

# **2005 Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies**

## **Intermediate 2**

### **Finalised Marking Instructions**

**These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments.**

## GENERAL MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

### Two part questions

- (a) Pupils should display knowledge and understanding of the Key Concept/Issue. A maximum of 4 marks for KU with an additional 2 marks for clear references to sources. Pupils should also show the ability to analyse (compare/contrast/discuss). 10 Marks
- (b) Pupils should demonstrate the ability to evaluate by presenting a discursive answer with a personal conclusion. A maximum of 6 marks allocated to an answer only stating one point of view. 10 Marks

### Three part questions

- (a) Pupils should display knowledge and understanding of the Key Concept/Issue. A maximum of 4 marks for KU, with a maximum of 3 marks for an answer that contains no references to sources. 4 Marks
- (b) A maximum of 2 marks for KU. Pupils should also demonstrate the ability to analyse (compare/contrast/discuss). A maximum of 5 marks should be allocated to an answer with no reference to sources. 6 Marks
- (c) Pupils should demonstrate the ability to evaluate by presenting a discursive answer with a personal conclusion. A maximum of 6 marks allocated to an answer only stating one point of view. 10 Marks

- NB**
- Where questions ask about Religious Authority, specific examples from a variety of religious viewpoints have been given in these marking instructions. Candidates may use other examples in their answers. These would be perfectly acceptable.
  - Making Moral Decisions: Explanation of the moral stances must be directly related to the issue specific to the question. Marks should not be awarded to general definitions of Egoism, Utilitarianism or Religious Authority

### Code:

**KU** – Knowledge and Understanding  
**AN** – Analysis  
**EV** – Evaluation

## **CONTENTS**

### **Section One: World Religions**

Buddhism	p. 4 - 8
Christianity	p. 9 - 12
Hinduism	p. 13 - 17
Islam	p. 18 - 23
Judaism	p. 24 - 29

### **Section Two: Making Moral Decisions**

Medical Ethics	p. 30 - 35
Human Relationships	p. 36 - 40
Human Rights	p. 41 - 46
War & Peace	p. 47 - 57
Gender	p. 58 - 66
Ecology & Environment	p. 67 - 74

### **Section Three: Nature of Belief**

Existence of God	p. 75 - 80
Science & Belief	p. 81 - 85
Belief & Action	p. 86 - 90

### **Section Four: Justice in the World**

Social Justice	p. 91 - 96
Global Solidarity	p. 97 - 102

### **Section Five**

Metaphysics	p. 103 - 109
-------------	--------------

## SECTION ONE

### WORLD RELIGIONS

#### BUDDHISM

##### 1. The Human Condition

- (a) Give examples of how Anicca (impermanence) can be seen in the world today. (4)

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

- Anicca can be seen in the ageing process in each one of us – as we grow older we change constantly and we grow older.
- It can be observed in a river, no river is ever the same from one second to the next.
- In the seasons of the year we see that Anicca is present all around us.
- Anicca can be seen in the changing moods that each one of us goes through each day.
- It can be seen in the fact that all things come to an end, relationships, friendships, happiness, sadness, all things move on and decay.

**Sources:**

- “No man can step into the same river twice” Dhamapada
- “Everything that is liable to origination is also liable to cessation” Sermon at Benares

- (b) In what ways do Buddhists believe that Anicca (impermanence) is part of the Human Condition? (6)

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max 5 without sources)**

- Anicca contains the idea of illusion – all things around us are unreal – failure to see this leads us into suffering.
- Anicca is one of the three universal truths that outline the Human Condition, Anicca all life is suffering, Dukkha suffering is caused by desire, Anatta – no soul.
- Anicca leads us to suffering because we fail to recognise the impermanence of things we desire and imagine they will bring us happiness. Suffering comes about through the realisation that even when we find happiness it will not last and we will suffer.
- Failure to see Anicca in our lives means that we continue to desire – Dependent Origination – this leads us to Karma formations, becoming and grasping and through the chain, locks us in Samsara.
- All Buddhists must understand and accept Anicca as the cause of their suffering and this suffering is central to the Human Condition.
- Suffering (Dukkha) is seen by Buddhists as all forms of anxiety or dissatisfaction. It is more than just physical pain, it is the sense of discontent that we all feel, this discontent springs from our grasping for things that will not last. We all experience such sensations as a result of our failure to accept the impermanence all around us.
- Only by recognising the impermanence of all things can we break with suffering and until we make that recognition we are locked in the endless cycle of Samsara and suffering.

**Sources:**

- “Pain is suffering, old age is suffering ...” Dhamapada

- (c) **“You cannot understand suffering without understanding Anicca”. How far do you agree? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 without both sides of the argument)**

**For**

- Failure to see the truth of Anicca leads us to imagine that we have permanence – we put our passing lives to the back of our minds and are only too willing to chase after our desires.
- We feel our desires and ambitions and this leads us into Karma formations and this in turn leads us into Samsara and the cycle of rebirth. Dependent origination traces the chain locking.
- By not seeing the impermanence of ourselves and of the things we grasp we are led into Dukkha (suffering).
- Suffering is caused by desire and will only end when we accept the impermanence of our desires. The things we want will end and will lead us into depression and unhappiness when they do.
- Only by seeing this can we break free from the cycle of desire, etc.
- The Buddha illustrated this through the story of Kisogotami when she was brought to see that the desire to bring back her son was destroying her by holding onto that which would not last – that which was gone.
- Anicca may be illustrated in the story of the Four Sights.
- The eightfold path was designed to allow us to live a life that would illustrate the futility of clinging on to what will not last and this is the key to dealing with suffering.
- This links to the idea of Anatta – no soul and our own impermanence and the illusion of self.

**Against**

- Some might argue that the Buddha actually saw the suffering first and that an understanding of suffering is what will lead us to a deeper understanding of the doctrine of Anicca.
- It was the Four Sights that led the Buddha to search for truth and to see the need for meditation. Only then did he come to see the truth of Anicca.
- By understanding suffering we come to understand the root cause clinging and grasping to material things, this in turn leads us to see Anicca – so perhaps an understanding of Dukkha could be argued to be more essential – maybe we need to understand suffering before we can understand Anicca.

## 2. The Goals

- (a) **Some Buddhists say that the concept of Nibbana (enlightenment) is difficult to explain. Why?** (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Nibbana literally means ‘blown out’ the end of all desires. Nibbana is seen like a fire that has gone out, desire is the fuel that has kept it going.
- Nibbana is the goal that all Buddhists work towards.
- Nibbana is beyond all comprehension and human understanding, it can only be experienced, and this is what makes it so hard to understand.
- It is the end of all existence in the sense that we understand yet it is also never ending bliss “existent non existence”.
- It is the point when all the fires of desire are extinguished, it is the absence of all sense and feeling.
- It is freedom from all suffering.
- It is acceptable to explain how Nibbana is a difficult concept to explain and difficult to describe if you are not there.
- Nibbana is the ultimate goal of all Buddhists.
- Nibbana is difficult to define – it cannot be fully explained only understood through experience.
- It is hard to achieve – and can only be done through the effort of meditation and commitment to following the path or Magga. Nibbana is described by some as existent non existence.
- “As no seeds grow on the mountain top so seeds of all passions cannot grow in Nibbana”. In the same ways there can be no desires that grow on the fields of Nibbana.

**Sources:**

- Dhamapada 204
- “Nibbana is the greatest joy”
- The story of the Turtle and the Fish.

- (b) **“Nibbana is irrelevant to ordinary Buddhists”. How far do you agree with this statement?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max without both sides of the argument)**

**For**

- Nibbana can be achieved in this life when enlightenment is gained and one becomes an Arahant in Theravada Buddhism or a Bodhisattva in Mahayana Buddhism. Such people are known as stream crossers - those who have gone beyond – but for many lay people this is simply not relevant to ordinary life.
- To be enlightened you must meditate and live by the eightfold path; this is almost impossible for lay Buddhists with the daily routine they have to go through, work, family and other commitments in life.
- In Theravada Buddhism only those who have achieved the status of Arahants can achieve enlightenment – only monks and nuns are able to achieve this and it is irrelevant to others.
- At this stage you have ended all desire – all Karma formations in the body. There is to be no more rebirth but ordinary people have still to deal with karma and even when they become Buddhists they are a long way from enlightenment.
- It is such a distant goal to many it hardly seems worth striving for.

### **Against**

- Mahayana Buddhists however see that Nibbana can be a realistic goal for everyone. As the ‘greater vehicle’ they see Nibbana as something anyone can achieve. It is not necessary to enter a monastery for life to attain this.
- The Three Bodies of the Buddha doctrine says we all have the Buddha spirit in us and this can be awakened in any lifetime and therefore all can potentially achieve enlightenment. This can happen to us anywhere and true meditation on the truths can be done anywhere even in the ordinary daily routines we follow.
- Even for Theravada Buddhists it is important to ensure a good rebirth so while Nibbana might be a distant goal we must all strive for it and ensure we make progress through many lives.
- Even the Buddha had to go through many lives to achieve Nibbana and ultimate enlightenment.
- By making it more realistic the Mahayana tradition allows its followers to see the worth of following the path. Like many people in the world they recognise the importance of dealing with the unsatisfactoriness of life and this can be done by lay people through devotions to the Buddhas in the celestial realms.
- You can be aided in the search for enlightenment by this spiritual help and still remain in the secular world.

### **3. The Means**

#### **(a) Explain which aspects of the Buddha’s life are symbolic of the Dhamma (teachings).(10)**

#### **KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Buddha was born in the Spring when it was neither too hot nor too cold, symbolic of the middle way.
- Legends tell us he spoke of this as his last birth symbolic of his future enlightenment as the Buddha.
- In his early life he lived in luxury in the palace kept from the reality of the outside world. This was symbolic of the illusion and impermanence of life as we experience it – closing our eyes to the passing years and the fact that all life will end – Anicca. Desire as he had experienced it was a futile human emotion leading us into attachment to what will not last – locking us into Samsara, etc.
- The Four Sights are symbolic of the awakening that all must go through in the path to enlightenment.
- The life in the forest shows the futility of a life of extremes – extremes of luxury and self denial will not lead to enlightenment, only by following the Middle Way will you see the truth.
- The centrality of meditation is seen in the way the Buddha achieved enlightenment – through seeing the ‘eye of the doctrine’ the impermanence of all things.
- The Dharma was handed down by the Buddha and was a central feature of his life after enlightenment.
- Even the Buddha’s death was seen as symbolic of the Middle Way – from a stomach bug - nothing dramatic. He told his followers not to mourn his death as it was just part of the universal truth that everything is impermanent. He also told how they should look to the Dharma and not to him to find enlightenment – symbolic of Anicca.

#### **Sources:**

- “There is no satisfaction in desires ... desire is painful” Dhamapada 14:8  
Legends of the Buddha

**(b) To what extent is it practical to follow the Dhamma (teachings) in today's world? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for only one side of issue)**

**Unrealistic**

- To truly see the truth you must end all attachment to things – family, possessions, ambitions, etc. This is hard for people and would lead to a break down of society as we know it.
- We learn of the Dhamma through meditation, reciting the scriptures and this is hard in the modern world. “If someone has thoroughly understood this my Dhamma then he is released from the net of suffering” Buddhist Scriptures. How can we give the devotion required to achieve this in the way we live today, only those withdrawing from responsibility and commitment to daily tasks can possibly achieve this.
- Good Karma is built up in the same way – hard in the pressures of modern living - to many an unrealistic lifestyle.
- The Eightfold Path puts duties on people which are difficult to obey in the world affecting lifestyle, employment and even social relationships. Right Action, Right Livelihood (no working with meat, sexual proscriptions, etc). Right Speech calls for a commitment that many would find hard in the world today. Give credit for examples.
- Theravada Buddhism accepts only the Arahats as truly enlightened – ordinary people can not achieve this.
- Only the Sangha are seen as able to achieve the lifestyle needed to lead to enlightenment by following the Eightfold Path and the rules of the Vinaya Pitaka, etc. This is not a realistic lifestyle in the modern world.

**Realistic**

- Mahayana Buddhism – the Greater Vehicle allows for a greater access to enlightenment through spiritual devotions which can encourage people to fit in with life.
- Zen Buddhism allows for deeper meditation even as we are doing everyday tasks allowing us to fit in the Middle Way while we carry out duties and responsibilities of everyday life. Attachment to the scriptures and formal meditation are seen as less important.
- Mahayana Buddhists see the possibility of the transmission of truth from teacher to pupil “the direct transmission of the awakened consciousness” as Cush describes it. In this way the Buddhist way of life can be made more relevant to the everyday lifestyle of ordinary people. The effort lies with the monk or nun and is transmitted in an easy way to the more harassed Buddhist.
- There is merit in the calmness we can get through such practices, even in a busy life, that may even help us with the stresses and strains of modern living. Taking time out for devotions is still a way of learning the Dhamma, and developing positive Karma even in a busy life.
- It is perfectly possible to develop good Karma in the duties of daily life – treating people with respect, developing loving kindness and compassion for those we work with and meet. Right Speech, Right Action, etc are not necessarily incompatible with modern lifestyle; may be even beneficial to the alienating and stress filled lives we lead.

## CHRISTIANITY

### 1. The Human Condition

- (a) Describe Christian teachings about the origin of Sin. (4)

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

- Definition of sin, eg any deliberate act against God, falling short of God's standards, etc.
- God sets limits for Adam and Eve in Garden of Eden – don't eat the fruit.
- The serpent tempts Eve who then tempts Adam.
- Adam and Eve disobey God and eat the forbidden fruit.
- Humans deliberately rebel against God.
- All humans inherit the consequences of this original sin.

**Sources** could include

- Genesis 3 (the story of the Fall)
- Romans 5:12-21.

- (b) In what different ways has Sin been understood within Christianity? (6)

**KU & AN 6 marks (2 marks for basic KU of issue, Max 5 without sources)**

- Pelagius – humans are morally neutral, they can choose not to sin.
- Adam's sin does not directly affect us – he is no more than a bad example.
- Augustine – all humans are alienated from God, we can only be good with God's help.
- Adam's sin is inherited by all people.
- Thomas Aquinas – Adam is our representative, we share the consequences of his action.
- Roman Catholic Church – original sin is removed by the sacrament of baptism.
- Sin categorised – Venial sin (less serious) and Mortal sin (more serious, unless forgiven cannot enter God's presence).
- Calvin – 'total depravity', all humans corrupted by sin.
- Hansen and Hansen – story of Adam and Eve is a myth used to connect sin with us all.
- Adam and Eve represent humanity – when we obey God we 'live' in his presence, when we disobey God we are alienated from his presence.
- Sin is our misuse of freewill.
- Any other valid interpretation of Christian belief about sin can be accepted.

**Sources** as above.

- (c) ***“Everyone has sinned and is far away from God” Romans 3:23.***  
**To what extent is this an accurate explanation of the Human Condition?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Accurate**

- People are alienated from God and basically selfish.
- People are rebellious at heart often choosing what they know is wrong or harmful.
- The consequences of a sinful nature can be seen in our society, eg social problems, general values held by many are based on egoism.
- The increase of war and violence are the consequences of a sinful nature.
- The destruction of the environment is evidence of our sinful nature.

**Not Accurate**

- The Christian view of human nature is too negative; many people sacrifice time and energy for the good of others.
- Humans are capable of great achievements, eg space exploration, discovering cures for diseases.
- Many individuals are working to change the consequences of sin on society, eg homelessness, racism, drug or alcohol abuse.
- Many individuals give time to environmental issues.

**2. The Goals**

- (a) **Explain the relationship between Judgement and Eternal Life?** (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Definition of eternal life, eg quality of life with God, not just long lasting life.
- Death is not the end of a person’s existence.
- God is holy and cannot allow sin in his presence.
- Old Testament depicts God as a judge who rewards people according to their actions.
- In New Testament Jesus presents himself as judge of humanity.
- John’s Gospel suggests a self-judgement which depends on your response to God.
- The dead will be raised for judgement at the end of time.
- Every person will be judged by God.
- Without judgement there can be no eternal life.
- Judgement results in heaven (present with God) or hell (separation from God).
- Roman Catholic – Purgatory – souls cleansed of venial sin before entering God’s presence.
- Some Christians believe only an elect will be with God in eternity, eg Calvinists.
- Evangelicals believe eternal life begins at conversion to Christianity.
- They believe eternal life is a gift of faith and not earned by good works.
- Conditional Immortality – those not accepted by God at judgement annihilated and not sent to hell.
- Universalism – John Hick – because of his loving nature God will offer everyone a second chance at the final judgement and all will receive eternal life.
- Judgement is a continual process that begins now – eternal life is a quality of life.

**Sources** could include

- Deuteronomy 10:18 (not just the ‘Chosen People’ favoured by God but anyone who keeps his law)
- Deuteronomy 32:41 (God will punish those who hate him)
- Matthew 25:31-46 (the parable of the Sheep and Goats – people will be rewarded or punished according to their actions)
- John 3:18 (those who do not believe in Jesus will be judged)
- 1 Corinthians 15 (believers and non-believers will be resurrected for reward or punishment)
- Hebrews 9:27 (we die once and then are judged)
- Revelations 20 (Evil will be defeated and all people will be judged. Those with their names in ‘the Book of Life’ will go to heaven, all others will go to hell)

**(b) To what extent should belief in Eternal Life influence the lives of Christians? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Agree**

- Eternal life can encourage Christians to live morally good lives.
- Eternal life gives life meaning, value and purpose, as it is something that has to be achieved in this life.
- Eternal life gives hope of overcoming death.
- Death need not be feared as eternal life guarantees the continuation of life.
- It provides comfort to those who mourn.
- Without belief in the resurrection of Jesus and eternal life Christianity loses its truth.
- Eternal life is at the heart of the Christian religion.
- It is taught in the Bible so Christians should believe it.

**Disagree**

- Modern scientific knowledge suggests death is the end of an individual’s existence.
- No one has ever come back to prove there is life after death.
- Eternal life has no meaning today, as people are only concerned with the present.
- More people are becoming atheistic which reduces the relevance of belief in eternal life.
- People appear to live good Christian lives while not believing in eternal life.

### **3. The Means**

**(a) Explain why Christ’s death is central to Christianity. (10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Jesus was crucified on a cross with common criminals, Matthew 27:38, identifying him with outcasts and sinners.
- Christ’s death is God’s solution to human sin and its consequences.
- Jesus sacrificed himself so all people could be justified through grace before God.
- Jesus’ death is evidence of God’s love for humanity. (Romans 5:8)
- God and humans can be reconciled through Christ’s death.
- Anselm – it is satisfaction of divine justice. We don’t have ability to compensate for sin - only God can do that.
- By becoming human in incarnation Jesus achieved this.
- However, this means Christ’s death not as important as incarnation – incarnation all that needed.
- Prof Donald MacLeod – it is penal substitution. God is holy and must punish sin. Christ bore penalty of sin.

- ‘God made him who had no sin to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God’ 2 Corinthians 5:21.
- However, Hansen & Hansen thought this barbaric ‘butcher’s shop theology’ and pointed out Jesus appears more compassionate than God the Father.
- Peter Abelard – Christ’s death as our example. His loving self-sacrifice is an example to follow.
- Dr David Edwards – we can see what God like in Christ’s example on the cross.
- However, John Stott thinks this doesn’t treat sin as seriously as Bible. It is partly true but doesn’t deal with problem of sin and alienation.
- Gustav Aulen – God offered the Devil Jesus as ransom for sinners.
- However, some think this immoral and fails to allow individuals opportunity to repent for themselves.
- Calvin – ‘Particular Redemption’ or ‘Limited Atonement’ – only those God chose can receive benefits of Christ’s death.
- Most mainline Churches – any who genuinely repents, believes and perseveres will be saved.
- John Hick – (Universalism) Christ’s death for all, all humanity will be saved because God is a God of love. This is the only approach that can make sense of suffering.

**Sources** as above and also relevant biblical passages.

**(b) To what extent is belief in the resurrection of Jesus still important for Christians today? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Relevant**

- The resurrection is the guarantee that broken relationships between God, people and the environment can be healed.
- It gives hope that death is not the end.
- It gives hope that God will help them deal with difficulties in this life.
- In Romans 8 Paul says resurrection also gives hope for the environment that it will be restored to God’s ideal.
- It gives Christians a source of power that enables them to live according to Jesus’ high standards.
- Gutierrez - The resurrection is an act of liberation and sets the standards for God’s actions in the world.
- We are overwhelmed by the power systems of our world the resurrection enables us to overcome them.
- The resurrection gives power to challenge all evil in our world, eg political tyranny, economic oppression, racism, bigotry, etc in the power of the risen Christ.

**Not Relevant**

- It doesn’t influence some people because they don’t believe it took place.
- Modern scientific knowledge suggests death is the end of existence therefore resurrection is not relevant.
- It is not scientific or logical but superstitious belief and therefore not a healthy influence on people.
- Fewer people believe in it today so it is not really relevant any more.
- Few Christians seem to be influenced by such a powerful belief, their lives seem ordinary or hypocritical.

## HINDUISM

### 1. The Human Condition

- (a) Explain how the Human Condition is affected by the Transience of All Things. (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

#### **Key points about the Transience of All Things**

- The universe is transient, in a state of constant change, and is contingent (dependent). Anything you can think of will change sooner or later.
- Hindu Brahma (Creator) Vishnu (Preserver) Shiva (Destroyer) reflect this continual process of change for all things except Brahman (the basis of all else).
- This also relates to Samsara which literally means "sea of change" and refers to movement of soul "atman" from one existence to another.
- Even the atman (soul) changes as it relates to our experiences in life – psychological/emotional change, atman changes from one body to another in process of samsara.
- Although we may perceive the universe as permanent this is not so - it is maya (or illusion) and those who accept its permanence suffer from avidya (ignorance) of the true nature of reality.
- Even the ego (self) is impermanent although people do not always understand this. It is in the process of constant change.

#### **Relationship to Human Condition**

- The permanence of Brahman should be the focus of concentration on moksha, and the goal of life for the Hindu to overcome the human condition which is in constant flux of change.
- Samsara can tempt people to think of some kind of permanence but this is merely a transient step towards the achieving of moksha.
- As everything is believed to come from Brahman (the universal soul) the point of life is to get back to this original state, then change is a necessary part of this whole process until the permanent Brahman is achieved.
- The aim of Hinduism is to release people from the constant change and limitations of the human condition into the permanent reality of Brahman.

**Sources** might include:

- **Katha Upanishad 6:17** "the inmost self...from the body wrench him out.....pure and immortal is he." (Reference to impermanence of body in relation to Atman or Self).
- **Chandogya Upanishad 6, 8 2-3** "This is the finest essence, the whole universe has it as its Self. That is the Real (Brahman):That is the Self." (Reference to Brahman as only permanent Reality).

- (b) *“The Transience of All Things is an accurate explanation of the way the world is.”* (10)  
How far do you agree?

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**The Hindu view of the way the world is, is an accurate one**

- Impermanence and change is a feature of reality as revealed by modern science which shows everything to be “on the move”.
- Everything is in a state of flux or change as the world and reality is continually on the move.
- Human beings are part of this process. We change in small and imperceptible ways all the time - often so small that we do not often realise this is happening.
- When we learn new knowledge or gain experience of certain things in life this can cause us to change. We may appear to be the same from the outside from day to day but inside we are changing all the time. This apparent permanence we think is true is actually maya (illusion).
- The concept of samsara (reincarnation) also suggests that things change all the time. The "soul" is continually on the move towards Brahman and the state of moksha. This is a basic belief in Hinduism and is very relevant for today.

**The Hindu view of the way the world is, is not an accurate one**

- If everything was continually "on the move" then everything would change more quickly. The laws of nature need to be permanent or life would be in chaos.
- Modern ways of looking at ourselves and the world are involved with the promotion of the self and modern emphasis on self and its development does not accept the possibility of other lives but in this life only - death is the end, no reincarnation, no final destiny, etc.
- The Hindu view of impermanence and change only makes sense if everything is heading towards Brahman. But if there is no Brahman (and this cannot be proved) then the whole structure of Hinduism is based on wrong ideas.
- Modern philosophy and knowledge would question the idea of people "having" a soul which separates from the body at death. If this belief is open to question then the whole basis of Hinduism is itself an "illusion" (maya).

