

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report

June 2011

GCE Religious Studies 6RS02 1C

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code US028658

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Investigations Paper of June 2011 demonstrated a high level of scholarship evident across all areas of study and many responses demonstrated the engagement that candidates had with their area of investigation. The enthusiasm for and knowledge of the chosen topic was clearly conveyed in many responses that were truly academic in their approach. Candidates were 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. It is important to stress again that the 'Investigations' unit has a definite academic purpose. The aim is to involve candidates 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 responses were considered.

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. There was evidence of candidates choosing a different question on the paper to the question they had clearly prepared for before the examination.

Candidates were not penalised if correct entries were not made or a cross was put in a box that did not match the answer. Examiners were encouraged to mark positively. 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.

Variation in achievement was related to the two Assessment Objectives. These objectives should receive prominent attention in the process of the investigation. Importantly, in the exam itself there must be explicit attention to these objectives in the examination response. 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. In preparation for this examination candidates may find it useful to write up their investigation under exam timed conditions to a variety of different possible questions. They might build up a number of different essay plans to different possible questions. The important point in these activities is to enable candidates to develop their management of material such as how to best structure their content to answer the specific question. However, success can be undermined by writing up a rote-learned response which was not adapted to the question set or by answering a question that has been written for a topic they have not studied.

Question 1

MEDICAL ETHICS

It is good to report an overall improvement in candidates' responses to the medical ethics questions on this unit this year. This was by far the most popular question, with the majority of candidates choosing the topic of abortion or euthanasia. It was encouraging to note that more responses to medical ethics questions were attempted with an eye to scholarship and candidates had a very wide ranging understanding of ethical theory. Over the range of scholarship there was evidence of more contemporary scholarship being introduced. On the whole there was a move away from brief responses to a more substantive academic style of engagement with the question.

The best responses explored the important religious and ethical issues with reference to well-deployed scholarship and modern day examples. Some candidates also applied Aristotle's virtue ethics and Aquinas' natural law convincingly. Some candidates did not address this question directly; instead they wrote about the topic that they had investigated without relating it to the focus of the question. Once again, centres are encouraged to go beyond the predictable range of material and the candidates just have to resist unloading pre-prepared answers with little regard for the question. Responses can be improved by taking decisive views, based on the evidence and also by paying close attention to the demands of the question. The most memorable responses concerned issues such as organ transplants and stem cell research/embryology and candidates angled their material to the question with a decisive view as to whether religious ethical principles were a hindrance or a help in decision making. Abortion, as a topic, attracted weaker responses working with a wide range of material but often saying very little about it. The best responses had a long and highly discursive conclusion, making it clear that the candidates recognised they were dealing with an issue. Far too many candidates presented the material they had prepared and added a four or five line conclusion in a bolt on fashion beginning with 'therefore' or 'in conclusion' when there was little explicit relationship between this conclusion and the body of the essay.

Some candidates were tempted to give over-long introductions to the topic, sometimes as much as two pages. Although good introductions are needed, long descriptions of what abortion and euthanasia are, complete with medical detail, amounts to a digression rather than clear focus on the question. In the body of the essay, masses of narrative, without addressing the question, can limit achievement. There was also evidence of "It's up to them?" type responses where personal choice was often assumed to be the self-evident guiding principle, when of course in ethics personal choice is usually under scrutiny somewhere along the line. It was perceived by many as immoral that the religions stood against total freedom of choice, thereby reinforcing the suspicion that there is nothing so illiberal as a liberal.

Candidates often argued that religions ought to move with the time. 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.

Responses that dealt with abortion evidenced a significant number of candidates sidelining foetal rights deliberately and completely. Plenty of candidates assumed far too much when they wrote that an accidental pregnancy would result in an unwanted child, and then exacerbated that by adding that it would therefore be better to abort a baby than have it unwanted.

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. There was little evidence of reflection on the implications of science unfettered by ethics or religion.

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 this topic was discussed.

The extract from this essay shows how the candidate has set out their study with clear awareness of the demands of the question.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3

Euthanasia is a complex issue within the 21st century, due to it dealing with death and the fact/question, is it right/acceptable to allow someone to die before their natural death. This essay will discuss religious and moral principles been a hindrance within the debate of euthanasia.

