1 Ethical Thought

1A – Divine Command Theory

Now Test Yourself – page 7

1. What four qualities do Theists claim God has?
   Omnipotent, Omnibenevolent, Omniscient, Omnipresent

2. How can I know what is good according to Divine Command Theory?
   Goodness is what God commands.

3. What is the meaning of the words Deontological and Universal?
   Deontological – From the Greek (Deon) meaning duty or obligation

   Universal – Applicable in all cases

4. How can I find out what God commands?
   By looking at the commandments in scripture or Church teaching

Now Test Yourself – page 8

1. Who developed the Modified Divine Command theory?
   Robert Adams

2. What does arbitrary mean?
   Random/without reason

3. Why can’t God command anything arbitrary?
   Because God’s nature is intrinsically, unfailingly benevolent

Apply Your Knowledge – page 9

Look at the following commandments from the Bible.

- You shall not profit by the blood of your neighbour – Leviticus 19:16
- You shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed – Leviticus 19:19
- (He must not) return the people to Egypt to acquire more horses. – Deuteronomy 17:16

What could such commands imply about the qualities of God and what it means to be good?

It is unclear why God commands the laws above. They are a mixture of some that appear to be clear moral exhortations, and others that appear not to be. Maybe the second one is practical, the third seems to be rules for a King. The commands can make God appear arbitrary as some of his commands make no sense to us today. This suggests that God’s rules are not objectively good at all and that God may be changeable.
1B – Virtue Theory

Now Test Yourself – page 11

1. How does Virtue Ethics differ from other normative theories?
   While most will ask the question; ‘How should I behave?’ Virtue Ethics asks; ‘What kind of person should I be?’ Virtue theory is an assessment of the kind of personal qualities that contribute to making a good person, rather than constructing a system of rules and laws. It considers the purpose of ethics being to achieve a good character by considering our mental state rather than the acts we perform.

2. What is the purpose of human action?
   To achieve Eudaemonia – Happiness/well-being/human flourishing

3. How will we learn how to be virtuous?
   Virtue is achieved by mimicking or following the example of other ethical people in order to develop the same desirable character traits.

4. Name and define three virtues and their vices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vice of Deficiency</th>
<th>Virtue (The Golden Mean)</th>
<th>Vice of Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowardice (lack of bravery)</td>
<td>Courage (Bravery)</td>
<td>Rash (Reckless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insensibility (no awareness</td>
<td>Temperance (Moderation)</td>
<td>Licentiousness (uncontrolled, especially sexually)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiberality (gathers money</td>
<td>Liberality (Generosity</td>
<td>Prodigality (over spends and under-receives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but doesn’t spend)</td>
<td>in small amounts of money)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimony (miserliness)</td>
<td>Munificence (generosity</td>
<td>Vulgarity (flamboyant with money)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in large amounts of money)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusillanimity (afraid to</td>
<td>Magnanimity (generous in</td>
<td>Vainglorious (Vanity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand up for themselves)</td>
<td>forgiving)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want of ambition</td>
<td>Right ambition (in small</td>
<td>Over-ambition (personal goals beyond reason or competence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Unmotivated)</td>
<td>honours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritlessness (Unconcerned)</td>
<td>Good temper (Patience)</td>
<td>Irascibility (Easily Angered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surliness (Understatement)</td>
<td>Friendliness (good</td>
<td>Obsequiousness (Overly flattering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>natured/sociable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironical depreciation</td>
<td>Sincerity (Truthfulness)</td>
<td>Boastfulness (tends to brag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Undervaluing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boorishness (bad mannered/</td>
<td>Wittiness (verbal skill/</td>
<td>Buffoonery (Ridiculous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coarse)</td>
<td>humorous)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamelessness (blatant)</td>
<td>Modesty (moderate/humility)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callousness (Malicious</td>
<td>Just resentment (righteous</td>
<td>Spitefulness (Envy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyment)</td>
<td>indignation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What is the Golden Mean?
   **Golden Mean** – The middle, moderate character traits between two vices of excess and deficiency.
Now Test Yourself – page 12

1. List three virtues from Matthew and their respective rewards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Poor in Spirit (humbleness)</td>
<td>Kingdom of Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mourn (sadness due to separation or loss)</td>
<td>Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Meek (submissive/gentle)</td>
<td>The earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hunger and thirst for righteousness (seeking justice)</td>
<td>Will be filled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Merciful (compassionate or forgiving)</td>
<td>Shown mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pure in heart (sincere intentions)</td>
<td>Will see God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Peacemakers (bringing reconciliation)</td>
<td>Called the children of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Persecuted for being righteous (suffer for standing by their principles)</td>
<td>Kingdom of Heaven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Give the Scriptural reference where the beatitudes can be found

Matthew 5:3-12

Apply Your Knowledge – page 13

1. Amelia and Bryony are best friends. It is Amelia’s birthday and Bryony finds Amelia’s boyfriend cheating on her with another girl at her birthday party. What is the virtuous thing for Bryony to do?

A brave and truthful person would speak to Amelia and tell her what has been happening. They would do so quietly and privately to avoid callousness. They may wait until after the party in the spirit of patience and temperance.

2. What problems did you discover when making this moral decision according to Virtue Theory?

There are several possible ‘correct’ virtuous responses. The suggestion above is one of many answers that could be deemed virtuous and the list of virtues does not help you interpret behaviour accurately.
1C – Ethical Egoism

Now Test Yourself – page 15

1. Give an example of a good deed that appears to be altruistic
   Helping someone to their feet when they have fallen over, even though it means you miss your bus to college.

2. What reinterpretation could this act be given to show self-interested motives?
   There are people watching who might judge you if you don’t help. You didn’t want to get to your first lesson on time anyway.

3. Why is Ethical Egoism described as a Teleological ethic?
   Because the purpose or goal of any action is to achieve one’s own self-interest.

Now Test Yourself – page 16

1. What does Stirner mean when he says we are slaves to obligations?
   We act according to a sense of duty, guilt or conscience, mistakenly believing we are acting in self-interest. In our ignorance, we are controlled by these senses.

2. Why wouldn’t people become greedy if they followed egoism?
   My uniqueness gives me power over the obligation I feel to my physical desires. This means I don’t need to be bound by these things. It might not be in my own self-interest to be controlled by them. There is no benefit to an ego to be greedy or anti-social.

3. What does the term Einzige mean?
   **Einzige** – Ego

Apply Your Knowledge – page 17

Three egoists arrive at a car park in their own cars. There is one parking space that is near the exit and all three of them wish to park there. Try to establish what solutions there might be to this dilemma. What kinds of problems do you foresee?

**Solutions:**

- Discuss who has the greatest need amongst the three. This would speed up the process and ensure that they don’t all remain there arguing which would be in no-one’s self-interest.
- They could agree that the one who has the space parks elsewhere next time.
- Someone could park elsewhere anyway because it is in their own interest not to become involved in a lengthy debate.

**Problems:**

- It isn’t in any of the motorist’s self-interest to back down and let someone else have the space.
- It could be in someone’s self-interest to lie so that they get their own way.
- There is nothing to control how people go about achieving their own personal goals. This could lead to unfairness.
Specimen Exam Questions

Sample AO1 Questions – page 20

1. Outline Aristotle’s Virtue Theory (AS Only)

- A normative theory that takes a different approach.
- Normative means: Formulates systems and procedures for judging moral acts and regulating moral action.
- Virtue Ethics asks; ‘What kind of person should I be?’
- Assesses the kind of personal qualities that contribute to making a good person
- Not a system of rules and laws.
- Based on work of ancient Greek empiricist scholar Aristotle.
- Virtue Theory based on the Greek word for virtue/excellence: arete.
- Virtue is achieved by following the example of other ethical people to develop the same desirable character traits.
- Virtue theory is teleological – it considers the purpose/goal of ethics being to achieve Eudaemonia. (well-being/flourishing)
- Three kinds of happiness needed to achieve Eudaemonia:
  - Happiness as an individual
  - Happiness as a member of a community
  - Happiness as a philosopher.
- Necessary to develop qualities of character (Virtues) that will help you achieve Eudaemonia
- Two kinds of virtue – Intellectual and moral.
- Twelve moral virtues, each fall between two vices of excess and deficiency.
- Known as the Golden Mean.
- E.g. Courage (bravery) falls between the vices of rashness (recklessness) and cowardice (lack of bravery)
- Modesty (humility) falls between shamelessness (blatantness) and bashfulness (shyness)
- Friendliness (sociable) falls between obsequiousness (overly flattering) and surliness (understatement)
- We learn these moral virtues through developing them as habits.
- We become courageous by performing courageous acts.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

2. Compare the Ethical theories of Virtue Theory and Ethical Egoism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Egoism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative – What kind of person should I be?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Normative – How should I behave?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleological – Goal = Eudaemonia</td>
<td>Teleological – Goal = Self Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle (Ancient Greek philosopher)</td>
<td>Stirner (German nineteenth century philosopher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim to gain happiness as an individual, member of society and a philosopher</td>
<td>Aim to gain happiness for the self and, when necessary for self-interest, as member of a union of egos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should act according to the Golden Mean, we sometimes do fall prey to vices</td>
<td>We should act out of self-interest, we do act out of obligation to controlling factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We learn to be virtuous by following the example of other virtuous people  
We should follow no laws, but do what is most practical to achieve our own self-interest

Selfishness is a vice through illiberality, parsimony or surliness  
Selfishness may allow me to serve my own interest, or may prevent me from doing so

Co-operation with others can be a virtue, friendliness provided we don’t become too obsequious  
Co-operation with others can be practical to achieving our own self-interest but is not required in any way.