## 2. The Goals

(a) What do Hindus mean by Moksha (release)? (4)

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

- Moksha is Hindus' final destiny, stage of existence. Moksha is "release" from the cycle of rebirths (samsara) where soul will never be reincarnated.
- It involves release from the suffering (dukkha) and limitations of a narrow view of the self and an awareness of one's eternal destiny.
- It is the union of the individual soul (atman) with the universal (Brahman).
- It is the state where the purpose of life and the successive progress of the soul has been achieved and so no further rebirths are necessary.
- It is the highest state of happiness/bliss within Hinduism.

**Sources:**

- **Aityeraya Upanishad 3.1.3** "The Universe has Consciousness as its eye and Consciousness as its end. Consciousness is Brahman."
- **Upanishads** teach that Brahman and Atman are identical, ie this is Moksha.
- **Bhagavad Gita** Arjuna in says that "when we reach moksha, we are in everything and everything is in us."

(b) How is Moksha (release) related to reincarnation? (6)

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max 5 without sources)**

Some of the key points which could be made are

- As moksha is Hindus' final destiny, final stage of existence. Moksha is "release" from the cycle of rebirths (samsara) where soul will never be reincarnated.
- Moksha is the point at which all reincarnations cease (samsara).
- It involves release from the suffering and limitations of a narrow view of the self and an awareness of one's eternal destiny – it is the end of the sequences of incarnation in this life.
- It is the end of the individuality of the soul (atman) in its cycles of rebirths and the union of the individual soul with the universal (Brahman).
- It is the state where the purpose of life and the successive progress of the soul has been achieved and so no further rebirths are necessary.
- It is the end of the "journey of the soul" through many lives and its achievement of the whole point of the samsara/reincarnation process.

**Sources;**

- **Bhagavad Gita, eg Arjuna.**

(c) ***“Moksha cannot be described; it can only be experienced.”***

**To what extent do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

Some people might agree with this statement because

- Moksha (union with Brahman) is such a unique and different experience that it is impossible to describe adequately. It can only be experienced.
- How can you describe pure consciousness or ultimate reality?
- Such experiences can only be described by analogy, eg a drop of water from a river emerging with the sea. Language is inadequate to describe this.
- Many things in everyday life cannot be adequately described, only experienced. Love, for example, is very difficult to put into words but this does not mean that it is not real or doesn't exist.
- The experience of moksha is therefore the only really valid way of understanding its significance.

However, others might disagree saying

- If moksha cannot be described then is it real? Surely people can describe something of the experience even if it's difficult to do so.
- If those who claim they have experienced moksha cannot say what they have experienced, then how valid is that experience?
- Moksha is regarded as a very remote possibility anyway for most Hindus - so vague and unclear descriptions may make it seem even more so - especially for those who are poor and in the lower castes.
- Many Hindus have problems just surviving and so moksha and the motivation of spiritual/moral improvement may not be seen as a major concern so not being able to describe/experience moksha is not very significant.

### **3. The Means**

(a) **Explain the difference between the paths of Jnana (knowledge) and of Bhakti (devotion) in Hinduism.**

**(10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

Jnana as a means to salvation involves

- Allowing people to be more clear headed and concentrated on personal improvement and spirituality and forces them to study and concentrate hard on achieving salvation.
- Leading Hindus to a freeing of themselves from the bonds of attachment to the material world enabling them to reach a higher spiritual level.
- Giving Hindus a better and clearer understanding of the universe and their place within it and therefore opens up their minds to ultimate reality and hence the path to salvation/Moksha.
- A more complex way of achieving salvation with a spiritual teacher and the time to develop such techniques; it is a more permanent and rewarding approach compared to bhakti and karma.

**Sources:**

- Jnana - Yajur Veda Rudri 2:1-2 "Know that God resides in the earth and in the entire universe....he is in all of them."

Bhakti, by contrast

- Is more meaningful for those who want to concentrate on ritual/involvement and include emphasis on emotions/worship. It's very accessible to all Hindus.
- Involves corporate, eg family/temple worship and develops a sense of togetherness and so Hindus can help one another achieve the goal of Moksha.
- Is the most popular because it involves a more physical/participatory kind of approach - more ritual, pre-set actions, etc which is more straightforward for ordinary Hindus.
- Is seen as a valid way by many of achieving moksha or towards moksha based on a practical, ritual approach which can be easily incorporated into the everyday life of Hindus.

**Sources:**

- Bhakti - Bhagavad Gita - " Whatever you do, eat, offer all that to me " ie, devotion.

**(b) To what extent is Karma (moral liability) an accurate way of explaining why life often seems unfair? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 marks for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

Some may argue that karma is a reasonable way of explaining the unfairness of life:

- Actions performed in one lifetime believed to influence what happens to the person beyond death. Karma must work itself out so that life of an individual at any time is directly related to state of their atman from previous incarnation. Good/bad behaviour has consequences.
- This leads to the idea of "you reap what you sow." Good actions (karma) produce good results and bad actions produce bad consequences. This is very true of human behaviour in a "cause and effect" way.
- Karma gives an explanation for the apparent inequality/unfairness in the lives of individuals today. Good and bad actions are simply working themselves out in a moral karmic way.
- This idea also relates to the caste (or varna) system which reflects the structure of the universe in which there are differences of levels of human beings which are a working out of the good/bad karma.

However, there are several arguments against this view

- It has been seriously questioned whether a "soul" can be reincarnated in another body. If this is true then the idea of karma does not make sense.
- Would it be fair to punish someone in a later incarnation for the bad karma of another person in a previous existence?
- People are unequal in life for a whole variety of reasons, not just karma. (Candidates may give some examples such as heredity, environment, circumstances, etc). This gives too convenient an explanation and a reason for nothing being done to improve people's lives now.
- Caste system is an unfair and immoral one. It needs to be changed. To explain it in terms of good or bad karma misses the point. It just gives a justification to continue things as they have always been rather than change them.

## **ISLAM**

### **1. The Human Condition**

- (a) What does the Qur'an teach about Idolatry? (4)**

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

- Qur'an opposes idolatry and states it is an act of wrongdoing, the worst kind.
- Idolatry prevents person from worshipping Allah to the fullest extent.
- Idolatry turns person away from the love and care of Allah.
- Idolatry puts a creature before the sovereignty of Allah.
- It does not just involve worshipping statues or images of God. Idolatry includes giving too much attention to money and acquiring material possessions.

- (b) Explain the consequences of Wrongdoing for Muslims. (6)**

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max 5 without sources)**

- Allah will judge the deeds of every individual on the last day.
- Wrongdoing will put the relationship between man and Allah in crisis.
- Allah will avenge the Wrongdoer. Death is the ultimate suffering.
- Suffering will occur as result of wrongdoing. This might be for the individual, the family or the whole community depending on the actual wrongdoing.
- Suffering may be in the form of personal pain and anguish or might affect others. Some wrongdoing can affect innocent members of the community. Wrongdoer must accept responsibility for this.
- Have to work through the suffering in order to understand our wrongdoing and be able to learn from it.

**SOURCES:**

**Surah 2:** 105: 135: 219

**Surah 4:** 15 ff: 48 ff: 51

**Surah 6:** 91

- (c) ***“To understand the Human Condition fully, Muslims must accept that Wrongdoing is unavoidable.”***

**To what extent is this true?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Agree**

- Wrongdoing is a result of free will.
- Moral law is reflected within each individual conscience.
- Allah does not control our thinking or behaviour we have the ability to choose between right and wrong.
- Wrongdoing is unavoidable because of the role played by Iblis (the Devil). He tempts us into wrongdoing and we are too weak to resist.
- The modern world is full of idolatry and it is too difficult for us mere humans to resist.
- We are also influenced by those around us, our up-bringing and our peer group. This influence is often too strong for us to go against because we are weak and our hearts are easily swayed.

**Disagree**

- Free will is about choice. We do not have to be weak; we can choose to avoid wrongdoing.
- Muslims believe we have an inner spiritual nature (rouh – the soul) which helps us to make decisions if only we listen to it.
- Allah guides us in right and wrong through the Qur’an. If we read it and follow his guidance we will be kept on the right path and avoid wrongdoing.
- It’s a matter of personal responsibility and hard work. Avoidance of wrongdoing is a matter of effort on our part. We can choose to make the effort or choose to be lazy.
- Iblis cannot force us to do anything we do not want to do. He can only guide us in his way if we allow him to.
- Concentrate on doing Allah’s will rather than our own.

## 2. The Goals

(a) Explain Muslim beliefs about Eternal Life. (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Eternal Life = Akhirah. Paradise = "al Jannah".
- Life has two stages, ie the life in this world and eternal life.
- Allah decides who will be with him in Paradise depending on how we have lived in this world.
- Our choices regarding good/evil will determine our final destiny.
- Status of a soul's place in eternity will be decided at Judgement.
- Soul is questioned by two angels. If it answers correctly the soul will lie in comfort until the day of judgement, if not, it is kept in great discomfort.
- Eternal life means an eventual resurrection of the body.
- On reaching Paradise the Muslim will be handed the Book of Life – right hand go to Paradise, left hand – go to Hell.
- Allah is fair and reliable. We cannot keep secrets from him.
- Qur'an is full of warnings to non-believers.
- Eternal Life gives Muslims hope of a better life to come.
- Gives meaning and value to the world.

**SOURCES:**

**Surah 2:30:106 ff**

**Surah 41v46**

**Surah 14:44 ff**

**Surah 31:33 ff**

**Surah 30v42-45**

**(b) To what extent is Eternal Life the most significant goal for Muslims? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Most Significant:**

- Belief in life after death is very basis of genuine living.
- Motivation to do good works throughout the whole of one's life.
- Muslim desires to please Allah throughout whole life.
- Reward for obedience will be entrance into Paradise.
- Belief in Eternal Life will comfort the bereaved.
- Joining Allah in Paradise is ultimate aim for Muslims. Importance of this reflected in life of many martyrs.
- Eternal consequences of actions on earth will constantly encourage Muslims to keep their faith.
- Spiritual joy of Paradise as described in Qur'an is well worth working towards. Torment of Hell is undoubtedly worth avoiding.

**Not So Significant:**

- True Muslims should not focus on desire to gain Eternal Life as motivation for good deeds. Good deeds should simply be seen as following the will of Allah.
- It is wrong to do good if the motivation is some future reward.
- More important to live a good life and focus on one's future judgement.
- Judgement Day will precede Eternal Life.
- Allah will decide – we cannot influence His decision. Eternal Life is a gift.

**Sources:**

**Surah 1**v1-7

**Surah 74**v38-47

**Surah 4**v123

**Surah 30**v14-16

### 3. The Means

- (a) Explain how keeping the Five Pillars helps to strengthen the world-wide Muslim community. (10)

**KU & AN – 10 marks (Max 8 without sources). Max of 4 marks for description of Five Pillars.**

- Shahadah = Declaration of faith. Every Muslim makes same declaration no matter where in world they live. Tremendous sense of encouragement comes from this.
- Salat = Prayer. Five times daily all facing Makkah. Strong sense of being part of something bigger than your own community. Standing side by side in mosque regardless of riches, all are equal.
- Zakat = Almsgiving. Showing responsibility towards others in the Muslim world. Helping the needy creates bond. Also know that if you are ever in need people will help you.
- Saum = Fasting. Helps to understand the suffering which many experience through poverty. Support for each other to achieve this difficult goal. Knowing that everyone is fasting at the same time creates huge community spirit. Time to focus on strengthening faith in Allah through reading Qur'an and prayer. Giving of alms at the end of Ramadan. Community celebration during Eid.
- Hajj = Pilgrimage to Makkah. Creates a direct link with Muslims all over world and with the shared history. All are equal (Ihram – clothes worn). Everyone completes pilgrimage in same way. Amazing atmosphere and sense of achievement.
- Public acknowledgement of what it means to be a Muslim.
- Keeps faith alive – regular commitment.
- Bond with other Muslims (Ummah – Brotherhood).
- Understanding of others' needs.
- Encourages sense of communal responsibility.
- Sharing with others or giving up our riches encourages us to value what we have.
- Development of self-discipline, commitment, patience and compassion.

**Sources:**

**Surah 2:** 183 ff, 185, 215, 262 ff, 270 ff

**Surah 3:**v97

**Surah 22:**v27 ff

**Surah 11:**v114

**Surah 17:**v78ff

- (b) *“Keeping the Five Pillars is not the most important aspect of a Muslim’s relationship with Allah”. How far is this true?*

(10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 marks for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Not True**

- Islam means “submission to will of Allah”. Five Pillars are fundamental way for Muslims to show this submission in their daily lives.
- Without Five Pillars Muslims would have no direction in life.
- Give spiritual discipline and practical way to build relationship with Allah.
- They are the heart of the Shari’ah.
- Give meaning and purpose to Muslim community.
- Enable stability and cohesion to be established and create a sense of identity.
- Keeping Five Pillars is a way of atoning for wrongdoing and therefore can help to re-establish relationship with Allah after a period of wrongdoing.
- Keeping Five Pillars diligently will be rewarded with Eternal Life.

**However**

- Some Muslims may not be able to fully participate in the all of the Five Pillars.
- For those living in non-Muslim countries it is often difficult to fulfil every aspect of religious duty.
- Worship and praise of Allah is the most important underlying principle. As long as Muslims remember this then this will make up for not being able to keep any of Five Pillars.
- Allah is most concerned about how we develop our relationships with others and the honesty with which we practice. It is the love in our hearts and our compassion towards others which will form the basis of our Judgement.
- Would be easy to keep many aspects of the Five Pillars in a routine way – this is something to be avoided. Better to fulfil whatever aspects one can, but do it sincerely. Allah will be more pleased. Allah knows what our lives are like and if we can/can’t do things. He will forgive if we are genuine.

## **JUDAISM**

### **1. The Human Condition**

- (a) **Explain how the suffering of their ancestors might make Jews believe they are God's Chosen People.** (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Suffering reminds Jewish people of their own history, as suffering lies at the heart of many historical events and their festivals.
- Detailed reference to any of the key events in Jewish history where the Jewish people suffered. 2 marks for developed detailed event, 1 mark for simple reference to previous event. Examples below:
  - Slavery in Egypt
  - Greek Invasion – Antiochus
  - Exiles in Babylon
  - Pogroms in Russia
  - WWII
- The suffering made the Jewish people stronger and more determined to succeed. It gave them a cause in the past to believe in and it gives the modern Jewish people a sense that if they suffer they are still God's people.
- From Adam and Eve, suffering has been part of the human experience, it is what life is like - it is not new.
- The Jewish people were tested by God, to show what it meant to be God's Chosen People.
- It is an example to Jewish people today not to give in – their ancestors suffered, but won through in the end.

#### **Sources**

Appropriate Scriptural References as mentioned in the marking scheme.

**“Examining Four Religions”** – Michael Keene.

**“Belief, Values and Traditions”** – Ann Lovelace & Joy White.

**“Ethics & Religions”** - John Rankin, Alan Brown, Paul Gateshill.

(b) ***“Suffering is a punishment from God as a result of sin.”***

**To what extent do you agree**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 Marks (Max 6 marks for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Agree**

- Jewish Scriptures are full of incidents of them or other people suffering as a result of their sinful behaviour.
- Genesis 3 - the Story of Adam and Eve. Paradise was living with God in perfection. Gen 3:16-19 – Pain and suffering is the punishment given for going against God’s word.
- When Moses came down with the Ten Commandments (Ex 32:19-35), the people had turned away from God and were worshipping the Golden Calf. As a punishment for their sin, God sent a disease among the Israelites (Ex 32:35).
- David’s wrongdoing with Bathsheba (2 Sam 11:1-12:14) results in God promising that David will see his own family being destroyed – punishment for his sinning.
- The Exiles were the result of the Israelites turning their backs on God and living a sinful life.
- There are many individuals who are punished by God for what they do. If someone is mentioned, there should be a source to gain 2 marks.

**Disagree**

- Suffering is part of the human experience, plenty different people suffer - the suffering experienced by the Jewish Nation over the years is no different to that experienced by many other people.
- Suffering was man-made – it was simply people choosing to do wrong – the Holocaust, the Exodus, pogroms, exiles, etc are examples of one group of humans ill-treating another group.
- Jewish people see suffering as a positive thing. Suffering gives value and meaning to being Jewish. It is seen as a physical sign of being chosen by God to be one of his “People” – Adam & Eve.
- Suffering is an essential part of God’s plan for salvation. In order to be saved in the next life, you have to have suffered in this life.
- People are united in suffering, giving a sense of “solidarity” – there is some comfort in knowing if one suffers, everyone suffers.
- Suffering is seen as God’s way of “testing” the faith of his “Chosen People” in order to see if they were strong enough in faith – Job.
- Some Jews see suffering as an inspiration because of its effect on future generations – it creates a bond between past, present and future – Passover/Exodus – Book of Exodus.
- The importance of suffering historically, through the Pesach celebrations, mark out the Jewish Nation. It sets them apart from everyone else.
- Though they suffer, Jews believe they will never be abandoned by God. Suffering exemplifies the redemptive nature of God; he will always be there for them.

**Sources**

Appropriate extracts from Scripture of Chosen Religion  
“Moral Issues in Six Religions” Ed. **W.Owen Cole**.

## 2. The Goals

- (a) **Explain how Teshuva (repentance) and spiritual improvement affect a Jew's personal relationship with God.** (10)

### **KU & AN 10 Marks (Max 8 marks without sources)**

- Personal relationship with God should show the following:
  - Spiritual Improvement which results in Closeness to God
  - Closeness demands people seek Teshuva

The candidate's answer should now look in more detail at these two things:

- Teshuva is saying sorry for the wrong a person has done.
- A Jewish person is given the chance to start again, to wipe the spiritual slate clean.
- According to the Old Testament, if someone wants to be closer to God, then repentance is essential. (Isaiah 1:17-18: Amos 5:14-15).
- For the spiritual improvement of the individual, repentance is essential. A person can only make themselves better if they are sorry for the wrong they have done.
- A Jewish person is given the chance to start again, to wipe the spiritual slate clean. This will make the individual feel a sense of God's love, thus making them feel more potent and cared for – being part of God's people.
- Repentance should become part of people's life, something carried out daily and not just with God. No matter where they are, people should be able to identify what they do wrong and say "sorry" for it.
- By repenting, people will grow to realise the importance of other people, rather than themselves. Teshuva is, therefore, helpful in character-building, making the person more selfless, a better person for the future.
- The significance of Teshuva and Closeness to God/Spiritual Improvement can be seen in the Jewish way of life through the different festivals and practices within Judaism – the festivals would not exist if Teshuva or Closeness to God was not significant.
- ROSH HASHANAH – "The Day of Judgement", "The Day of Repentance" – the Jewish New Year – Lev 23: 23 - 24.
- The Jewish New Year is marked by ceremonies and symbols where repentance is a key theme. The sounds of the Shofar are meant to signify the sounds of repentance.
- YOM KIPPUR (YK) – "The Day of Atonement" – a day set aside for asking for forgiveness. (Leviticus 23: 26-32)
- YK is marked by ceremonies and symbols where repentance is a key theme. "Kol nidrei" – a hymn asking forgiveness for not keeping vows. Any other examples.
- Prayers help people in their repentance and being closer to God – "Amidah" is a prayer which helps to heal the relationship between God and his People.
- The Shema is another prayer which is used in repentance and spiritual improvement as the person submits to the will of God.

- (b) **How far do you agree that closeness to God is an individual goal rather than a shared goal for all Jewish people?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 Marks (Max 6 marks for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Agree**

- Closeness to God is the key goal, being part of the chosen people is not enough.
- One of the key parts of the Shema is the instruction to “love the Lord your God with all your heart....might”. This shows that individual closeness to God is the key goal.
- The Shema continues to demand a personal commitment to the Jewish relationship with God. If a Jewish person carries this out it can only result in one thing – the person themselves being closer to God.
- Jewish people are asked to use the Shema in the Tefillin, for prayer, they have to wear it when they are praying. It shows the importance of closeness to God, otherwise they would not be encouraged to use them so often.
- Jewish people are also encouraged to know the Torah, this will directly bring them closer to God. By knowing the Torah, they will know God, know what he wants and this, ultimately, will bring the person closer to God. The Bar-Mitzvah – knowing the Torah.
- Jewish People are encouraged to have a personal prayer life with God, the use of the siddur. This will bring them closer to God as he will help them live their life better and fight temptation.

**However**

- For some Jews it is not the individual goal which is the key, but being close to God by being part of the Chosen People. There is a communal aspect to being close to God.
- The Shema charges Jewish people to pass it on to their children. The importance of The Shema, and therefore closeness to God, must be seen as a communal thing shared by the whole community.
- The use of Mezuzahs, containing the Shema – it marks out the Jewish household – a common bond between Jewish People, bringing them all closer to God.
- So much of the practice of Judaism is done in community – the candidate could refer to a variety of rituals which have communal aspects to them:
  - Rosh Hashanah
  - Yom Kippur
  - Shabbat.
- “Amidah” is a prayer used to heal the relationship between God and his People, it continually uses “we” and “us” – this stresses the communal aspect of the importance of the “people”.
- The use of other prayers recreates a sense of community among Jews throughout the world.

### 3. The Means

(a) What are the key features of the Torah (Law) for Jewish people? (4)

**KU 4 Marks (Max 3 marks without sources)**

- The Torah is the “Word of God”, given to Moses by God on Mt Sinai.
- There were two Torahs given, the written Torah and the oral Torah.
- In general terms, the written Torah, on Tablets of Stone, can be described as the five Books of Moses: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. However the actual laws appear in Exodus 21-23, Leviticus 1-27 and Deuteronomy 5-31.
- The oral Torah was passed down by word of mouth, in other words each generation passed it on to the next.
- The oral Torah is an explanation and interpretation of the written Torah.
- It explains God’s plan for mankind from the beginning until the end of time.

(b) In what different ways has the Torah (Law) been understood within Judaism? (6)

**AN 6 Marks (Max 5 marks without sources)**

- Orthodox Jews view the written Torah as the “Word of God”, for this reason it has not changed whatsoever over the years.
- The Orthodox Jews believe that the Torah was written by Moses; it is eternally valid and cannot be changed.
- Practice of the Torah, for Orthodox Jews, is essential because it is God’s commandment.
- They carry out the 613 mitzvot exactly as it is written as they see this as their obligation.
- Orthodox Jews do not interpret the Torah, they follow it exactly just as their forefathers have done.
- Reform Jews have a more relaxed view of the essential nature of the Torah – it needs to be interpreted for today’s Jews.
- They do not follow all 613 mitzvot to the “letter of the law”.
- Reform Jews interpret the Torah as being written by Moses; this ancient writing needs to be re-interpreted in the light of modern society.
- Liberal & Reform Jews welcome valid criticism of out-dated laws, since they question the authorship of the Torah by Moses.

#### **Sources**

- **Examining Four Religions** – Michael Keene
- **Belief, Values and Traditions** – Ann Lovelace & Joy White
- **Support Materials** – HSDU.

(c) *“The Torah has little influence on how Jews live their daily lives.”*

**To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 Marks (Max 6 marks for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Agree**

- Life has changed since the Torah was written, it was written for a nomadic tribe of the Middle East. That lifestyle is very different to the challenges set Jews today.
- The Ten Commandments are formulaic – they do not deal with the variety of the challenges facing people today.
- Some Jewish people will be under pressure from their Gentile peers in a way that is not conducive to observing the Torah. People around them, day by day, do not share the same values, the Torah does not help them.
- Business practices and demands have superseded the Shabbat rules on working. Many Jewish festival days and holidays are not officially recognised, Jewish people have to work or take “leave of absence”.
- Food laws and hygiene demands make it impossible to carry out the Kosher rules. Few supermarkets in Scotland cater for the Jewish community, it is impossible to expect Jewish People to keep the Food laws.