Euthanasia, derived from Greek 'eu' meaning 'good' and 'Thanatos' meaning death, so it essentially means good death, and in today's society is used to describe the action when one feels they are no longer able to live so they end their lives early, usually due to a chronic and terminal disease/disability. It allows people to die a dignified and pain-free death.

The act of ~~eth~~ euthanasia is not legal in the UK, but countries such as Switzerland, Belgium and the Netherlands do allow it and so many British Citizens travel abroad for their 'right to die'.

In the UK, it is ~~it~~ legal to commit suicide and the act of suicide was decriminalised.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The introduction gets off to a slow start but the second page introduces with ease a range of scholarship that continues throughout the essay.

in 1961, however the Suicide Act 1961 states that one should not help someone to end their lives.

The main hindrance within the debate of euthanasia is the principle of Sanctity of Life (SOL). SOL is both a religious and moral principle and hinders euthanasia as it states that life ~~have~~ has intrinsic value.

Religious people, Christians believe that life is sacred and a gift from God and believe "God gives life, God takes life (Job)" and therefore believe it's wrong to end one's life early as only God has the right/power to do that. Lucy Spencer in the article 'Death Too Soon' states that God made us in his own image 'imago dei', but that does not mean that he gave us all his qualities, like omnipotence (all powerful) and therefore God is the only one who is omnipotent and consequently should be the only one to cause death. This is a major hindrance to euthanasia, as Christians believe in God, and if they are made in his image, ending their lives early (even if it seems the right thing to do) would be wrong as it would be essentially killing off part of God, the divine, who gave them



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Do not spend too long on your introduction - especially if you obviously have much material to cover - you might run the risk of running out of time.

This candidate handles a substantial range of material on gene therapy in a short space with careful attention to analysis throughout.

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

'Religious and/or moral principles are a hindrance within medical ethics.'

The main religious principles which relate to ~~genetic~~ gene therapy, which is part of medical ethics, is sanctity of life and personhood. These two major principles can certainly be called a 'hindrance within medical ethics' because they conflict with what gene therapy consists of, that being destroying an embryo, changing DNA for cosmetic reasons or to treat genetic defects and germ-line therapy.

Sanctity of life is a Christian held principle. They argue that all life is sacred and that it should be protected, not destroyed as it is a gift from God and we are not in such a position to discard that gift, only God is. Natural law deontologists are firm believers in this and can be called vitalists. Philosophers such as Aquinas, Plato and Aristotle are in favour of this argument

and argue that all innocent life should be protected. This is especially true when ensoulment occurs, as Aquinas argues this happens at 40 days after conception for boys and 90 days for girls.

In other words, this means that at these points in time

the fetus receives its soul from God; this then 'enlivens the body'; for Aquinas and Aristotle this means that this is when we can call them a person and it is after this it is definitely wrong to kill the ~~the~~ embryos.

However, now Catholics argue that human life is sacred at the moment of conception and regard it intrinsically wrong to kill it, no matter what. This poses a great 'hindrance' on gene therapy as people from a natural law perspective are against gene therapy, when it involves the destruction of an embryo. However they also disagree with other treatments that gene therapy does, such as changing DNA, ~~this~~ germ-line therapy as it is ignoring the free will of the future generation which will come from that patient because of the risks involved and as we do not have the same duties to future generations as we do to our own children.

On the other hand though, revealed law ethicists, who are also from a Christian/Catholic background, argue ~~points~~ two points related to sanctity of life. Those being strong sanctity of life and weak sanctity of life. Strong sanctity of life are ~~vitalist~~ 'vitalists' - in philosophical terms, is ~~pro-life~~ 'pro-life'. They of course believe that all innocent life is sacred and should be protected.

Weak sanctity of life also argue this, but believe that sometimes it is necessary to take a life

believe that sometimes it is necessary to take a life if it produces more benefit and happiness than the opposite. They allow the taking of life in extreme cases, for example if a person was going to die if they did not have a treatment, which this could have to involve the destruction of an embryo. So to these ethicists it would be permitted.