Intellectual virtues are also valuable and should be cultivated.  
The first step to ethical behaviour is understanding the authority that I have over my own ego

It is unethical to become slaves to the vices of greed and boorishness  
There is no benefit to the self to be greedy or anti-social

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

3. Examine the challenges levelled at Divine Command Theory

- The Euthyphro dilemma dates back to Plato’s work, *The Last Days of Socrates*
- The character Euthyphro and Socrates discuss how we know what holiness is.
- Socrates states the dilemma: is the holy approved by the gods because it is holy or is the holy holy because it is approved by the gods?
- The first ‘horn’ of the dilemma suggests the gods are only good because they live up to an independent standard. They are no longer the ultimate moral authority.
- We have no need for God. We can just do what is good.
- The second ‘horn’ of the dilemma suggests the gods can approve of and command anything they like, and it would be good because it is approved of by them
- This God doesn’t sound worthy of our worship
- The second ‘horn’ is sometimes called the arbitrariness problem.
- God can command something random and declare it good.
- Whatever God declares good does not have to have any special quality that allows it to be judged this way.
- The third problem with Divine Command Theory is the pluralism objection
- There are many religious/ethical systems that claim authority with reference to God, or gods.
- Some of these systems conflict.
- How do we know which system is right?
- There are different interpretations of how laws are meant or applied. E.g. Christian teaching forbids divorce in Matthew 5:32 yet allows it in Deuteronomy 24.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

4. Explain Ethical Egoism with reference to Max Stirner

- A normative ethic.
- Normative means: Formulates systems and procedures for judging moral acts and regulating moral action.
- Egoism is teleological.
- Teleological means: (Greek – telos) goal/end focused.
• Goal of achieving one’s own self-interest.
• Contrasts with altruism which has the good of others as its goal.
• Altruism means: selfless concern for others.
• Egoism says that the only duty a moral agent has, is to themselves.
• Differs from psychological egoism
• Psychological egoism says altruism is egoism in disguise.
• We are not free to act in any other way.
• Ethical Egoism says that we ought to act according to our own concerns (but we don’t).
• This prescribes moral behaviour.
• It argues we should avoid altruism when it works against our own interests.
• Self-interested actions are not always concerned with immediate gratification.
• A seemingly selfless act can have a self-interested long-term goal.
• German philosopher Max Stirner in The Ego and His Own developed Ethical Egoism
• In contrast to psychological egoism that says we must act in self-interest, Stirner claimed:
  o We think we are acting out of self-interest, but we are not.
  o We are slaves to other interests like duty, guilt or conscience.
  o We are deceived into thinking it is in our self-interest to obey those interests.
• Our acts are controlled by a sense of duty to some other value.
• Obligation is a hidden control that removes our freedom to choose our own best interest.
• They remain, ghost-like, behind our motives.
• Stirner argued:
  o The Ego (Einzige) is a slave to obligations.
  o Freedom comes when I recognise my ownness (Eigenheit) or authority over myself.
  o Our uniqueness (Einzige) gives us power to make our own decisions.
• One obligation is to our physical desires, my uniqueness gives me power over this control.
• Therefore, I need not be selfish or materialistic to act in self-interest.
• There is a benefit to our ego to cooperate with others.
• There is no obligation to other egos.
• it is practical to find unprincipled ways of recognising that other unique egos are operating around us.
• He called this the Union of Egoists.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

Sample AO2 Questions – page 20

1. Evaluate the view that Virtue Theory is impractical when faced with a moral dilemma.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction:
• Impractical = not useful or useable.

Paragraph one:
• It is impractical because it gives no useable instructions when faced with a moral problem.
• However, rules or instructions can cause more problems than they solve as rules can be restrictive and binding.
• It is practical because it is adaptable in modern life, this means it can be useable in any age or culture – this is very desirable in the modern world, so people would be more likely to use it.

**Paragraph two:**
• It is impossible to legislate a society that works in this way, so it is impractical.
• However, it is not structured as a system of law but is a personal ethic. It could work alongside a legal system rather than replacing it.
• It is practical because it has underpinned other systems like Natural Law so is has been used successfully in the past.

**Paragraph three:**
• It is not useful because there is no universal list of standards that apply to all so there is no way of judging morality within a culture or across cultures.
• But in any ethical system a virtuous person would never do anything to harm others in society. There are some universal ideals that are held by all societies.
• It is useful because we need virtue to underpin moral law so that our laws are reasonable and just. Law itself is only good if it is virtuous.

**Conclusion:**
• It seems that Virtue Ethics has practical elements when it is used alongside a system of laws. The value of Virtue is in its flexibility, but to be useable in a society it needs to have structure so that there can be a set of controls. As a personal ethic it is far more useful to help an individual govern their own moral behaviour when laws do not cover the circumstances.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence**

2. ‘There is no such thing as a selfless good deed.’ Evaluate this view.

**There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.**

**Introduction:**
• A selfless good deed = an altruistic action i.e. something done for the benefit of others even though it has no benefit to the agent.

**Paragraph one:**
• Altruistic acts seem to exist because there are plenty of examples of historical people who put others before themselves e.g. Christ, Mother Teresa, Gandhi
• However, Egoists argue that these actions were not altruistic as these characters were serving their own self-interest without realising it
• In life, people only do things to benefit others if it makes themselves feel good, so altruistic acts must be impossible.

**Paragraph two:**
• We might not do it consciously, but we only do things that we want to do, so there can never really be a selfless good deed. All good deeds are selfish.
• However, this argument assumes that we have no free will to act outside our obligations, and it may be that in fact we are free to respond to the needs of others if we wish.
• If we look at religious and political martyrs, we can see they have no self-interest served by their own death. They do not gain anything from it personally, but they can help further a cause. So, there are selfless good deeds.

Paragraph three:
• As Stirner claims, there are no altruistic acts. The reason we hold fast or reinterpret our values is due to external controls like guilt or conscience.
• Yet, many people hold fast to ideals even when it causes them harm suggesting that there is such a thing as altruism.
• However, all this shows is that the person values an ideal more highly than their own comfort. This just replaces one selfish value with another. A person gains something for themselves by holding fast to their own ideal, so all actions are selfish.

Conclusion:
• Many seem to confuse an altruistic action with an action that has no positive side effect for the agent. There is no reason why an agent cannot act out of selflessness yet benefit from that action in the long run. For instance, a person may help a lost child because they see she is suffering but may be thanked by that parents which makes the agent feel good. This is not absence of selflessness, so selfless good deeds are possible.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.
1 Ethical Thought

1D Meta-Ethical Approaches - Naturalism:

Now Test Yourself – page 22

1. How can we know the meaning of ethical language?
   By finding their evidence for good or bad in the empirical world.

2. What makes Ethical Naturalism different from Divine Command Theory?
   Divine Command theorists find their evidence through revelation.
   Ethical Naturalists find their evidence through scientific process.

3. What can we do to check the meaning of ethical language?
   Look at the evidence from the empirical world. Use the principle of verification/falsification.

Now Test Yourself – page 23

1. Where can we observe moral facts?
   In the empirical world, specifically by looking at our role in society.

2. What is morally good according to Bradley?
   Living according to our role in society.

3. How can I know that murder is wrong?
   By considering the observable facts that murder disrupts society and causes a break in family life. It removes a person from their societal role. Murder causes physical destruction of life. It introduces fear into families and the whole of society.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 24

1. Using the examples of abortion, homosexuality or immigration, show how Bradley would determine the good thing to do.

   There are multiple observable facts regarding each of these issues. Some examples of possible ideas include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Issue</th>
<th>Observable Facts</th>
<th>Constructive in the life of a woman who does not want a child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>Destructive of potential life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuality</td>
<td>Challenges traditional gender roles in society</td>
<td>Allows mutually supportive and stable relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>Puts pressure on over stretched public services</td>
<td>Allows human flourishing and cultural diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Construct ‘is’ and ‘ought’ statements from your examples.

   Whichever way you construct your statement, whether it states that one ought or ought not to do something, it still is deriving an ought from an is. The below are just some examples you could use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is</th>
<th>Ought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abortion is destructive of potential life</td>
<td>Therefore, one ought not to abort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homosexuality is a challenge to traditional gender roles
Therefore, one *ought* not to practise homosexuality

Immigration is a practice that allows cultural diversity
Therefore, one *ought* to allow immigration

1E Meta-Ethical Approached - Intuitionism:

Now Test Yourself – page 26

1. What is Ethical Non-Naturalism Intuitionism.

2. How do Non-Naturalists agree with Naturalists?
   Moral facts can be known, they exist objectively and apply universally.