**However**

- The Torah is the “Word of God”, it can never be affected by time or place. Truth transcends time and place, it must be observed even in today’s society.
- The Torah, though once written on tablets of stone, is now written in people’s hearts – Jeremiah. The people keep it alive by living it day to day as best they can.
- The Torah details the Jewish way of life, laying out clearly how Jewish people should behave and practise their religion:
  - Shabbat
  - Circumcision
  - Kashrut
- It identifies Jewish Festivals and tells them how to commemorate them: Sukkot, Pesach, Shavuot, etc.
- The heart of the Covenant is expressed in the Ten Commandments, though Moses received 613 laws in all. They identify, in general, fundamental Rights, which affect others: Loyalty to the Community; Loyalty to the State; Brotherly Love; The Sanctity of Human Life and the Sanctity of Property. These are very relevant today.
- In our troubled modern society the Torah is seen as something which can be turned to whenever Jews need it. It is like a lighthouse standing out in the mist showing off its beacon.
- The Jewish Community will not let the Torah or its observance disappear, The Jewish family will continue to encourage adherence to it no matter what is happening around them.
- Perhaps some ideas need to be re-interpreted, but it does not make the rest of it invalid. Reform Judaism brings the Torah up to date for the native follower so it reflects modern living.

## **SECTION TWO**

### **MAKING MORAL DECISIONS**

#### **MEDICAL ETHICS**

##### **1. The Beginning of Life**

- (a) State Egoist viewpoints for and against abortion. (4)**

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

**For**

- The Egoist may not want a child with a handicap.
- The woman's life/health may be at risk.
- Having a child may threaten her education/career.
- The individual has the right to decide whether or not to give birth.

**Against**

- Abortion can make society less caring and therefore a less pleasant place to live.
- It devalues life, this may eventually threaten the Egoist's own well-being.
- The aborted foetus may have grown up to benefit the Egoist in some way.
- The individual may regret it later and become troubled with guilt.

**Possible egoist sources may include:**

- Nietzsche 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.
- Max Stirner – Egoist philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- James L Walker – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.

- (b) How might Utilitarians differ in their views on abortion? (6)**

**AN 6 marks (2 marks for basic KU, Max 5 without sources)**

**Utilitarianism**

- The majority of people in society are in favour of abortion.
- It is better for society not to be burdened by unwanted children.
- The foetus is only a potential life but the mother is a real person, her happiness is more important.

**However**

- Abortion may make society a less caring, happy place to live.
- It may devalue life and result in suffering for many people.
- Potentially the foetus may develop into a person who can help millions.

**Possible Utilitarian sources may include:**

- Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832, John Stuart Mill 1806-1873 – An action may be said to conform to the principle of utility, when the tendency it has to improve the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

(c) *“Abortion is unacceptable because it ignores the rights of the unborn child.”*

**How far do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Agree**

- Children are a blessing from God, to be cherished.
- All life is sacred to God, he has given the foetus the right to life.
- The foetus should be regarded as a person from conception.
- It is vulnerable and should be protected.
- Laws exist to protect the child from the moment of birth, as a child can survive birth from 23 weeks, we need to extend this protection to during the pregnancy.

**Disagree**

- The foetus has no rights; it is only a collection of cells.
- The woman’s rights are more important.
- The foetus is not a person until it survives birth.
- The rights of any existing children are more important.

**2. Prolongation of Life**

(a) **Explain how two different moral stances respond to the issue of organ transplants. (10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

**Christianity**

- Treat others as you would like to be treated yourself – The Golden Rule.
- Love your neighbour – the Good Samaritan (Luke 10) – organ donation is another way of showing God’s love.
- It shouldn’t be compulsory as it should be up to the individual to decide for him/herself.
- Use of dead donors is acceptable as long as the relatives are comfortable with it and it was the person’s decision when alive.
- Selling organs is exploitation of the poor.
- The use of animal organs is generally acceptable as long as no suffering is involved for the animals.
- The Church of Scotland teaches that the fundamental Christian argument in favour of organ donation must be Christ’s commandment to love your neighbour.

**Islam**

- Organ donation is an act of compassion.
- In 1995 the Muslim Law Council issued a fatwa saying Muslims could donate organs, carry donor cards and permit the removal of organs from close relatives.
- Some Muslims disagree and believe the body should be left whole for the day of judgement.
- Muslims oppose selling of organs as exploitation of the poor.
- Most Muslims would have problems with animal donors in case the animal was haram (unclean), eg a pig.

### **Egoist**

- It may or may not be in the Egoist's best long-term interest. It depends whether it is the Egoist or someone else who is to receive the organ transplant.
- They may want their own life preserved at any cost.
- If their life is extended there is always hope that a complete cure may be found.
- The patient may be someone they care about.
- A society which does not support organ transplants may not be a good place to live.

### **However**

- They may want an elderly relative to die in order to relieve them of their responsibilities.
- Life only has value when your own self-interest can be achieved. If not, there is no point in living any longer.
- The treatment is very expensive and may prevent money being spent on treatment needed by the Egoist.
- It also ties up medical staff the Egoist may need.
- He/she may be frightened that their own life may be ended to 'harvest' organs.
- There is a high rate of failure with some transplants.
- If made compulsory it could affect the Egoist's rights.

### **Possible Egoist sources may include:**

- Nietzsche 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.
- Max Stirner – Egoist philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- James L Walker – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.

### **Utilitarian**

- Your organs are of no use to you after death.
- It would solve the problem of a shortage of donors.
- This would take away the pressure from the grieving relatives of making the decision.
- People would be free to carry a non-donor card if they wanted.

### **However**

- Doctors keen to obtain organs may hasten death or they may not try as hard to save someone.
- It could go against someone's personal freedom of choice, eg if they had forgotten to carry their 'opting out' card.
- Compulsory donation would not be an act of kindness; to be compassionate it should be an act of free will.
- This gives the State and the medical profession too much power. People would have less trust in their doctors.

### **Possible Utilitarian sources may include:**

- Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832, John Stuart Mill 1806-1873 – An action may be said to conform to the principle of utility, when the tendency it has to improve the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

(b) *“Animal organs should not be transplanted into humans.”*

To what extent do you agree?

(10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Agree**

- It is against nature.
- It is interfering with the will of God.
- We don't fully understand what all the consequences may be.
- Life should not be maintained at all costs, quality of life is more important than quantity.

**Disagree**

- All life is sacred and should always be preserved.
- God has given us the ability to prolong life in this way so we should use it to the full.
- This has been successfully happening for years with no side effects.
- Every moment of life should be valued; once it is allowed to end it can never be replaced.

**3. Ending of Life**

(a) **State Utilitarian viewpoints for and against voluntary euthanasia.**

(4)

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 marks without sources). Maximum of 2 marks for each side of issue.**

**For**

- There are more benefits for the individual from ending his/her life than by prolonging it.
- The individual has the right to choose when to die.
- It is a good way of lifting the burden of caring for the dying from the community.
- It is an escape from pain and suffering.
- Euthanasia is a way for society to care for its members.

**Against**

- The consequences of encouraging euthanasia may not be beneficial for the majority.
- Society may devalue life and become less caring and pleasurable.
- Only having two options – death or suffering – is not genuine freedom.
- All possible options should be explored in order to maximise happiness.
- Hospices provide a suitable alternative to euthanasia.

**Possible Utilitarian sources may include:**

- Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832, John Stuart Mill 1806-1873 – An action may be said to conform to the principle of utility, when the tendency it has to improve the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

- (b) **How might a religious person and an egoist agree in their attitude towards voluntary euthanasia?** (6)

**AN 6 marks (2 marks for basic KU, Max 5 without sources)**

**Christianity**

- Life is sacred and a gift from God – Job 1:21.
- Do not commit murder - Exodus 20:13.
- Euthanasia is a grave violation of the law of God – Pope John Paul II.
- Nothing and no one can in any way permit the killing of an innocent human being. No one is permitted to ask for this act of killing – Catholic Truth Society, 1980.
- Human life is on loan from God. We have responsibilities to care for one another – Church of Scotland, 1997.
- There can be a purpose in suffering.

**Islam**

- No one dies unless Allah permits. The term of every life is fixed – Surah 3:145.
- Suicide is wrong. Euthanasia is a form of suicide. It is interfering with Allah's will.
- There can be value in suffering; it is part of Allah's will. Surah 31:17.
- It is the code of life the doctor aims to maintain and not the process of dying – Islamic Code of Medical Ethics, 1981.
- Anyone who kills a believer deliberately will receive as his reward a sentence to live in hell forever. God will be angry with him and curse him and prepare dreadful torment for him – Surah 4:93.

**Egoist**

**For**

- If it was the Egoist's own life it would be best that a doctor helps him/her die as this is more efficient and may cause less suffering.
- An individual should have the right to decide when to die.
- It may help others to face death if an individual is allowed to face death with dignity.
- It would help doctors if they were aware that the patient wanted euthanasia.
- The Egoist may benefit in some way from the person's death, eg as the beneficiary to their will.

**Against**

- It may not be in the Egoist's best long-term interest.
- It may lead to abuses which eventually threaten the Egoist's own life.

**Possible Egoist sources may include:**

- Nietzsche 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.
- Max Stirner – Egoist philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- James L Walker – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.

- (c) **“To refuse voluntary euthanasia is against a patient’s human rights” To what extent do you agree? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Agree**

- God gave us freedom we should have freedom to choose when to die.
- Quality of life is important, not quantity; the value of life is related to its quality.
- Modern medicine sometimes prolongs a person’s life when they would have died naturally escaping suffering.
- Euthanasia is an act of compassion. It is cruel to prolong someone’s life when they are suffering.
- It relieves the burden on families and society as a whole.
- Being a doctor is not just about saving lives; it is also about doing what is best for the patient.
- We can be prosecuted for allowing an animal to suffer; we should not be allowed to let people suffer.

**Disagree**

- All life comes from God and is sacred.
- God gives life and only God should decide when to take it away.
- Many people recover after being told they will die.
- Modern medicine and palliative care is so good almost all pain can be relieved.
- People will trust doctors less.
- It is the beginning of a slippery slope.
- It devalues human life.
- It is an easy option; we shouldn’t just be allowed to end our lives when we feel like it.

## **HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS**

### **1. Marriage/Alternatives to Marriage**

- (a) State Utilitarian viewpoints for and against marriage. (4)**

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 marks without sources)**

#### **For**

- It is an important and valuable institution as it provides the best setting for bringing up children.
- It helps to maintain a safe and stable society.
- It provides a legal framework for relationships giving security for the majority.
- Most people want to get married; even those who divorce want to remarry.

#### **Against**

- It depends on whether marriage produces the greatest good for the greatest number.
- Marriage can be seen as restricting personal freedom.
- 1/3 of all marriages end in divorce, many marriages are unhappy.
- Alternatives to marriage can provide just as many benefits for society.

#### **Possible Utilitarian sources may include:**

- Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832, John Stuart Mill 1806-1873 – An action may be said to conform to the principle of utility, when the tendency it has to improve the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

- (b) How might a religious person and an Egoist disagree in their attitude towards the importance of marriage? (6)**

**AN 6 marks (2 marks for basic KU, Max 5 without sources)**

Candidates should refer to sources and viewpoints from a specific religious faith in their answer, eg

#### **Christianity**

- Marriage is part of God's plan for humans –Genesis 2:23-24.
- Marriage is an exclusive, monogamous relationship – Genesis 2:23-24.
- Christians should only marry other Christians – 2 Corinthians 6:14.
- The Church of Scotland teaches that marriage is good because God's love is expressed in the relationship; God made men and women for each other to help one another through life; sex is a powerful instinct, marriage gives it a focus; both Jesus (John 2) and Paul (1 Corinthians 7) supported marriage.
- The Roman Catholic Church teaches that marriage is a sacrament, once consummated it is everlasting.

#### **Islam**

- Marriage gives security to the couple and provides a sound basis for bringing up children – Surah 4:25.
- Most Muslims marry other Muslims – You shall not wed pagan women, nor shall you marry idolators - Surah 2:220.
- Marriage is a partnership with Allah as the master.
- Arranged marriage is common.
- Monogamy is the ideal but polygamy is allowed.

### **Egoist**

- It means restrictions on personal freedom.
- 1 in 3 marriages break up; it is too risky, the egoist may be hurt.
- Living together is more acceptable now and children of unmarried parents can still have a good and secure upbringing.

### **However**

- It may provide a more stable long-term relationship.
- It may help to keep his/her partner faithful because they are legally bound together.
- It provides legal protection and therefore more recognition and stability for society.
- It provides the most stable situation in which to raise a family.

### **Possible Egoist sources may include:**

- Nietzsche 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.
- Max Stirner – Egoist philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- James L Walker – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.

(c) ***“It is wrong for a non-religious person to want a religious marriage ceremony.”***

**To what extent do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

### **Agree**

- The couple may not be believers therefore a religious ceremony would be hypocritical and meaningless.
- They may have a religious ceremony for the wrong reasons, eg to please relatives.
- If they are not sincere it suggests their promises are not being taken seriously.

### **Disagree**

- The language and atmosphere emphasise the seriousness of the vows taken by the couple.
- All love comes from God therefore a couple should involve God when they express their love to one another and the community in marriage.
- Historically Scotland is a Christian country - this is part of our tradition.
- Marriage is a legal ceremony - it doesn't make any difference whether the wedding ceremony is civil or religious.

## 2. Divorce

- (a) Explain how an Egoist and a Utilitarian might disagree in their opinion on divorce. (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

### **Egoist**

- There is no need to endure a bad relationship.
- Children can be damaged living in a bad situation amidst conflict.
- Marriage breakdown is stressful enough without making divorce difficult.
- No one willingly suffers the pain of a divorce.

### **Possible Egoist sources may include:**

- Nietzsche 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.
- Max Stirner – Egoist philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- James L Walker – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.

### **Utilitarian**

- Divorce is acceptable if it produces the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people.
- There is no point continuing with a relationship in which there is more suffering than pleasure.
- If it is taking more effort to maintain the relationship than he/she is getting out of it then divorce is acceptable.
- The increased rate of divorce may not necessarily be a bad thing if it has led to a happier society.

### **However**

- Benefits of continuing in failed relationship may be said to outweigh those of divorce, eg for children involved, for financial purposes. In this case divorce would not be seen as best option.

### **Possible Utilitarian sources may include:**

- Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832, John Stuart Mill 1806-1873 – An action may be said to conform to the principle of utility, when the tendency it has to improve the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

(b) ***“Couples who have taken marriage vows before God should not divorce.”***

**How far do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Agree**

- The couple took vows to love each other before God; this is a very serious thing to do.
- Divorce is damaging society: one-parent families, social problems, children emotionally damaged, and a massive drain on the Welfare System.
- 40% of marriages end in divorce.

**Disagree**

- This has nothing to do with God.
- People shouldn't stay in a destructive relationship.
- It is up to each individual. People should be allowed to choose to divorce if they want to.
- Prolonging a bad relationship can be more harmful to the adults and the children involved. There is no need to endure a bad relationship.
- No one willingly suffers the pain of divorce or takes it lightly.
- Divorce is an accepted part of life in Scotland now, there is no stigma attached to being divorced, there is nothing to worry about.

**3. Sexual Behaviour**

(a) **What opposing views might an Egoist and a Utilitarian have concerning sexual behaviour?**

**(10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

**Egoist**

- Sex is a natural function of human life.
- It is a pleasurable activity to be enjoyed.
- It doesn't need to be restricted to marriage.
- Even in marriage casual sex is acceptable.

**However**

- Casual sex can spread STD's or HIV and therefore harm the Egoist.
- Society as a whole may degenerate and become more immoral risking harm to the Egoist.
- The Egoist may get hurt emotionally.

**Possible Egoist sources may include:**

- Nietzsche 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.
- Max Stirner – Egoist philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- James L Walker – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.

**Utilitarianism**

- Utilitarians will be concerned about whether sex before marriage will produce the greatest amount of happiness for the most people.
- It can lead to fewer long-term stable relationships and therefore affect society.
- It can lead to an increase in STDs and HIV.
- It can lead to unwanted children.
- Sexual freedom involves wider interests than personal pleasure.

**However**

- Personal freedom is important.
- Casual sex can be enjoyable and produce happiness with fewer emotional ties.
- If the majority of people in society were in favour it would be acceptable.

**Possible Utilitarian sources may include:**

- Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832, John Stuart Mill 1806-1873 – An action may be said to conform to the principle of utility, when the tendency it has to improve the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

**(b) To what extent is religious teaching about sexual behaviour relevant today? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)****Relevant**

- Still relevant because permissiveness is dangerous and can cause suffering, eg AIDS.
- It is a gift from God.
- It unites people in love.
- It should only take place within a marriage relationship.
- It is very special; it can create new life.
- Homosexuality is against God's ideal of heterosexual relationships – Leviticus 18:22, Romans 1:24-27. Some Christians do accept homosexuals but as sexual intercourse should only take place within a heterosexual marriage they expect them to remain celibate.

**Not Relevant**

- It is a natural part of human life and should not be restricted by rules.
- Religious teaching was formed thousands of years ago and is out of date.
- As long as there is mutual consent and no one is hurt it is acceptable.
- Using contraception and other forms of 'protection' means we don't have to worry about spreading STDs.
- People don't have to be married to have sexual intercourse or to love each other.
- Homosexuals can love each other and be just as committed as heterosexuals.

## **HUMAN RIGHTS**

### **1. Capital Punishment**

- (a) **Explain the views of two opposing moral stances on capital punishment. (10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

#### **Religious Authority:**

Candidates should refer to sources and viewpoints from a specific religious faith in their answer, eg

#### **Christianity**

- ‘Do not commit murder’ – Exodus 20:13. Capital punishment is murder committed by the government.
- Life is sacred and should only be ended by God – Job 1:21.
- Do not take revenge – Matthew 5:38-39, Romans 12:19.
- God is merciful; we should follow his example.
- Jesus taught that forgiveness is important.
- There has to be room for repentance and reform.

#### **However**

- There is no direct statement in the Bible that forbids capital punishment and in the Old Testament there are a number of crimes for which capital punishment is recommended. Some Christians do support capital punishment.

#### **Islam**

- Do not take life, Allah has made it sacred – Surah 17:33.
- Allah is merciful; we should be merciful too.
- Those who are forgiving will be rewarded – Surah 42:40.
- Blood money (compensation) can be an alternative to capital punishment – Surah 2:178.

#### **However**

- Under Shari’ah law capital punishment is allowed for two crimes: murder and openly attacking Islam.

#### **Utilitarianism:**

- Utilitarians base their beliefs about capital punishment on the principle of what produces the greatest good for the greatest number of people. A Utilitarian could be for or against capital punishment depending on the consequences of capital punishment.
- Capital punishment only involves pain or suffering for a small number of people.
- It is a deterrent and will lead to the security and happiness of the majority.
- The death penalty protects the majority of people in society by killing individuals who are murderers.
- It is good for the majority to know that the punishment fits the crime. It encourages people to obey the law.
- Although some innocent people may die, if this helps the majority of people in society to respect the law and live free from fear it is a worthwhile sacrifice.
- A life sentence is more cruel than the death penalty.

**However**

- Innocent people are killed. It is better for people to live in a society where they can be confident that they will not be victims of a miscarriage of justice.
- If prisoners are given a chance to reform, society can benefit from their contribution. They may encourage others not to break the law.
- If the law doesn't respect life, people may no longer value life in other situations. This could make life more unpleasant for the majority.
- It is not a deterrent. The murder rate actually increases when the death penalty is practised in a society. This is not good for the majority.

**Possible Utilitarian sources may include:**

- Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832, John Stuart Mill 1806-1873 – An action may be said to conform to the principle of utility, when the tendency it has to improve the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

**Egoist:****Agree**

- There will be one less criminal in society.
- It will save the taxpayers money. It is cheaper to execute someone than to imprison them.
- It is a deterrent and will make society a safer place to live.
- If the Egoist was the condemned criminal death might be preferable to life imprisonment; it lessens his/her suffering.

**Disagree**

- It does not act as a deterrent so society is not safer for the individual.
- An innocent person may die; mistakes are made.
- It does not help the relatives, eg nothing can replace the life of the victim.
- If capital punishment is practised he/she may be put to death one day.
- He/she may be wrongly convicted of a crime.
- He/she may be upset at the death of another, therefore capital punishment is wrong because it is not good for them to be upset.
- It does not act as a deterrent.

**Possible Egoist sources may include:**

- Nietzsche 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.
- Max Stirner – Egoist philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- James L Walker – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.

- (b) ***“If a person commits murder they deserve to be executed.”***  
**To what extent might a religious person agree with this statement?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Agree**

- It is for the common good of society.
- It expresses society’s condemnation of serious crime.
- It would help to establish clear moral standards in society; justice would be seen to be done.
- It helps the families and friends of victims.
- It is good for the majority to know that the punishment fits the crime.
- Life sentences are not long enough, eg 10 –15 years.
- God is just and wants to punish all evil.
- An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is fair.
- Society needs to be protected.
- It is the ultimate deterrent.

**Disagree**

- Innocent people may be killed.
- It devalues human life in society.
- Society can benefit from reformed criminals.
- It is better for society if the Law respects human life.
- It is not a deterrent.
- All life is sacred.
- If killing is wrong then the Government should not be allowed to kill either.
- Two wrongs don’t make a right; it sets a bad moral example for society.

**2. Racial Prejudice**

- (a) **How might an Egoist and a religious person differ in their views on racial prejudice?(10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

**Egoist**

- Egoists base their beliefs about racism on the principle of what is best in their own long-term interests. An Egoist could be for or against racism depending on the circumstances.
- The Egoist may benefit in some way from being racist. For example, it may increase his chances of getting a job, a house or obtaining services.
- Being racist may protect his way of life. If people of other races are integrated into society things will change.
- It will allow him to use others as scapegoats to take attention away from his own failings. He can blame them when things go wrong in society.

**However**

- If the Egoist is a member of an ethnic minority, he could be a victim of racism. This would not be in his best interests.
- It is in the individual’s interests that everyone be treated equally.
- The Law makes it clear that racism is wrong.
- A society free from racism would be a more pleasant place to live.
- Bullying and discrimination are wrong no matter what form they take.

**Possible Egoist sources may include:**

- Nietzsche 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.
- Max Stirner – Egoist philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- James L Walker – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- Thomas Hobbes 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.

**Christianity**

- All humans are created in likeness of God – Genesis 1:26.
- Christians are called to “love thy neighbour” – Luke 10: 25-37.
- The Golden Rule – do for others what you want them to do for you – Matt 7: 12.
- Jesus showed love and compassion to everyone.
- Paul said that we should never discriminate – Galatians 3: 28.
- Christianity stresses love and acceptance towards everyone.
- The Roman Catholic Church rejects discrimination against anyone or harassment of them because of their race, colour, condition of life or religion.

**However**

- The Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa supported Apartheid. They based this on Noah’s words in Gen. 9 where he cursed one of his sons to be a slave. They said this meant that black Africans should be their slaves.
- The Roman Catholic Church was involved with Nazis in WW2 and aware of Holocaust but did not try to prevent it.
- Also possible to consider the actions of the Conquistadors and the Jesuits in Latin America or the Crusades in the Middle East as racist actions performed in name of God.

**Islam**

- Everyone is a creation of Allah and deserves respect – Surah 49;13.
- An Arab is not better than a non-Arab ... a “red” person is not better than a black person – Muhammad.
- The Qur’an celebrates the diversity amongst humans – Surah 30;22.
- All humans are part of same family.
- Muslims should treat non-Muslims with kindness.

(b) *“The Media encourages racism.”*

**How far do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Agree**

- The Media use of stereotypes fosters racism.
- Advertising shows a euro-centric ‘white’ image of the UK.
- Campaigns against asylum seekers in the tabloid press encourages racism.
- People are influenced by the Media.
- Television news programmes only present stories showing ethnic minorities in a bad light.
- Stereotypes in TV soaps foster racism.

**Disagree**

- There are other causes for racism (ignorance, upbringing, etc).
- Many people who are racist are not influenced by the Media.
- Some newspapers, etc try to highlight racism and campaign against it.
- Documentaries on TV help to highlight racism.
- Scotland is a racist country anyway, the Media doesn't make any difference.

**3. Freedom of Speech**

- (a) **Explain why a religious person might support freedom of speech.** (4)

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 marks without sources)**

**Christianity**

- Christians should speak out in defence of any oppressed person.
- Jesus challenged corruption in politics and religion.
- The Old Testament prophets challenged any corruption in their society and often spoke in defence of others.
- People should feel free to speak out about what they think is wrong.
- Censorship denies people individual freedom.