Peter Singer also gave an account of sanctity of life, but which is more flexible and less of a 'hindrance' on gene therapy than the sanctity of life put forward by natural and revealed law deontologists.

He argued that a child should only be brought into the world if it wanted, that all humans should be allowed to live or die if they ~~decide~~ ^{wish}, that all species are equal, whereas Christians believe that humans are more superior and important than animals etc.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Precision in the use of words helps to achieve both Assessment Objectives with ease.

because we have a soul and to them, they can't do not. Overall though what Peter Singer argued ~~made~~ makes gene therapy less of a moral problem than it is deemed by Christians/Catholics.

However, not all people with a religious faith disagree with gene therapy, some Christians and Catholics ~~also~~ believe that gene therapy is not so bad if it is just helping to make someone better,

e.g. by ~~removing~~ ^{disabling} or repairing a gene abnormality.

People of a Jewish faith argue that gene therapy is good if it protects and prolongs human life, this is a strong held belief and is considered ~~more~~ ^{important}.

Personhood is another religious principle that can also impose a hindrance on gene therapy.

Personhood was developed by John Locke; he argued that we can call a human being a person when the following criteria is filled. They must be a physical being, intelligent, have rational thought, memory and be able to remember their thoughts etc in different times and places. Most of all they must have consciousness. Without these, according to Locke they are not a person; thus if they are not considered a person because they do not fulfil this

criteria then it is not a problem terminating that life. This implies that John Locke would not be against the destruction of an embryo because he would view it as not intelligent and so on.

Despite these strong, well thought out and most likely accepted by a good amount of people he has been criticised for casualty and people who argue that there is such a thing as ensoulment.

Kantian ethics is a theory devised by ^{Kant} Immanuel and he argued that moral decisions should be based on what we 'ought to do' and that feelings/emotions

should not come into it. He gave two ^{categorical} ~~imperial~~ imperatives which showed his idea of sanctity of life, a non-religious version. The first being the practical imperative, which meant that people should not be treated as a means to an end but as an end in themselves.

The second categorical imperative is called the 'Kingdom of ends'. This is about giving everybody equal dignity and being ^{themselves} law-makers. His argument seems as though he would believe it to be wrong to destroy an embryo for a treatment with gene therapy, but the 'Kingdom of ends' goes against that, as it highlights that embryos cannot be a 'law-maker' because they have no say or rational thinking, so she does that means we can destroy it. This

overall makes it unclear as to what Kant would argue in relation to gene therapy.

Non-religious ethicists on the other hand, are such as normative ethicists - act utilitarians and welfare utilitarians are quite in favour of gene therapy.

Act utilitarians argue success rates in IPS are 1 in 5,000 cells but that it is worth the risk if the results could turn out well. They also argue that we should collect ES cells and use them as a model for IPS cells. Plus they go against Christians about the fact that killing an embryo is like killing a human

because they are not sentient beings and thus by destroying the embryo it is not denying any choices or preferences and it is not causing them harm.

Welfare utilitarians argue for germ-line therapy, while however act utilitarians. They argue it reduces the costs for ~~some~~ future somatic genetic treatments. Also they believe that consent is not an issue - due to germ-line therapy not being able to ask future generations for consent; this is because they argue that we make plenty of decisions that affect future generations without sometimes realising / making consent an issue.

In conclusion there is a mixed view on the topic; thus it would be wise to find some common middle ground on which people from all faiths and people with no faiths can agree upon concerning this ~~issue~~ subject.

Even though it is sometimes argued that when it comes to gene therapy it is 'playing God' it is argued by some people, including Tom Torrance a Protestant Christian theologian that it is not actually playing God but using nature as a means of progress and helping others. He also argued that it is not playing God but actually serving Him. As Jesus said 'For him that knows to do good, and does it not, to him it is sin.'

In other words if we deny our responsibility to others and do not make use of what we know and can achieve through the use of gene therapy then

it would be a great shame as it would mean a lot of people could die now and in the future because of genetic diseases e.g. Huntington's disease and Alzheimer's.

