

**GCE**

**Religious Studies**

Unit **G572**: Religious Ethics

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2017**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.








All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking:

Annotation	Meaning
	Level one – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level two – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level three – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level four – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level five – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Highlighting a section of the response that is irrelevant to the awarding of the mark.
	Point has been seen and noted, e.g. where part of an answer is at the end of the script.

## MARK SCHEME

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	<p data-bbox="255 282 300 314"><b>(a)</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 282 1218 314"><b>Explain why some people believe there are no moral absolutes.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 352 1397 448">Candidates could explain the different approaches of relativist morality, explaining that for relativists moral truth varies according to culture, time, place and religion, so they believe that there are no moral absolutes.</p> <p data-bbox="331 486 1375 652">Candidates could explain that moral absolutes mean that moral decisions are based on the fact that actions are right or wrong intrinsically, that consequences and circumstances have no bearing and that moral commands are considered objectively and universally true. They may explain why some people do not believe this as they do not consider that morality is fixed.</p> <p data-bbox="331 691 1384 818">They may explain that for those who say there is no fixed morality what is right and wrong is subjective. They may say that different human situations mean that it is not possible to have one moral rule that will always fit everyone and require different moral rules.</p> <p data-bbox="331 857 1361 952">They may use examples to illustrate their explanation, such as the difference between cultures or religions in ethical matters, such as sex before marriage or execution for apostasy.</p> <p data-bbox="331 991 1397 1086">Alternatively, they may explain relativist ethical theories such as Utilitarianism, which is relativist because it applies the principle of utility to each situation. Some candidates may explain that no ethical theory is completely relativist.</p>	25	<p data-bbox="1556 352 2078 480">Some candidates may include discussion of dependence thesis and diversity thesis as part of their response.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 518 2078 684">Some candidates may use an absolute theory such as Kantian Ethics as contrast within their response – however this should not dominate the answer.</p>
	<p data-bbox="255 1168 300 1200"><b>(b)</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 1168 1368 1232"><b>‘Individual circumstances cannot be taken into account when considering human genetic engineering.’ Discuss.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 1264 1391 1391">Candidates may argue that some individual circumstances should be considered, such as in the case of saviour siblings. They may also argue that genetic engineering could lead to the eradication of some genetic diseases. They may argue that human genetic engineering could be allowed in particular</p>	10	<p data-bbox="1556 1238 2078 1366">Some candidates may make use of an absolutist ethical theory such as natural law in constructing their argument.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>circumstances, such as research into miscarriages. Alternatively, they may discuss whether medical decisions can be made from individual circumstances as it is not possible to consider long term consequences.</p> <p>However, candidates could counteract this with the Utilitarian argument that genetic engineering could lead to a wide gap between those whose individual circumstances would allow them to be able to afford genetic engineering and those who were too poor to do so.</p> <p>Alternatively, candidates may take a Sanctity of Life approach and argue that embryos used in genetic engineering simply become objects. They may argue that if individual circumstances were considered it could lead to 'designer babies' and humans taking charge of their own evolution. Additionally, they could suggest that the use of genetic engineering could mean that society would consider that certain traits, diseases, disabilities etc. should be eliminated.</p> <p>This could be contrasted to a Quality of Life approach and candidates could argue that the individual circumstances should be considered, especially if it would lead to improved life chances.</p>		
2	<p><b>(a) Explain how a follower of Natural Law might justify going to war.</b></p> <p>Candidates might consider that Aquinas developed the theory of Natural Law from the ideas of Aristotle and that the theory states that certain acts are intrinsically right or wrong. They may also consider the idea of purpose which gives Natural Law a teleological nature. They may explain that Natural Law directs people to their divine purpose and can be deduced through reason. Good acts are those which enable humans to fulfil their purpose, and are in accordance with the primary precepts: to preserve life, to live in an ordered society, to learn and to</p>	25	<p>If a candidate constructs a response to argue that natural law could not justify going to war, then this is not answering the question that is set.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>educate the youth, to reproduce and to worship God. They may explain that the secondary precepts are derived from the primary precepts through practical reason and so become prescriptive according to the situation. They may explain the Synderesis principle 'that good should be done and evil avoided' which is innately known through our conscience.</p> <p>They may explain how the primary precepts lead to secondary precepts and how these may be used to justify going to war. They may give examples to illustrate this, such as the fact that war often fails to protect innocent life, disrupts education and learning etc., but that on occasion the Doctrine of Double Effect can be applied to war so that innocent life may end up as collateral damage. They may explain that the secondary precepts are less absolute than the primary precepts. This they may link to the Just War principle of proportionality that force should be proportionate to the suffering inflicted. It could be argued by proportionalists that, as a deterrent the Doctrine of Double Effect may still aim at peace with pre-emptive air strikes at military targets, but that the final aim should be disarmament and peace.</p> <p>Candidates may also consider that Aquinas was one of the early architects of Just War Theory and may explain that the theory aims to limit the justifiable reasons for going to war and examine <i>jus ad bellum</i>. They may explain that Aquinas considered that peace and justice may need military force.</p>		
(b)	<p><b>Assess the view that war can never be justified.</b></p> <p>Some candidates will take the pacifist position and reject any form of violence as a means of settling disputes between countries, including self-defence. They may back this up with either religious or philosophical reasons.</p> <p>Some responses may consider that the loss of life, and/or economic and social damage to be too great to justify war in any circumstances.</p> <p>Other candidates may defend a Just War or realist approach, allowing war when all other avenues have failed. They may argue that to give up the right to self-</p>	10	