**Islam**

- All injustice should be opposed.
- A corrupt government should be reminded of what is right and fair.

**Sources:** Any relevant scriptural passage

- (b) **How might a Utilitarian argue that freedom of speech benefits the majority of people in society?** (6)

**AN 6 marks (2 marks for basic KU, Max 5 without sources)**

**Agree**

- Personal freedom is important; anything else will result in unhappiness.
- People should be free to make their own choices.
- It can encourage the development of democracy.
- Society could become a better place to live in.

**Disagree**

- It might be best to limit the freedom of some to benefit the majority.
- Censorship can be valuable as it protects the majority from the minority.
- People may not always make decisions that benefit others.

**Possible Utilitarian sources may include:**

- Jeremy Bentham 1748-1832, John Stuart Mill 1806-1873 – An action may be said to conform to the principle of utility, when the tendency it has to improve the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it. (The greatest good for the greatest number.)

(c) *“Allowing total freedom of speech lets dangerous people say dangerous things”*

To what extent is this a problem for our society?

(10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**No Problem**

- Every human has the right to freedom of speech.
- Treat others in the way you would like to be treated yourself - The Golden Rule. If we want to have freedom of speech we should allow others that freedom too.
- Denial of freedom of speech creates a fearful, insecure society.
- We should respect each individual's right to express personal opinions.
- Some people have suffered and died in order to win freedom of speech.
- Censorship threatens personal freedom.
- It is a matter of personal taste. What is offensive to one person may not be offensive to another.
- What individuals do in private does not harm anyone else.
- People should have the right to make personal choices.
- Banning something usually only helps to make it more popular.

**A Problem**

- If it is used to harm others, eg libel, slander, to incite violence, to express racist views, to create fear to cause distress. It is important to protect individuals in society from anything hurtful.
- If it is used to break the law.
- The law protects people in other areas; it should also protect them from offensive statements, slander, etc.
- Treat others in the way you would like to be treated yourself - The Golden Rule. If we want people to restrict their freedom of speech towards us and not insult us, etc we need to restrict our freedom of speech too.
- People should not be free to make statements that will hurt others.
- It may be important to protect state secrets.
- Censorship protects freedom.

## WAR AND PEACE

### 1. Non-violence and Pacifism

- (a) Explain the views Utilitarians and religious people might hold on Pacifism? (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

#### **Utilitarian**

##### **Pacifism is right**

- The utilitarian might believe that pacifism will bring better long term solutions, therefore violence is not justified.
- The utilitarian may believe that pacifism is right because fewer people will be killed.
- Society will grow and develop as people will learn to work with one another. They will build better relationships.
- Pacifism will not lead to the destruction of the land, people will not suffer. More people will benefit therefore pacifism is right.

#### **However**

##### **A Religious Viewpoint Against Pacifism**

- A person who takes this stance will look to their Religious traditions in order to make a moral decision. They will look to appropriate scripture, social teaching or to a religious person for example on this issue.

#### **Christian**

- There are several Old Testament sources which would argue against Pacifism when faced with violence, especially crime – Deut 19:21 – “..a life for a life, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a hand for a hand...”.
- In John 18:36, the response of Jesus to Pilate is “my men would fight to keep me from being handed over”. Some Christians argue that this statement shows that society may have to fight against a greater injustice. The cleansing of the temple shows Jesus using violence when he felt it was justified in order to right a wrong.
- The “Just War Theory” – Thomas Aquinas – lays out conditions, defending the weak, etc, which must be followed after which violence is justified.
- Crusades – Holy War – defending the Faith.
- Liberation Theology – armed struggle is justified to fight against injustice if all other avenues have been exhausted.

#### **Jewish**

- Violence is also justified as part of punishment – Lev 24:20.
- “Milchemet mitzvah” are obligatory wars which God commands them to fight in order to defend themselves – there are three reasons:
  - in self defence, if another army invades – Ex 17: 8-13
  - more controversially, if they feel threatened they can make a pre-emptive strike – attacking an enemy in order to avoid being attacked or avoid lots of casualties
  - responding to another country who are being invaded in case you are next.
- “Milchemet reshut” is an optional war, on the same lines as the “Just War” Theory in Christianity - Violence is justifiable on certain conditions – Judg 11: 12-33.

## **Muslim**

- Pacifism not consistent with Lesser Jihad - Defence of the Faith and the nation is considered acceptable if under threat.
- The use of violence is acceptable, but it must bring about good, not evil.
- Sufficient force can only be used.
- The Qur'an teaches that there should be no widespread destruction of people, animals or land.
- Justifiable War for the following conditions
  - Self Defence
  - Defence of family, tribe or country
  - Fighting oppression
  - Put right injustice

## **Pacifism is wrong**

- The utilitarian might believe that most people would benefit if force was used in a particular situation – violence is justified.
- The utilitarian may believe that violence is the only thing someone else may understand.
- Non-violence has never been shown to be successful in the past – WWII – Hitler only understood the use of force. Greater numbers would suffer if violence was not used.

## **A Religious View Supporting Pacifism**

### **Christian**

- Central to Christianity is the teaching “Love your neighbour” – at no time are people encouraged to use violence.
- “If anyone slaps you, turn the other cheek.” (Matt 5:39) and “Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you” (Matt 5: 44) – more teachings by Jesus.
- “Do not commit murder” (Ex 20: 14) is one of the Ten Commandments.
- “Blessed are the peacemakers” is one of the eight beatitudes – Matt 5: 9.
- Jesus, Martin Luther King lead by example – non-violence more effective – treat people as you would want to be treated.
- “He who lives by the sword, dies by the sword” – this should make the Christian use non-violence.
- Early Christian example - being thrown to the lions without fighting back. For some Christians their non-violence is based on this.
- Maximilian Kolbe - his treatment in the concentration camp.

### **Jewish**

- Proverbs: “If your enemy is hungry, give him bread. ...water to drink” – they should go to great lengths not to fight. Jewish people are encouraged to use non-violence where possible.
- Shalom means “Peace” and is the greeting used by Jews everyday. It expresses the hope that one time all mankind will live in peace.
- In Isaiah 2:2-4, a time in the future is looked forward to when there will be no war and their swords turned into ploughshares.
- Micah 6:8 – “to do what is just, to show constant love, and to live in humble fellowship with our God.” – at the heart of God’s plan for humans is peace. Non-violence would be consistent with this.

## **Muslim**

- Peace is important in the Qur'an, which states that violence is wrong.
- We should be looking after the welfare of others, not killing them.
- Peace is one of the basic aims of Islam, it is the final part of daily prayer – “peace be upon you”. Therefore non-violence should be considered important.
- Reconciliation should be sought, not revenge. Try to turn hatred into friendship by forgiveness and love.
- Human rights are important since Muslims believe Allah created all humans – “Let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice.” The use of violence violates people's human rights.
- Humane treatment of enemies – treatment should reflect Qur'an.
- Allah has 99 names which often relate to peaceful qualities “the one who gives safety and peace” or “the gentle and tolerant” – interestingly no names describe Allah in terms of a fighter or soldier.

## **Sources**

- **Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) /John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)** – The greatest good for the greatest number of people.
- **John Stuart Mill** – On Liberty.
- Appropriate extracts from Scripture of Chosen Religion mentioned in Marking Scheme above.
- “Moral Issues in Six Religions” Ed. **W.Owen Cole**.
- “Ethics & Religions” **John Rankin, Alan Brown, Paul Gatheshill**.

**(b) How effective can non-violent actions be in turning people against war? (10)**

## **AN & EV 10 Marks (Max 6 marks for only one side of argument)**

### **Effective**

- MLK was greatly influenced by the teachings of Jesus, especially the Eight Beatitudes, he spoke out against the Vietnam War. He advocated non-violence as a response to resolve a dispute. He therefore believed that violence could never be justified under any conditions people had to find non-violent actions.
- Muhammad Ali, an American Muslim boxer, created headlines with his opposition to the Vietnam War. He refused to go and fight in Vietnam and carried out what is called “civil disobedience”. He was sent to prison and stripped of his boxing “crowns”.
- Experience shows us that negotiation is the way forward – any examples from the past – violence does not solve anything, people have to negotiate.
- The United Nations can influence countries and their involvement can force countries to back down.
- Different sanctions, trade embargoes, etc can be carried out or put in place against aggressive countries.
- Cutting off diplomatic relations with aggressive countries.
- Protest marches have been the most obvious method of non-violent action – there were many during the Vietnam War and the Iraq War.
- Human Shields – some people decide to put themselves in strategic places so bombing cannot take place.
- Sit-ins in public buildings have taken place to register people's view against war.
- Organising protest groups to raise awareness of the conflict and the possible suffering as a result.
- Public awareness meetings to allow people to voice their disapproval.

- Media campaigns on TV and in the press have been very successful in accessing various people, and informing them thus changing the public opinion on war.
- Letter campaigns to people's MPs have resulted in open debate about war.
- Singers and writers have used a variety of genres to oppose war and highlight the suffering experienced by those who have participated in a war.
- Candidates may suggest other examples.

### **However**

- Bullies/aggressors need to be tackled, otherwise they would make everyone else suffer. Non-violent actions would not be tolerated by some dictators, they would have no effect.
- The United Nations have not been successful in stopping war; countries just ignore them.
- Sanctions and trade embargoes do not stop war, they did not bring down Saddam Hussein. It was only when the allies entered into physical battle was anything really achieved.
- In some countries protestors are seen as political agitators, their protests are actively discouraged, and in some cases they are jailed.
- If politicians feel that it is right to go to war, they will just ignore dissenters. Dissenters are of no consequence, they do not count.
- Some problems are far too deep-rooted in hatred to be solved by a non-violent response. A new start is necessary, therefore violence is necessary to solve the situation.
- Candidates may suggest other examples.

## **2. Just War**

**(a) Describe the main points of the Just War Theory. (4)**

**KU 4 marks (3 without sources)**

- Thomas Aquinas argued that it was possible for war to be justified, however in order for it to be justified certain conditions had to be adhered to - "JWT".
- War is justified if one country is helping to protect another weak country from an invading force.
- All other sources have been followed, ie diplomacy, sanctions, etc; war should be the last resort.
- During the war only sufficient force can be used, in other words you cannot use too much force in order to defeat the enemy. For example, you cannot drop a nuclear bomb on a country over a dispute about boundaries.
- Only the Government, with the backing of all political parties, can deploy the army in the "JWT".

**(b) In what ways might an Egoist and a Utilitarian agree with the Just War Theory? (6)**

**AN 6 Marks (Max 5 without sources)**

- The candidate should identify where there are similarities between the Egoist and a Utilitarian.
- They should show that they may be for or against warfare.

**Egoist**

**Agree with the Just War Theory**

- The Egoist would be willing to go to war if it will bring better long term solutions for themselves.
- An Egoist will feel a war is justified if their personal security was improved by removing the threat of a dictator or aggressive enemy.
- If the war made things improved for the Egoist's children, then they would see the war as just.

**Utilitarian**

**Agree with the Just War Theory**

- A Utilitarian would be willing to go to war if it would bring better long term solutions for the greatest number of people.
- A Utilitarian will feel a war is justified if the security of the majority of people was improved by removing the threat of a dictator or aggressive enemy.
- If less people were to be killed or suffer by going to war, a Utilitarian would see it as a "right" action in order to save the greater number of people from suffering.

**However**

**Egoist**

- Some Egoists may feel that long term there may be more disadvantages than advantages, so they would not see the war as justified.
- If the Egoist feared that they might be killed in the war, they would be against it.
- If the Egoist felt that his/her children could suffer as a result of the war, they would not see a war as justifiable.

**Utilitarian**

- Some Utilitarians may feel that long term there may be more disadvantages in going to war than advantages. So they would not see the war as justified, if the greater number of people suffered at a later date as a result of the war.
- If a Utilitarian feared that there would be greater casualties as a result of war, they would view the war as wrong. Better to decrease the numbers suffering.
- A Utilitarian may not be willing to interfere in a smaller country's politics, as by doing so they may bring more suffering to their own people.

## Sources

### Egoist

- **Thomas Hobbes** – 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.
- **James L. Walker** – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- **Max Stirner** – Egoist Philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- **Nietzsche** – 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.

### Utilitarian

- **Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832)/John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)** – The greatest good for the greatest number of people.

(c) ***“War can never be right.”***

**How far do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

### Agree with statement

- UDHR – everyone has the right to life – to take someone’s life is to deny them their human rights.
- Only God has the right to take life, human beings have no right to play God.
- Think of all the innocent people who die as a result of war. Recent figures show the vast majority of people killed in wars are civilians, not soldiers. This cannot be right.
- Violence breeds more violence – mankind regularly carries out atrocities under the banner of war - Genocide in WWII, Kosovo, Rwanda, etc.
- Countries are devastated by war, economies and societies are destroyed and people suffer years after the war has finished.
- Violence can never be condoned, the teachings of Jesus – “Turn the other cheek”, “Love your enemies”, etc.
- Martin Luther King, Ghandi and others have shown that non-violence can be as useful a weapon as violence.

### Against

- Self-defence – just as we have the right to defend ourselves personally, if we feel our lives are being threatened, so if we feel threatened by another country, we have the right to go to war.
- Our country is a rich country because of the empire, we have to look after those countries in the Commonwealth who we exploited. We have treaties and such-like, it would be legally wrong not to defend them in their hour of need
- As one of the rich and powerful countries in the North, we have a responsibility to look after smaller, poorer countries in other parts of the world, if they are under threat.
- If we do not stand up against open aggression directed at another country, who says that it won’t be us next. You have to stand up against a bully.
- You have to stand up for what is right, “For evil to thrive good men only have to do nothing” – think of Nazism in WWII.
- If all other avenues have been sought and there is no other alternative, then war is justified.

### 3. Control and Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

- (a) Explain how two different moral stances might respond to the issue of possessing nuclear weapons. (10)

**KU & AN 10 Marks (Max 8 without sources)**

#### **For**

##### **Egoist**

- An Egoist may view nuclear weapons as essential in order to have the best weapons to defend themselves against an aggressor. Therefore they may feel justified to possessing them.
- An Egoist may feel possession of nuclear weapons is a deterrent to other countries attacking, so they benefit. The more they have the bigger the deterrent.
- An Egoist may see nuclear weapons as useful in getting what they want. The more they have the more powerful they will feel.

##### **Utilitarian**

- A Utilitarian may look at Nuclear Weapons as a deterrent – that is a way of frightening or discouraging other people from using them. More people will benefit in the long run, they will see possession as justified.
- Financial profit - the Utilitarian may realise the country makes money out of nuclear weapons in the Arms Trade. Therefore they should be used because of the amount of people who will benefit from the money and jobs. More stock piling – the more money they will make.
- The Utilitarian may have short goals, this lifetime, it will save problems for the vast majority of people, if we use nuclear weapons. Possessing nuclear weapons will benefit their short term goals.

##### **Religious Authority**

##### **Christian**

- Some Christians believe that without nuclear weapons we would be open to nuclear blackmail. They may be happy to possess them.
- By using nuclear weapons a greater evil may be combatted that could bring far more poverty and suffering. Possession is justified if we defend the weaker nation.
- Some Christians believe that technological advances have made nuclear weapons more accurate and less discriminatory.
- Some Christians believe that nuclear weapons are justified if they are used as a deterrent to stop other countries thinking of invading or using nuclear weapons.
- Some Christians believe nuclear weapons are acceptable as a negotiating tool for disarmament with other countries. It gives us power to negotiate.

##### **Islam**

- Nuclear weapons can be used as part of the jihad – some muslims feel charged to protect Islam using any method, even nuclear weapons.
- The Qur'an preaches peace. Some Muslims believe that nuclear weapons are justified if they are used as a deterrent to stop other countries thinking of invading or using nuclear weapons which may lead to destruction.

### **Judaism**

- Some Jews believe that nuclear weapons are justified if they are used as a deterrent to stop other countries thinking of invading or using nuclear weapons. They would not be against even stockpiling them.
- Some Jewish people believe they should have any weapons on the market to carry out pre-emptive strikes to lessen the suffering of their people. They would have no problem in stockpiling them.
- Strong army is seen in the past as a sign of the power of God – the Israeli army should be armed with the best equipment. The more weapons, the more powerful they will be.

### **However**

#### **Egoist**

- An Egoist may view nuclear weapons as useless because their life may suffer if there was an accident. By possessing them, the risk of an accident is greater, therefore they are in greater danger.
- The money used to make nuclear weapons could be used to make an Egoist's life better in many different ways. Therefore they would be against having them.
- If nuclear weapons were used it could result in the destruction of the planet, so in the long run they would not benefit from them. So what would be the point in having them?

#### **Utilitarian**

- A Utilitarian may view the possession of nuclear weapons as excessive because the majority of people would not survive a nuclear war anyway. Why have them then?
- A Utilitarian may disagree with the stock piling of nuclear weapons on grounds of expense - the money used in expenditure could instead be used to raise the standard of living - do away with poverty, etc. Money could be used to improve people's life-style. This may help more people in the long run, therefore more attractive to the Utilitarian.
- There could be dangerous side effects, radiation, acid rain, etc, which could affect people if we have nuclear weapons. The Utilitarian may not think they are worth it due to the destruction of people and, even, the planet in the long run.
- The danger of accidents could be increased if nuclear weapons are stock piled - burn-outs or transportation disasters. These would seriously affect people. It's not worth the risk to endanger a large number of people by having nuclear weapons
- The Utilitarian may have long term goals and consider the possession of nuclear weapons as a threat in the long term for the majority of people. We may be unaware of certain factors which could take place if nuclear weapons are stored.

## **Religious Authority**

### **Christian**

- Huge amounts of money are necessary to possess nuclear weapons. Some Christians feel this money would be better going to the poor and solving other problems – Matt 25:30-46 – “...whenever you do this for the least...” – THE SHEEP AND THE GOATS. To have them would be to increase this injustice.
- Instead of buying nuclear weapons some Christians believe that that money could be used to relieve the huge debts of the developing countries – this would make the idea of possession of them even more unjustified.
- The work of the “Ploughshare” Protestors – Faslane – is to stop nuclear weapons, not increase the amount of them. They would never agree that having them could be justified.
- Some Christians believe that nuclear weapons are unacceptable because of the number of casualties – if we use nuclear weapons we will increase the numbers of people who are dying. Therefore there is no need to possess them.
- Some Christians believe that nuclear weapons are unacceptable because of the destruction they will bring. They are happy with conventional weapons but feel nuclear weapons is just too far. There is enough devastation in the world without adding to it, possessing them could lead to more destruction.
- Some Christians feel that the teachings of Christ are totally opposed to the use of nuclear weapons, Christianity teaches “love” – agape – how can we love and respect people and possess nuclear weapons?

### **Muslim**

- Charity is one of the Five Pillars of Islam, the money used to purchase nuclear weapons could be better used. Muslims are charged with improving the lot of people, health, education, etc, - the possession of nuclear weapons would seem totally contradictory.
- Some Muslims believe that nuclear weapons are unacceptable because of the destruction they will bring. The possession of nuclear weapons could lead to greater risk of destruction.
- The fact that nuclear weapons are indiscriminate, more innocent people will be affected. They are indiscriminate, both in place and time - innocent people will be killed - as a result of the blast and with radiation fall-out.
- The Qur’an teaches Muslims to seek peace – the use of nuclear weapons would seem to them to be the exact opposite.
- Muslims are expected to show compassion to civilians and prisoners of war – nuclear weapons do not take prisoners.
- The Qur’an does not allow the burning of bodies.

### **Judaism**

- Some Jews believe that nuclear weapons are unacceptable because of the destruction they will bring. The possession of nuclear weapons would be seen as unacceptable.
- They are indiscriminate, both in place and time - innocent people will be killed - as a result of the blast and with radiation fall-out.
- Some believe they are wrong because of the cost of them – money could be used elsewhere. To have nuclear weapons would be seen as even more wrong as it will result in more money be used.

## Sources

### Egoist

- **Thomas Hobbes** – 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.
- **James L. Walker** – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- **Max Stirner** – Egoist Philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- **Nietzsche** – 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.

### Utilitarian

- **Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) /John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)** – The greatest good for the greatest number of people.

### Religious Authority

- Appropriate extracts from Scripture of Chosen Religion
- “Moral Issues in Six Religions” Ed. **W.Owen Cole**
- “Ethics & Religions” **John Rankin, Alan Brown, Paul Gateshill**

- (b) **How far do you agree that the use of nuclear weapons in a war could be morally justified?** (10)

### AN & EV 10 Marks (Max 6 marks for one sided argument only)

#### Agree

- Nuclear weapons give us security, knowing we can defend ourselves makes people happier. We have a responsibility to ensure our country is properly protected; this would justify the use of nuclear weapons.
- In order to fight effectively and cut down suffering in war, we should have the latest equipment. If by using nuclear weapons we reduce the overall suffering in war, it is justification to use them.
- Nuclear weapons are justified because they are deterrent to other countries who may express aggression towards our country. If we do not have the weapons we are seen as a soft touch.
- They are a good tool for negotiation, if other countries know you have them.
- If other countries have them, then we need to be armed the same way. If we are seen to be weaker, other countries may attack us.
- In order to protect weaker countries - Just War Theory - we need to be armed to assist the smaller countries.

## **Disagree**

- In years gone by, one bullet fired would kill one person. Shelling made it possible to kill more people with an individual strike. Nuclear weapons have taken this onto a new frightening level – they are so destructive.
- People, perhaps, forget that with nuclear weapons it is not just the initial explosion which causes damage. There is the fall-out, short-term and long-term effects on people. This is what makes nuclear weapons so frightening to some people.
- Nuclear weapons are totally indiscriminate; completely innocent people and land will be destroyed. More people should be reminded of this.
- Accidents can happen. Do some people think of the possible results to our country or waters if there was to be an accident? People should think about this rather than squabbling over the price of nuclear weapons.
- Some people forget or do not realise the suffering and illness which would take place as a result of using nuclear weapons. Years after the event, people will be still suffering from radiation sickness.
- Nuclear weapons will destroy the land so nothing will grow. Even when growth does take place, there may be a sharp increase in deformities and mutations of plants, animals and even humans. People should care more about this rather than argue about the price of nuclear weapons.
- Britain cannot afford to pay for some social funding, yet it pays out £1.5 million on Trident.
  - The National Health Service - A small percentage of the money spent on nuclear weapons could go a long way to help the NHS crisis.
  - Our schools and colleges. After years of neglect, some people would rather improve education and thus improve society at the same time.
  - Student fees and top up grants could be abolished if the money spent on nuclear weapons was redirected into proper university and further education funding. We could improve society this way rather than running the risk of destroying it by using nuclear weapons.

## GENDER

### 1. Opportunity at Work

- (a) Describe Egoist views on the ordination of women. (4)

**KU 4 marks (3 without sources)**

#### **Egoist**

##### **For ordination of women**

- Egoist women would be very keen that women should be ordained, since they may benefit from it in the long term.
- They would be keen about the ordination of women if it meant the Egoist would have a better life as their wife has better prospects in life.
- Egoists may feel that ordained women are a benefit in the long run for their life.

#### **However**

- Some Egoists may feel, however, that the ordination of women may not benefit them in the long term.
- Some Egoist men may feel that it will affect them if less men are ordained – their own job.
- Some male Egoists may feel that their wife should be home looking after their own family, rather than the needs of a parish.

#### **Sources**

##### **Egoist**

- **Thomas Hobbes** – 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.
- **James L. Walker** – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- **Max Stirner** – Egoist Philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- **Nietzsche** – 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.

- (b) Explain different religious views on the ordination of women. (6)

**KU & AN 6 Marks (2 marks for basic KU, Max 5 without sources)**

#### **Religious**

##### **Ordination of Women**

- In today's society we have Equal Opportunities and the UDHR – legislation which demands that women should have the right to be employed at any job she wants – the Church needs to modernise, so women should be ordained. Work is seen as a great opportunity for women, humans are equal, no matter their gender – work creates equality. Why should that equality not be present in the ministry of the Church.
- In Genesis Ch 1, it says he made them, “male and female...to be like us”. So it says from the very beginning of Genesis, men and women are equal in God's eyes. It should be the same in the working of the Church, women should be ordained. Some modern religious men/women see the role of women very differently than before, no longer second class.
- Jesus lived at a totally different time in history – he came from a very different society to the one we live in. We live in the twenty-first century, the ideals and practices of the times of Jesus are out of date with modern thinking. So the Church's ideas should reflect this century's values, not values that are two thousand years out of date.