We should not stop our progress in this field because in the long run it will be beneficial to all, we just have to get the right balance. The only way from here should be forward.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Don't waste words as time can run out fast. Learn how to say a lot in a few words!

Question 2

Q2 THE NATURAL WORLD

This question was either done well by the majority or superficially by a few; where it was done well 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.

Weaker responses tended to write a lot about current trends in environmental issues with very little ethical/religious content at all. Many candidates demonstrated clear use of scholarship with relevant examples in a range of very interesting responses; candidates expressed viewpoints clearly and with a consistent approach. It is disappointing that only a small number of candidates attempted this interesting area but encouraging to note that within these limited numbers there were a number of high quality. Candidates expressed viewpoints clearly and with a consistent approach. Candidates had clearly researched the topic of the environment in depth and often 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.

This essay shows how the deployment of a range of accurate vocabulary can enhance the overall impact of the argument.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3

75% of the UK's 436 million tonnes of waste goes to landfill each year. In my discussion I will explore whether this is due to stewardship becoming impossible due to human greed taking over, or whether it is due to a unwillingness to accept responsibility for care of the natural world.

Stewardship is the approach which places humans with the duty of caretaker of God's natural world. It can be supported by Genesis 1:26 which is where the Lord says to Adam "land must remain Sabbath to the Lord". This means humans should be worried by the fact 90% of waste on landfill sites is recyclable, renewable or reusable, as this shows a disregard for God's creation. However, stewardship is not opposed to humans using the earth as a resource, as long as due respect and care is taken. In Genesis God allows humans to "reap the fields and prune the vineyards" for 6 years, as long as the 7th year acts as a "sabbath year of rest for the land". An example of

bad stewardship in modern day society is the fact just 9% of paper manufacture companies have replanting or conservation projects ongoing, despite paper production being the number one cause for deforestation each year.

Despite stewardship now being a near impossible challenge, there have been many influential supporters of it over the years. Pope John Paul II stated that it was "wrong to have a life which is directed ^{forwards} ~~to~~ having rather than being", therefore attacking the way society puts consumerism and consumption before their practice of caretaking Gods Earth. Arne Naess, ~~developed~~ ^{non-religious} a Norwegian environmentalist, who developed his own approach to caring for the natural world with shallow and deep ecology. Deep ecology is the belief that everything on earth has intrinsic value and therefore should be preserved, conserved and respected at all times. This is in keeping with the teleological arguments approach to caring for the environment. Shallow ecology ~~states~~ ^{speaks} from a more anthropocentric view of the natural world and says how we should look after the parts of nature which are of use to humans. Applying this to everyday life would mean preventing a factory being built on a well known beauty spot, as this would decrease human enjoyment of nature, but allowing it to be built on an already industrialised area. ~~Alth~~ Although deep ecology would be a preferable approach, shallow ecology seems to make the task of stewardship ~~im~~ impossible as it allows humans to carry on

with the lives they have become accustomed to, whilst still placing a duty of care and responsibility with them.

However a Dominion approach may be taken towards care of the natural world. The Dominion approach believes that when God gave the earth to Adam, he gave humans ~~the~~ ultimate sovereignty of his creation. This can also be supported by Genesis which is why the Bible is contradictory over the argument of environmental care. The Bible quotes God giving Adam "rule over the fish in the sea, birds in the sky and all other livestock." However this has the potential to justify a more dangerous attitude as it does not place humans with a duty of care for the natural world. Therefore it is hard to lay blame on the fact 89% of Britains admit to shopping unethically due to low prices of fast fashion, regardless of the pollution, exploitation and production costs involved.

