



Teacher Resource Bank

GCE Religious Studies

Unit RST3A Religion and Ethics

June 2011 Examination Candidate Exemplar Work



2011 (June) Unit 3A *Religion and Ethics*

Example of Candidate's Work from the Examination

Grade B

- 01 Explain the concepts of the personality and the moral self in libertarianism. (30 marks) AO1

Candidate Response

Freedom is defined by the psychologist Valentine as being a voluntary decision, made only by the person making the decision. There are three main theories which explain how much freedom human beings have. These are hard determinism, soft determinism and libertarianism. The two determinist theories believe that, to some extent, all human behaviour has a cause whereas libertarianism completely reject determinism and accept free will and moral responsibility.

The main concepts of libertarianism are the personality and the moral self. These basically explain how and why human beings make free choices. The libertarianism theory in general has been explained by CA Campbell, who explained that human beings see themselves as free agents and therefore accept moral responsibility for their actions. All libertarians believe that every single choice, decision or action a person makes is down to them alone. They must accept responsibility for these actions and face any consequences that may come their way.

Libertarians would use the case of John Venable and Robert Thompson to demonstrate this. They were two boys aged ten and eleven who tortured and murdered three year old Jamie Bulger. While hard determinists would claim that this behaviour had a cause and the boys could not be held morally responsible, or soft determinists would argue that their actions were affected by their upbringing, libertarians would maintain that only they made the decision to carry out that act. They were free agents and therefore morally responsible.

To some extent, their behaviour could be explained by the concept of personality. This is basically saying that people make decisions and carry out certain actions as a result of their values and personality. For example, an individual who had a violent upbringing may become violent in later life. This is because violence has become a part of their personality and is therefore one way of explaining their behaviour. However, the personality can be overcome by the moral self.

Libertarians believe that a persons moral self can counteract their personality. This means that the person may decide to do an action which goes against their own self interest, instead acting out of duty to others or the greater good. Essentially, they choose to overcome their personality by themselves. For many people, this is hard to do and instead they make decisions based on their personality. For example, John Demjanuk was a nazi guard during World War II. Rather than using his moral self to choose to go against the nazi regime, he used his personality and thus is morally responsible for all of his actions (i.e the deaths of thousands of Jews).

Commentary

The first paragraph stands as an introduction for the whole answer. It doesn't really answer the question, but it sets the scene. Many candidates use this technique; it steadies them and allows them thinking time. It also helps them put the answer in context. (However, they might be better advised to spend those few minutes writing an essay plan which would serve them better.)

The second paragraph begins well. However, the rest of it is about the concept of libertarianism, which was not the specific focus of the question.

The third paragraph also had potential by mentioning the foci of the question, but didn't develop the themes of 'personality' and 'moral self'. The example of Venables and Thompson was relevant but was also not fully developed.

The example is developed further in the fourth paragraph, but in the abstract.

The concept of 'moral self' is returned to in the last paragraph. Another example is also used, but only developed from one side. (It is also debateable that Demyanuk's personality overrode his moral self.)

Overall, a good attempt at the question, showing quite a lot of understanding, but not making the most of the examples cited. Consequently, it was felt that it could just be placed into the level 6 band; 'generally thorough', 'almost all accurate and mainly relevant.'

02 'In libertarianism there is no moral responsibility.'

Assess this claim.

(20 marks) AO2

Candidate Response

Many people would instantly disagree with the claim that 'in libertarianism there is no moral responsibility'. One of the main concepts of libertarianism is that human beings are morally responsible for all of their actions. This is because all acts involve a conscious processing of the decision being made, which therefore means the individual making the decision is weighing up both sides of the choice (i.e. should I do this or not). Ultimately the person makes the decision and obviously must be held accountable for the decision.

However others would agree with the statement. Hard determinists in particular would argue that libertarianism fails to take into account just how much human beings are influenced by factors such as genetics, upbringing and religious views despite referring to it as part of libertarianism theory i.e. personality. They'd say that any act which is in any way affected by something other than the conscience of the individual is not a free act, and therefore the person involved simply cannot be held morally responsible.

It could also be argued that a person cannot be morally responsible for an action, if they are being forced or coerced into a decision. For example, in Sophie's Choice a mother is forced to choose which one of her two children would die, otherwise they both would be killed. She cannot be morally responsible for the death of her children despite using her free will to make the decision according to both hard and soft determinists.