3. How do they disagree?
   Moral facts cannot be defined with reference to the natural world.

Now Test Yourself – page 27

1. What is the connection between observable facts and moral obligation?
   There is none. Observable facts do not tell us what we ought to do.

2. What is the relationship between general thinking and moral thinking?
   Our general reasoning can be used to check our moral intuition but cannot prove it.

3. How do I establish a moral rule?
   Through intuition. If I need reassurance, I can check if I have had the same intuition in the past.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 28

In Phillipa Foot’s Trolley Problem (see page 74) we must decide who to save:

- The five workmen on the left track
- The one workman on the right track

Do we pull a lever to choose a track? Or do we push a large man off a bridge, onto the track to derail the trolley and save all six workmen?

Does it change anything if:

- The large man is the one responsible for the problem?
- The one person on the track is someone you love?
- The one person on the track has the cure for cancer?

Make a list of the problems you come across when using your intuition, rather than reasoning to decide.
1. My instinct tells me to save the five workmen, but this could be wrong because I am still killing someone.
2. My instinct also tells me not to kill anyone, so I have more than one intuition and they conflict.
3. My intuition tells me not to push the large man, but then I go against my instinct to save the six.
4. While I am deliberating, everyone dies.
5. My instinct might be clouded or influenced by my emotion. If I am angry with the large man for causing the problem or my love for the person on the track means I can’t sense what is right.
6. If my instinct says I save the majority I must kill five people if the one person has cancer.

1F Meta-Ethical Approaches – Emotivism

Now Test Yourself – page 30

1. What does non-cognitivism mean?
   An ethical statement neither makes any truth claims about the world, nor says anything that can be demonstrated as true or false in any real sense.

2. Why is emotivism sometimes known as the ‘boo’/‘hurrah’ theory?
   A moral claim like ‘stealing is wrong’, is only an emotional expression or an expression of approval or disapproval.

3. How does Stevenson explain moral disagreements?
   Attitudes (preferences/feelings) and beliefs (claims about facts) are both involved in moral debate, but disagreements about morality concern attitude. You cannot prove attitudes, so a moral argument is a challenge to shout the loudest feeling and attempt to persuade someone to change their attitude.

Now Test Yourself – page 31

1. Which kinds of ethical statements are true philosophy according to Ayer?
   Meta-ethics. The only ethical philosophy according to Ayer.

2. Which did he dismiss as meaningless?
   Normative and applied ethics.

3. Give an example of an ethical statements for each of Ayer’s four categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-ethics</td>
<td>The word ‘wrong’ means I feel bad about something when I use it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive Ethics</td>
<td>In Buddhist ethics, pacifism is generally promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Ethics</td>
<td>It is wrong to kill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Ethics</td>
<td>To avoid killing, I need to make sure I don’t get involved in a war, or a physical conflict with weapons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Give two reasons why Emotivism is not subjectivism.
• Emotive statements are emotional utterances, whereas subjective statements are propositions about a person’s emotional state. E.g. An emotive statement is ‘Yuck!’ whereas a subjective statement is ‘Clare hates pickle and ice cream sandwiches’. ‘Murder is wrong’ is more like the first type of statement according to Ayer.

• Emotive statements cannot be checked, whereas subjective statements can. E.g. ‘Yuck’ is not a phrase that we know how to check or look for evidence of. ‘Clare hates pickle and ice cream sandwiches’ can be checked. You can check the look on my face and the behaviour I exhibit when my son eats a pickle and ice cream sandwich. You can also check his appearance and behaviour to see if the statement is true or false, but you will not find a conclusive answer. According to Ayer ‘Murder is wrong’ is not a statement that we know how to look for evidence for. (‘I hate murder’ would be a subjective statement.)

Apply Your Knowledge – page 32

1. List ten normative statements that ordinarily have a consensus. E.g. Murder is wrong.

Ten examples:
• Rape is wrong.
• Helping people is good.
• It is wrong to hurt innocent people.
• Child abuse is evil.
• You should always pick up your own rubbish.
• You ought to avoid damaging the environment.
• It is good to hug your children.
• You should not lie.
• It is bad to steal.
• We should treat others the way we want to be treated.

2. Which of these statements are concerning if they are reduced to emotional utterances?

Any of them.

3. Why is this the case?

Any of them are concerning if reduced to emotional utterances, but if the statements about rape or child abuse are only expressions of a feeling, then they are as valid as those who have an opposite feeling. This would mean we cannot condemn such behaviour in a meaningful way.

4. Look back at Naturalism and Intuitionism – do either of these theories solve the problems you have just raised?

Naturalism – Allows you to condemn actions that conflict with our role in society or cause damage to it.

Intuitionism – Allows you to condemn actions that you instinctively understand are wrong, even if you cannot produce a reason for it.

Specimen Exam Questions

Sample AO1 Questions – page 35
1. Compare the meta-ethical approaches of Naturalism and Intuitionism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naturalism</th>
<th>Intuitionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral Realism – there are moral facts</td>
<td>Moral Realism – there are moral facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral/Ethical Naturalism</td>
<td>Ethical Non-naturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective moral facts can be known</td>
<td>Objective moral facts can be known innately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent of human opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral statements can be verified or falsified.</td>
<td>Moral statements are not based on anything rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral imperatives are observable in the empirical world</td>
<td>Moral imperatives are not demonstrable with empirical evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical naturalists find their evidence for good or bad in the empirical world</td>
<td>Intuitionists claim we all have an immediate intellectual awareness of good or bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Naturalism attempts a scientific approach</td>
<td>Intuitionism says that we all recognise these intuitions without need for training or analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical statements are cognitivist</td>
<td>Ethical statements are cognitivist but not definable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical rules can be applied universally to all people regardless of culture or situation</td>
<td>Humans all have the same in-built ability to know intuitively the difference between right and wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Herbert Bradley</td>
<td>Harold Arthur Pritchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral language rests upon certain propositions that can be demonstrated as true or false</td>
<td>He agreed with Hume’s law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical statements express facts about the world, our position in society and thus our moral duty</td>
<td>Our apprehension of good is immediate and does not need any supporting evidence from reason or the senses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness is achieved through understanding and satisfying our role in our family and community, to achieve unity with God</td>
<td>Our feelings of obligation cannot be reduced to anything else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We can know our societal role by observation and analysis of the society in which we live</td>
<td>Gathering evidence to support intuition results in deeper uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We can observe constructive acts and deduce that they are right and therefore they are our duty.</td>
<td>The best evidence is if we feel the same obligation in the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

2. Examine the meta-ethical approach of Emotivism with reference to A.J. Ayer.

- Emotivism originates in the work of the Vienna Circle/Logical Positivists.
- There are only two types of meaningful statement:
  - Analytic statements
  - Synthetic statements
- Moral statements do not express propositions about the empirical world, nor are their properties self-defining, therefore they are factually meaningless.
- Non-cognitivism is a form of irrealism or anti-realism.
- Ethical statements only profess a feeling on the part of the speaker and nothing more.
- ‘Stealing is wrong’ only expresses my feelings about stealing.
- It makes no truth claim about stealing.
• The claim cannot be evidenced.
• A moral claim is only an emotional expression and not even a statement of belief.
• Giving reasons to support my statement is just giving examples of my feelings, not logical support.
• ‘Euthanasia is good’ is no more meaningful than me saying “Euthanasia, hurrah!” Condemning the possession and use of nuclear arms is no more meaningful than saying “Nuclear arms, boo!”
• A.J. Ayer.
• The idea of rightness or wrongness is a pseudo-concept.
• A statement such as ‘stealing is wrong’ contains no more information than if I shouted ‘stealing!’
• The look on my face or the size and shape of the exclamation mark attached to the word, offer no analysable content.
• Ayer identified four types of ethical statements:
  o (Meta-ethics) – the only ethical philosophy according to Ayer.
  o (Descriptive Ethics) – belongs with psychology or sociology.
  o (Normative Ethics) – does not belong to any category of philosophy or science. (Emotional Statements)
  o (Applied Ethics) – does not belonging to any category of philosophy or science. (Emotional Statements)
• Ethical judgements are symbols that represent the sensation I get when I think about a particular issue.
• Such statements have no objective validity.
• Ethical statements also seek to persuade you to feel the same way as me.
• Ayer claimed that Emotivism was different from subjectivism.
• Subjective statements are propositions about a person’s emotional state, whereas emotive, moral statements are just emotional utterances
• Subjective statements can be considered in the light of evidence, but emotive, moral statement contain no facts about the self.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

Explain the challenges to Ethical Naturalism.

• Hume stated that we observe facts/‘is’ statements in the natural world
  o These give us a picture of what the world is like.
  o We cannot infer from these what the world ought to be like.
  o e.g. murder is the violent/premature ending of a life therefore we ought not to murder.
  o The error is, there is nothing in the premises that necessitates the conclusion.
  o Hume’s law states that an ‘ought’ cannot be derived from an ‘is’.
  o Ought statements are not moral facts.
• G.E. Moore claimed it is an error to define an ethical property in the same way as a natural one.
  o Good, like the colour yellow, cannot be broken down into constituent parts for definition.
  o Ethical Naturalists conflate natural and moral properties.
Moore says that using a non-moral premise to establish a moral conclusion is an error or fallacy.