Rapture, a right wing Christian fundamentalist group are the embodiment of how Dominion can justify a dangerous viewpoint. They believe humans have ultimate dominion over the natural world but have however filled this role so badly, it is Rapture's duty to cause the Second Coming of Christ. Rapture wish to bring about an Apocalypse in order to cause Christ's return, this will be brought on by the world ending and so the group encourage mistreatment of the earth to speed up the process. This means the group would be pleased at facts



Do not be afraid of expressing religious ideas with accurate technical terms. Learn basic terms and add to your repertoire of language. This will have a qualitative impact on your writing and often saves valuable time if you need less words to say the same thing.

such as the ~~the~~ average American teenager produces as much waste in a lifetime as small villages in ~~the~~ Ethiopia have been recorded to. Pastor John Hagee, a senior member of the movement states that on the day of Apocalypse "occupants will rise from graves to soar into the heavens". Rapture also try to stir up political or religious troubles well as they also believe war will bring about the Apocalypse.

However Dominion is not always applied extremely and so does not make stewardship of the natural world impossible alone. Aquinas and Aristotle both heavily influenced the church and took the Dominion approach of care of the earth. They both believed "animals exist for the sake of man" with Aquinas adding "all animals are naturally subject to man". This shows how despite taking an anthropocentric view to the universe, both men recognised the importance of other living organisms in helping to establish world order. Aristotle also produced a hierarchy of reason about his approach to nature. As it was based around the ability to reason, it placed philosophers like himself nearer the top, and animals around the lower levels. However what is important is that he

recognised animals as being vital in establishing a hierarchy of the world. Then this means that

despite ~~often~~ enforcing ~~both~~ anthropocentrism, both men would agree facts such as only 5% of people shop ethically consciously ~~are~~^{is} worrying due to the blatant disregard it shows for God's earth.

Consumerism is a major problem in making successful stewardship of God's earth a nearly impossible task. The modern day society focus has shifted which means that the days of 'make do and mend' have been replaced by a fixation on image, longevity, leisure and consumption. ~~All of these~~ This has a negative effect on production, waste and pollution figures, therefore not applying stewardship well. Businesses are using consumer culture to boost profits, rather than combat the problem. ~~Also~~ Tesco continue to sell jeans for as little as £4 despite being repeatedly told of for unethical payment and treatment of their suppliers. American Apparel also produced a lower price T-shirt line called Timex, complete with the tagline "Use Once then Throw-away". Lower prices and higher wages have encouraged a society which values the longevity of objects based on what they ~~cost~~^{cost}, rather than their impact on the natural world. Just 18% of Britain donate to charity on a monthly basis, which means whilst some countries live in a world of consumption & consumerism

many developing ones are suffering. 79% of British clothing worn is made in the Far East, yet it has been shown that 43% of businesses who are suppliers in that region have been proven to be paying workers unethically or be providing unsafe, inhumane working conditions. Stewardship may also be an impossible challenge due to the standard of life we have come to enjoy. What was once seen as a luxury is now an every day occurrence - such as flying. The 71% of families in developed countries take a plane trip each year with 92kg of carbon being deposited into the air per hour of flight time, again showing human disregard for the impact they have on the natural world.

can also be seen to show
The teleological argument ~~also implies~~ why humans should make more effort in their duty of stewardship of the natural world. The argument implies that 'God created the world with intelligent design therefore there is complex awareness for adaptation and growth present on earth at all times. To disrespect God's earth as humans have been doing, due to greed and consumerism shows how human may be failing to recognize the complex design behind the earth. Therefore angering supporters of the argument with facts such as a staggering 81% of people admit to

not thinking about where products or items have come been manufactured if the price is low, making

not thinking about where products or items have ~~come~~ been manufactured if the price is low, making exploitation of workers, pollution and unethical production techniques, all to save money. ~~indicating~~ ^{This indicates} the greedy society we live in can sometimes be shown to ~~be~~.

Although it is a brutal fact that Stewardship of the natural world has become an impossible challenge, I believe it may be true. The standard of life we have grown to enjoy would have to undergo massive changes in order for humans to apply the duty of care needed for the natural world. ~~Therefore~~ being able to combat facts such as 50% of Americans would admit to buying something they planned on using or wearing just once, will not come easily or naturally to humans. This is why I believe John Muir, a leading environmentalist sums up my exploration of this topic with ~~his~~ ^{his} quote "~~properly~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ "we must remember, when we tug at a single thing in nature, we find it attached to the rest of the world" ~~As to~~ I believe humans must recognise the link between their lifestyle and the huge but not easily noticeable effect it has on their stewardship of the natural world. Failure to recognise this link is what makes caring for the natural world whilst applying ~~the~~ the approach of stewardship nearly impossible.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

The candidate has used a good range of accurate terms appropriately.