Libertarians on the other hand would maintain that a person is always morally responsible for any decision they make, even if they are being forced into a decision. The individual could simply not decide, and would not be responsible for the action. Determinists would counter this again, saying that even not deciding is making a decision and something bad could still happen (such as both children dying in Sophies Choice) however would maintain that they are not completely morally responsible.

In conclusion, most people would disagree to a certain extent that there is no moral responsibility. However, they'd concede that this may not necessarily be the case in extreme circumstances such as a person being forced to make a decision contrary to their own wishes and desires.

Commentary

An obvious discussion, with 2 clear points of view, and a conclusion of sorts. As above, these should have been developed further and with examples.

The candidate also loses focus in the third paragraph. If there is coercion, then it is hard to see how it can be libertarianism. There is further lack of focus with the candidate talking about determinism.

Views are explained with some supporting evidence and arguments. Although there are two points of view, because of the other comments regarding this answer, it was felt that level 5 was the appropriate level.

07 Examine the perspectives within one religion concerning animal experimentation. (30 marks) AO1

Candidate Response

The Christian view regarding animal experimentation is somewhat conflicted, as there appears to be both support for it and against it in the Bible. One quote from the Bible is “not one sparrow is forgotten by God” which means that all living things are special and important to God. People would interpret this to mean that God would be against experimentation on animals as it is using them as a means to an end and not respecting their life as much as humans. As we know from the creation story, God created all animals. He would not have made all of these creatures merely for them to be destroyed by man, which is essentially what experimenting on animals would do.

When God created the world, he gave human beings stewardship which means they are responsible for the Earth and all living creatures in it. He gave humans this responsibility so that they would take care of animals, however many would argue that by experimenting on animals we are going against God's word.

Despite this, both the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England would find animal experimentation acceptable as long as they were treated with respect and did not have to suffer needlessly. So they would find it acceptable to test medical treatment such as cancer drugs on animals but would be absolutely against some of the experiments that took place at Porton Down for example. During one experiment, several pigs were blown up merely to see how fast it would take them to bleed to death. All Christians would be against this form of experimentation as it puts the animals through a great deal of unnecessary pain and isn't in any way beneficial to human life.

There are also many instances within the Bible which religious believers interpreted as finding animal experimentation acceptable. In the Old Testament, God tells Noah he can use any animal he needs as food which implies that in some circumstances it is perfectly acceptable to use animals to benefit human beings. Christians would also refer to the idea of dominion, where God gave human beings dominance over all other living creatures. This means that mankind is allowed to use animals for any purpose they see fit, as long as they are not to put through unnecessary pain. Another reason Christianity generally views animal experimentation as acceptable is that several times in the Bible, animals are referenced as having no souls. This suggests that human life is more valuable than animals, so using them to improve it or prolong it is acceptable.

Commentary

This is a much weaker answer than the above. The candidate has very little specific knowledge about what Christianity has to say about animal experimentation. There are a few (largely irrelevant bible verses) and nothing from specific churches or leading figures. With the wealth of information supplied by Andrew Linzey and Celia Deane-Drummond to name two scholars, this is remiss. It is not good enough at Advanced level to take biblical quotes out of context and put an interpretation to them. Furthermore, it is hard to see how anything from the last paragraph has any relevance at all.

The Porton Down reference is problematic as there is evidence to suggest that the pigs were already dead.

This is a satisfactory answer, with the information being mostly accurate and relevant and the candidate has shown a reasonable understanding of the information included; level 5.

08 How far should religious views determine the ethics behind animal experimentation?
(20 marks) AO2

Candidate Response

Many people would completely disagree with the idea that religious views should determine the ethics behind animal experimentation. They'd argue that different religions all have different views regarding animal experimentation, so it would be impossible to put into practise. Even within the same religion (such as Christianity) there is sometimes conflict as to whether or not it is for or against animal experimentation.

However, others would argue against this point and agree that religious views should determine the ethics as the majority of ethical viewpoints today stem from religion anyway. Almost everybody's opinions regarding various ethical issues today stem from religion originally anyway (e.g. do not kill). It could be argued that religious views do not belong within scientific advances such as this, because all religious scriptures are so old that they do not refer to issues such as this directly. It is open to interpretation and so very much subjective to the individual as to what a certain religious view is.