- Moore developed the open question argument.
  - A closed question can be settled easily by defining terms, whereas an open question cannot.
  - Attempts to conflate morality with a natural property will always produce an open question, but a definition should produce a closed question. So good cannot be defined.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

**Compare the work of H.A. Pritchard to that of A.J. Ayer.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pritchard</th>
<th>Ayer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intuitionist/Ethical Non-naturalist</td>
<td>Emotivist/Ethical Non-cognitivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejects Ethical Naturalism</td>
<td>Rejects Ethical Naturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral statements cannot be analysed rationally, but nonetheless contain truth and meaning</td>
<td>To be meaningful, statements should be synthetic or analytic. Moral statements are neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our apprehension of good is immediate and not based on anything else</td>
<td>Moral statements profess a feeling on the part of the speaker and nothing more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral claims express objective truths that cannot be analysed</td>
<td>Moral claims express nothing more than ‘boo!’ or ‘hurrah!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We cannot produce evidence or reasoning for why we should obey them.</td>
<td>Moral claims cannot be evidenced and so are factually insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right and wrong are factual truths but cannot be proven rationally</td>
<td>The idea of rightness or wrongness is a pseudo-concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative moral statements are possible.</td>
<td>The only ethical philosophy is meta-ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical judgements come from an intuitive sense of obligation</td>
<td>Ethical judgements are symbols that represent our feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our intuition tells us what we ought to do and establishes specific duties</td>
<td>Ethical statements seek to persuade you to feel the same way as me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best evidence for moral accuracy is if we feel the same obligation in the future.</td>
<td>Moral statements have no objective validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

5. **Examine the cognitivist meta-ethical theory of Ethical Naturalism.**

- Cognitive statements = true or false; factual if true; objective; can be checked with empirical evidence; e.g. trees absorb carbon dioxide; murder is wrong (Ethical Naturalists)
- Ethical Naturalists treat ethical statements in the same way as any other statement about the natural world.
- Once an ethical statement has been verified as true, this means that they are an objective fact and true regardless of opinion.
- They can be applied universally to all people regardless of culture or situation.
- This is a kind of moral realism, where statements like ‘murder is wrong’ can have an objective reality.
- Ethical Naturalists take a more scientific approach to ethics.
Moral statements can be factual in the same way that or chemical properties are facts.
We use sensory information and apply logical faculties to it to obtain factual truth.
E.g. J.S. Mill or Aristotle take Naturalist approaches.
Francis Herbert Bradley.
Moral language, such as the words ‘good’, ‘bad’, ‘right’ or ‘wrong’, rests upon propositions that can be demonstrated as true or false.
We can know what is good or bad is by observing objective features of our world, and our place in society.
We can know our societal role by observation and analysis of the society in which we live.
We can observe the destructive nature of some acts and deduce that these acts are wrong. Equally, we can observe constructive acts and deduce that they are right and therefore they are our duty.
E.g. murder disrupts society, and breaks up families and their social roles, therefore murder is wrong.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

Sample AO2 Questions – page 35
1. Evaluate the view that there is no evidence to prove that moral intuition exists.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction:

- Evidence = rational or empirical. For there to be proof of moral intuition, one would expect either or both to be in place.

Paragraph one:

- There is no evidence. G.E. Moore – like the colour yellow. Good is good. There is no evidence or equivalent.
- However, Pritchard pointed out that we can find support for our intuitions in general thinking when we need to.
- Both Moore and Pritchard’s views rest on the assumption that there is no evidence for moral intuitions, we just know.

Paragraph two:

- Ayer would argue that moral intuitions are simply emotive utterances. They only express our feelings. Nothing more.
- However, even if Ayer is correct, there is no evidence for our feelings other than our experience. If we reject all experience, then we become so cynical then we can’t accept the reality of anything. The evidence for intuition is in the experience of intuition.
- Personal experience seems flimsy as evidence for objective moral standards that apply universally. People desire more concrete, observable evidence.
Paragraph three:

- We shouldn’t trust a gut reaction on its own, that would be immoral because it could lead to terrible actions. We should look for evidence to support moral intuitions.
- But all cultures share this same sense of duty when confronted with moral issues, so the evidence is in shared human experience of morality.
- Freud would argue that this ‘gut reaction’ is unconscious programming by society so this means it cannot be trusted without evidence of objective morality outside of our programmed existence.

Conclusion:

- It seems that the whole point of Intuitionism is that there is no evidence to support moral propositions. All Intuitionists agree on this. The difficulty is not whether there is evidence, but whether statements that cannot be rationally or empirically supported can be considered meaningful or useful. The debate should be about whether unsupported moral exhortations should be trusted or treated with suspicion.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence

2. ‘Meta-ethical theories add nothing useful to ethical debate.’ Evaluate this view.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction:

- Useful = able to be used/practical/competent in achieving a purpose. Can meta-ethical be used in ethical debates to help us come to an understanding of morality?

Paragraph one:

- They are useful because they force us to be aware of the assumptions we make about good or bad.
- However, it is impossible to move forward in ethical analysis if such terms are dismissed as emoting or meaningless.
- It is vital to have this debate before moving on with ethics, so that we can all agree on the same terminology. Otherwise our ethical debate will be at cross purposes.

Paragraph two:

- Divine Command prevents us from arguing with a moral pronouncement at all. This is not practical in an ethical debate and therefore not useful. The same can be said of the logical positivist but for a different reason. Both refuse to let contradictory statements to be considered.
- We need clarity in debate. Defining terms through meta-ethics is necessary.
• A.J. Ayer thought that meta-ethics was the only real form of ethics. Descriptive ethics being only sociology or psychology and the others being a persona just emoting. His point is valid because it is the only kind of philosophy that questions the basis of our knowledge and assumptions.

Paragraph three:

• Stevenson’s emotivism is useful because it encourages debate as moral exhortations are persuasive.

• But Logical Positivists would say that all such debate is meaningless since it has no basis in evidence or rational analysis.

• Instead, Naturalism gives us something concrete we can debate about unlike other theories. It is then facts that we strive to collect rather than unsupported feelings or intuitions.

Conclusion:

• The purpose of meta-ethics is to establish common meaning of words, either so that we can all use them to mean the same thing, or so that we can establish an objective equivalent to the words. There is no consensus of the meaning or purpose of ethical language, and until we can establish one, it is difficult to see how meta-ethics can offer anything useful.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.
2 Deontological Ethics

2A – St Thomas Aquinas’ Natural Law – laws and precepts as the basis of morality

Now Test Yourself – page 36

1. What is meant by the term Natural Theology?
   Knowledge about God derived from observation of the empirical world.

2. How did Aquinas think we can establish moral laws?
   Through the divine gift of reason, given by God at creation.

3. What does deontological mean?
   From the Greek (deon) meaning duty or obligation.

4. What is the role of scripture in Natural Law?
   It is divine law that conforms to God’s created order and serves as a moral reminder for humans.

Now Test Yourself – page 38

Give three ways in which Natural Law is dependent upon the existence of God.

1. Union with God is the purpose or final cause of all moral behaviour.
2. Moral Laws are deduced through observation of God’s created order.
3. Worship God is one of the primary precepts and not to be frustrated.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 39

A mad axe murderer is at your door, asking if your best friend is in the house. He helpfully tells you he wants to torture and kill her. Your best friend is hiding in your spare room. Use the precepts to work out what Natural Law would tell you to do.

Lying is by nature a deliberate deception and therefore threatens the order of society.

N.B. If you add to this, your knowledge regarding interior and exterior acts and of virtues, you might also say that lying with the intention of deceiving or harming another person is a sin. Also, lying from the sheer enjoyment of lying, lacks virtue since it lacks agape or restraint through temperance. (Aquinas recognised that we lie for different reasons but saw all as sinful, even though some are forgivable.)

2B – Aquinas’ Natural Law – the role of virtues and goods in supporting moral behaviour

Now Test Yourself – page 41

1. List the revealed virtues.
   Faith, hope and love.

2. How are the cardinal virtues established?
   Recta ratio (right reason).
3. Identify possible interior or exterior acts in the following scenarios:
   a. A woman who steals bread to feed her child
      Interior – preserve innocent life
      Exterior – sin of stealing
   b. A man who shoots and kills an intruder that breaks into his home
      Interior – preserve own life
      Exterior – sin of murder
   c. A doctor who gives a large dose of painkiller to a suffering patient.
      Interior – to defend someone from pain
      Exterior – sin of murder

Now Test Yourself – page 42

According to Natural Law, arrange the following actions into real and apparent goods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Real good</th>
<th>Apparent good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering CPR</td>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex within marriage</td>
<td>Sex with a girlfriend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling the truth</td>
<td>Euthanasia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to church</td>
<td>Using birth control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending school</td>
<td>Murder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apply Your Knowledge – page 42

You are a doctor and you have a sick patient who is begging to be allowed to die. They are in pain, and have a life-limiting condition, but are not about to die imminently. How would the virtues help you, the doctor? How might they help your patient?