Question 3

Q3 EQUALITY IN THE MODERN WORLD

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 some were not able to make this link coherent or sensible. Candidates must be clear about attempting the question they have prepared for. Better responses did not make this error and these invariably debated homosexuality along well trodden lines of argument. There is no evidence of responses that deal with equality as a principle in moral philosophy and more able candidates could be encouraged to explore this approach.

This question was interpreted very differently by some candidates. Some candidates explored issues surrounding homosexuality and this was either clearly supported with ethical theory and scientific argument or it was done weakly and resulted in a one-sided argument with limited support.

As with question 1, the best responses tended to be more aware of the 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.

An example of a solid study on homosexuality that has effectively answered the question.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate avoids opinionated comment in favour of objective analysis. A very good range of theological sources cited that are important for this study.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2 Question 3

Homosexuality (the attraction to somebody of the same sex) is a matter of great controversy concerning whether or not it is morally correct. As a result of this there is even greater controversy concerning whether or not they should have equality in the modern world and whether the principles in place concerning it can be upheld unless equality is practiced in the modern world. ^{Personally I believe that they}

One of the theories concerning homosexuality's

Psychological genesis is a difficult childhood. Moberley supports this as she states that "homosexuality is not caused by a ~~genetic~~ hormonal imbalance, genetic presupposition or a personality disorder but difficulties in the parent-child relationship especially in the earlier years of life". The idea therefore suggests that homosexuality is caused by children having an unstable childhood which affects how they learn about the fundamentals of life ~~within~~ which are learnt in the early years of childhood. This may have an effect on how the child forms relationships thus changing their sexual orientation. All in all this means that homosexuals should

have equality within the modern world as they can not help the circumstances they were brought up in therefore can't help their sexuality. Furthermore, this results in the view that religious/ethical principles cannot be upheld unless equality is practiced in the modern world as equality for homosexuals should be a god given right. If this isn't the case then there should be no religious/ethical principles.

A further cause of homosexuality which is being deliberated is a genetic presupposition. This is when the sexuality of a person is decided before birth. If a person's sexuality is indeed decided in this way then homosexuality is natural and a God given. Nina Rosenstand expands on this by stating that "if homosexuality is a natural occurrence then traditional

attitudes towards homosexuality are made redundant² and therefore "it is no longer acceptable to discriminate against homosexuals". ~~The~~ Rosenstand's views confirm that if homosexuality is natural then it must be God approved and far from against the natural order he set up. All in all if homosexuality is natural then a person shouldn't discriminate on the basis of it anymore than they should a person's skin color. Moreover, they should be treated equally and without discrimination in the modern world. This

means that religious/ethical principles shouldn't be upheld unless equality is practiced in the modern world because anything else would be discriminatory towards homosexuals.

Furthermore, the Law is very significant when questioning whether homosexuals have equality in the modern world and if religious/ethical principles should be upheld if otherwise. The Sexual Offences Act of 1967 is particularly significant when examining this argument. The act legalised private homosexual acts for men over the age of (21) and in 2000 lowered the age to (16) (when the age for heterosexuals was lowered). This gave homosexuals equality before the law where sexual acts are concerned but the law still needs to go further to include homosexual marriage. It's only with this amendment that homosexuals ~~started~~ would have true equality within the modern world. All in all this means that religious

ethical principles should ~~not~~ be upheld in the modern world at present as true equality isn't being practiced in the modern world to a good enough extent.

Moreover, the Bible condemns homosexuality strongly and is one of the main reasons for the condemnation of the act within the Christian Church.