- St Paul described the Church as the “body of Christ”, a body is made up of different parts, each working together for the body’s benefit – 1Cor 12:12. So why can’t some women’s roles be to lead the congregation by being ordained?
- The Church’s teaching on marriage is that two people become one body, the same – Gen 2:24. If it is only right that a woman be the same as her husband in marriage, shouldn’t the Church be the same? Women should be ordained in the Church.
- St Paul in Gal 3:28 “ So there is no difference...between men and women; you are all one in union with Christ Jesus” – so if we are all one in Christ it is only correct that women be ordained.

### **However**

- In Gen 2, it is shown that male and female are alike; unlike the other animals who man has dominion over God could not find a mate for the man. However it is also shown that male and female are different. Man is given power over a woman in their relationship, this should be reflected in the Church - man has the power, the leader, woman serves the man. Therefore it would be wrong to ordain women today.
- In Gen 3, it is shown that they are allocated different jobs by God, man to work the land, women to bear children and look after them. Traditionally society has reflected this, men have the job to lead the community, women to support men and care for children. The Church should also reflect this, men to lead the community, ministers/priests, women to help and support the work by the minister or priest, Women’s Guild or Union of Catholic Mothers. Therefore to ordain women would be going against God’s plan, so it would be wrong.
- As stated above, in Gen 3, women were created by God to bear and care for children; to take women away from children is detrimental to the well-being of the family. Since the Church’s role is to promote stable family relationships, it would be wrong to ordain women into the Church if this was detrimental to families.
- When Jesus was choosing his Apostles to carry out his work, he did not select any women. The Church, today, should then take the example of Jesus and should not ordain any women. Priest’s role has always been important in the Eucharist - Jesus inaugurated this practice so must be a man that continues to do it.
- St Paul 1Cor 11 – This whole chapter states clearly that women should be subservient to men. St Paul echoes Gen 2/3, woman was made for man’s pleasure, not the other way round.
- Pope John Paul II – no women priests in his lifetime.

### **Religious Sources**

- As above in Marking Scheme.
- **Joe Jenkins** – “Contemporary Moral Issues”.
- **Anne Jordan** – “Christianity and Moral Issues”.
- **Anne Lovelace & Joy White** – “Beliefs, Values & Traditions”.

- (c) **To what extent should we expect fairness and equality to be shown to women in the workplace?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

#### **Equality In The Workplace**

- Today we have the UDHR – legislation which demands that women should have the right to be employed at any job she wants – our country signed up to it, so our society should show it in action in the workplace.
- In our society we have Equal Opportunities Legislation and equal pay for equal work – fairness and equality should be shown to all workers regardless of gender.
- Government policy is that equal work deserves equal pay – consistent with traditional Labour view – a worker has a right to a fair wage.
- Females are under the same demands to provide for their families as males are, some women are the “breadwinner” in the family.
- According to Gen 1:27, God made male and female equal, “male and female...to be like us”. So, according to Scripture, from the very beginning God’s plan has been that men and women should be equal.
- Everyone has the same chances as each other and are treated the same, including women, so they should be able to do the same things and expect the same treatment in our society.

#### **However**

- In Gen 2, it is shown that male and female are alike, however it is also shown in Gen 3 that male and female are different. Man is given power over woman in their relationship, this means, in the workplace, man has the power, the leader, woman serves the man.
- In Gen 3, it is shown that they are allocated different jobs by God, men to work the land, women to bear children and look after them. Traditionally society has reflected this, men have the job to lead the community, women to support men and care for children.
- Modern day business practices demands flexibility, perhaps this will clash with the woman’s role as carer in the family.
- You cannot expect fairness and equality in the workplace since it is built on the principal of getting as much for yourself at other’s expense. Fairness has no place in the cut and thrust of the workplace – it is “dog eat dog”.
- The higher someone goes in a company the less possibility of fairness and equality to women, there are still fewer women in the boardroom in comparison to men. That is just business.

## 2. Dependence And Independence

- (a) Explain how an Egoist and a religious person might agree on the economic independence of women? (10)

**KU & AN 10 Marks (Max 8 without sources)**

### **Pro Independence For Women**

#### **Egoism For**

- Traditional picture of women stuck in house may create a problem for a woman who is an Egoist. If things were shared, and the woman had a job, the woman may be happier with her economic independence.
- Women often have sole responsibility for looking after children, therefore increased economic independence for a woman would benefit her children and herself in the long run. This would please a woman who was an Egoist.
- Egoist husband may feel that he will benefit if his wife works - there will be more money in the house. She can pay more as she has more finance.

#### **A Religious Viewpoint**

- The candidate will show that the religious person will look to their own religious traditions in order to make a moral decision. They will look to appropriate scripture, social teaching or to a religious person for example in a particular area.

#### **Christian**

- Some Christians believe that as society has changed, so should the Church's attitude. They believe that it is only right that women should be as equal as men to be independent.
- In a modern Christian marriage, the woman is seen as an equal partner in the relationship. It is only right that both have the opportunity to be economically independent.
- A woman may feel that she can complete her role in the family when she can stand on her own two feet; she can only do this if she is economically independent.

#### **Muslim**

- Women should be economically independent as they are the people who oversee the running of the Muslim family. The father is a figurehead.
- Muslim women are to be treated, according to the Qur'an, as individuals in their own rights. They can only do this if they are economically independent.
- They have the right, according to the Qur'an, to own and dispose of property, to buy and sell as they wish. They can only do this if they are economically independent.
- Khadijah, Muhammed's wife, employed him originally, she was a rich woman. This example can be used to show that Muslim women should be economically independent.

## **Against Egoism**

- The Egoist male may look at a personal level, the immediate family, it will benefit their family security if the woman stays at home. Therefore he will benefit in the long run if his wife is not economically independent.
- An Egoist man may feel that he must control purse strings by giving wife only so much money. He controls the rest, so he would not want an economically independent wife.
- An Egoist man may think that he is not properly providing for their family if he is not the sole earner. He may see an economically independent wife as a threat to his role and position in the house and in his relationships.
- An Egoist wife may feel that she benefits because while the husband works, she benefits by being able to look after the house and family. She may not feel it does not fit to be economically independent.

## **A Religious Viewpoint Christian**

- The traditional religious view is that a woman's place is in the home with the children. The man's role is to provide, the woman's role is to nurture the children and support the man. Being economically independent would go against this idea.
- GEN 2/3 - God's plan - God created women to keep man company. Man has dominion over women. Man is to work the field, woman is to have children and look after them. Economically independent women do not fit in with the classic role models of the Creation stories.
- GEN 3 - The Fall - If we break God's plan and go against it, we will suffer – Adam and Eve expelled from Eden, examples for us are divorce, family break-up, crime and social breakdown. Negative aspects of women working are not outweighed by financial benefits to family.
- OLD TESTAMENT - Women were husbands' property - any earnings or rewards for women belonged to their husband – this does not fit economically independent women.
- ST PAUL - His letters reinforce OT roles of male/female. St Paul would not like economically independent women as they would undermine the image he created for male/female role models.

## **Muslim**

- According to the Qur'an, male and female are equal. Mohammed taught that Allah has given men and women different, but complementary roles. Women serve men, therefore economically independent women would not fit into this model.
- Women are expected to look after the family. Therefore work outside the family is only possible if it does not affect her family duties. Family comes first, so this would not encourage women to be economically independent.
- Women with young families are not expected to go to the mosque, rather they should stay at home looking after the children. So if they can't leave the children and go to the mosque, they should certainly not be leaving them for a job. Therefore there is little that economically independent women fit this image either.

### **Jewish**

- Women are supposed to be the bedrock of a Jewish family, in the house they wield the power.
- The traditional religious view is that a woman's place is in the home with the children. The man's role is to provide, the woman's role is to nurture the children and support the man. Being economically independent would not fit into this image.
- See marriage – the ketubah – man makes vows to wife, wife makes no vow to husband – this is supposed to show the woman she has a secure future - no need to work or be economically independent.
- GEN 2/3 - God's plan - God created women to keep man company. Man has dominion over women. Man is to work the field, woman is to have children and look after them. She is to support her husband, he is the provider.
- No economic reward can compensate for a mother neglecting her family duties.

### **Sources**

#### **Egoist**

- **Thomas Hobbes** – 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.
- **James L. Walker** – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- **Max Stirner** – Egoist Philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- **Nietzsche** – 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.

#### **Religious**

- Appropriate extracts from Scripture of Chosen Religion mentioned in Marking Scheme above.
- “Moral Issues in Six Religions” Ed. **W.Owen Cole**.
- “Ethics & Religions” **John Rankin, Alan Brown, Paul Gateshill**.
- “Making Moral Decisions” **Joe Walker**.

(b) *“To improve the economic independence of women you have to change people’s attitudes as well as changing the law”*

**How far do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

#### **Agree**

- Just like men, women should be free to decide how they live their life and what they want to do with it, including being financially independent. Women must break away from the old stereotypes.
- Women feel more empowered when they have their own money, they feel more secure in knowing that they can help any situation. They do not need to depend on a man to provide for them, men who feel they need to provide are just sexist.
- Having a job and her own money makes a woman less likely to be manipulated by her partner. Men have to realise how this has held women back in the past.
- In some cultures and relationships, women are viewed as the property of their husbands. By having a job, being able to provide money would make the woman freer in society to make decisions she wanted to make.
- In today's society, working can be the best way to support the family, including paying for childcare. Our society has made it easier for this to happen, women don't have to stay in the home to provide for their children.
- Essential if single mum, less stigma attached if she can support herself financially.

- Often woman's wage may be the only external source of finance in this climate of male unemployment.

#### **Disagree**

- UDHR – right to work – women have the right to meaningful and dignified opportunities to earn a living. Government has been involved in programme of reform.
- Everyone has the right to be treated equally, employment law reflects this.
- European Union Legislation on Human Rights and employment are helping to improve the economic independence of women.
- Recent employment legislation has been trying to improve short term contract jobs. Since these types of jobs are often filled by women, it is increasing the economic independence of women.
- Local Government Policy on employment, in some councils, intends to change application form so applicants do not write full name but purely use initials – this way applicants' gender will not be known.

### **3. Violence Against Women**

- (a) **Explain how a Utilitarian and a religious person would support their belief that violence against women is wrong.** (10)

#### **KU & AN 10 Marks (Max 8 without sources)**

##### **Utilitarian**

- Overall, Utilitarians would state that there is no justification for violence against women, it brings no benefit to society.
- Society is weakened if a large number of it are threatened in some way, women make up more than half the population.
- There is often more than one victim, especially children, so long term a Utilitarian would see violence against women as wrong as it would be detrimental to society in the long run.
- Domestic violence is associated with controlling people and the loss of people's freedom, Utilitarians would not see this as beneficial for society.
- If violence against women did not exist there would be greater choice and greater freedom, thus improving the well-being of the society. This would seem to be more desirable towards a Utilitarian.

##### **Christian**

- Christian Social Teaching states that violence towards the weak or poor is wrong. The concept of Christian "love" - agape - is to care and look after people, not oppress them.
- Man is expected to provide for woman – Gen 2/3. Women should look to their husbands for protection, not possible threat.
- Cutting off the servant's ear (Matt 26:52) - Jesus did not condone the use of violence on people. Understanding and other actions are suggested, not violence.
- Today support groups have been set up in the churches to help victims and educate the wider community that domestic violence is wrong.

##### **Jewish**

- Women are seen as equals to men, so should be treated likewise.
- They play a very important role in family life, being the backbone of the family. Therefore they should be shown respect especially by their husband or partner.
- God created males and females equal, but they have different roles in life. They should complement each other.

- In Gen 2/3 – Man is given a companion by God to have dominion over. However this does not mean men should abuse women, it means they should care and look after their partner.
- The great female role-models from Scripture are all women who are shown respect and treated properly, Ruth, Esther, etc.

### **Muslim**

- According to the Qur'an, Allah made male and female equal.
- Men and women are seen to very different roles in life, they are seen as complementing each other. If violence is used, this partnership will not work equally.
- Muhammad taught that women were men's helpers and partners - "treat women well and be kind to them". You cannot be kind and use violence in a domestic relationship.
- Muhammad's teaching on property shows that he respected women, so he would not condone the use of violence on women.
- Women were seen to be the ones looking after the family – if the husband beats his wife how is this a good example to children?

### **Sources**

#### **Utilitarian**

- **Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) /John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)** – The greatest good for the greatest number of people.
- **John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)** – "The Subjugation of Women".

#### **Religious**

- **Joe Jenkins** – "Contemporary Moral Issues".
- **Anne Jordan** – "Christianity and Moral Issues".
- **Anne Lovelace & Joy White** – "Beliefs, Values & Traditions".

(b) *"Women are still treated badly because of the traditional view about them held by religions"*

**How far do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Agree**

#### **Religious Stereotyping Of Women**

##### **Judo/Christian**

- Traditional gender roles from Bible can be seen as counterproductive – man is given authority over woman – this was a prevalent attitude in both Jewish and Christian communities.
- In Gen 2, it is shown that male and female are alike, however man is given power over a woman in their relationship, man has the power, the leader, woman serves the man.
- GEN 3 - God's plan - God created women to keep man company. Man has dominion over woman. Man is to work the field, woman is to have children and look after them. Man has power over the woman.
- In Old Testament times and even today in some Jewish communities, some women are treated just like any other possession, they belong to their husbands. The woman becomes the man's possession, he can do what he likes with her.
- Wives were told to be subservient to their husbands (St Paul) – some Christian men have enforced this idea physically and see no wrong in it.
- The Roman Catholic Church has still never, officially, come out against husbands who abuse their partner.

### **Muslim**

- GEN2/3 – male/female roles from Genesis – male has power, woman is subservient.
- Fundamentalist treatment of women.
- According to Shari'ah Law, women can be punished for bringing disrespect to their families – woman was sentenced to death in Nigeria last year.
- Two years ago, a girl was beheaded by father because she could have been raped, which would have brought shame on the family name. So the father killed his child out of a sense of honour.
- Earlier this year in London, a Muslim father killed his daughter, because she refused to stop seeing a non-Muslim boy.

### **However**

- You do not have to be religious to abuse women. Many people who have no religion, have been known to hit their wife or partner.
- Some naturally violent people are unable to express themselves or control themselves in highly charged situations, at football matches, roads, etc – they resort to violence. Personal relationships can also develop along the same line, they hit out. They have no religious upbringing.
- Some men feel the need to exercise their own power physically, it is a way of showing who is in charge. The reason is based on insecurity of the men, nothing to do with religion.
- Some people have been brought up thinking in a very traditional way. They have been told women are weaker and men are the stronger sex. The man decides to show who is the stronger. These have been the values that society has suggested, not religion.
- Some families grow up with violence, people know it's wrong but put up with it. Some women will accept domestic abuse to them if it protects her children, men who use violence on women may use it on children as well.
- Some women believe they can still change their partner for the better, because they love them. They will put up with the violence, even make up excuses, in the hope the man will change.

## ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT

### 1. Depletion of Resources

- (a) Describe the ways in which humans are depleting the Earth's resources. (4)

**KU 4 Marks (Max 3 marks without sources)**

- Depletion of fish stocks – EU quotas essential to tackle problem.
- Harvests yielding less crops – yet technology has improved.
- Last tin mine – 6/3/1998.
- Coal stocks were declining and led to closures of mines.
- Mineral/metal stocks running out.
- Losing large amounts of forests.
- Poorer quality foods such as animals and vegetables, not enough time given to recover.

- (b) Explain how the depletion of the Earth's resources might be a problem for a Utilitarian and a religious person. (6)

**AN 6 Marks (Max 5 marks without sources)**

#### **Utilitarian**

##### **Depletion is a problem**

- Some Utilitarians, Rule Utilitarians, would see depletion of resources as a problem, eg overfishing would result in a breed becoming extinct – this is wrong. Man has to look after the environment is the general rule.
- Some Utilitarians, Act Utilitarians, would view using up the Earth's resources, use of chemical fertilisers now as wrong, if in the long term this would not benefit human beings.
- Utilitarians would not be happy with the quality of produce, which is not being allowed to recover naturally. The majority will lose out in the future.

##### **Christian View**

- Depletion of resources would be seen as wrong as humans are merely “Stewards” for God. Christians believe they have to look after the Earth.
- God gave humans “dominion” over the Earth which means they have to look after what they have been given. They must look after it and ensure its continuation.
- In original Creation story, we are told God made all the animals and it was paradise. There was plenty natural resources, “God saw that it was good”. It is up to us to keep it that way, for humans to deplete resources completely would be wrong.

##### **Sources**

- **Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) /John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)** – The greatest good for the greatest number of people.
- “Ethics & Religions” **John Rankin, Alan Brown, Paul Gateshill.**
- “Making Moral Decisions” **Joe Walker.**

- (c) **To what extent do humans have a duty to use the Earth's resources wisely?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Agree With Statement**

- Religious people would argue that we have to look after our environment – we were put here in charge – Gen 1/2 – we must do the right thing. Depletion of the Earth's resources is all our responsibilities, we must use them wisely.
- Many people, with no religious affiliations, realise the need to use the Earth's resources wisely for the continuation of life on this planet. We are affected by what each other does, therefore there is an obligation on us to do those things which will benefit life in years to come. To do something else would be wrong.
- Animals have died out because of humans' desire for certain resources, this has a detrimental effect on eco-systems and the animals. Humans are abusing their power and position - this is our problem, we must do something about it.
- Humans' technology has led to problems arising - sophisticated machines have led to increase in yield of crops, people found working easier – production increased, demand increased but the land has not been given time to recover – we are going against nature. This is wrong, it is our responsibility, so we should use the Earth's resources wisely.
- Fishing technology has improved – sonar is used to catch fish – fish are given less chance to replenish stocks. Nets have become more complicated. This is because we demand cheaper fish but greater choice. If we do not check quotas we are going to fish the seas “dry” of stocks, it is our responsibility to use resources wisely.
- Short term fixes/gains vs long term losses – humans look to be searching for quick solutions rather identifying what is best in the long term. Politicians only really paying lip-service to these problem, they represent us. Therefore we must tell them what we want - it is our responsibility.
- Too many examples of humans bleeding the planet dry – coal, tin, oil, wood, even gold – all because of man's demands. We have to take a stance and do something about it.

**Disagree With Statement**

- Life is about living, it is up to us how we live our life. If we want to use the resources around us that is fine. There is no moral obligation on us.
- Only people who are religious would possibly see this as moral, in their belief that they are in charge. Life is about our survival, we should use the resources as we want to.
- Humans not in charge, to be in charge you have to control. Humans do not control the Earth, they simply strive to survive. They have to adapt to their environment, taking any necessary action.
- Awareness for the need to do something to help the problem of the Earth's resources has resulted in an increase in “alternative” lifestyles. The growth of “New Age” ideas shows mankind responding to this problem of the Earth's resources because they believe that the Earth has its own “spirit” and man must work with it. We do not control it.
- Recycling has now really taken off, private companies and local authorities have come together in partnership to make more use of recycling. This will take some pressure off natural resources so we do not need to take the Earth's resources.
- Humans are also looking at ways to harness nature in order to create alternative energy sources. Solar heating and wind farms are just two of the successful ways humans have found of natural alternative energy sources. This is an example of humans working with nature, rather than humans being in charge of it

## 2. Pollution

- (a) What range of views might Egoists and religious people have about pollution? (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 marks without sources)**

### **Egoist**

#### **Accepts pollution**

- The Egoist may view the pollution of water as correct or justifiable if they themselves gain overall benefit.
- They may view pollution a necessary evil if the end result is an improvement for their and their children's immediate life.
- They would feel that it is acceptable for a company to pollute a river, if their life were improved by the products the company was making.
- Likewise, oil slicks may be a by-product of drilling for oil, but an Egoist could live with it because of the benefit brought by oil.

### **Religious Viewpoint Against**

#### **Christian**

- God made the world (Gen 1) - "saw that it was good" - to destroy nature would be to go against God's wishes - it would be wrong. To create pollution would be wrong to these Christians.
- God puts humans in charge (Gen 1) - the ultimate being in Creation – stewardship of the Earth - dominion over everything - our responsibility to look after - to destroy nature by pollution would be seen as wrong.
- Stewardship of Earth by humans is for the future – Some companies do not seem to look to the future, they are more interested in making profit. They seem not to care about the future or pollution which they create. Pollution today creates a different world for tomorrow.
- Image of Adam/Eve working the land for survival (Gen 3) - cut off from God – looking after the Earth and seas will reconcile humans with God – trying to right environmental wrongs is part of making up with God. Man should look after Nature, not destroy it by polluting it.

#### **Jewish**

- Creation Gen 1-2 - God created the world, to pollute therefore is wrong – humans should look after it.
- Psalm 24:1 – "The earth is the Lord's and all it holds..." It is man's responsibility to look after it, to pollute is to do something wrong.
- In the Torah, Jews are warned against destroying trees – Deut 20:19. There is even a festival Tu b'Shvat, when trees are planted – this implies pollution must be wrong.
- Neot Kedumim is an example of how man is trying to restore the Israeli landscape. It shows a connection between biblical tradition and Israel's nature and agriculture. This, therefore, implies to do the opposite must be wrong – pollution is wrong.

### **Muslim**

- According to Muslims, Allah created the world and man is responsible for looking after and caring for it – Khalifah – Surah 6:165 “inheritors of the Earth”.
- There is a balance, a pattern which man must maintain- to destroy it would be to do something wrong.
- Mohammed and water – washing in the stream – this story shows that we should look after nature and use it to our benefit, not pollute it.

### **However**

#### **Egoist**

- If they themselves do not gain overall benefit, an Egoist may view the pollution of water as incorrect and unjustifiable.
- They may view pollution as an evil if the end result is a diminishing of their and their children’s immediate life.
- They would feel that it is unacceptable for a company to pollute a river, if the end result meant a beauty spot, used by the Egoist, is destroyed.

#### **Judeo/Christian**

- God puts humans in charge (Gen 1) - the ultimate being in Creation – stewardship of the Earth - dominion over everything. Humans are simply doing what God asked. Man is in charge and what is being done is being done for our benefit. Pollution is a by-product, a necessary evil.
- Stewardship of Earth by humans is for the future – they are doing their best for future generations. These are the best ways forward for human beings, accidents will happen.
- Image of Adam/Eve working the land for survival (Gen 3) – God indicates there will be some suffering for the benefits we gain from the land. The pollution is simply the suffering that comes with working the land – it’s a by-product.

### **Sources**

#### **Egoist**

- **Thomas Hobbes** – 1588-1679 – if everyone looks after his/her own self-interest, then everyone should be happy.
- **James L. Walker** – Egoism is the doctrine of self-interest.
- **Max Stirner** – Egoist Philosophy is the realisation that you are an individual.
- **Nietzsche** – 1844-1900 – the only way to give meaning to your life is to act in your own best interests.

#### **Religious**

- Appropriate extracts from Scripture of Chosen Religion.
- **Joe Jenkins** – “Contemporary Moral Issues”.
- **Anne Jordan** – “Christianity and Moral Issues”.
- **Anne Lovelace & Joy White** – “Beliefs, Values & Traditions”.
- **John Rankin, Alan Brown, Paul Gateshill** - “Ethics & Religions”.
- **Joe Walker** - “Making Moral Decisions”.

(b) *“Pollution is a necessary evil”*

How far do you agree?