- **Temperance** – ensures you are moderate in your decision making and do not rush into an ill-considered decision.
- **Fortitude** – gives you courage to stand by the right decision even if it feels difficult.
- **Justice** – ensures you treat each patient fairly, giving them an equal chance to achieve the precepts.
- **Prudence** – ensures you make a rational decision in accordance with natural law rather than an emotional response.
- **Love** – allows you to care and empathise with the patient.
- **Faith** – allows you to trust that God is in control and will protect his child.
- **Hope** – allows you to look forward to a time when the patient will end their suffering and achieve union with God.

2C – Aquinas’ Natural Law application of the theory

Now Test Yourself – page 44

1. Which aspects of Natural Law are not mentioned in the examples above?
   - Deontological/teleological
   - Faith
   - Hope
   - Temperance
   - The four levels of law
   - Order society
   - Worship God
   - Educate
   - Interior/exterior acts

2. Could you apply any of them to this example?
   - It is Sky’s duty to obey the primary precepts and not frustrate them.
   - She should act with the purpose of achieving the beatific vision when she makes her decision.
   - Faith and hope will enable her to trust that God has a plan for her and that he will reward her attempt to adhere to law. (She will need to repent of her sins.)
   - Temperance or moderation should help her to resist the temptation to rush into an action that she has not thought through.
   - The Divine Law requires that Sky must not kill so she must remember this when deciding.
   - Order society means that there must be laws that govern her moral behaviour and she has a duty to adhere to them.
   - Part of worshipping God means acting according to his created order. The purpose of sex is reproduction, and a pregnancy has the purpose of producing a child. Sky must not frustrate this.
   - Sky can then go on to ensure that the child is educated in the way of natural law so that (s)he can go on to fulfil the purpose God has set out.
   - Sky’s interior act must always be to do God’s will. She should obey the primary precepts with her exterior act.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 45

Try and apply the principles of Natural Law to the following situations to decide what is acceptable:

1. A young man is on dialysis with stage 5 diabetes and whose only hope is a kidney transplant. He refuses further treatment
   - It would be better for the patient to choose treatment in accordance with preservation of life.
   - Primary precepts: preserve Life, order society.
   - Virtues: love (from the doctor) hope and faith (for the patient).
   - Recta ratio: to do only good and avoid evil.
   - Apparent good is to ease his suffering or to force him to have a transplant.
• Real good is to treat him as much as possible, and to allow him to have a peaceful death.
• The death may not be hastened in any way.
• All that can be done to save his life according to his will, should be done.

2. An elderly woman near the end of her life wishes for help to die.
• Apparent good would be to help her.
• Real good is to preserve life.
• If she is in pain, her pain can be treated.
• If her pain is severe and the only way it can be treated is by a treatment that could kill her, the doctor can only give as much treatment as will ease her pain. If the side effect of her hastened death is unintended, this is double effect.
• Prudence will allow the doctor to judge actions wisely, not emotionally.

3. A middle-aged woman with early onset Alzheimer’s, but otherwise healthy, wants to end her own life, but needs help.
• Preserve life, order society, worship God all indicate it is the woman and the doctor’s duty to keep her alive.
• Virtue of Love and of fortitude mean that other kinds of help should be sought.
• The real good would be to do everything to keep the patient alive.
• As this theory is legalistic and absolutist, it makes no difference who the person is, what they are suffering from or how old they are. Euthanasia is not allowed.

Now Test Yourself – page 46

1. Define voluntary euthanasia.
‘Gentle, easy death’ or mercy killing, requested by the patient as a solution to extreme physical suffering.

2. Which primary precepts are most useful when deciding about Euthanasia?
Preserve life, order society

3. What would Aquinas call the apparent good of Euthanasia?
A sin

Specimen Exam Questions

Sample AO1 Questions – page 49

1. Outline the laws and precepts found in Aquinas’ Natural Law. (AS Only)

Aquinas identified four hierarchical laws of the universe.

• Eternal Law – the foundation of all of God’s creation, nothing can challenge it. E.g. gravity.
• Divine Law – the laws found in scripture. Achievable because they conform to God’s created order. E.g. the ten commandments.
• Natural Law – conforms to God’s eternal and divine laws but can be known purely through right reason (recta ratio). E.g. the primary precepts.
• Human Law – laws that govern society. Applicable to specific situation. Must conform to the laws above. E.g. secondary precepts or the legal system of a country.

Natural Law uses recta ratio to establish five, absolute, deontological, primary precepts.
1. Preserve innocent life
2. Order society
3. Worship God
4. Educate
5. Reproduce

The precepts help us to achieve our created purpose of fellowship with God, by doing good and avoiding evil.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

2. Examine the role of rational thought in Aquinas’ Natural Law.

- God gave us reason (recta ratio) at creation when he made us in his image.
- Natural Law is derived through right reason, by looking at the empirical world and observing God’s created purpose for all things (Natural Theology).
- We can use reason to identify our own created purpose (fellowship with God by doing good and avoiding evil).
- Recta ratio establishes the five primary precepts (preserve life, order society, worship God, educate, reproduce)
- Recta ratio can apply the primary precepts to establish secondary precepts. (Do not kill, have sex within marriage, go to church etc.)
- We have a duty to follow it to achieve our God given purpose.
- Recta ratio establishes the cardinal virtues (prudence, temperance, justice, fortitude).
- Prudence (wisdom) will enable us to reason between real and apparent goods.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

3. Explain the role of the seven virtues in Aquinas’ Natural Law.

- Aquinas used a combination of Aristotelian reasoning and scripture to establish two lists of human qualities that we should strive towards.
- Revealed virtues – virtues that cannot be established through reason but are shown to us in scripture – 1 Corinthians 13:13.
  - Faith – trust in God
  - Hope – wish or desire for the future (fellowship with God in heaven)
  - Love – agape/charity – altruistic concern for other people
- These give us the desire to reason correctly and discover God’s will for our moral behaviour.
- Cardinal virtues – virtues that can only be established through reason (recta ratio) alone.
  - Temperance – moderation/self-control
  - Prudence – wisdom/the ability to judge between actions
  - Fortitude – courage/strength of character/confronting fear
  - Justice – fair behaviour/treatment of others
- These give us the ability to establish and then follow natural laws so that we can act in accordance with God’s will.
They work in concert with the precepts – precepts tell us how to behave virtues tell us what sort of person to be

Virtues help to establish the intention or interior action while precepts help to govern the exterior action.

A worked example can be used: a pregnant woman who does not want the baby. Love for the child, despite the situation, will enable the woman to choose what is best for the child. Temperance will prevent a rushed, ill-considered response and prudence will ensure that she reasons through her behaviour before acting.

Perfecting our virtues requires practice.

We will become more like God and will have the personal qualities necessary to make correct moral decisions, rather than giving in to temptation and making bad choices.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

4. Apply Aquinas’ Natural Law to the issue of voluntary euthanasia.

Voluntary euthanasia means ‘gentle, easy death’ or mercy killing, requested by the patient as a solution to extreme physical suffering.

In the Aquinas’ hierarchy of law, Divine Law must be obeyed. Scripture does not forbid voluntary euthanasia, but many teachings may apply to this issue.

Scripture condemns murder and supports the sanctity of life.

Jesus refuses a narcotic substance to ease his pain when dying.

In the Old Testament, David condemns a man who he believes killed Saul at his own request when mortally wounded in battle.

Natural Law applies recta ratio (right reasoning) to moral action.

The primary precepts (preserve life) favour quantity of life rather than the quality of life that being experienced.

This is a deontological theory. So, life is a duty/responsibility not an optional right.

Give an example: a man with terminal cancer has asked a doctor to help him to die quickly and painlessly.

All the people involved should make sure of right reason so that good may be done and evil avoided in line with God’s purpose (the highest good).

The man would be helped to decide by developing the virtues of:
  o Hope – for eternal life in heaven with God
  o Faith – trust in God’s will
  o Fortitude – courage to face what is coming

The doctor would benefit from developing the virtues of:
  o Love – compassion for his patient
  o Temperance – moderate behaviour, avoiding extremes
  o Prudence – wise decision making, right reasoning

Reason means that the primary precepts show all involved that they have a duty to preserve life.

This means we can establish secondary precepts of do not kill, do not euthanise, give medical treatment to preserve life.

The primary precept to worship God means they should look to God’s Divine Law which forbids killing.
• The primary precept to order society means that they should follow human laws, so in the UK, voluntary euthanasia is still illegal.
• The apparent good is to ease the man’s suffering since that is what he desires. However, this is a sin.
• Right reason shows that the real good is to preserve life in accordance with the primary precepts and God’s authority.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

Sample AO2 Questions – page 49

1. Evaluate the view that Aquinas’ Natural Law requires belief in a creator God to make sense.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction:
• Requires = Natural Law cannot be considered rational without belief in God. To follow Natural Law, belief in God is necessary.

Paragraph one:
• The foundation of Natural Law is in Eternal and Divine Law, which require God to create them.
• However, reason is the basis of the precepts, this is different from Divine Commands. So, you don’t need to believe in God to apply reason.
• Therefore, while God is the basis as the creator of law, it is possible to follow the laws without faith meaning belief in God is not required.