In conclusion, religious views should help determine ethics behind animal experimentation to some extent. The main ideas should be included, such as do not allow animals to suffer needlessly, but should not get in the way of science and technological advances.

Commentary

The answer is extremely short, suggesting that the candidate is running out of time. This implies poor time management.

Nevertheless, the candidate still manages to put two points of view, with a conclusion of sorts.

The first paragraph is succinctly yet clearly argued. The second paragraph begins well, but then the candidate loses focus (again) and starts to argue against the point. Once again, this candidate would have been better served if they had written a plan.

The concluding paragraph is once again succinct, but sums up the brief debate by saying that religious views should have some input, particularly as they appear to put the animal's welfare more at the forefront than others might, but that progress should not be impeded.

Because of the problems with the second point of view, it was felt that level 5 was a more appropriate placing for this answer rather than level 6.

Grade A

- 03 Explain one version of Virtue Ethics and apply this to any ethical issue apart from issues in science and technology.

(30 marks) AO1

Candidate Response

Virtue ethics is a proactive system, that focus on a person's character and how it could be developed. It is agent-centred as opposed to being act-centred. Aristotle, who was a student of Plato developed virtue ethics further. Aristotle believes that in order for an individual to become or develop a good virtuous character they need to adopt certain virtues or attitudes. According to Aristotle all humans have a telos which is to be successful. Applying the ethical issue of environmental ethics, an individual needs to have good thoughts such as the intentions to give up using a car because of the effect this has on the environment and how global warming has increased dramatically. In order to do this they would need to put these thoughts in action and stop using a car due to CO2 emissions and maybe start cycling to work or walk. However because virtue ethic encompasses one entire life just by giving up using a car once isn't going to make you a virtuous person. You will need to practise this regularly and make it a habit. Once you have done this you will develop a good character and will be closer to achieving your aim / purpose which is Eudaimonia (human flourishing). This shows that there is a process which individuals need to go through, such as good thoughts, good actions, good habit, good character and eventually Eudaimonia. Giving up using a car will make you a virtuous person because you are making the environment and society a better place to live and this will be beneficial for the individual and the rest of the world.

Aristotle identified 12 moral virtues which he believed individuals could develop. Applying this to the ethical issue of environment ethics an individual would need to adopt the virtue of courage which is the golden mean between the excess and deficiency. For example if you are thinking about giving up using a car then you would need to keep this a habit and not jump to easy or take shortcuts such as running into a car at the first sight, this is the deficiency of courage which is cowardice. You are being rash (excess) if you decide to walk to work in the rain and not take a bus, it will be okay if you take the bus because it beneficial for the environment because it carries a majority of people as opposed to a car, so is less damaging to the environment. Patience is another moral virtue that can also be applied such as being patient and not giving up. The deficiency would be to give up once you have stopped using a car which is being spiritlessness. The excess would be impatience as you can't ignore comments from other people such as your friends who may still drive and losing your temper and not be patient. So the golden mean which are courage and patience should be adopted when deciding to give up using a car.

Aristotle also identified 9 intellectual virtues, there are 5 primary and 4 secondary these can't be developed they are innate, people are born with. So applying episteme (scientific knowledge) would be that driving a car is wrong and that it has a damaging effect on the environment and by you continuing to drive a car is wrong because you know the effects of driving a car such as pollution. Being considerate and understanding of why something is you are applying sunesis. Practical wisdom (phronesis) is that you will need to be practical such as taking the bus when it's raining rather than walk to work in the rain this also benefits the environment.

Commentary

The answer begins well, with two sentences which set the scene and are clear, confident and accurate. The candidate quickly and smoothly moves onto the thrust of the question, and writes about Aristotle's virtue ethics. The application of [in this case] environmental ethics to virtue ethics begins almost immediately, and moves confidently from the general to the more specific in paragraph 2.

In the time available, this candidate gives a clear and focussed answer to the question set. There is very little in this answer which is irrelevant. There is no doubt that it could have been more thorough, but it is quite satisfactory, with key facts that have been developed, thus level 5. More could have been said about Virtue Ethics as a system and this would have improved the grade.

04 With reference to your chosen ethical issue, assess the strengths and weaknesses of Virtue Ethics as an ethical system.