(10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

- God put humanity in charge, it is up to humanity how best to act. Humanity decides what should be done, we have dominion on Earth. Human beings have the right to do what they think is right for progress.
- The stewardship of Earth by humans is for the future, not for just now - humans' role in providing for future generations may have been achieved at a price - this may mean destroying today for tomorrow's future. It's a necessary evil.
- Technological Advances - benefits outweigh drawbacks of destroying nature. Humans are developing by using technology, even though we may be harming the environment – the advantages of progress are more important than the drawbacks.
- Our use of electricity is only possible because we used nuclear fuels, now we can start to think about alternative energy sources. This is only possible because we know we have a fall back if demand cannot be satisfied. The pollution caused by nuclear industry has been worth it because of the advances made.
- As a by-product of the oil industry, pollution is a small price to pay considering the improvements which have been made because of it. The use of oil in manufacturing man-made substances may have led to pollution, but the new substances last far longer than natural substances – they do not need replaced so often.
- Many man-made substances are not biodegradable and cause some pollution –, ie plastic bags, cartons, etc. This has saved the environment in other ways – less use of natural resources.
- Humans have already started programmes to replenish the resources that he has used, ie tree planting, fishing policy, etc and restore the environment destroyed by pollution – West Coast of Spain, Gallia.

**Against**

- God made the world - destroying nature is going against God's wishes - it is wrong. Any destruction, no matter the benefit, is not worth it.
- God puts humans in charge - stewardship of the Earth - dominion over everything - our responsibility to look after the Earth. We are supposed to do what is best for the Earth, not what is simply best for humans.
- The technological advances do not outweigh the result of research. We are destroying this world by pollution in the belief that the advantage gained by the progress makes it worth it to sacrifice nature – this is wrong, a fallacy. We do not want to destroy nature for progress, what is the point if we have no place to live?
- Examples of advances which in fact create greater problems – use of chemical pesticides for greater harvests of fruit/vegetables vs fish and other animals being driven from our rivers, etc.
- We are to provide for our children - so we have to look after nature in order to provide for our children. If there is no future because we destroy the land by pollution, what is the point?
- Pollution can find its ways into the food chain, this could be far costlier in the long run than we realise now.

### 3. Treatment of Animals

- (a) Explain how a religious view on the use of animals for human benefit may differ from Utilitarianism? (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 marks without sources)**

#### **Religious Authority**

##### **Christian**

- Humans are seen as the culmination of Creation, Gen 1/2, they have importance over all other animals. If humans decide to use animals for commercial purposes, then it is morally correct.
- According to Gen 1, God puts humans in charge over all the animals, humans have power over the animals. Man must decide what is the best way forward, how best to use the resources. If this means using animals for commercial use, then some Christians would feel justified.
- Gen 3 – the story of Adam and Eve – Man’s punishment is to till the land and work it. Man is free to choose how best to go forward, including using animals to their benefit, including commercial use.
- Gen 9 – Noah – “God made Covenant with Noah and all living beings” – Some Christians see our relationship with animals as part of this covenant, so humans should look after the animals. This however does not mean to say they cannot be used in the best way humans see fit, even for commercial use.

##### **Jewish**

- In Gen 1:26. Humans are given authority over animals, humans are expected to look after animals. If they wish them to be used for commercial use so be it.
- Gen 6 – When Noah receives the Noachide laws, one of them was to look after the animals and use them.
- The slaughter of animals for food must be done according to shechitah, the ritual killing according to the Law. This method, it is claimed, is more humane than modern methods of slaughter. In key British cities you can find Kosher butchers, so using animals for commercial use is acceptable since these butchers are used day in day out by Jewish people.

##### **Muslim**

- Muslims see humans as Allah’s greatest creation – their welfare is paramount. All other animals are secondary to man, so they could be used for commercial purposes.
- Muslims believe that Allah put humans in charge of animals, therefore it is up to humans how animals are used.
- Animal sacrifice is still used in many countries by Muslims, if there is justification for using the animal then it is not wrong.
- The slaughter of animals for commercial use would be acceptable as long as it follows the ritual killing of animals. “Halal” butchers exist in Britain and these butchers are used by Muslim people day in and day out.

##### **Against Utilitarian**

- Some Utilitarians may be against the use of animals for commercial reasons if it did not benefit the majority of people. If farming or food practices led to the suffering of animals and most people were against it, they would not be for it.
- Some Utilitarians are against modern food practices because they lead to illness and disease in humans, salmonella in eggs or BSE. Since humans suffer because of these, some Utilitarians would be against using animals in some commercial procedures – intensive farming.

**However**

**Religious Authority Against Christian**

- Some Christians feel that animals, since they are part of God’s creation and the covenant with Noah, Gen 9, should have rights just like humans. They deserve to be treated justly without suffering, so if they are to be used it should be done in a humane way.
- Some Christians are vegetarian because they feel so strongly that many of the processes used in meat production are cruel and the animals suffer needlessly.
- Some Christians feel so strongly that they join pressure groups to change animal rights.

**Jewish**

- The slaughter of animals for food must be done according to shechitah, the ritual killing according to the Law. This method, it is claimed, is more humane than modern methods of slaughter. Therefore Jews would not see modern methods of commerce, including battery farming, etc as acceptable.
- Several of the Laws make direct reference to animals and their treatment – Sabbath rules (Ex 20:10), fallen ox or ass (Deut 22:4), muzzling an ox (Deut 25:4). Therefore they must be important and should be shown due respect, this would not seem to happen to animals being used for commercial use.

**Muslim**

- Muhammad taught that Allah forbids any creature, no matter the size or type, being hurt – the story of the ants and the fire – therefore humans are right to use animals in farming however not in the intensive way they are used in “battery farming” today.
- The Qur’an teaches that Allah created all living creatures – they should be shown respect – Surah 24:41 – methods of farming and other commercial uses should reflect this.
- Animals are like humans, they have feelings and a purpose to their life – they should be shown respect – Surah 6:38 – they are not being shown respect if they are being mistreated.
- Muhammad told stories which stress the importance of caring for animals.
- As early as 13<sup>th</sup> Century, an Animal Rights Bill had been proposed for Islam.

**Utilitarian For**

- Utilitarians would be keen that benefits to the wider community should be brought; if this means animals are used for commercial reasons so be it. A Utilitarian would find this justified.
- The Utilitarian may be willing to overlook their own preference against violence towards animals if human beings benefited in the long run.

**Source**

- Appropriate extracts from scripture of chosen religion.
- **Joe Jenkins** – “Contemporary Moral Issues”.
- **Anne Jordan** – “Christianity and Moral Issues”.
- **Anne Lovelace & Joy White** – “Beliefs, Values & Traditions.
- **Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) /John Stuart Mill (1806-1873)** – The greatest good for the greatest number of people.
- **John Rankin, Alan Brown, Paul Gateshill** - “Ethics & Religions”.
- **Joe Walker** - “Making Moral Decisions”.

(b) ***“Animal rights are just as important as human rights.”***

**To what extent do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**For**

- Animals are part of God’s Creation, therefore they should be given the same respect as other animals created by God – humans.
- Animals have rights, these should be adhered to, so they don’t suffer. We do not have the right to use them any way we want to.
- Some people say that humans were given dominion over the animals – to hurt animals or others in our care is an abuse of our power. We should look after animals and care for them, not use them any way we want.
- There is such a difference between human life and animal life that any research or experimentation has to be questioned. What is the point? If we would not experiment on humans, why should animals be any different?
- We have the technology not to need to test animals – tests can be done in laboratories using alternative “guinea pigs”, chemicals and cultures, rather than animals.
- Some Christians feel that animals, since they are part of God’s Creation and the Covenant with Noah, should have rights just like humans. They deserve to be treated justly without suffering, unlike battery farms.
- Some people are vegetarian because they feel so strongly that many of the processes used in meat production are cruel and the animals suffer needlessly - abattoirs and production and transport of veal.
- Cloning has been successful but at what price? Think of all the “failures” before the success - animals which have suffered and died. We do not have the right to “play God” with these animals lives.
- We are still unaware of long term effects of cloning on animals – Dolly is now dead – was her death premature? We can be condemning these animals to a life of suffering – this cannot be right.
- Some people feel so strongly that they join pressure groups to change animal rights.

**Against**

- Science would argue that humans are the pinnacle of life because they have been so apt in adapting to their environment. This includes using things to their benefit. Humans are therefore right to use animals in their quest to survive and continue the species.
- Animals are not the same as human beings, therefore they do not have the same human rights.
- According to Gen 1, God puts humans in charge over all the animals, humans have power over the animals. Man must decide what is the best way forward, how best to use animals in any way they see fit. Human rights come before animal rights.
- Gen 9 – Noah – “God made Covenant with Noah” – Some Christians see our relationship with animals as part of this covenant, so humans should look after the animals the same as Noah did. Noah also used animals for the benefit of his plan, we can also use animals for our purposes.
- Farming methods try to use the most humane practices while gaining the optimum result, intensive farming. Sometimes it is necessary for animals to suffer in order that farming runs smoother. Human needs are far greater than animal rights.
- If the result is progress in the future, surely it is worth using animals to help this progress. The use of animal experiments can result in a better future for people or other animals, surely we should be allowed to do what we want.
- Any examples of the use of animals where the justification is the progress as a result – vivisection, cloning – Dolly, etc.

## SECTION THREE

### NATURE OF BELIEF

### EXISTENCE OF GOD

#### 1. Existence Of God

- (a) Describe two arguments which might be used to support the view that God does not exist (4)

**KU 4 marks (3 without sources). Maximum of 2 marks for each argument.**

#### **Humanist Arguments**

- David Hume compared the world to a vegetable, it is self-propagating.
- Why are people deformed? Why are people not perfect? If a supreme being exists, how do you explain the existence of evil and suffering.
- Charles Darwin would argue that there is no need for a God, because nature can take its own course – evolution, natural selection.
- Evolution stops and starts, it is an alternative to God. It explains designs and nature without reference to God.
- You don't need a designer, it could just be nature taking its course.
- Chaos – no organisation in life, patterns can equally emerge from chaos.
- Immanuel Kant – we impose order but the work of the mind.

- (b) How might Christians respond to the view that God does not exist? (6)

**AN 6 Marks (4 without sources)**

#### **Christian Viewpoint**

- The argument from design – when you look at the world and see such complexity, people come to the conclusion that it cannot be an accident. Such complexity can only be the result of some kind of “designer”, where everything has a purpose, therefore God exists.
- Lots of examples could be used – DNA, snowflakes, butterfly, etc, which have persuaded so many people in the past that God exists.
- William Paley “Natural Theology” (1802) - theory of the watch.
- Evolution is seen by some Christians as God at work through a gradual process – he is still designing in a different way.
- Some Christians see the “chance” element in evolution as God’s creative purpose, it helps dispel theories of preordination. It is God’s way of control where creation is going.
- Richard Swinbourne “The Existence of God” – he sees orderliness throughout the universe, though scientific laws are not sufficient explanation for him. He argues that God is the only explanation for the existence of the order and laws in nature.
- The Anthropic Principle – evolution could have been so easily different, just one change would have thrown everything off. Yet our universe has resulted against impossible odds – everything seems to be very carefully and precisely arranged for the development of life, particularly human life.
- Aquinas – First Cause argument.
- Quantum Physics

## Sources

### Primary

- “Humanist Dipper” – British Humanist Association.
- “Humanism” – **Barbara Smoker**.

### Secondary

- “A Beginner’s Guide to Ideas” – **William Raeper and Linda Smith**.
- Extracts from “Questions about God” – **Patrick Clarke**.
- “Nature of Belief” – **Joe Walker**

(c) **To what extent should belief in God be based on reasoned argument? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

### For

- These arguments have developed over hundreds of years, they have been used to defend belief in God against many different theories.
- First cause – something had to start all this – the world couldn’t be the result of an accident - there had to be a first cause. Belief in God gives a sense of order to some people, which may be essential in people’s life today.
- Ontological argument – St Anselm – God means “Perfect Being”. By using the word “God” we are stating existence of God – this simple truth about belief in God is still relevant, even today.
- The argument from design - Paley’s theory of the watch. Belief in God gives a structure to our existence, just like the watch.
- In nature, there are many things which are so beautiful or awe-inspiring, that some people say they cannot be accidental. Things so beautiful and intricate need a designer, ie the human body, DNA, butterfly, etc- belief in God therefore gives life a special meaning.

### Against

- Religious experience – people believe there are things that happen in life which have special meaning and cannot be explained – they can be used as a valid argument for the existence of God.
- People who are religious live longer, because they have a better attitude and outlook to life – the existence of God gives life meaning and purpose.
- Moral codes in most religions are good for the basis of society, it is therefore relevant to show their basis as a belief in God.
- For some people the very fact the numbers of those who believe in God are so high is proof enough that God exists.

## 2. Religious Experience

- (a) Explain how a Humanist and a religious person would differ in their views on religious experience. (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (8 without sources)**

### **Christian Viewpoint**

- Some kind of deep awareness of some spiritual reality beyond themselves. Experiences of a power or presence beyond themselves. It gives a meaning to life.
- A sense of mystery which some people come to feel in certain circumstances. Rudolf Otto - Stars/Universe - sense of beauty and wonder of nature, these can be classed as religious experiences. These strengthen people's belief.
- When people experience events which change or devastate people's lives, this makes them feel they have had an experience beyond the normal. This makes it a religious experience which helps people deal with life's problems.
- Incidents or things which are eerie or uncanny can be considered by some people as a religious experience.
- Group experiences where there is a dynamic in the group as a result of a shared experience – it can give people great encouragement.
- Some kind of deep awareness of some spiritual reality beyond themselves. Experiences of a power or presence beyond themselves.

### **Humanist Viewpoint**

- People are open to suggestion, they want to believe in religious experience and miracles. They are simply participating in one life's experience, but they want to see it as special.
- The body reacts to any experiences and depending on the experience it reacts in certain ways – grief/cry/joy/laughing, etc. It may be simply the result of the body's chemicals reacting in a certain way which create feelings which people misunderstand as “religious experiences”.
- David Hume would argue that religious experiences and miracles are against the laws of nature, they are not possible, unnatural.
- Superstitions - cannot be attested by large number.
- When people, through ignorance, cannot explain the world they look beyond and consider it special. Many things in the past were thought to be special, however with advances in technology we can now start to explain things. Religious experiences are merely experiences which we are not yet able to explain but in the future we will.
- They could be drug-induced experiences, where reality and fantasy mix.

### **Sources**

- References mentioned in Marking Scheme above.
- “Introduction to Philosophy” - **James E. White**.
- Support Notes – **HSDU**.

(b) *“Religious experience is a matter of fact, not the product of people’s imagination.”*

**How far do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Agree**

- Religious experience is some kind of deep awareness of some spiritual reality beyond themselves. Since they are experiences of a power or presence beyond themselves, they are real not imagined - proof to people that God exists.
- When things happen, but they cannot be explained properly, some people come to feel a sense of mystery in those circumstances. A mystery is beyond the normal human experience, for some people it shows God exists.
- Some people in discussing the existing of God, would simply suggest we look around. Rudolf Otto believes that the stars and universe give us a sense of beauty and wonder of nature. Look at all this wonderful world, it can only show there must be a greater being in charge. These are not things imagined but things we can see around us.
- When events change or devastate people’s lives, there can be different reactions to it. People look for a deeper understanding to them which finds sense in the existence of God. These things happened, they were not imagined, the existence of God makes sense to the person.
- Some people believe that incidents, which can be eerie or uncanny, cannot be explained normally. They happen for a purpose, only God knows that purpose.

**Disagree**

- David Hume stated that Religious experience was against the laws of nature, it is not natural. Miracles are impossible to take place, therefore they must have been imagined.
- Religious experience is merely the superstitions of individuals. They cannot be attested to by large numbers of people, they are the word of one or two individuals. It tells us more about their fertile imaginations, rather than about God.
- People are open to suggestion, they want to believe in miracles. This tells us more about the nature of some human beings, rather than the proof of the existence of God.
- Science can give us the answers to our questions about the universe. Belief about miracles results from ignorance about how the world actually works. It shows how narrow minded people are that accept the myth of miracles, rather than the facts from science which stares them in the face. It proves nothing about God but a lot about man’s creative ability.
- Religious experience is not real, it is merely the result of the body’s chemicals reacting in a certain way. The person’s experiences can be explained as a result of nature, rather than a proof of the existence of God.
- Incidents, which others might describe as religious experience, could be drug-induced experiences, where reality and fantasy mix. Again this tells us more about the human psyche rather than proves the existence of God.

### 3. Suffering and Evil

- (a) Explain different viewpoints about the existence and cause of suffering and evil (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (8 without sources)**

#### **Humanist Viewpoint**

- No creator, who created all things, would make people suffer through famine, droughts, etc – conclusion – if suffering and evil exist then God cannot exist.
- If evils, like famine, droughts, etc, exist, they do so because God wants them to. So God cannot be all loving. If God is good, he wouldn't let evil things happen. So God either is not good or he does not exist.
- Suffering and dealing with it is part of the human experience, it's what happens to everyone. We just have to get on with dealing with it – it is not the work of a supreme being.
- Suffering and evil is the result of a lack of moral guidance which people receive from society. These disasters are made worse by human beings choices else where, it is not created by God.
- Biblical stories explaining the existence of suffering and evil, Adam and Eve, is not consistent with our scientific knowledge. We know we did not come from just one pair of humans, likewise neither did suffering and evil. Suffering and evil exist because humans decide to evil things which cause suffering.

#### **Christian Viewpoint**

- Rather than proving that God does not exist because evil and suffering do, Christians would argue the very opposite – suffering and evil are used by God to help man.
- Genesis 2/3 – God gives human beings the gift of freewill – at this point evil is then a reality of life – humans chose to do evil. So since evil exists and it is a result of man's freewill given by God - therefore God must exist.
- Evil is used by God to teach us the difference between right and wrong and helps us appreciate happiness and what is good – Adam & Eve.
- Evil, which brings suffering to people, is used by God to develop human's moral responsibility. This hardship brings out the best in people - working together to help others who suffer because of evil. God is trying to show us how to act – Maximilian Kolbe, Mary Slessor.
- Through evil and having to deal with it, we become mature, better human beings. Human beings in a process of creation, this is God's way of showing people how to live their life
- Evil can only be seen in the context of life after death a reward for the next life – it is a test for the next life – this shows God exists – Lk 16: 19 – 28.
- There is a difference between natural evils, disasters, etc, and moral evils, the result of humans' actions.

#### **Sources**

##### **Primary**

- “Humanist Dipper” – British Humanist Association.
- “Humanism” – **Barbara Smoker.**

##### **Secondary**

- “A Beginner's Guide to Ideas” – **William Raeper and Linda Smith.**
- Extracts from “Questions about God” – **Patrick Clarke.**
- Beliefs, Values & Traditions” – **Anne Lovelace & Joy White.**

**(b) To what extent can belief in God help someone to deal with suffering?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Agree**

- Most suffering is a result of humans' free choice - it must exist if humans are to be fully free. Therefore the presence of suffering is not an argument for questioning whether God exists, some people may even argue the exact opposite – suffering is way of showing that God exists.
- Suffering can be used in a positive way by people, as we suffer people pull together. Suffering is a challenge which humans use to their benefit; look at the bombing of the Trade Centre, many good things have come out of that tragedy.
- Suffering and evil are the price we pay for being humans. Most suffering is man-made, not God-given. Humans, because we have free choice to do right or to do wrong, can chose to do evil – we suffer as a consequence. God gave us that free choice, otherwise we wouldn't be free.
- Suffering exists, not because of God, but as result of humans' behaviour as described in the story of "The Fall" in Gen 3. They abused the freedom given to them by God and decided to do evil things which result in suffering.
- Suffering, according to Christians, can only be seen in the context of life after death. If God did not exist, it would affect the afterlife. Suffering in this life will be rewarded in the next.
- Arthur Peacock - the way the world is made, evil, hence suffering, is an integral part of the human condition. It reinforces the earlier point that the existence of evil has to do more with Man's decisions and behaviour, rather than denies God's existence.

**Disagree**

- Suffering is just a simple fact of the human experience, belief in God does not help you handle suffering .
- Human suffering is too often the result of human decision, it has not got anything to do with the existence of God.
- Human suffering brings people closer, this will help more with suffering than anything to do with belief in God.
- People's previous experiences will help them handle suffering, they will get to know how to handle it.
- The existence of suffering raises questions about God's existence, rather than belief in him helping. Surely a God would not want suffering to exist if his people were to suffer. This therefore raises the question "Does God really exist?".
- If God is "all-good", he wouldn't let suffering happen – Bertrand Russell. The fact that suffering exists points therefore to the thought that God does not exist.
- If God is all powerful he would interfere and stop the suffering.
- Since suffering exists it implies God can't stop it. Either God is therefore not all powerful, so he can't be the supreme being and is why he doesn't interfere. More likely, it shows God doesn't exist.
- If suffering exists, would this be the work of a God of love? – the Christian God of love would interfere to care for his children. Bertrand Russell - since he does not and evil exists, it raises the possibility that he does not exist.
- Isaiah describes the Kingdom of God as a place where no suffering and evil exist - "restore sight to the blind". God should therefore do something to alleviate evil and suffering, suffering should therefore not exist if there is a God.
- Much suffering is a result of man's decisions about religion – it is to blame some of the greatest evils and most suffering in our history.

## SCIENCE AND BELIEF

### 1. Scientific Method and Religious Belief

- (a) How does the “scientific method” help us to understand the world? (4)

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

**The scientific method allows us to**

- Discover knowledge about the natural world and how it works.
- This involves a process of observation, hypothesis, experiment, law (appropriate illustrative example may be included).
- Involves the study, investigation of processes of nature to find general laws behind the operation of the natural world to explain how things happen in the world.
- Provides evidence/information of a provisional nature which is subject to change in the light of new evidence/discoveries; this is regarded as one of its main strengths.
- Develop universally agreed standards of objective knowledge which can apply to all people in all parts of the world free from any individual, cultural or personal bias.

**Sources**

- **Francis Bacon** who first developed the scientific method approach.

- (b) How might religious belief be helpful for humans? (6)

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max of 5 without sources)**

**Possible answers could include**

- Religious belief can give people a sense of meaning, value and purpose in human life.
- It provides this related to the concept of God or other spiritual moral aspects of life.
- Aims to give a set of moral values/principles by which to live - a way of living in the world, not a description of how the world works.
- Deals with issues which are beyond the scope of science, eg beliefs concerned with aspects of reality which aim to relate to why things are as they are, eg significance of human consciousness, the intelligibility of the world, etc.
- Operates at the personal, subjective level and not with general or universal ideas as science often does and is much more meaningful as a result.

**Sources**

- There are any number of philosophers and theologians who have written on this subject. Some of these might include **Polkinghorne, Peacocke, Wittgenstein, Bultmann, Cupitt et al.**

**(c) To what extent is it possible to hold both a religious and a scientific view of the world?(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max. 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**It is not possible to hold both views**

- Some see religion and science as being contradictory so it's necessary to hold one view or the other but not both.
- Science has disproved much of the beliefs/claims of religion so it's better to hold a scientific view which is more accurate than a religious one.
- Many or most religious views are now seen to be out of date by many people. By contrast, science is more modern and up to date.
- People may hold both religious and scientific views of the world but to do so means some sort of inconsistent or contradictory opinions.
- People should not try to do this as it's illogical.

**On the other hand, it could be argued that to hold both views is possible**

- Science and religion deal with different aspects of life so need not be seen as being contradictory.
- Many people see the natural world in a scientific way but understand many of the teachings of religion/the Bible symbolically. It is quite possible to do this.
- Many people who are religious are also scientists. There is no problem in this for them so it cannot be impossible to hold both views at the same time.
- Science cannot answer all kinds of questions, we need more than just science. Many questions about meaning and purpose in life and about our moral beliefs and values cannot be dealt with by science but religion. The two can complement one another.

**2. The Beginning of the Universe**

**(a) How do religious and scientific views about the beginning of the universe differ? (10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max of 8 without sources)**

**Scientific: The main points of the Big Bang theory is as follows**

- Universe began with "explosion" around 12 -15b. years ago from event called a "singularity" having no specific "cause".
- Particles produced which then developed into electrons, protons and neutrons and became the main atoms/molecules of the universe.
- These atoms/molecules expanded and cooled, some clumped together under gravity and formed galaxies out of which came suns.
- Clouds of gas developed which spun under the force of gravity, heat, first stars, elements, eg hydrogen, helium, carbon, oxygen, etc more stars, planets.
- Solar system appeared about 10.5 b. years ago as the universe evolved.

**The two main pieces of evidence for this are:**

- Rate at which galaxies are currently moving away from each other suggest universe is expanding.
- Red shift principle confirms this, ie the light which emanates from the various galaxies, the faster the galaxies travel the redder the light from them.