Paragraph two:
• Belief in God is a small part of Natural Law, there is much more to it than this. E.g. preservation of life, ensuring love/agape is the basis of action etc.
• But the worship of God is an absolute precept. Natural Law collapses if we dispense with it.
• In addition, the whole purpose/telos of Natural Law is the beatific vision or fellowship with God so belief in God is surely required.

Paragraph three:
• God is not necessary in Natural Law since the atheist is just as capable of valuing life and an ordered society as the religious person
• However, absolute laws surely only have authority if there is a guarantor in the form of God. All laws we construct are ultimately subject to the divinely created order.
• Yet, acts can have intrinsic worth even if there is no God to judge us. We all know that murder and rape are wrong regardless of whether there is a God, so belief is not required.

Conclusion:
• Ultimately, Natural Law is reason-centric, based on empiricist, Aristotelian logic. If this is the case, there is no requirement for belief in a creator God. But reason has established that these laws are subject to an eternally created order. This is what gives the rational laws their
authority and is the source of all human reason. It makes little sense to take a deontological approach to Natural Law without belief in a creator God.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.

2. ‘Aquinas’ virtues are ineffective in addressing the issue of abortion.’ Evaluate this view.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction:

- Ineffective = not producing any significant or desired effect. The desired effect of Natural Law would be to outline a clearly ethical action regarding the issue of abortion. One would expect the virtues within Natural Law to assist in coming to a clear conclusion regarding how to behave.

Paragraph one:

- The virtues make Natural Law a holistic approach, supporting the needs of the pregnant woman through the virtues, not just policing her acts. (e.g. fortitude, hope)
- However, when deciding about abortion, the virtues leave us none the wiser regarding what action we should take.
- Rules are helpful when it comes to making a clear decision, but a virtuous, person who is loving may want to put a law forbidding abortion aside to save a woman’s mental health. The virtues therefore are not effective at providing a clear decision.

Paragraph two:

- The deontological approach of Natural Law allows a pregnant woman to suffer if having the baby causes her problems. But the virtues allow for the face that some people have more burdens than others by giving them the strength to cope.
- Yet, insisting that a suffering person develop more fortitude or temperance is unsympathetic and callous. The virtues shift the blame for moral suffering back to the victim, saying she is not brave enough or faithful enough.
- It seems that the virtues are not effective if they allow Natural Law to still stick rigidly to their rules and blame the woman for her suffering.

Paragraph three:

- Every theory struggles to meet each person’s unique need, but Natural Law takes it too far by policing character through the virtues. This limits our moral freedom more than rules.
- However, it may be that someone who is facing a difficult decision like abortion, where there may be no positive outcome, might find solace in the virtues.
- If the virtues can provide comfort when a decision is unclear and can help to guide a person’s inner voice when weighing up the options, then they are effective.

Conclusion:
• The virtues alone are ineffective as they do not provide any clear moral guidance regarding the issue of abortion. Both mother and unborn child may require love, both lives will suffer no matter what the outcome. However, the virtues are a small part of Aquinas’ theory and cannot be taken alone. The woman who is genuinely agonising over what to do, may find that if she has the virtue of prudence, it is easier to conclude. If she is temperate, she may react with caution and this could mean that the right decision is made in the long term.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.
2 Deontological Ethics

2D John Finnis’ Development of Natural Law:

Now Test Yourself – page 50
1. List the seven basic goods
   - Life
   - Knowledge
   - Play
   - Aesthetic experience
   - Friendship
   - Practical reasonableness
   - Religion

2. How do we know what the seven basic goods are?
   They are self-evident.

3. Who do the goods apply to?
   They are universal to all people in all cultures.

Now Test Yourself – page 52

1. List the nine requirements of practical reason
   - Have a coherent plan of life
   - No arbitrary preferences among values
   - No arbitrary preferences amongst persons
   - Detachment
   - Commitment
   - Efficiency within reason
   - Respect for every basic value in every act
   - The requirements of the common good
   - Follow one’s conscience

2. Give three ways in which practical reason differs from theoretical reason
   - Theoretical reason is concerned with truth, whereas practical reason describes how to act
   - Theoretical reason cannot produce contradictory statements whereas practical reason offers us a choice of action which may be contradictory.
   - Theoretical reason considers what constitutes a valid argument whereas practical reason considers how to put our knowledge into practice

3. What is the relationship between emotion and reason in moral decision making?
   Emotions play a part in decision making but correct practical reasoning should not be ruled or distracted by them.

4. Why is practical reason useful?
   Practical reason is universal and timeless. It is the working out of the reasons why we should act, followed by establishing the options for action that are guided by those reasons.
Now Test Yourself – page 53

1. Why is the common good so important?
   Humans need to live together and cooperate with each other, for our own well-being and the well-being of everyone around us. If society is unfulfilled, then I am less likely to be fulfilled.

2. What is the difference between morality and law?
   A moral theory like Natural Law, establishes what is good, law provides rules that govern behaviour.

3. Should we obey an unjust law?
   We might still be obliged to obey an unjust law if by breaking it we would threaten the common good. For example, disobedience might break down the system of authority and make it harder to coordinate everyone.

4. Give three features of a successful authority.
   • Has a leader who acts as a coordinator.
   • Non-coercive.
   • Leaves individuals the freedom to pursue the basic goods autonomously.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 53

1. Which of these actions would be morally acceptable according to Finnis’ Natural Law?
   a. Lying to your teacher to avoid reprimand – No. (It does not foster friendship and shows no commitment to the project of learning.)
   b. Playing a practical joke on a class mate – Maybe. (It can serve play, but in some cases might challenge friendship. You should not show arbitrary preference for some values over others.)
   c. A parent preventing their teenager from attending a festival before exams – No. (Authority should be non-coercive. However, the teenager should have a coherent plan of life and not show arbitrary preference for play over knowledge)
   d. Protesting outside an abortion clinic – Maybe. (There should be no coercive behaviour involved, the action must foster the common good. It may not foster the common good to interfere with women’s right to access medical services. It may foster the common good to prevent loss of life.)
   e. Having a pyjama day and watching Netflix – Maybe. (There should be no arbitrary preference between values, and the action should foster a good rather than prevent another. It depends on whether it is fostering play and aesthetic experience or if it is having an arbitrary preference for some values over others)
   f. Skipping class to meet your girlfriend – No. (There should be no arbitrary preference between values. We should not choose play or friendship over knowledge and we should have a coherent plan of life.)

2. Can a just authority punish people for not obeying Natural Law?
   • Yes – if it is the only way to protect the common good.
   • No – an authority must be non-coercive.
2E Bernard Hoose’s overview of the Proportionalist debate:

Now Test Yourself – page 55

1. Define the terms deontological and teleological.

   Deontological – Greek: (deon) means duty. The agent has a duty to obey universal, absolute laws. Teleological – Greek: (telos) means purpose/goal. The agent’s intention and/or the consequences of the action are what makes an act moral.

2. Explain when it would be acceptable to break a rule

   Hoose claims that it is never right to go against a principle unless there is a proportionate reason which would justify it.

Now Test Yourself – page 56

Give three qualities of an evil moral act and three qualities of an ontic evil act.

- An evil moral act is caused by humans, it is intentional and can also be called a sin.
- A pre-moral or ontic evil is the lack of perfection in creation, it is harm or damage that is inevitable and can be tolerated if it is for a proportionate reason.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 57

Hoose considers an executioner (Proportionalism, pp. 47–48) who carries out capital punishment on criminals according to the direction of the courts of law.

- What would be the morally good action in this situation?
  To perform the execution because it is his duty to do so.

- What could be the motive if the executioner refused to carry out his duty?
  To preserve life according to the primary precepts.

- Identify the value and the disvalue if the executioner refuses to do his job.
  - The value could be that life is preserved and that the intention was to preserve the primary precepts. This is morally good.
  - The disvalue could be that (s)he had not performed his/her duty and that may frustrate order in society.

- What is the right action for this executioner?

It may depend upon the potential consequences, and what the crime was that the criminal committed. Performing the execution is morally right if it is for a proportionate reason. However, if more disvalue is created (which Hoose is inclined to think would be the case) then it would be morally right to refuse. This is because the crime committed cannot be reversed, paid for sufficiently through another death, and the criminal cannot be rehabilitated through capital punishment.
2F Finnis’ Natural law and Proportionalism: application of the theory:

Apply Your Knowledge – page 59

How would the answers to this example change (if at all) if Aashi was in one of the following situations:

a. At risk due to war
   There will be more value caused by allowing her to come as her life will be saved and she could not contribute to her community or have a flourishing life if she were killed.

b. A highly educated doctor
   She would be able to contribute more value to either community whether she remained in India or came to the UK. More value could be created by her coming here if there were more career development prospects in the UK. More value could be created by here staying put, if her village did not have a doctor without her.

c. Had no family in the UK
   There will be less value created if she moves to the UK where she cannot pursue a family life. There will also be more disvalue if she is dependent upon the state to support her if she has no family to do so. There may be some value in her learning English in the UK to pursue meaningful relationships and supporting herself in the future.

d. A criminal
   There may be more disvalue in allowing her to come to the UK if her crime was likely to be repeated. However, if her criminal acts were due to her social circumstances, more value would be created by removing her from that environment to be with family and with access to better resources.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 61

What aspects of Finnis’ Natural Law or Proportionalism have not been mentioned in the answer above? What could you add to improve these responses?