The two most explicit passages regarding homosexuality are both in Leviticus. The first is in Leviticus chapter

(18) and states that "no man should have sexual relations with another man" and Chapter (20) states that "no man should have sexual relations with another man. They have done a disgusting thing and should be put to death." These passages suggest that homosexuals are going against God and his rules as they are being condemned within the word of God. This leads the Christian Church to condemn homosexuality as it ~~is~~ proves the condition to be against God and therefore society as part of the natural order he set up. This allows me to conclude therefore that in the eyes of God and his church, homosexuals shouldn't have equality in the modern world. Therefore, ^{the} religious and ethical principles can be upheld as there shouldn't be true equality in the modern world as punishment for the homosexual sin.

However, Jesus teaches against discrimination within his New Testament teachings. His most famous teaching regarding it is "love thy neighbour". This introduces the idea that everybody should be loved

regardless of their sexual orientation. Furthermore homosexuals (despite being sinners) should be loved by others and treated equally as its result. All in all this means that religious/ethical principles should not be upheld unless there is

true equality in the modern world. This is because Jesus taught that there should be equality and to go against that and discriminate would be going against him and his teachings.

Moreover, the Catholic Church has a very deontological view of homosexuality which leads them to condemn the act of homosexuality and fail to treat them equally. The Catholic Church condemns the act of homosexuality because of the teaching in Leviticus, "no man should have sexual relations with another man. They have done a disgusting thing and should be put to death". It is this passage that taught the Catholic Church that the act of homosexuality is a sin therefore an act against God. This is a view which is further articulated in the Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC) as it states that homosexuals should remain celibate and degrades that homosexuals cannot become priests. Despite the Catholic Church also teaching not to discriminate against homosexuals this rule means that homosexuals can't have true equality in the modern world. Homosexuals aren't allowed to be priests as they are supposed to be a role model for the community and actively avoid sin. As a

homosexual this is impossible to do homosexuals cannot be Catholic priests. All in all the view of

the Catholic Church means that homosexuals do not have true equality in the modern world. This is because they can't be accepted into the Church because of their sins and many can't fulfill their vocation due to their sexuality; all because in the eyes of the Catholic Church homosexuals can either be corrected or condemned. This means that religious/ethical principles should be upheld as equality is not practiced in the modern world.

The point is this; despite homosexuality being condemned by the Bible and the Catholic Church homosexuals should be treated with equality within the modern world. This is because Jesus' teachings such as "love thy neighbour" and "love one another" mean that homosexuals shouldn't be discriminated ^{against} as a result of their sexuality. Also if God loves everyone regardless of who they are and what they do meaning that homosexuals should be treated the same as the rest of society by society itself. Therefore, religious/ethical principles should be upheld as homosexuals (because of the teachings of Jesus) should be treated equally in the modern world.

Furthermore, ~~the~~ Aquinas' Natural Moral Law teaches that homosexuals should be condemned therefore shouldn't have equality in the modern

World. Aquinas' Natural Moral Law embraces the idea that God has given the human race certain rules and purposes which are within a person for their whole lives. Aquinas and the Catholic Church have a very strong connection as many of the rules he articulated with regard to homosexuality are reflected in the doctrine of the Catholic Church. A particular ~~part~~ teaching set out by Aquinas is that "God made man to procreate" which shows homosexuals to be against the moral code set out by God. Homosexuality - among other acts such as masturbation are forbidden by Aquinas and the Catholic Church as children cannot be made from these actions. Moreover, if homosexuals are going against the reason God gave the human race sexual relations they are committing a sin of the worst kind as they are going against the will of God himself. This in the eyes of Aquinas and the Catholic Church makes homosexuals sinners who should be condemned thus unworthy of equality in the modern world. All in all, the ethical/religious principles of society should be held up as homosexuals have proved themselves unworthy of equality within the modern world.

Interestingly, the conflicting yet influential viewpoints of the Anglican Church mean that ~~for~~

homosexuals cannot have equality within the modern world, meaning that the religious/ethical principles of society should be held up. The Anglican

Church decided at the National Synod that there should be 4 views on homosexuality and each diocese should decide on the view that a area would follow. These views are...

- Homosexuality is completely natural and acceptable
- Homosexuality can't be helped but sufferers must remain celibate
- Homosexuality is a sin and sufferers should repent
- Although monogamous relationships are ideal homosexual relationships are better than promiscuous ones and are therefore acceptable.