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>defence would mean no protection for the vulnerable such as children, the physically and mentally disabled and the very old.</p> <p>They may discuss the views of contingent pacifists who object to specific wars or reject the threat or use of nuclear weapons on the grounds of their indiscriminate and disproportionate use.</p> <p>Some candidates might approach this through the application of ethical theories, arguing, for example, that a Utilitarian might say that war cannot be justified if it does lasting harm to the greatest number of people, so nuclear and chemical weapons should not be used. They could argue, on the other hand, that war might be justified if it brings happiness or pleasure to the greatest number of people, but might also consider the difficulty of accurately calculating the long term effects of a war.</p>		
3	<p><b>(a) Explain how Preference Utilitarianism might be applied to abortion.</b></p> <p>Candidates may explain the principle of Utility: the greatest good for the greatest number. They may explain how Peter Singer refines the Utilitarianism of Bentham and Mill by focusing on the seventh criterion of the Hedonic Calculus – the number of people who will be affected by any pleasure or pain arising as a result of the act in question; and stating that they all need to be considered.</p> <p>They may explain that Singer judges right and wrong according to whether they fit the rational preferences of the individuals involved.</p> <p>They may explain Singer’s approach to be that of the impartial spectator with all preferences counting as equal so that everyone involved is considered. They may say that for Singer the best consequences have to be what is in the best interests of all involved. Where preferences cannot be taken into account, Singer argues that we should revert to Act Utilitarian approaches.</p> <p>They may then apply this approach to abortion by explaining that for Singer the idea of the sanctity of human life is outdated and unscientific and adds nothing to</p>	25	<p>Some candidates may include the preference concepts developed by Hare prior to Singer including his concept of walking in another’s shoes.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss Singer’s ideas of the different levels of sentience within their response.</p> <p>The focus of the response must be directed towards preference utilitarianism and not be a general examination of utilitarian principles.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>a debate about abortion. They may explain that for Singer the life of the foetus has no intrinsic value as it has no awareness of itself and he rejects any argument from potentiality.</p> <p>Candidates may explain Singer's 'replaceability argument' which extends further than abortion by arguing that a disabled infant could be killed as 'the loss of life of a happy life for the first infant is outweighed by the gain of a happier life for the second.' Sentience, self-awareness and preferences for the future means that he considers primates to be of higher value than foetuses, and so a foetus does not have an automatic right to life. Abortion, according to Singer, should be made on a calculation of the preferences of the mother with the preferences of the foetus – his preference utilitarian view allows parents to exercise their choice.</p>		
(b)	<p><b>To what extent is the Sanctity of Life the most important issue when considering abortion?</b></p> <p>Candidates may support the statement by discussing the Sanctity of Life and how all life is God-given and valuable; therefore, killing a foetus is always wrong. They may argue that the foetus is a person from the moment of conception and that the Sanctity of Life gives all equal value and respects the individual's future, thus avoiding pressure to abort a disabled foetus.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates may argue that the quality of a person's life is the most important factor. For example, allowing a child to live with a severe or life threatening handicap may not only impinge on the quality of life of the child but also on the rest of the family and even on society as a whole as medical resources are used to prolong the child's life. They may use the arguments of Peter Singer or Situation Ethics to support this view.</p> <p>They may also consider the view that the Sanctity of Life cannot cope with conflicts of duty – which life is more sacred or has greater rights: that of the mother or that of the foetus?</p>	10	Some candidates may argue from the issue of rights and individual choice as being the most important issue over the concept of Sanctity of Life.



Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4	<p data-bbox="255 217 300 248">(a) <b>Explain Kant's theory of universal maxims.</b></p> <p data-bbox="333 280 1402 448">Candidates may explain that Kant's moral theory tries to show the objectivity of moral judgment and the universal character of moral laws. It attempts to base morality on reason as opposed to feelings, inclinations, consequences or religion. He does not reject desires and feelings, but says that they have nothing to do with morality. Only reason is universal.</p> <p data-bbox="333 488 1391 687">They may explain that the theory of universal maxims forms part of the Categorical Imperative which applies to everyone, and the different forms it may take: the formula of the law of nature which universalises maxims without contradiction; the formula of end in itself which means that we should not treat others as a means to an end; and the formula of a kingdom of ends which means that we should act as if everyone is a free, autonomous agent.</p> <p data-bbox="333 727 1379 823">They might explain that, for Kant, moral precepts were rooted in rationality, were unconditional or categorical and presupposed freedom. They might explain the importance of a good will and doing one's duty.</p> <p data-bbox="333 863 1402 1094">They may contrast the theory of universal maxims in the Categorical Imperative with the Hypothetical Imperative which tells some what to do in order to achieve a particular goal which applies to the particular person. For example, 'If you do not want to go to prison, do not steal'. However, if you do not mind going to prison this imperative does not apply to you and so cannot be universalised. According to Kant, Categorical Imperatives are moral as they will tell us what to do irrespective of our desires.</p> <p data-bbox="333 1134 1391 1262">In explaining Kant's reasons for arguing in support of universal maxims candidates may use examples, possibly those of Kant, such as suicide, and borrowing money (failure to keep promises) which are contradictions in the law of nature and cannot be applied universally.</p>	25	

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p><b>Universalisation of maxims does not help when making ethical decisions.’ Discuss.</b></p> <p>Candidates may argue that Kant’s theory is abstract and not easily applied to ethical situations. They may argue that moral laws are not <i>a priori</i> but the result of culture and environment, using arguments from psychology and sociology.</p> <p>They may consider that Kant’s approach does not consider outcomes, that there are conflicts between duties and that there is no room for emotions and so does not consider the important role of human relationships in ethical decision making.</p> <p>They may use the argument of Alasdair MacIntyre that the universalisation of maxims can be used to justify anything.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates may argue that Kant’s understanding of universal maxims does help when making ethical decisions as it gives clear criteria to know which actions are moral.</p> <p>They may say that it respects human life, and the idea of duty means that we will always do what is right and are not swayed by emotions and feelings. They may say that his rules are fair as they apply to everyone and moral rules cannot be just in one society and unjust in another.</p>	10	Candidates could contrast the universalisation of maxims with a more teleological approach to making ethical decisions.

## AS Levels of Response

Level	Mark /25	AO1	Mark /10	AO2
0	0	absent/no relevant material	0	absent/no argument
1	1–5	almost completely ignores the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>little relevant material</li> <li>some concepts inaccurate</li> <li>shows little knowledge of technical terms</li> </ul> <i>L1</i>	1–2	very little argument or justification of viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>little or no successful analysis</li> <li>views asserted with no justification</li> </ul> <i>L1</i>
Communication: often unclear or disorganised; can be difficult to - understand; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
2	6–10	A basic attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>knowledge limited and partially accurate</li> <li>limited understanding</li> <li>might address the general topic rather than the question directly</li> <li>selection often inappropriate</li> <li>limited use of technical terms</li> </ul> <i>L2</i>	3–4	a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some analysis, but not successful</li> <li>views asserted but little justification</li> </ul> <i>L2</i>
Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts - spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
3	11–15	satisfactory attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some accurate knowledge</li> <li>appropriate understanding</li> <li>some successful selection of material</li> <li>some accurate use of technical terms</li> </ul> <i>L3</i>	5–6	the argument is sustained and justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some successful analysis which may be implicit</li> <li>views asserted but not fully justified</li> </ul> <i>L3</i>

Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts - spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
<b>4</b>	<b>16–20</b>	<p>a good attempt to address the question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accurate knowledge</li> <li>• good understanding</li> <li>• good selection of material</li> <li>• technical terms mostly accurate</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>L4</b></p>	<b>7–8</b>	<p>a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some successful and clear analysis</li> <li>• some effective use of evidence</li> <li>• views analysed and developed</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>L4</b></p>
Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole - spelling, punctuation and grammar good				
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<p>A very good/excellent attempt to address the question showing understanding and engagement with the material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information</li> <li>• accurate use of technical terms</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>L5</b></p>	<b>9–10</b>	<p>A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• comprehends the demands of the question</li> <li>• uses a range of evidence</li> <li>• shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>L5</b></p>
Communication: answer is well constructed and organised - easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good				

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2017