None of the following basic goods were mentioned specifically:

- Knowledge
- Play
- Aesthetic experience
- Friendship
- Practical reasonableness
- Religion

Of the nine requirements of practical reasonableness, the following were not specifically mentioned:

- No arbitrary preferences among values
- No arbitrary preferences amongst persons
- Commitment
- Efficiency within reason
- Respect for every basic value in every act
- Follow one’s conscience
From Proportionalism the following elements were not mentioned specifically:

- Good and right acts
- Proportionalism based on agape

### Specimen Exam Questions

#### Sample AO1 Questions – page 64

1. Compare Finnis’ Natural Law with the Proportionalist approach to ethics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finnis’ Natural Law</th>
<th>Proportionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deontological approach (duty based)</td>
<td>Deontological/teleological hybrid (duty and purpose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws are absolute and objective</td>
<td>Laws are objective, but can be broken for a proportionate reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of morally good actions is possible</td>
<td>A choice of morally right actions is possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven basic goods are self-evident</td>
<td>There are no rules about how to weigh up value against disvalue, we know intuitively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We can distinguish a good act (one which follows a moral law) from a right act (one which, if it breaks a moral law, does so for a proportionate reason)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical reason is required to understand what to do</td>
<td>It is possible to distinguish an evil moral act (an intentional, deliberate evil) from an ontic evil (a lack of perfection in the created order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine requirements of practical reason help to establish laws</td>
<td>Reason and intuition help us understand when to break laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighing up a morally right act should include considering the value/disvalue brought about through:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The act (which should follow law to be good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The intention/motive (which should be loving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The consequences (which should provide value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must aim for the common good</td>
<td>Must aim for the maximum value and minimum disvalue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone has an equal right to the basic goods</td>
<td>Actions should be performed from the intention of love/agape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules should be organised by a non-coercive authority</td>
<td>In an extreme situation the moral agent has to make their own decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.*
2. Examine the place of the nine requirements of practical reason in Finnis’ Natural Law

- Finnis asks what makes a worthwhile life.
- Actions are only worthwhile if they serve one of the seven basic goods.
- Practical reason is one of the seven basic goods.
- It is the working out of how to put the basic goods into practice.
- It is different from theoretical reason which is understanding what is true.
- Practical reason is understanding what to do.
- There are nine requirements of practical reason.
  1. Have a coherent plan of life – view life as a whole, plan commitments properly and don’t live purely in the moment.
  2. No arbitrary preferences among values – prioritising of goods is necessary but must be rational and never reject a good outright.
  3. No arbitrary preferences amongst persons – goods should be available to everyone equally. Be impartial. (The Golden Rule)
  4. Detachment – don’t fixate on a project, avoid fanaticism so that life doesn’t become meaningless when a project ends.
  5. Commitment – don’t abandon commitments lightly, be faithful to a project.
  6. Efficiency within reason – actions should be effective/fit for purpose/efficient in achieving basic goods.
  7. Respect for every basic value in every act – don’t actively damage a basic good. All goods should be respected in every act.
  8. The requirements of the common good – foster the goods for everyone in the community.
  9. Follow one’s conscience – even though conscience can make errors, never do something you believe is wrong.
- You can freely choose from a range of activities that support the basic goods.
- It is a sin to go against a basic good.
- One of the basic goods is that they are for everyone – the common good.
- It makes the individual happier if society is happier.
- Authority should help to organise the basic goods for everyone using practical reason.
- Appropriate examples should be given to illustrate the above points.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

3. Explain the deontological and teleological features of Proportionalism

- Deontological (Greek: deon) means duty based
- Teleological (Greek: telos) means purpose/goal
- Hoose agrees that Natural moral laws are absolute and objective. This is deontological. It is our moral duty to obey them.
- It is morally good to obey Natural Moral Laws.
- Hoose argues that there is sometimes a difference between what is good and what is right.
- The moral agent must weigh up the value against the disvalue caused in an action.
- If there is more value than disvalue caused by breaking a rule, this is proportionally acceptable.
• Value and disvalue can come from consequences and intentions as well as from the act itself.
• This makes Proportionalism teleological.
• Proportionalism considers the disvalue from ontic evils.
• If an action that is morally good causes too much disvalue in a situation due to ontic evil then it is morally wrong.
• This is teleological because it considers circumstances.
• A morally good intention is always one which comes from a love of God and his law. This is deontological because agape is a duty we must realise.
• A good intention or a good act is not enough to make an action right. This is teleological because it considers other factors, not just rules.
• Appropriate examples should be given to demonstrate the above points.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

4. Apply Finnis’ Natural Law to the ethical issue of immigration

• Finnis made a controversial statement in 2009, that we should be cautious with immigration law. He wrote that the UK culture and population were decaying, replaced by reverse colonisation, by other people, cultures, religions and ambitions, regardless of their worth.
• Natural Law is deontological (duty based)/objective (there are clear set rules that are not a matter of opinion)/absolutist (they apply universally).
• Any moral rules made about immigration are absolute and must be obeyed.
• Moral rules are made using practical reason to ensure that we can follow the basic goods.
• Basic goods include life, play, friendship, knowledge and religion amongst others.
• Allowing immigration could mean that some people are more likely to develop these basic goods.
• Someone who is persecuted for their faith will be more likely to develop the basic good of religion if they immigrate to a multicultural society.
• If a country is at war, immigration could save lives which upholds a basic good.
• The basic goods are absolute and for everyone. This is called the common good.
• It would be against natural law to deny someone access to the basic goods.
• The nine requirements of practical reason include showing no arbitrary preferences amongst persons, so we should apply the goods to anyone
• Another requirement of practical reason is that we have a coherent plan of life. Therefore, we cannot just allow free movement, or controlled immigration unless it is planned for and accommodated in systems of government.
• There must be respect for every basic good, so it is not acceptable to abandon immigration altogether when people’s lives may be at risk.
• Finnis is concerned about the removal of UK culture if immigration continues, but we could also point out that a basic good is friendship and aesthetic experience which might be interpreted to include an appreciation of other cultures and traditions.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.
Sample AO2 Questions – page 64

1. Evaluate how acceptable Finnis’ Natural Law is for contemporary society

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction:

- Acceptable = tolerable or suitable
- Contemporary society = for the twenty-first century/in today’s world

Paragraph one:

- The fact that Natural Law allows people the freedom to choose from a wide range of appropriate goods makes it acceptable to people in the twenty-first century because freedom to choose is valued.
- However, having men fix acceptable choices of goods into law regarding issues like abortion limits women’s freedom and has a detrimental effect upon their health and well-being. This is not acceptable in today’s world.
- It seems that Finnis’ Natural Law demonstrates that there can be more than one way to perform a good action but is still very limiting for those who start at a disadvantage compared to the law makers. Thus Finnis’ Natural Law is not acceptable in contemporary society which values freedom and fair treatment.

Paragraph two:

- There is no reason for today’s society to accept the Finnis’ basic goods as absolute. He claims that they are self-evident but there is no basis for this claim.
- Yet, many of these basic goods are shared as important values for contemporary society. Play, aesthetic experience and friendship are all vital in today’s world and so this makes Natural Law quite suitable.
- Finnis gives us the freedom to prioritise some goods over others in certain situations, provided it is rational and doesn’t actively prevent other basic goods being achieved. This appears reasonable and is more tolerable in contemporary society than some other deontological approaches.

Paragraph three:

- Within Finnis’ Natural Law a coordinating authority encourages positive cooperation rather than resistance. This is very attractive to a society that values autonomy.
- However, what use is a non-coercive authority for ensuring the common good? There is nothing to prevent people from doing as they please and so there is nothing to protect the vulnerable or ensure fair treatment. This is an unacceptable system of morality.
- Having said this, Natural Law still gives some guidance that is needed for cooperation in a large community. It doesn’t leave people in an antinomian state, so it is acceptable to some extent.

Conclusion:

- Finnis’ Natural Law preserves the same things as Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It aims to protect basic values that human beings need for survival and wellbeing. The
message it sends is that there are some behaviours that are right and some that are wrong and this is acceptable in a large contemporary society that needs organising for the common good.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.

b.) ‘Proportionalism is ineffective in dealing with capital punishment.’ Evaluate this view.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction:

- Ineffective = not producing any significant or desired effect. The desired effect of Proportionalism would be to outline an ethical procedure regarding the issue of capital punishment. If proportionalism is ineffective then it does not help a moral agent decide what it is right to do.

Paragraph one:

- Proportionalism’s differentiation between good and right makes it possible for us to make effective moral decisions in extreme situations. The death penalty is a punishment for extreme situations because it is a time when we are suggesting that we suspend the law not to kill. This makes it effective because it gives us options.
- However, Hoose makes it impossible to ever use capital punishment on the basis that it would be an ineffective punishment. (It cannot rehabilitate or deter an offender, nor can it repay for the crime.) This makes it ineffective as the options seem to be illusory.
- However, in the very extreme case that an offender is unrepentant and truly a danger to all others around them, including staff, it may be that the value in allowing capital punishment for the protection of others outweighs the disvalue of taking a life. This makes proportionalism effective at protecting goods, but capable of responding to the truly extreme.