(20 marks) AO2

Candidate Response

When applying Virtue Ethics (V.E) to the ethical issue of environmental ethic it can be seen that V.E is of value as an ethical system because it doesn't just guide individuals in individual acts but aims to help and encourage them as to how to build a good character this is because V.E is agent-centred as opposed to being act-centred. For example it guides individuals as how to have good thoughts which should be put in action and how these should become a habit such as cycling to work everyday in doing so not only are you developing good character you are setting a good example for to follow and it's good for your health. This shows that V.E doesn't just tell you what to do such as teleological ethical systems would argue that you give up driving because it has good consequences for you and your environment but it expects you to do it once not on a regular basis. So virtue ethics looks beyond the external consequences and focuses on the heart of the acting human therefore it is of a lot of value and an ethical system especially in application to the ethical issue of environmental ethics.

On the other hand, it is of little value as an ethical system when applying to the ethical issue of environmental ethics because it doesn't really guide or tell the individual as to how they ought to act it just states that you should the most virtuous thing. So for example in a situation where a person has given up using a car but they have to make the decision to whether they ought to drive the car because they are getting late for work and taking the bus will make them late. V.E as an ethical system wouldn't be able to guide the individuals behaviour it would just state that they should the most virtuous thing whereas other ethical systems argue that he/she take the car because they will be late which could have severe consequences for them such as losing your job. Therefore it doesn't seem to be of value when applying it the ethical issue of environmental ethics.

In conclusion, V.E is a proactive system, which aims to encompass ones entire life and rather than focusing on a individual acts it guides individuals how to become a good, virtuous person throughout their life and not just once. So quitting driving once doesn't make you virtuous but you should do it habitually which help you to achieve your telos eudaimonia which in this case would be to make the world a better place and to help decrease global warming rather than adding to it.

Commentary

Once again, the candidate is focussed on the answer, and, instead, of just discussing the strengths and weakness of virtue ethics, does so in the context of environmental ethics. The conclusion brings us back to their starting point in 03, so neatly rounding everything off.

Overall, a smooth, confident, focussed response to the question set. It fits the level 6 criteria well; more critical analysis was needed for level 7.

05 Examine the ways in which one religion uses scripture as a basis for its teachings about sexual behaviour.

(30 marks) AO1

Candidate Response

Christianity differs in its interpretation of scripture when it comes to sex. Christians believe that premarital sex is wrong and should only be practiced in the confines of marriage. For example in Corinthians 6:16 love is patient, 'love is kind, it does not envy, it is not rude.....' This shows waiting is the sign of true love and that Christians should be patient because they wouldn't want to miss out on the blessings of the wedding. The bible also states that pre-marital sex has many consequences that should be avoided such as sexually transmitted diseases and aids. In Corinthians 6:18 flee from sexual sin no other sin so clearly effects the body as this one does, for sexual immorality is seen a sin against your own body. This clearly means that Christians should not participate in premarital sex because scripture states that if one does then it is going against the will of god and achieving salvation is going to be impossible. Anglicans take a liberal approach to this because adopt situation ethics and apply this to all situations such as always doing the most loving thing even if this allows premarital sex to take place. However Catholics argue that pre-marital sex is forbidden and shouldn't be done. This is because they follow natural law where one of the five primary precepts is reproduction that is to have children. So Christians should only engage in sexual activity in the confines of marriage because that is the best place for children to be brought. This approach is supported by the quote in Genesis 2:26 God made the first man Adam and first women Eve, God commanded them to go forth and be fruitful and multiply. So this shows that one of Gods purposes was to procreate which is evident in the above quote.

Homosexuality is considered a sin in Christianity. In the past when religion had great importance it was considered as a mental illness and a taboo. In Leviticus (18:22-25) Do not lie with a man as one lies with a women, that is detestable and punishable by death. From this we can infer that for Christians engaging in homosexual acts is forbidden and should not be acted out whatsoever as this goes against the teachings of scripture. In Genesis 2:25 for this reason a man will leave his mother and father and be united to his wife and they will become one flesh. This shows that heterosexual was the norm and that this is what God intended as his purpose so Christians, male and female could engage in sexual activity and reproduce as opposed to be homosexual.

Homosexuality was also seen as immoral by St Paul. St Pauls letters influenced Christians churches and teaching. He quoted men engaging in indecent acts with men and how it was seen as unnatural. He also refers to phrases such as aresontai and malakoitai known as male prostitute and sodomite. So scripture teaches that homosexuality is wrong and shouldn't be allowed no matter what as it goes against the teachings of God.

In Christianity, celibacy is considered as something everyone should look up to such as it's seen as being the highest status. St Paul believes that celibacy is a special gift and isn't for everyone and that "let those marry who can not restrain themselves". In the bible (scripture) it shows how John Luther left his monestry to marry and Erasmus who believed that marriage was the natural state and celibacy as the unnatural state. Anglican believe that marriage should be adopted because its about loving and natural intimacy and that celibacy is not that important as the Anglican priests aren't celibate.

Commentary

This answer begins in a less focussed manner than 03. Whilst what the candidate is writing, is not incorrect, it is rather generalised and there is little here that is specific. There is also some interpretation of scripture.

The second and third paragraphs are more focussed and the candidate ensures that the example of homosexuality is made relevant to the wording of the question set.

The final paragraph contains some inaccuracies, but begins well and relevantly.

Overall, a good answer with some careless statements which makes it generally thorough with the information being almost all accurate and relevant; level 6.

- 06 Assess how far these teachings can be said to have any relevance today. (20 marks) AO2**

Candidate Response

Religious teaching regarding sexual behaviour is seen to be out of date. One of the many reasons for this is because society has changed, it has modernised over time. Secularisation as a process is dominating today's society where religious teachings are of no value or importance. For example, in the contemporary UK, there is a civil relationship act 2004 which allows homosexuals to practice their sexuality and love in public rather than just in the private sphere. The Discrimination Act 2006 also takes into consideration discrimination against homosexuals and is regarded as being against the law. Some would argue that religious teaching about sexual behaviour which were rooted in the Hebrew scripture, how can they ever be said to be relevant in today's society where sexual behaviour such as homosexuality, pre-marital sex are evident. Cohabitation has increased dramatically over the recent years and that for many it's an alternative to getting married, these individuals would engage in pre-marital sex. Therefore religious teachings are out of date and they no longer apply to today's society which is characterised by different forms of sexual behaviour which didn't exist years ago or in the past.

On the other hand, it can be argued that religious teachings regarding sexual behaviour is relevant in today's society. Even though secularisation is on the increase and religious importance on the decline, many devout Christians still abide by the teachings of scripture. For example Catholics still believe in getting married for procreation and abiding by the ten commandments. The Pope Benedict 16th has forbidden contraception which is still practiced by many Catholics who don't use contraception to prohibit the purpose of having children, to procreate. In today's society religious teachings are relevant more than ever because society has become immoral because of the increase in sexually transmitted diseases and AIDS. So if society was to abide by what scripture says then these problems would be avoided and overcome.

Commentary

There are two points of view, but no conclusion; presumably the candidate has run out of time.

The first paragraph is very good. It is focussed and well argued, picking up the point made about homosexual relations made in 05.

The second paragraph is less focussed. The main thrust of it concerns Roman Catholics abiding by their Churches teaching on procreation and contraception. Whilst these are excellent and relevant points, they were not mentioned in 05 and therefore not strictly relevant here as the question asks for the teachings made in 05 to be discussed. The paragraph returns to focus at the end with a general argument about the need for moral [religious] behaviour to avoid sexually transmitted diseases.

As a consequence of the comments made above, and the feeling that more could have been made of the second point of view, it is a Level 5 response.

Grade A*

01 Explain the concepts of the personality and the moral self in libertarianism.
(30 marks)

AO1

Candidate Response

Libertarianism is the ethical notion that upholds the theory that as humans we are free autonomous agents and as a result we are able to act upon the premise of our free will and so can be duly punished or praised for any action we undertake. The notion of personality is widely debated and is an empirical element of which many Libertarians suggest we have the ability to override with our moral self.