These views are very conflicting and mean that homosexuals cannot be treated equally in the modern world as they can't be within the Anglican Church. This is because there is no universal view for the Anglicans to follow meaning that homosexuals are treated differently wherever they go within the Church. Therefore, they are not being treated equally. All in all the religious/~~principles~~ ethical Principles of Society should be held up at present because equality is not currently being held up within the Anglican Church due to the split on how

best to deal with the issue of homosexuality.

So to conclude, I agree with the view that religious/ethical principles ~~should~~ cannot be upheld without equality in the modern world. However, at present ~~the~~ it is impossible for this to happen as the influential teachings of the Bible, the

Catholic Church, ^{Aquinas} and the Anglican Church ~~make~~
this impossible, promote the discrimination and
condemnation ~~ness~~ necessary to ensure ~~the~~
inequality of homosexuals. The teachings of Jesus
and the theories of how homosexuality is caused
however move some individuals not to discriminate
and move homosexuality towards a more equal
society. All in all despite the fact that religious/
ethical principles ~~is not~~ cannot be upheld without
equality in the modern world the world is far from
equal at present so those principles, currently remain
upheld. must

* (the quality or state of being equal)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure your study covers the ground. Religious themes and sources are vital for the study of each topic. It is not a good idea to have sparse religious sources.

This essay is an example of a topic that fits in with this unit very well even though few choose to study it. There is evidence of independent research on Anti-Semitism that is supported by a very good range of sources.

Commandments such as "Thou shalt not kill" were
broken and killing became part of every day life

However, there were some religious believers who
followed a different side to the Christian faith and
attempted to stop this persecution.

The one church that stood up to the Christian
regime was the Confessing Church who taught religious
principles such as the Golden Rule 'love thy neighbour'

as yourself' and in doing so race against Hitler to protect others. Bonhoeffer was part of this Church and adopted a utilitarian approach as he made attempts on Hitler's life. Although murder was wrong in the eyes of the Church, he believed that killing Hitler would've saved many lives and therefore his act would've been justified. Bonhoeffer risked his life to save others and offer them protection as he was taught to by the Christian faith and the examples set by Jesus. This faith continued until his execution where he prayed until he was hung and ~~was~~ accepted God taking him.

Another example of the Christian faith which helped those in the Holocaust was Maximilian Kolbe, who was part of the Church. Kolbe had taken in as many people 'on the run' from Nazis as he could regardless of their faith as he believed it was the Christian thing to do. He kept his practise until his death when he sacrificed himself to take the place of another man who



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate knows their field. The citation of sources flows though the narrative with ease.

was to be punished alongside nine others because one man had escaped from the death camp. Kolbe and the others were left to starve but he kept great strength in staying alive for three weeks and he continued to believe in God, the saviour. The question is about

The Star of David became a symbol highly associated with the Jews in the Holocaust as Hitler forced all Jews to ^{wear} ~~were~~ the star to identify themselves,

he saw it as a humiliation and punishment whereas they saw it, as described by Isaac Levy as an "assertion that the Jewish people were still alive", they changed the symbol to a symbol of strength and faith.

However, it can be questioned whether such strength demonstrated was a result of religion's teachings ~~or~~ or whether it was just human instinct in regards to the moral thing to do in a human's conscience. Many lost their faith in religion at the time of the Holocaust such as Elie Wiesel who claimed her "faith in the Holocaust went up in smoke the day her sister died in the furnaces of Auschwitz." Therefore it is reasonable to believe that without religious teachings as guidance many risked their lives to help others in the Holocaust because it was their human duty.

This was demonstrated by the Belzki Triad. The Triad began with the Belzki brothers who were on the run and hid in the forests of Belourose as they knew



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Hard work pays off! Following a line of enquiry that is supported through appropriate reading will get results.

Paper Summary

6RS02 reports features work produced by the candidates in the actual examination for candidates in Area 1A, 1B and 1C where possible. Areas 1D, 1E, 1F and 1G have smaller entries and the style of report is briefer for these areas of study.

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>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028658 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning