irrelevant and we follow our obligations
rather than acting how we would like. This
is a top down system which gives you laws
to follow ~~whether you will be~~ or else.

Anscombe is a major critique of top down
system. She states that to have laws you
need an ultimate lawgiver ^{to} enforce them. Since
most people under God are dead or irrelevant
then they are flawed because there is no punishment
for not obeying laws. An example of this is the
police department criticised the government for passing

a law stating it is illegal to smoke in a car with a person under 18 years of age.

Laws like these are simply unenforceable and people have no inclination to follow the laws. This is the same for top down theories so they are flawed.

Another ethics on the other hand is a ground up system which focuses on the agent. The agent develops themselves in order to better not only for themselves but for society. It is about striking a golden mean between two extremes of behaviors and developing your virtues.

This theory is realistic because virtuous people such as Jesus, Martin Luther King and Gandhi have lived so we should follow their examples. This theory can also work because people's opinions keep change.

~~The major problem~~ For example wearing fur became very unpopular because people understood how producers made it and even though it is not illegal to wear fur it is looked down upon.

The major problem in this theory is the practicality of it. Robert Louden explains that if a woman is to give birth ~~what is the~~ to a disabled child what is the virtuous thing to do.

You only know in hindsight. For example a
a ~~man~~ ^{mom} and dad died trying to save ~~their~~ their
children in the floods in Portugal in 2003.
What was the virtuous thing to do because if
they stayed there they would have been ~~goals~~
confronted but trying to save them was a noble
decision. What would the courageous thing to do

We shouldn't have a communitarian view.

Rawls veil of ignorance explains that if we
didn't know ~~our~~ ^{our} status in society then we
would treat each other equally. But rich people
aid the poor such as Bill Gates giving
a lot of his wealth to charity.

We need global justice. Peter Singer used
the example of the drowning child. If a child
was drowning in front of you would you save
~~the~~ him at little cost to yourself. The answer would
be yes. So when technological advances we
are able to help out people in other parts of
the world at very little cost to ourselves.
~~that we do things~~ ~~to~~ such as buying clothes from

To conclude I firstly ~~to~~ believe that we need virtue ethics. Even though the practicality of the theory is an issue theories based on rules are pointless without a law giver. Real change comes from people and their souls rather than laws. We also need global justice because we can help others at ~~little~~ little expense to ourselves. When we buy clothes from Primark we are making a person in a third world country work long hours for little pay and when we ~~we~~ get in a car the harmful gases cause global warming which affects peoples health across the world. We are quick to affect peoples lives in a negative way so we should act them in a positive way.

On the other hand, ~~to~~ have we really moved away from God. With the rise of ISIS and other religious groups are we doing a full circle and returning back to divine command.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The above script shows detailed scholarly analysis in AO1 and range of relevant topics in AO2 including Virtue Ethics.

Paper Summary

This paper was first examined in 2010. It has been a significant and worthwhile feature of the current specification, enabling candidates to study sources in detail and to develop synoptic links.

In 2018 the new A level specification will be first examined (with AS in 2017). The new A level develops the opportunity to study sources. All A level components have anthologies, normally with four sources and these will have a compulsory question on all A level papers. The Ethics sources consist of Barclay on Situation Ethics; Kant on Deontology; Aristotle on Virtue Ethics and Wilcockson on euthanasia.

It can be noted that the ideas in the current anthologies can continue to be used in various ways across the new specification.

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.