The personality is an element of wide debate in libertarianism. A leading libertarianist John Stuart Mill believed that as a means to allow our personality to develop we must be given the means of freedom, as he suggests the state should not quash the freedom of an individual as 'the worth of the state, in the long run, is only the worth of those composing it'. Mill upheld the notion that reflects Libertarianist thought which is the ideology freedom is the necessary force which allows for the attribution of moral praise or moral punishment and ultimately suggests our personality in an expression of our freewill. Mill goes on to state that an individual's identity in terms of their personality is equally a result of the identity they are born with as the choices they make. Libertarians equally uphold the notion that personality is a notion of the human self which is developed indeterministically. Libertarianism is incompatible with the incompatibilist theory Determinism which suggests that we are determined equally through our external and internal environment albeit a predisposition in our genes or a result of being raised in a criminal household which determines our being and so we cannot act on our freewill and so are not mostly praise worthy or punishable. Therefore, philosophers like Kant suggest the empirical element of personality is just that, however, it is indeterministically developed as a means from the choices in which we undertake. This is reflected in C.A Campbell's notion that 'self is sole action' it is very much the notion that Libertarianism upholds that we are causally undermined and so we are free to make choices, highlighted in the notion that we may deliberate between a good and poor decision. Therefore, unlike Determinism Libertarianism upholds the ideology that as we have total access to our freewill, we are able to shape our personality as Kant upholds the notion 'Ought implies can' and so if one can act on their free will they ought to and so we have a means which allows us to shape our personality.

The moral-self is fundamental to the means of ethical decision making in Libertarians. However, opposed to Mill some Libertarians perceive our personality as a means in which is shaped by our identity. Determinists argue that our personality is shaped through our society and genes, such as in 2002 a scientist found a child with a specific gene is more likely to act in a bad way in a similar vein if that child is then exposed to violence they are more likely to go on and abuse themselves. This perception of personality as an empirical notion which is causally determined through such factors is accepted by some Libertarians. With some Libertarians stating however, our moral self is able to override this premise. If one takes for example what the moral-self entails we will see Libertarians uphold it as something which allows for deliberation to be made and of which free will is a necessary component for our moral-self to work as Kant states, 'the...inestimable worth of absolutely good will consists... precisely of the freedom of an action from all consequences.' And so one can see moral-self is an ethical dimension of which allows one to shape through their actions. If one takes for example a criminal their inclination may very well be to follow the steps of criminality due to their personality being shaped in such a way, but, a Libertarian would argue this can be overriden by our moral self which recognises the rightness and the wrongness of an action.

Moral self is exemplified in the case of Mary Bell, who killed two children, Determinists would argue her causal personality due to her mother's violence towards her and her exposure to sexuality and enforcement to engage in the mother's prostitution forced her personality to be shaped in this way and so explaining her actions. However, a Libertarianist would fundamentally argue that Bell had the means in which to act on her moral-self, her ethical dimension and so freely chose to undertake such acts.

Therefore, it is evident that Libertarians perceive the existence of a moral-self as fundamental and without it one cannot be morally praised or punished. Whether personality is an expression of freedom or causal is debated, however, Libertarianists uphold the notion that ultimately you have a means to override it anyway.

Commentary

The first paragraph is focussed and an excellent introduction to the answer. The candidate writes with confidence.

This confidence is continued throughout the answer, which is also fluent and informative. The candidate moves easily between the two central concepts of 'personality' and 'moral self', explaining each and supporting these explanations with scholarly quotations.

There is only one example given, and this is highly relevant; more would have been good, but it is obvious that the candidate is in full cognisance of the topic.

Level 6 was felt to be the appropriate place for this answer as more examples were needed for it to be a level 7 answer.

02 'In libertarianism there is no moral responsibility.' Assess this claim.

(20 marks) AO2

Candidate Response

The notion that there is no moral responsibility attached to Libertarianism is fundamentally inaccurate. Libertarianism upholds the notion that we have a means in which to act upon our free will and so we are morally responsible for our actions. However, the fundamental dependant of the ethical response is free will and if this is suppressed or kept from an individual the means of moral responsibility may diminish or become non-existent. Fundamentally, it's the relationship of free will that depends on moral responsibility.

If an individual has access to free will then they are duly and morally responsible unlike the Determinist view that individuals are causally moulded through external and internal factors, Libertarianism upholds the ideology that we have the ability to act on free will and so should be punished. Take for example the murderer Fred West who was arrested for the murder of twelve women. Libertarianists would uphold the ideology that as West's free will was not infringed in terms of the ideology he was not coerced or given no moral choice then he is fundamentally responsible for his actions.

However, in Libertarianism the fundamental ideology is free will and Libertarianist do take into account the notion that this is sometimes withheld and so moral responsibility is diminished to an extent. As Kant states 'Ought implies can' it is the notion that moral responsibility may only be attributed to actions freely undertaken. So if an individual acts under the premise of enforcement they are not to blame as they acted in ignorance, for example if a general took his troops into a valley after making the correct security checks he is not to blame if they are ambushed as the notion exists he did not foresee it and so is not to blame. This notion extends to the notion of psychological capacity as it was reported a Muslim man was being taunted for his religion and he consequently killed the taunter yet the chemical imbalance in his brain infringed his ability to act on his free will.