**Religious: The main points over a seven “day” period in Genesis 1 are**

- When created, the original earth formless and desolate God said “ Let there be light” light and darkness, night and day, separation of waters to make sky and earth.
- Plants and fruit, sun, moon and stars, all living things, eg sea monsters and birds followed by domestic animal life.
- Finally human beings created, given dominion and responsibility over earth, etc.
- Seventh day God rested having completed act of creation.

Candidates may also consider Genesis 2

**Main points in Genesis 2 – no specific timetable included**

- God made universe containing no life, no plants, animals, etc.
- God created a man giving breath into him followed by a garden into which he placed the man to cultivate it.
- The man is given instructions to eat any fruit apart from fruit of tree of good and evil. The man has to name the animals and birds.
- God created a woman out of man’s rib to be companion. Both were naked but were not embarrassed.

(b) ***“The Big Bang Theory will never remove the need to believe in a creator God.”***

**To what extent do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Some may disagree with the statement saying**

- Widely accepted that science has disproved literal understanding of Genesis.
- Science speaks of the Big Bang and the evolutionary development of life and provides good evidence to support this whereas literal interpretations of Genesis say that the world was created in 6 days and humans were specially created by God.
- Many people do not believe in this view of Genesis because they accept that science has a better explanation.
- Science is more up to date and have more equipment to probe the universe.
- The Biblical account is primitive and written about 2500 years ago.
- There can be no comparison between science's account of the world and the Bible's — the scientific account is much more accurate and superior.
- Science gives us a much better understanding because it is based on facts and evidence and observations and not just on speculation about how the world might have come into existence.
- Science really leaves no room for God in its understanding of the world.

**Others may agree arguing that**

- Many scientists are also religious people and do not see any conflict between scientific discoveries and various interpretations of Genesis (except literal ones).
- People do not regard the Bible as a "scientific text book" which is in opposition to science — modern theology has given people the knowledge and tools to interpret Genesis religiously not scientifically.
- Genesis written about 2500 years ago so unintelligible as a scientific explanation of the origin of the universe.
- Issues of Genesis go beyond science — no need to try to square them with modern science — irrelevant. Genesis more concerned with meaning and purpose than explanation.
- Creation is a continuing process not a one-off event.
- Genesis is a statement about God's relationship with the world and regards God as the sustaining power behind the whole process — not the initial step in the natural process.
- Stories are aimed at looking at the significance of human beings and their place as the climax of creation so far and an integral part of the natural world, eg "you have come from dust and to dust you will return". "Adam" and "Eve" are representative humans.

**3. The Origin of Life**

- (a) **Describe the main points of Darwin's theory of evolution.** (4)

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

**The key points in the theory of evolution could include**

- Life has developed over many millions of years from tiny microbes into all the different species you find in the world today — including human beings.
- All forms of life originate from the same beginnings so life has a common source.
- Many forms of life have become extinct in the process or have developed into more complex forms in relation to the way they have adapted to natural changes in the environment and by heredity.
- The most suitable forms of life to their environment have survived and those who could not adapt have died out (the survival of the fittest).
- There is no need to suggest that life must have had a creator — it is a natural process which originated and developed in conjunction with the conditions on earth.

**Sources:**

- Charles Darwin, Richard Dawkins, etc.

(b) Explain why the theory of evolution is seen as a threat to the faith of some Christians.(6)

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max of 5 without sources)**

**Some Christians may see evolution as a threat because**

- Bible says all things created by God directly in present form and not subject to change from one species to another so is Bible wrong?
- Evolution does not see people as being different from other life forms and therefore does not give them unique status.
- The idea of God as creator seems to be left out if life developed in a natural, evolutionary way; no “guiding hand” in the process and development of life.
- If life has not been created but simply evolved in natural ways then it can have no meaning or purpose and this threatens human dignity.
- Evolution contradicted idea of God designing the world/life as it was with each species appropriately suited to its environment, eg Paley’s design argument.
- The timescale of evolution – over 3000 m. years – goes against Biblical story should the Bible be questioned?

**Sources:**

- Peacocke, Polkinghorne, etc.

(c) *“The fact that many Christians accept the theory of evolution shows that the Bible may be wrong about the origin of life.”*

**How far do you agree?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**Some may argue that evolution does show the Bible to be wrong about the origin of life**

- Evolution is a very widely held view about the origin and development of life and has a lot of evidence to back it up. Biblical account is simplistic and naïve by comparison.
- People who wrote the Bible had little idea of how life had developed and just made up simple stories out of their imagination. These stories are far short of the truth.
- If many Christians do accept the theory of evolution then they must also accept that the Bible account is not an accurate one.
- Life originated millions of years ago in the sea according to evolution whereas the Bible account has it all happening in the garden of Eden. This Biblical account is obviously untrue.

**Others may argue that evolution does not necessarily contradict the Bible.**

- The Biblical account can only be seen to be wrong if it is taken literally. The Bible is not a scientific textbook.
- Many Christians see the Bible as a symbolic account of the importance of human life in world – it has spiritual and moral aims. Understood in this way, this has nothing to do with scientific accounts of the origin of life.
- Many Christians see evolution as the process by which God created and developed life which is why they accept the theory. Science and religion are not contradictory.
- Science and religion have different purposes. If they are confused, the result is an apparent conflict between the two. This need not happen if both are understood correctly.

## **BELIEF AND ACTION**

### **1. God: Real or Imagined**

#### **(a) “God is not real”**

**Explain how Christianity and Marxism differ in their response to this statement. (10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks ( max. 8 without sources)**

#### **Christianity**

- God is real.
- Humankind is made in the image of God.
- We gain knowledge of God through personal religious experience.
- Various theological arguments which support the view that God is real, eg design argument, first cause argument.
- The anthropic principle – it seems that the universe has been made for mankind.
- Evidence of God through the huge amount of goodness to be found in our world. Good people like Mother Teresa, Gandhi, etc.
- God is spirit – over and above material things.

#### **Marxism**

- God is not real.
- No real evidence to suggest otherwise.
- No-one has seen God.
- The huge amount of suffering in the world contradicts the existence of a caring God.
- People make God out of what they cannot explain.
- God is the projection of the needs of humanity.
- Science and the knowledge it has brought to humankind seems to disprove the theological explanations of the origins of universe.
- Religion is mere superstition.
- Society just encourages belief in God as a means of controlling the masses.

#### **Sources**

- **Christianity:** Aquinas, Paley, Genesis chpt 1-3, examples of human beings do good.
- **Marxism:** Feuerbach, Karl Marx.
- **Also:** Nature of Belief - Joe Walker & Looking for God – Robert Kirkwood.

- (b) **Many people nowadays think it is foolish to believe in God. To what extent do you agree?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Agree**

- God is unseen and cannot be experienced.
- People often turn to God in troubled times but he doesn't help – they are fooling themselves into false sense of hope and security.
- Believing in God encourages people to escape from the reality of life. Instead of hoping for better life in the future they should concentrate on working hard together now to create a better society.
- Too many people wait for God to solve their problems when they could be solving them themselves. Human beings have tremendous potential but it is not always used.
- If there is not heaven or afterlife of any kind then religious people are wasting a great deal of time and energy trying to achieve a goal which is not achievable.
- Belief in God is usually passed down through family and is therefore a cultural thing – it is wrong not to question this in the light of modern scientific knowledge.

**Disagree**

- Belief in God can give life real meaning, value and purpose.
- God can guide people's lives purposefully.
- Belief in God helps people to overcome the more negative aspects of life, eg suffering, illness, grief, old age.
- Belief in God has inspired some to complete great works of charity and religion has been responsible for much good in the world.
- God must be real – many people claim to have direct experience of His existence therefore it cannot be foolish to believe in Him.
- Belief in God can bring people together through worship and celebration – this is a good thing for society – such bonding makes us a stronger unit.
- There is a great deal of evidence and reasoned argument to support belief in God.

**2. Religion and Social Justice**

- (a) **How do Christians promote social justice throughout the world?** (4)

**KU 4 marks (Max. 3 without sources)**

- Christians follow the example of Jesus and put his teaching into practice through their work for the poor in the world.
- Christians give both time and money to help those suffering from social injustice.
- Christian organisations like CAFOD, SCIAF and Christian Aid work to highlight problems of social injustice.
- Christians preach from the Bible and raise awareness of social injustice.

**Sources**

- Gospel of Matthew.
- Gospel of Luke.
- Extracts from reports of relevant Christian organisations.
- Nature of Belief: Joe Walker.

- (b) Explain how Marxism encourages people to work against social injustice. (6)**

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max. 5 without sources)**

- Marxism seeks to kindle awareness of sources of injustice, eg governments and religious bodies.
- Encouragement of the oppressed to stand up against the forces of social injustice.
- Organise and support strike action against social injustice.
- Inspire revolutionary spirit in those who are the victims of social injustice.
- Educate the victims in their statutory rights to social justice.
- Promotes armed struggle in an attempt to achieve social justice.
- Agitate politicians at local and national level in an attempt to bring about change.
- Marxism advocates direct and practical action against social injustice.

**Sources**

- Joe Walker: Nature of Belief.
- Joe Jenkins: Contemporary Moral Issues.
- Writings of Karl Marx.

- (c) To what extent have Christian organisations been more effective than Marxism in challenging social injustice? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max. 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Christianity more effective**

- Christian organisations have worked hard to improve conditions for those who are oppressed. Many charities have given money and other forms of aid to allow the oppressed to take charge of their own lives.
- Christian organisations have played a large part in educating the poor – this is long term support and has long term benefits for those who suffer.
- The Church has been well established in many areas where people are oppressed and liberation theology promotes practical help and spiritual support to those who suffer from social injustice.
- Christianity liberates people in spiritual sense as well as practical – this is very important because this spirituality gives them the strength to challenge social injustice.
- Christian ministers and priests preach the biblical message against social injustice – this raises awareness throughout the world and allows others to understand and challenge the plight of the oppressed.
- Mainstream Christianity adopts a non-violent approach to challenging social injustice; this is more effective because more people accept this peaceful approach. Governments more likely to respond to peaceful protest and requests for help than to violent campaigns.

### **Marxism more effective**

- Marxism promotes direct action of those who are oppressed.
- Marxism puts into practice what Christians can only preach.
- Marxism preaches the conversion of society and gives people the tools to bring this about.
- This effectiveness has been seen in China and in the former Soviet Union before these political systems themselves became sources of social injustice.
- Marxism encourages armed struggle and works to directly overthrow corrupt governments and organisations that oppress the poor.
- Marxism teaches that history is made by people on earth and so encourages people to create their own history.
- Marxist approach to change is quicker than Christian approach. Christians depend on the change of each individual's heart, this is a very slow process.

### **3. Oppression and Liberation**

- (a) **Explain how Christianity and Marxism have been brought together in Liberation Theology.** (10)

**KU & AN – 10 Marks (Max 8 without sources) Max of 4 marks for definition of Liberation Theology.**

- Liberation theology identifies with the poor.
- Its main aim is to liberate the oppressed, this is aim of both Christianity and Marxism.
- It speaks out against corrupt governments and other institutions which oppress the poor.
- It aims to educate the poor in order to empower them to take control of own lives and to challenge oppression. This is theme of Jesus' teaching and of Marx.
- Preaches a gospel of liberation – justice for the poor.
- Works with the poor to organise and enable political action.
- Gives practical support through feeding hungry and healing sick.
- Aims to bring about a better society for the poor. This is message of parables of Kingdom of God and of Karl Marx.
- Liberation theology advocates violent action if necessary.
- Teaches that real freedom for individuals will be brought about by changes in society.

#### **Sources**

- Luke 4: 18-21.
- Amos, Isaiah, Lamentations.
- Gustav Gutierrez: A Theology of Liberation.
- Archbishop Oscar Romero.
- Dom Helder Camara.
- Joe Walker: Nature of Belief.

**(b) Should Christians be involved in political action against oppression of the poor? (10)**

**AN & EV – 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**Yes**

- People need to survive physically. Political action can bring about aid in the form of food, health care, better living conditions, etc.
- Christian duty to follow the example of Jesus – he fed the hungry and cured the sick. Christians must do likewise.
- If people do not have basic amenities then life is a constant struggle to survive – they will have no time for spiritual matters. If Church is to thrive it must take care of its people in practical ways.
- There are many examples of Jesus challenging the authorities of his time. Political action is in line with his teaching.
- “Love your Neighbour” – true love must involve action to bring about lasting change in people’s lives.

**No**

- Christians should be more concerned with spiritual salvation than political action.
- Earth is a temporal place that will eventually end. The fate of our eternal soul is much more important than the temporary poverty that might be suffered here on earth.
- Christ’s teaching that the poor will always be with us shows that he believed we should not be too concerned about poverty – to be spiritually impoverished is a greater problem.
- We will all get our just rewards in next life so dealing with poverty in this life is not so essential. Some Christians might even argue that the experience of poverty can even be good for us!
- Prayer and spiritual devotion can bring about changes in our world.
- Christ argues that we should “obey them that have rule over us” – accept our lot and do our best to get closer to God.
- Political campaigning and violent protest against governments might actually damage the image and influence of the Church.

## SECTION FOUR

### JUSTICE IN THE WORLD

#### SOCIAL JUSTICE

##### 1. Challenging Inequality

- (a) What evidence is there of social injustice in the UK today? (4)

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

- Social justice implies that a society is equal, everyone has equal value and worth. Many would argue that this is not true for all in our society.
- Many people in Britain live below the poverty line and do not enjoy the advantages of a rich society.
- Many people are “socially excluded” through poverty, relying on state benefits, poor diet, homeless, unable to keep warm in winter, poor quality housing, poor health.
- Many people in poverty are disadvantaged educationally, having only access to the poorest schools. Statistics show that in the UK the poorest achieve the lowest grades.
- Poor people vote less excluding them from important decision making processes.

**Sources**

- Government statistics on poverty, unemployment, education, etc.

- (b) Why should social inequality be of concern to Christians? (6)

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max 5 without sources)**

- Christians should be concerned because Jesus taught that it was important to help the poor.
- “If you have two coats give one to the person who has none” establishing the principle that you had to think of those less fortunate than yourself.
- Jesus came to bring good news to the poor showing a “bias towards the poor” and making it a duty of Christians to consider the poor. If they love Jesus and he loves the poor then it is essential that they show the same concern he showed.
- “Blessed are the poor” ... Matt.
- Jesus’ message to the rich young man to sell all that he had and give it to the poor if he was to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Again it is a duty to all Christians.
- “Love your neighbour as yourself”. How can you show love to your neighbour if you do not love the poor or are not concerned by blatant social injustice.
- The early Christians shared their wealth with one another seeing this as a duty - if the early church saw this as a duty then it is important that all Christians see this as their duty today.

**Sources**

- Biblical passages as above.
- Church reports, eg Faith in the City, etc.

(c) **“The poor will always be with us.”**

**How far do you agree with this statement?**

**(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 without both sides of the issue)**

**For**

- Jesus made this clear when the expensive oil was poured on his feet as an act of devotion he was realistic enough to see that the problem of poverty would always be present in society.
- Poverty will always be a problem as some people will waste whatever they have and will always end up poor. Many people are seen as lazy and unwilling to work and just will not help themselves, so why should others help them?
- Material wealth is seen as a barrier to religious belief and many Christians see poverty as a noble thing not necessarily to be challenged.
- To many Christians what matters is the life to come and poverty in this world is just a temporary problem to live through.
- The story of the rich man and Lazarus implies that the rich man’s wealth was a barrier to his entry into heaven. It almost suggests that it is a good thing to be poor as the compromises you make to get wealth will keep you from God.
- Wealth and poverty are seen as symptoms of the fallen world and as sin is an integral part of that world then poverty will always be here until the day of judgement.
- Poverty is just too big a problem to deal with.
- Some extreme Christians see wealth as a reward from God therefore see poverty as a punishment for wrongs done.

**Against**

- Jesus’ concern for the poor shows poverty must be challenged.
- There are enough resources in the world if we would just share them more equally; the UK is the 4th richest nation in the world yet there is a great deal of poverty in our cities. Christians argue this is wrong and this means that in no way should people in Britain be poor. The state can and should redistribute this wealth through taxation, some people have more than any individual and family could possibly need.
- Big companies make huge profits for their owners and shareholders but pay small wages to their workers. This is wrong and can be dealt with through a minimum wage - much of the poverty in the country is just caused by the greed of the rich and powerful.
- Not all poor people are lazy and do want to have opportunities to better themselves such as better education which can be paid for by the government and directed more to help the poor, or better health care or better housing.
- It is in everyone’s interest to want to eradicate poverty as it will make society better for all of us.

## 2. Building a Just Society

(a) Explain how injustice can affect the lives of people in the UK. (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Injustice is how other people are treated - it centres on the idea of equality in all things and injustice can be seen in a very broad range of areas in society.
- In Christian terms it is important as “all are created in the image of God and therefore must be of equal worth”. This is not true of the society we live in.
- Injustice is a lack of love therefore respect for other people for a number of reasons, leading to their not enjoying equality with the rest of society.
- Injustice can be seen in a number of ways in our society. It can be seen in poverty and the lack of equality that is given to people in wages and in wealth, in education and access to the best schools and universities.
- Poverty can often be seen to lead to crime.
- Injustice can be seen in the treatment of minority groups where they are not given equal rights. This may include the treatment of racial minorities who face attacks and discrimination on a daily basis in the workplace, in their homes, etc. Many black people find they do not get justice even when they turn to the law for help. It may include the inequality faced by women again in the workplace, or in the home. It may include injustice over issues such as sexuality or religious minorities.
- Injustice stems from a lack of respect for other people and there are many examples where respect is not offered to minority groups as outlined above.
  - failure to have equal pay for women, etc
  - failure to have equal opportunity for homosexuals, eg the current debate in the churches threatening to tear them apart. Is this justice or standing up for moral absolutes? Candidates can explore many such issues including the socially and economically excluded.
- Injustice leads to people feeling excluded from society and not enjoying the benefits citizens should take for granted.
- Injustice in the UK might also be seen as a denial of basic human rights and again examples can be given, eg asylum seekers, etc.
- The poor often do not get justice before the law. More people from poor backgrounds are to be found in prisons today reflecting that they lack the opportunities that may drive them to crime in the first place and then lack of equality and respect from the justice system.

### **Sources**

- Government statistics.
- Press reports.
- Quotes from TV programmes, etc.

- (b) **To what extent can it be argued that non-religious groups do more than Christians to challenge injustice?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 if only one side of the issue)**

**Against**

- Many secular groups do more to fight for the rights of those discriminated against in our society than the churches do, eg Shelter for the homeless, or Amnesty International fighting for fairness in the justice system.
- Many Christians see Christianity as prohibiting, challenging the state structures. “Obey them who have the rule over you”, “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's ...” both seen as quotes supporting the rulers God has put over us.
- Christianity is a religion concerned with the afterlife - the destiny of the soul - not the material wellbeing of the body and too often Christians particularly of the fundamentalist persuasion, appear to belong to the “hang them and flog them” group in society. They want tough sentences and see attempts at rehabilitation as weak and unsatisfactory. They argue against taking into consideration background, poverty, etc as making excuses for evil behaviour.
- Jesus appears to support the idea that spiritual wellbeing matters more than fighting for justice - allowing the pouring of expensive ointment on his feet. “The poor will always be with you” many Christians use this as an excuse to tolerate injustice and poverty in society today.
- Many Christians see that only God is just and they believe that he will one day judge us all and send those who break his laws to hell for ever. They see evil as the cause of poverty and inequality and would argue that human justice should be as harsh and they often have a different moral code from the rest of secular society which does not see anything wrong with the inequality faced by certain minority groups, eg many aids sufferers deserve what they get - it is the judgement of God.

The Churches still have influence in society albeit reduced from a past age.  
Governments still listen even if they do not always act on the churches’ calls.

**For**

- Individuals and groups may include George MacLeod and the Iona Community, Geoff Schaw, in the past or active members of the Church and Nation Committee of the Church of Scotland who call for the Church to be more active in matters of justice. Bishop Richard Holloway campaigns constantly through books and politics in call for Christians to show justice for all types of marginalised groups.
- Many Churches have called for justice in our society, eg the General Synod of the Church of England calls for a fair criminal justice system that “exercises mercy against justice”. The Church of Scotland calls for justice to reflect “the relationship between God and people” in other words one of forgiveness and mercy tempered with justice. It also calls for the justice system to help “mend broken relationships between offender and community.” They also call for the justice system to reflect “the complex causes of crime, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, drugs ...” clearly seeing the relationship between these injustices and the justice system that is designed to maintain law and order.
- Christians working to free prisoners unjustly imprisoned.

### 3. Working for Peace

(a) *"It is a Christian duty to campaign against war."*

**Why might Christians agree with this statement? (10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Jesus taught Christians to work for peace so many see it as a duty to campaign to this end.
- "Blessed are the Peacemakers" Matt 5:9. Jesus made it clear that he did not think violence was a good way of dealing with problems - this was unacceptable.
- Jesus stopped his disciples from fighting when the authorities came to arrest him in the Garden of Gethsemane. If this was his response to a situation of danger then his followers could not respond to problems with threats of violence.
- Jesus taught that we should "love our enemies" and "do good to them who hate us" suggesting that war was never going to be the best solution to solve problems. This does not suggest a man who would encourage war and fighting.
- Jesus is called the "Son of Peace" Luke 10:6 again emphasising the importance of peace in his thinking.
- "Peace I leave with you my peace I give to you ..." John 14:27 Christians see it as their duty to argue against war as this is in obedience to Jesus.
- There is a clear thread of peace in the teachings of Jesus and we can only assume that he felt strongly about not resorting to violence in the world.
- Along with others Christians would argue that in every war innocent people will be killed and this is unacceptable before God.
- Some might say that the Bible does allow war in situations when God's people are threatened - Joshua and the Battle of Jericho, the destruction of Ai, wars with the Philistines when God commanded that all the people be killed including women, children and livestock.

#### **Sources**

- Biblical passages as above.
- Church reports, etc.

(b) **How far can a Christian support war as a way of dealing with problems in the world?(10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 if only one side of the issue)**

#### **For**

- Aquinas and the Just War Theory. There are circumstances where war is necessary and very strict rules are laid down why war might be justifiable.
- There are wars against the enemies of God in the Old Testament and war is clearly used as a means of overcoming "evil".
- There are situations where evil needs to be confronted; self defence, or as in the case of evil regimes such as Hitler's Germany, Saddam Hussein, etc.
- War must be in pursuit of a greater good, when all other options have been exhausted and when civilian deaths are kept to a minimum.
- Arguments for nuclear deterrence could be strengthened by the argument that it was only the willingness to match weapons during the Cold War that led to the eventual "peace" through mutual respect. This kept the peace for many years - the balance of power. Many Christians saw that the ends justified the means.

- Terrorism as a modern force that requires a strong response to what are seen as unreasonable people or organisations. The story of the Good Samaritan is all very well some might argue as long as he is not wearing a bomb kit.
- War is sometimes inevitable and the suffering of not going to war is greater than the evil of war - the suffering in Kosovo only ended with decisive attacks or in the long term the suffering in Iraq was ended in a short war that toppled an evil regime that killed many more people than ever died in the war.

### **Against**

- Jesus was the Prince of Peace - he came to bring peace and justice to the world. How can his followers possibly support armed conflict that leads to the death of other humans made in the same image as God.
- Source “Blessed are the peacemakers for they are the children of God”. A true child of God must obey him and when you look at say the peace movement in Northern Ireland many would argue it has eventually borne fruit.
- Source “They shall beat their swords into plough shares and their spears into pruning hooks” Mica 4:3. In the recent conflicts, eg Iraq many have argued that it was better to go on talking. Many innocent people died and it is an important question to ask - is that ever worth it.
- Jesus taught peace and love “Love your neighbour as yourself ...”. Love for neighbours, love for others is the central theme of the Christian religion and many argue that Christians should be pacifists and should be against war and that it is better to talk or use methods other than war to end conflicts, eg sanctions, or UN negotiations, etc.
- Conflicts like the Israeli/Palestinian conflict only seem to move forward when they begin to talk otherwise there is a never ending cycle of violence that kills many innocent people on both sides. Jesus’ teachings on peace and reconciliation is relevant in such situations.
- Jesus also taught that his followers should “turn the other cheek” against an enemy so again how can they possibly support armed conflict - turning the other cheek won over violence in the Civil Rights campaign in the USA.
- Doing good to them that hate you is also central to Christian teaching - how can this be done in a war situation? - it is better to bring people together and discuss options.

Candidates can refer to Christian responses to current situations in the world and whether these fit in with Christian teachings as outlined above or in relation to either of the arguments presented.

## **GLOBAL SOLIDARITY**

### **1. Christianity and Poverty**

- (a) **Explain how poverty affects the lives of people in the developing world. (10)**

**KU 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

- Vast differences exist between the wealth of the developed world and the poverty of the developing world. Richer nations with a quarter of the world's population control three quarters of the world's wealth.
- Massive inequality exists in the trading arrangements between the rich and poor nations which many argue disadvantages the poor nations. The rich set up trading which ensures they pay little for the materials they buy and yet charge huge amounts for the goods they sell. They also bar manufactured goods from any poor countries to protect their own manufacturing industries.
- Poverty is then difficult to get out of. Poor countries borrow vast amounts of money they cannot repay, and this means they cannot afford basic health or education services as they are servicing debts. The populations of poor countries therefore have poor health, live in slums, are uneducated and have few skills which will attract industry.
- Effects mean that there is no food to feed people, simple medicine and vaccines are not available and many suffer ill health and early death unnecessarily. Epidemics such as AIDS spread as there is not enough medical infrastructure to deal with the cause of the effects.
- SAPS and Aid programmes make poor countries dependent on aid – aid programmes stop local development and do not encourage efficient production at home. Farms remain subsistence farms exposed to famine and further poverty.
- People are locked into this poverty. To try and get out of this they are encouraged to develop cash crops which will earn money to repay the debt but not feed the nation, examples may include sugar, coffee and even cut flowers all dependent on the world price, all taking away the ability of poor nations to feed themselves.
- In many poor countries a rich elite control the modest wealth of the nation and misuse the money. Human rights are affected and the poor are further oppressed.

#### **Sources**

- UN statistics.
- Government reports.
- Brandt report.
- Oxfam, etc.

- (b) ***“Love your neighbour as yourself.”***

**How far do Christians follow this teaching when dealing with world poverty? (10)**

**AN & EV - 10 marks (Max 6 without both sides of the issue)**

#### **Not Effective**

- Most of the rich countries are nominally Christian and many argue that Christians in the West do not do enough to change the trading relationships between the rich and the poor world.
- Too many Christians are happy to enjoy the fruits of wealth and care little about unfair trading structures.
- Many Churches are wealthy and spend their money on the maintenance of extravagant buildings while people in parts of the world starve to death.

- Many Christians see poverty as something people bring on themselves as through lack of hard work and are quick to quote parts of scripture to back up ideas, eg charity begins at home. Why should we care about people thousands of miles away.
- The mere existence of poverty on the scale it exists in our world is a sign that the millions of Christians in the world are failing to mobilise effectively to deal with the problem. They fail to bring pressure on their governments to do something about poverty and the inequality in the world and this shows they care little for the teachings of Jesus to love their neighbour.
- Few Christians come anything close to the Christian concept of tithing, a tenth of their wealth to God or to the poor.

### **Effective**

- Groups like Christian Aid, and Tear Fund work hard with the support of millions of Christians to bring relief to the most poverty stricken parts of the world.
- Such groups work to provide sustainable farming techniques and programmes amongst the poorest of the poor.
- Many Christian groups are involved in bringing goods produced in developing countries to rich markets.
- Jubilee 2000 was a high profile campaign organised by the churches to demand debt relief. They campaigned through western governments and the United Nations to have crippling debts cancelled to allow poor countries to develop.
- This campaign brought the attention of the world to the problem and has led to governments like the British to cancel billions of pounds of debt.
- Many Christians give to charity to bring aid to the starving and see it as a duty to share what God has given them with their fellow human beings.
- Many Christians give up a great deal to go and work in the mission field or to run hospitals and schools in the developing countries.
- Prominent Church leaders campaign vigorously for the changing of the way in which we trade with the developing countries.
- Many Christians have adopted the ideas of Liberation Theology as an important way to change to structures of the world order to benefit the poor.

## **2. The North/South Divide**

- (a) What trade problems are faced by countries in the developing world? (4)**

### **KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

- Multinational companies controlling markets to the detriment of developing countries. Monopoly on cash crops with some countries being dependent on a limited number of crops means that developing countries are vulnerable to fluctuations on the market.
- Unfair pricing structures for many commodities which mean that the developing country cannot get a fair price for their goods.
- Developing countries in debt take out new loans to cover old ones, thus pushing them deeper in debt and meaning whatever money they earn goes on debt repayment.
- Many developing countries have to struggle against a colonial past which still makes them dependent on their former colonial power and those powers still control their access to world markets.
- SAPS imposed by the rich nations through the IMF and World Bank further taking away control of trading terms from the poor countries.
- Inappropriate use of money in large schemes such as dam building rather than building of an appropriate infrastructure for the economic development of many countries.
- Tied aid or bilateral aid which can often be inappropriate aimed at the needs of the donor country and dictates the trade terms and prices to the advantage of the donor nation.

### Sources

- UN statistics.
- WTO.
- World Bank.
- Oxfam, etc.

**(b) Explain the effects unfair trade has on people living in the developing world (6)**

### KU & AN 6 marks (Max 5 without sources)

- Unfair trade discriminates against farmers in the developing world - subsidies in the EU and USA lead to massive over production and dumping of food on poor countries. Farmers cannot compete. Leads to poverty among subsistence farmers in developing world.
- Wages are kept low by multinational companies and this leads to major problems of housing, health and standards of living.
- Barriers against manufactured goods from the developing world stop the development of homegrown industries and employment - those in work are more vulnerable to downturns in trade.
- Cash crops again put farmers at the mercy of world prices leaving them powerless when sugar or coffee prices drop. It also stops farmers from growing food to feed themselves and the rest of the population. Poverty is then made worse.
- Lack of spending on health facilities and education further drives up poverty in the developing world.

### Sources

- WTO statistics.
- World Health Organisation, etc.

**(c) To what extent is it a Christian duty to work to solve the problems of unfair trade? (10)**

### AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 without both sides of the issue)

#### On the one hand

- Christians have a duty to “love their neighbours”. This will include the people who suffer as a result of unfair trading. Unfair trade leads directly to suffering and poverty in the world and if they are following Christ then they must challenge these structures.
- Many everyday household goods Christians buy such as coffee, tea, bananas, are also produced at low prices, and to keep the price in the shops down they are contributing to the poverty of countries that export these goods to us. This goes against their duty to “love their neighbour”.
- Jesus told the rich young ruler to sell all he had and give the money to the poor establishing a duty to be concerned about the poor - this must surely suggest that they should be concerned to work to make trading more fair to the developing world.
- The Bible teaches in Amos that “it is wrong to oppress the poor” and Christians must again work to solve unfair trade as the cause of poverty in the world. Other passages such as Jeremiah 22:16 and Isaiah 10:2 where God condemns the oppression of the poor again and again.
- Jesus taught that the poor were “blessed” and that “if we had two coats we should give one away to the one who has none”. All too often people professing to be Christians do not live like that. Given the scale of poverty in the world then you could argue that Christians should be ashamed about their lack of support for the poor.

- All human beings are important to God. All are created equal “each person possesses a basic dignity that comes from God” Catholic Bishops of England. This shows the duty of all Christians to the poor.

#### **Against**

- Jesus taught that the “poor you would always have with you” when the expensive ointment was poured on his feet. Religious devotion was therefore very important.
- God is more concerned with the afterlife and the affairs of the world including trading conditions between rich and poor as temporal matters that are not important.
- Suffering is seen as a virtue and many Christians see material wealth as a hindrance to a good spiritual life - Christians should be more concerned with saving eternal souls than worrying about trade and wealth creation.
- Christian duty is to spread the word of God; not to preach a social gospel.
- Many Christians see poverty being caused by lack of hard work and effort on the part of the poor. Often governments in the developing world are corrupt and it is their fault that they cannot take advantage of world trade benefits.

### **3. Protection of the Environment**

- (a) What is meant by the term “Stewardship”?** **(4)**

#### **KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

- The Earth is created by God Genesis 1-3 - it is his and he has handed over responsibility to human beings to look after the creation.
- God made humans stewards of the Earth.
- Stewardship implies looking after rather than ownership and if we are stewards of the Earth we have no right to exploit the Earth or its resources.
- “The earth and all that is in it belong to the lord” Psalm 24 v 1.
- Humans made in the image of God and established as stewards of the Earth have a duty and responsibility to take care of it.
- Care for animals - Genesis 2 Adam asked to name the animals showing authority.
- Rest in the fields on day seven - the Sabbath law is applied to all creation as a sign that God cares for his creation and humans have a duty to.
- We have a duty “to love our neighbours as ourselves” this means all humans and many argue it means future generations as well. There is a Christian duty to think about those that are yet to be born.
- There is a duty to hand on the Earth intact to the next generation.
- Jubilee year in Leviticus establishing the importance of allowing the Earth to recover and be replenished.

#### **Sources might include**

- Genesis 1:26.
- Psalm 104.
- Ecclesiastes 3.
- Matthew 6:26-30.

**(b) Explain how human activities might be spoiling the Earth. (6)**

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max 5 without sources)**

- Global warming is accepted by most scientists as a fact and it is a result of our abuse of the Earth polluting the atmosphere with hydrocarbons from cars and industrial activities. Many argue this is unsustainable.
- Industrial activity creates acid rain that destroys fish and pollutes water courses all over the world.
- Resources such as oil and minerals are being depleted in a way that is unacceptable and means that future generations will suffer.
- Destruction of the rain forest in many parts of the world has also led to global warming.
- Nuclear pollution has made many parts of the world unusable for many generations.
- Intensive farming in some countries is making the land less and less productive and again it is destroying the chance of future generations to feed themselves.
- Developing countries are creating more uncontrolled pollution in their drive for greater prosperity and eradication of poverty.
- Pace of abuse is growing and this goes against proper and responsible stewardship.

**Sources**

- UN reports.
- Friends of the Earth.
- Government reports.

**(c) How far should Christians oppose the economic activities that are damaging the Earth? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 without both sides of the issue)**

**They Should Not**

- Many Christians believe that the Christian religion is primarily spiritual; it is about eternity. They are more concerned about the soul and where it will end up than about the temporal problems of the Earth.
- The Bible teaches that humankind should “subdue” the earth and many have taken this as a right to control and tame the environment for our own benefit.
- Many Christians believe that God will destroy the Earth on the last day and create a new heaven and a new Earth - this Earth is spoiled by sin and that is why it is in a mess.
- The whole of creation fell with Adam so creation is spoiled and beyond redemption; it is not the duty of Christians to redeem a fallen world but rather to prepare for the world to come.
- Such Christians see it as a waste of time concerning ourselves with temporary things - you could solve the environmental problems but still not solve the real problem of alienation from God.
- Many Christians continue to enjoy the benefits of the things that contribute to the destruction of the environment - fossil fuels, cars, etc.

### **They Should**

- If the Earth is the Lord's then they have a duty to look after it and campaign for sustainable development.
- Many Christian groups campaign for the environment, eg the Meeting of Faiths in Assisi showing their concern.
- All major churches have statements on the environment and are beginning to show their concerns about the abuse of the environment.
- The Church of Scotland states our attitude to the environment is “to do with our responsibility to others and to the world as God's creation ...”. Such beliefs underline the importance that Christians should place on protecting God's creation.
- All property has a “social mortgage”. It is “borrowed”. All people are to be respected and to share the Earth's resources. On human work the Roman Catholic Church.
- “The earth and all life is a gift from God given to us to share and develop, not to dominate and exploit” Pope John Paul II.
- More and more Christians are becoming concerned about the environment and are working to change attitudes.
- The destruction of the environment affects human beings and many Church reports call for the preservation of the environment as means of showing love for the rest of humanity. The environmental degradation we now see is most acutely felt by the poor and it is the duty of Christians to help the poor.
- Many Christians see poverty being caused by lack of hard work and effort on the part of the poor. Often governments in the developing world are corrupt and it is their fault that they cannot take advantage of world trade benefits.

Candidates should express their own opinion about the extent to which they believe Christians should work to oppose environmental degradation.

## SECTION FIVE

### METAPHYSICS

#### 1. Freewill and Determinism

- (a) *“Everything that happens in the world has a cause.”*

**Explain how the views of Determinism and Freewill might respond to this statement.(10)**

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

**The key points of Determinism are:**

**5 marks should be allocated to each explanation**

- Everything which happens is caused by something - including human actions.
- These causes/forces are controlled by scientific laws which operate in and affect everybody in the same way. This is unavoidable and could not happen otherwise.
- People may feel they are free to choose but this is only because they do not know all or all about the controlling forces which affect all that we decide.
- Nothing can go against these laws and once we understand what they are then we know why this is the case.
- Many of the things that happen which we think are our own choices or decisions are not because they are actually controlled by things which happen in our brain, genes, previously existing psychological conditions, etc.
- Candidates may give examples to illustrate any point they make.

**Freewill:**

**Some of the points which candidates might make are:**

- Many things happen as a result of people's choices/decisions.
- People are free to choose between options and if this were not the case then we could not properly say that “I chose ..” or “I decided ..”, etc.
- Laws of nature do control many of the physical processes in the world and in human beings - but not all.
- People feel they are free to choose in many cases and this is because they are. Their free choices/minds cause them to make particular decisions or cause things to happen.
- It may be true to say that everything that happens has a cause if we also accept that human beings can be the causes of things that happen. Everything that happens is not necessarily the result of forces or causes beyond our control.
- Candidates may give suitable examples to illustrate the points they make.

**Sources:** For determinism some sources could include **Bertrand Russell** and **Jacques Monod** and those involving the idea of freewill include **Kant** and **Nietzsche**.

(b) In your opinion, does Determinism or Freewill best explain human behaviour? (10)

AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)

**Some may argue that Determinism best explains human behaviour because**

- Virtually everything which happens is the result of prior causes or forces which are part of the way the world is. This includes human behaviour.
- People often say that they did things which they didn't mean, but could not stop this happening because of things beyond their control – illustrating determinism.
- We only **think** we are free to choose between, eg stealing something or not. Everything in the world is controlled by natural forces, including human decisions. We cannot go against natural or psychological laws.
- People who make decisions do so because of a whole variety of complex processes – all of which are the result of pre-existing conditions. Many of these are desires which we are not always consciously aware of.
- Biology and genetics can be a perfectly acceptable explanation of people's behaviour. Once we fully understand these processes we will realise that we do not have freewill.
- People are not really free and therefore cannot be completely responsible for what they do – they often cannot help it. Nobody can go against the laws of nature – even in human decisions.

**However, from the point of view of Freewill:**

- Many things happen as a result of people's choices/decisions but people are free to choose between options.
- Laws of nature do control many of the physical processes in the world and in human beings - but not all. People feel they are free to choose and this is because they are.
- If there is no such thing as freewill it would not make sense to say that someone was responsible for an action, eg telling a lie or making a choice. Moral responsibility would have no meaning unless we accept that people can make real choices and are responsible for them.
- We blame and punish people for acting in a wrong or inappropriate way. This is what we call justice. This would be nonsense if we did not accept that people were free in many cases to decide between right and wrong.
- You cannot fairly punish someone if they have no control over what they do. In some cases we do make an exception if someone carries out an action under the influence of alcohol or drugs — but that is the exception which proves the rule.
- People accept that they can and do make free decisions. While it is possible to accept that many things which happen are caused by natural laws, this does not apply to everything.

## 2. Mind and Body

- (a) Explain two different theories about the relationship between the mind and the brain. (10)

**KU & AN 10 marks (Max 8 without sources)**

### **Physicalism**

**Some of the main points which candidates might consider are:**

- Everything in the world is made up of purely physical matter and is sufficient to produce mental life as it develops. Mental states are the result of conditions of brain states.
- There is no extra “soul” or “mind” to be added so nothing can exist or continue to exist when people die.
- Mental states are just states of the brain and eventually science will be able to explain this fact, eg our mental experience of tasting chocolate is just a series of complicated physical events in our brains.
- When we talk about the human “mind” or “self” we are talking about nothing more than describing human physical bodies and their actions - including brain activity.
- Everything can be reduced to the physical activity of the body and brain - this is often called “reductionism”.
- Candidates may give examples to illustrate these points, eg a bicycle is just the name of the parts which make it up; nothing more needs to be added to make a bicycle.

**The view of Dualism could contain some of the following:**

- Our experiences are inside our minds in a way which is different from the way our brain is inside our head. This means that our experiences and other mental states cannot be just physical states of our brains - there is more to us than our bodies and a complicated nervous system.
- One way of interpreting this is that we have a soul or mind attached to our bodies allowing some kind of control (like the pilot controlling the aeroplane).
- If so, then we are made up of two very different things - a complex physical organism and a soul/mind which is purely mental. This is a view which goes back to Plato who saw the body as the prison of the soul from which the soul would “escape” at death.
- The properties of the mind are seen to be different from the properties of the body — the body has purely physical properties while the soul has mental/spiritual ones.
- The soul or mind has control over the body and it is the soul which is the main part of what a human being is.

**Alternatively the view of Dual Aspect theory might be proposed and include the following:**

- That although your mental life goes on in your brain, all your experiences, eg thoughts, feelings are not just physical processes in your brain.
- This view thus differs from physicalism in the sense that it does not reduce all mental experiences to brain activity.
- Two different things are going on in your brain — a physical aspect of chemical/ electrical changes and a mental aspect, eg the taste of a piece of chocolate which you might be eating.
- Human beings **are** bodies/brains but are **not just** bodies/brains; there is a mental component which cannot be tied down to just physical activities.
- It is this aspect of human beings which have traditionally been called the “mind” or the “soul” but it is more accurate to talk about an inner reality (the mind) and an outer reality (the brain) of the same thing.

**(b) How far do you agree that when the brain dies so does the mind? (10)**

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of the issue)**

**The candidate’s answer to this may depend on what they have answered to part (a)**

**From a physicalist point of view, the candidate might argue:**

- There is no real evidence that the mind is a separate entity — human beings are unities of body/mind according to modern science and philosophy and earlier views of dualism have been shown to be inaccurate.
- Any evidence which has been put forward in support of a separate mind, eg out-of-the-body experiences, spiritualism can be better explained in other ways, eg imagination, chemical changes in the brain, wishful thinking.
- If the mind could be separated from the brain where could it go? What would it be like? How could it have a location if it is something spiritual? There are too many unanswered questions which show this theory to be wanting.
- In modern medicine people who are suffering from mental illnesses are treated with physical drugs which act on a physical brain and hence “mind”. These drugs can help people recover so provide good evidence that there is only a physical thing to be cured.

**Those who argue for a dualist approach to the issue might say:**

- The idea of a separate mind/soul and body has been held by hundreds of millions of people throughout history — in many different civilisations, eg Western Europe, Hindu and Buddhist cultures, etc. They can't all be wrong!
- The belief in life after death has depended on the separation of the body from the mind, which is believed to go on to another existence. This is one of the oldest beliefs of the human race and has been accepted by the majority of the world's population — and still is a strong belief today — even outwith religions.
- We know that in our lives our body can affect our mind, eg alcohol causing problems in our moral behaviour, and our mind can affect our body, eg we can mentally control forms of physical pain so there must be some kind of interaction between the two. This is because the brain and mind/soul are separate things.
- The brain and the mind are very complicated things. We should not rule out any theory of dualism until we are absolutely sure that it is wrong – and hence still hold the possibility of existence after death. The evidence against a separation is not conclusive and the belief is still held by many people — so why reject it?

**From the Dual Aspect theory key points might be:**

- Although your mental life goes on in your brain, all your experiences, eg thoughts, feelings are not just physical processes in your brain.
- This challenges physicalism in the sense that it does not reduce all mental experiences to brain activity.
- Two different things are going on in your brain — a physical aspect of chemical/ electrical changes and a mental aspect, eg the taste of a piece of chocolate which you might be eating.
- Human beings **are** bodies/brains but are **not just** bodies/brains; there is a mental component (a new dimension) which cannot just be described by brain activity.
- It is this aspect of human beings which have traditionally been called the “mind” or the “soul” but it is more accurate to talk about an inner reality (the mind) and an outer reality (the brain) of the same thing.
- It appears accurate to describe human beings in a holistic way – a unity of mind and body which is inseparable; on this basis the mind could not exist without the body/brain. Both the mind and the brain are real but in different ways (different realities).
- This theory would still reflect the belief that when you die that is the end of you because the brain and the mind are inter-dependent realities, so the death of one would automatically mean the death of the other.

**3. Appearance and Reality**

**(a) How does an idealist explain how we see things in the world?**

**(4)**

**KU 4 marks (Max 3 without sources)**

- Aspects of the world such as space, time, objectivity, etc are imposed by our minds on our experience; our minds therefore give a “structure” of the real world.
- As we can only experience the world through our consciousness and our minds — which is how we interpret what our senses may tell us, eg when we experience a desk. The desk does not exist independently of the existence/reality of our minds. The desk is an example of the way our minds make sense of the world.
- Therefore everything we experience, eg “desks” is the result of mental images or thoughts which exist or operate in our brains.
- Therefore we can only know our own thoughts and not those of others.
- We have no reason to think that there is anything “in reality” except our mental images/thoughts - as we cannot separate ourselves from them. When we see desks, we are experiencing mental images only, not what the world is actually like.

**Sources**

- **Bertrand Russell and John Locke.**

- (b) **How might a realist differ from an idealist in their explanation of how the world appears?** (6)

**KU & AN 6 marks (Max 5 without sources)**

- We see things around us, eg “desks” by use of our sense data which our brains/minds collect and translate into a series of information about the world. If our senses tell us there is a desk in front of us and other people confirm this with their senses, then it is reasonable to accept that it really is there.
- We compare this information/evidence with others who see/experience the same objects, ie what we literally call “common sense”.
- We work out from a variety of sense experiences and from the sense experiences of others, what the world around us is like.
- Generally speaking people accept that their senses do not deceive them — although we know in some cases that they actually do.
- We thus build up a view of what the world and its objects are really like.

**Sources:**

- **George Berkeley and Immanuel Kant.**

- (c) **To what extent do you think we can be certain that the world is as we see it?** (10)

**AN & EV 10 marks (Max 6 for answer stating only one side of issue)**

**NOTE: No marks for an answer to this part of the question which just regurgitates parts (a) and (b)**

**Some may argue that our senses tell us the world is as we see it:**

- This is why we generally operate as we all use our senses in whole variety of ways and our experience tells us that this is generally a fairly accurate way of doing things, eg our observations of a table or how someone is dressed.
- There are many situations in life where we work on the basis that most people who have senses see, hear and taste things in the same way as we do. We use/accept this as a true fact about the world.
- What we literally call common sense is how we experience things in relation to our common “sense” experiences. If we begin to question these aspects of reality then we will really have major problems in relation to what we can actually know the world is like.
- There are objects and realities out there in the world which we can relate to via our senses, which affect our senses and give us the experience of what is actually there. We can infer that the world is generally as we experience it from this information.
- Granted, our senses sometimes deceive us, we can get things wrong- but these are minor problems which we can overcome and the small differences which people have can be accepted without questioning the basis of our general picture of reality.

**Others may argue that this is not the case:**

- Different people looking at or experiencing the same thing do so in different ways — our perceptions are different, things do change according to how we experience them so how do we know which one is the right one — can we ever know this?
- Things change all the time, light makes a difference at different times of the day, things can look quite different in the dark compared to when it is light.
- So if the same object appears differently to different people at the same time — or to the same person at different times then how do we really know what the object is like?
- Even when people see the same thing, eg an accident, they will not all necessarily describe it in the same way, eg some people are more observant than others, remember things better, etc.
- Kant argued that we can only experience the world through our consciousness and our minds, eg when we experience the colour red this does not exist independently of our minds. It is the way our minds make sense of the world. So things we see depend a great deal on how our minds work or relate to them and not necessarily on what our senses actually tell us.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]