Moreover, Libertarianism does not uphold the ideology that all actions are free from consequence and so moral responsibility is fundamental. The soft Determinist view that we are only morally responsible to an extent due to the notion we only have free choice, in terms of uncoerced actions as Hume states all our actions have prior causes and so we are not fully morally responsible is abhorred by Libertarians. It is the notion if someone has free will they must and will be duly praised or punished. The element of negligence does not act as a means of excuse and so one can see in the notion of Loeb and Leopold who killed an individual on the premise that they wanted to show their superiority in society have full responsibility in the sense Libertarians such as Mill state they had freedom which shaped their personality and moral self and so should receive full responsibility.

Overall, it is the notion that the extent of free-will mitigates the extent of moral responsibility that can be implemented. Aquinas stated involuntary actions such as if one is drawn out to sea is not in control and so responsibility cannot be addressed. Furthermore, it is the notion that Libertarianism pragmatically acknowledges free will is suppressed in certain situations yet it's the fundamental acceptance of the existence of free will which allows for the implementation of moral responsibility.

Commentary

This is another fluent answer. It is flawed, however.

The first paragraph is very good. The counter-argument, contained in the second paragraph, is ultimately accurate, even if the candidate confuses coercion with ignorance or situations beyond a person's reasonable control. However, they set up the scenario so well, that it is obvious what they mean to be saying. The fourth paragraph is unnecessary as it talks about soft determinism, which was not the focus of the question.

The conclusion is also poorly expressed at times, but one understands what the candidate is trying to say, which is sound.

This is a good answer, but because of the issues cited in the summary above, it was placed in level 6, rather than level 7. If the answer had been a little more accurate, it would have been level 7.

05 Examine the ways in which one religion uses scripture as a basis for its teachings about sexual behaviour.

30 marks AO1

The Christian religion implements the use of scripture as the highest command for the way in which sexual ethics is implemented. Christian teaching explores a multitude of issues in light of sexuality such as sex in marriages, celibacy, homosexuality and procreation. For Christians Biblical writings and scripture is perceived as a medium of which to acknowledge God and so is of the highest importance.

The Christian Church has attempted to move with the times so it states in its encyclicals that sensuality and the unitise aspect of sex is allowed for with individuals of stout heart on the premise they allow God to 'enlarge and enrich his family day by day'. This acknowledgement of sensuality and procreation is scripturally based. Sensuality is exemplified in Genesis Song of Songs as it shows the erotic nature of love which accompanies the profound commitment of love as the bride tells the bridegroom, 'I held him and would not let him go 'til I had taken him to the room of the one who had conceived me'. This notion presents an ideology that religion is not desexual and upheld the notion of eros which allows for the identification of moral bonds in human relationships. Sex in terms of the Christian faith also has the ultimate aim of upholding procreation and this is sourced in the scripture of Genesis as God tells man to go forth and multiply, as in Exodus it exemplifies the ideology that one should be fruitful in God's name.

Christianity has always upheld the ideology of celibacy as a means of ensuring one keeps as a holy follower of God. This notion is found in the scriptural writings of a leading apostle St Paul who stated celibacy was the notion one should live at, especially as in the light of the imminent end of the world. However, his scriptural writing did acknowledge that celibacy is a divine gift, upheld in the church as one can see that Christian monasteries have at one time or still do uphold the ideology of celibacy. Yet the Christian Church recognises that this is a means that is only upheld by divine people and so the notion of marriage is upheld. The Christian Church teaches that marriage is a means in which we may avoid sin in light of the ideology that sex as a means to procreate can permissibly take place in this sphere. However, the church also upholds the notion that marriage is a sacrament of which the unitative and deep mutuality of individuals is recognised. This is exemplified in St Paul's writings as he likens marriage to the family of God in Ephesians and states a unison takes place as a means of which 'a mans body does not belong only to him but also to his wife' indicates the unison. The Christian church also upholds the ideology of monogamy as a result of this, poignantly expressing that to have more than one partner is to give away something that does not belong to you.

Heterosexuality and the equality of women and man is also upheld in Christianity. In Genesis it states 'A man should leave his father and mother and become one flesh with his wife' suggests of the normality of heterosexuality. The church also states that the equality of women and men is fundamental as Sansco states 'men and women are not different in value but function' and this notion of sexual equality is upheld in the ideology of the differentiation of man and women being for sexual fulfilment in Genesis. Furthermore, the notion of homosexuality is upheld as wrong not in the instinct but the act as it defies God's will for man to go forth and multiply as stated in Genesis. The Methodist church states it does 'not condone homosexuality yet they are no less than heterosexuals'. This is exemplified in the ideology of Leviticus as it states 'a man should not lie with a man as he does with a women that is detestable' suggests of the scriptally point notion of the wrongness of homosexuality.

Overall, one is allowed to see the ultimate level of adherence the Christian faith gives to scripture as it is a means of which God's law is encapsulated. Yet the notion does exist that this is sometimes ignored as monogamy is denied by the Mormon denomination of the feast of the latter day saints and the Angelican church implement an openly gay bishop into post in 2002. However, overall the notion is very much the acknowledgement and following of scripture as a means to attest sexual ethics.

Commentary

Once again, the answer begins well, with a succinct introduction. The candidate says that they will write about sex within marriage, celibacy, homosexuality and procreation, and they do.

It then proceeds with points being backed up with specific quotations from scripture, which are not taken out of context nor interpreted.

[The last paragraph adds nothing to the answer. One might argue that Mormons are not Christians. Moreover, scripture is not mentioned at all. However, the rest of the answer is very good and this examination board does not negatively mark.]

It was felt that a little more specific [and quoted] teaching would have made this answer more thorough, so it achieved the top of level 6.

06 Assess how far these teachings can be said to have any relevance today. (20 marks) AO2

Candidate Response

The relevance of such teachings are of limited validity in today's Western world with the deepening of gap between religious acts of homosexuality, marriage, sex and procreation. Instead the West is motivated in the ideology that the freedom of the individual is paramount and religious teaching are regressive in terms of its ignorance of science and that of emotion.

Firstly, the ideology of homosexuality is perceived as fundamentally out of date on the premise that it's perceived as the norm today and the thought of moral implications is alien. The introduction of 2007 Civil Rights act as a means of addressing homosexual legality as equal to the sacrament of marriage has aided this deepening drive. The notion of homosexuality as wrong or 'detestable' as stated by Leviticus is adhered in Western society as Stanford and Sundes suggest this acts as a means to implement intolerances, something perceived as wrong in today's society furthermore, homosexuality is perceived as normal and Moore states 'the church uses scripture unevenly to oppress homosexuals as Leviticus also states rules such as one should not wear clothes made of two materials, it's the idea that the Church ineffectively implants scripture that only acts as a means to support its marginalisation of individuals and so it is out of touch with modern society who realise this notion and are no longer God-focussed.

Scripture which implements the idea that sex prior to marriage or outside of it is the notion of living in sin is fundamentally out of date. The psychologist Demnia states an individual should be allowed to have sex outside the sacrament of marriage as long as it is a committed relationship, something outside the realms of the church yet arguably in touch with society. This notion is also furthered in terms of Thornes ideology that more and more people are co-habiting or using it as a replacement of marriage and so the church is ineffective in society.

However, some argue with the proliferation of sexual disease more and more sexual crime and abortion that we do need to return to these values. If one even looks at the filtration of sex even into children's clothes we may suggest sex has become an accepted commodity in the West. Instead notions of divinity and celibacy are arguably more relevant than ever and we need to return to it. The notion of adultery which is condemned as wrong in Exodus 'thou shall not commit adultery' is more relevant today than ever with a proliferate of divorce and as a result the offspring of marriage growing up in poverty. Arguably we need to ignore feminist and libertarianist principles of Western sex and the contractual notion that Libertarianism upholds that any consensual sex is permissible and return to scripture that allows for the acknowledge of the diversity is human celibacy, upheld by St Paul in order to prevent social disintegration.

Overall, sexual ethics has moved on yet such notions have very much transcended. Waskow states that personal expression is greater than forming children and homosexuality is legally and socially respected yet society arguably needs to return to a notion where sex isn't perceived as for egotistical pleasure only.

Commentary

This is a very clear debate, with critical analysis at all levels. Each point is counter-argued with evidence, and the debate goes back and forth.

The conclusion is weak, but the strong debate beforehand overrides this.
A clear level 7 answer.