Paragraph two:

- Proportionalism is impractical and therefore ineffective by appearing to reject punishment all together on the basis that it does not benefit the recipient. It is vital that society is protected for the wellbeing of the majority.
- Yet, part of being a deontological theory is upholding the rights of all people regardless of who they are or what they have done. We must accept this if we want our own rights to be protected. This makes Proportionalism effective because it has a consistent approach to capital punishment.
- It seems that Hoose is rather idealistic in his approach since protecting the rights of humans is clearly a good thing, but a society cannot run without enforcement of laws and rules. If we refrain from punishment that doesn’t benefit the criminal, we could end up with a chaotic society.
Paragraph three:

- Hoose relies on intuition more than a strict system. This could enable quick, and therefore effective, decisions to be made.
- However, an abandonment of even the smallest law is not a deontological approach and puts human beings in the role of God, making the rules and trusting their flawed and fallen impulses over the revealed, divine law.
- It is surely ineffective as a Christian system of morality if big decisions like whether a person lives or dies, is based on an instinct rather than a set moral code. Hoose recognises that we are fallen beings, so his reliance of intuition to make decisions seems ineffective.

Conclusion:

- Proportionalism has some strengths in that it recognises that one principle or a strict system will not work in every situation and it recognises the complexity of moral situations. However, it relies on individuals using our common sense in weighing up the value against the disvalue and we don’t all have this. When people have committed capital offenses, emotions run high with grief and anger and people cannot be trusted to do the good thing. Therefore, Proportionalism is ineffective in dealing with capital punishment.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence
3 Teleological ethics

3A Joseph Fletcher’s Situation Ethics – his rejection of other forms of ethics and his acceptance of agape as the basis of morality

Now Test Yourself – page 65
1. What is meant by the term antinomian?
   Literally lawless. The lack of any rules or guidance at all.

2. Why did Fletcher reject legalism?
   • It was too restrictive.
   • It lacked compassion for the challenges people faced.
   • It put laws before people.
   • Led to immorality by forcing people to obey laws even when it harmed them.

Now Test Yourself – page 66
Give three reasons why Fletcher thought love was better than legalism or antinomianism
   • It shows compassion to all people equally.
   • It is a firm principle upon which to base all behaviour, so avoids the chaos of antinomianism.
   • It is flexible, showing love to people in different ways, depending on who they are and what their situation is. This avoids the rigidity of legalism.

Now Test Yourself – page 68
1. Name six qualities that St Paul says that love has
   • Patient
   • Kind
   • Not envious
   • Not boastful
   • Not arrogant
   • Not rude

2. Give two examples of Jesus showing agape in the New Testament
   • Jesus rescues a woman caught in adultery from being stoned. He forgives her. (John 8:1-11)
   • Jesus heals a man with a withered hand on the Sabbath when it is forbidden to work. (Mark 3:1-6)

Apply Your Knowledge – page 68
Some people would argue that some actions are intrinsically wrong, and Situation Ethics encourages immoral behaviour. Think of a worked example where a loving action might be morally terrible.

This depends upon your perspective. A deontologist might argue that any action that breaks a moral rule would be a morally terrible act. For instance: an abortion performed out of compassion for a suffering mother would be considered terrible yet loving by some. But Fletcher would consider such an act morally acceptable.

An example that could trouble many people could be that of a long and brutal war which can only be finished by bombing a military base. The bombing of the base could save thousands and thousands of lives and is motivated by a love of all the innocent victims of the war. However, the base is within
a large hospital that is being used to treat hundreds of victims of the enemy regime. Fletcher might have also accepted this action.

**3B Fletcher’s Situation Ethics – the principles as a means of assessing morality**

**Now Test Yourself – page 69**

1. What is a boss principle?
   A leading or fundamental principle.

2. What does positivism mean?
   (Faith first) You cannot prove that love is the most important thing. We must just have faith that it is and then apply our reason afterwards to see how best to be loving.

3. Which of the six fundamental principles were evident in the passages of scripture from the previous section?
   1. Only love – the Samaritan put aside cultural norms to help the victim.
   2. Ruling norm – although the Samaritan was not a Christian, he followed this, now Christian, ideal.
   3. Justice = love – he treated the victim as he would have treated any Samaritan even though the victim was not from his cultural group.
   4. Neighbourly love – he treated the victim with respect as though he was a neighbour.
   5. Ends justify the means – the outcome was that the victim was cared for and enabled to recover. Breaking religious and cultural norms allowed this to happen.
   6. Situation – the Samaritan responded to the situation rather than referring to a rigid system of laws.

**Apply Your Knowledge – page 69**

Fletcher gives the example of a schizophrenic woman who is raped whilst in care and becomes pregnant. Natural Law would forbid abortion. Using the principles, explain why it might be loving to allow it in this case.

1. **Pragmatism** – an abortion is the most practical way to help the woman. A pregnancy and childbirth would damage her more psychologically.

2. **Personalism** – even if the law were to forbid abortion, it is the woman and her needs that are more important. She is unable to request an abortion on her own behalf, in Fletcher’s example, her father has requested it.

3. **Positivism** – one must trust that love is the best thing and then use reason to work out how we show love to the woman.

4. **Relativism** – we should abandon abortion laws to care for this woman and her needs. This will not set a precedent for other people. In her case her illness makes it very challenging to cope with the hormonal changes, change in her drug regime and physical abilities whilst pregnant. Coping with more changes after the birth and the instant removal of the baby for its safety is more than most well people could cope with.
1. **Only Love** – we must keep at the forefront, what is the most loving thing, not the rules.

2. **Ruling Norm** – it is the most Christian thing to do to love her in the way Jesus would have done. He made exceptions and showed compassion, we should too.

3. **Justice = love** – the woman is in an unfair situation having had a pregnancy forced upon her against her will. It is more in accordance with justice to allow an abortion remedy this.

4. **Neighbourly love** – showing care and compassion for her would be the only good. Sticking to the law, which at the time in the USA when Fletcher was writing would usually have forbidden abortion, would lack compassion.

5. **Ends justify the means** – the primary concern is care for the woman, so we should do whatever is required to help her. An abortion at the earliest opportunity, under anaesthetic to minimise her suffering, would possibly enable her to suffer the least.

6. **Situation** – to force her through pregnancy may require adjusting medication that could damage the unborn child. To force her through child birth and then remove the baby because she is unfit to care for it would be psychologically damaging. The child may suffer as a result of its background, inheriting psychological illness or potentially struggling without a stable family.

3C Fletcher’s Situation Ethics – application of the theory

**Now Test Yourself – page 71**

1. Which of the principles of Situation Ethics are not mentioned in the examples above?
   - Positivism
   - Relativism
   - Only love is good
   - Ruling norm of Christian decision making
   - Situation is judged relatively not prescriptively

2. How could you apply them to this example?
   - **Positivism** – in either case we must trust that love is the best outcome for Kai and Aylin rather than worrying about what the law prescribes. We must then apply reason to work out how to best show love to them.
   - **Relativism** – the best decision may be different for each of them. For Aylin the most love will be achieved by embracing her wish to commit to her girlfriend and pursue a life together. It harms no one else and is in accordance with their desires. In Kai’s case it is more complex. He cannot be forced into a relationship he doesn’t want, but he needs to be careful to show love to any potential partner. This requires using the principles, avoiding dishonesty and ensuring his partner has the same desires as he does, consenting willingly and in full knowledge is vital to love and using contraception for the safety of the partner is vital. If these things are not in place, it would not be a loving act.
• **Only love** – it doesn’t make any difference what societal or religious laws exist, love and compassion for the people involved is what is most important.

• **Ruling norm** – it is the most Christian thing to do to love both Aylin and Kai in the way Jesus would have done. He made exceptions and showed compassion, so we should too.

• **Situation** – in Aylin’s situation there is a lot of love made possible through the marriage and through the raising of a family in a stable and loving environment. In Kai’s case it is more challenging to see the love if the encounter is a one-night stand. However, as a human being it is important that Kai is treated the same as any other and if it doesn’t affect anyone else adversely, Fletcher would argue that it is a private matter and up to Kai to decide. To restrict him would not be loving.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 71

**Can you use Situation Ethics to forbid the marriage of Aylin and her girlfriend? Why/Why not?**

Some might argue that it would not be loving to allow the marriage because it is allowing them to deceive themselves regarding God’s will and plans for them. If God does not accept homosexuality, then permitting and authorising the actions is harming them. However, this misses the point of Situation Ethics because it says that Christ put aside such laws in some situations.

Others might point out that the kind of love experienced by Aylin is not agape. It is more like philios or eros. In this case it is not the kind of love that we are morally obliged to promote. However, we can argue that forbidding their union would lack agape because it denies the fulfilment that we allow heterosexual couples to have in life.

Now Test Yourself – page 73

**Which Bible verses do you know of that might suggest polyamory is not acceptable?**

• Therefore, a man leaves his father and his mother and clings to his wife, and they become one flesh. **Genesis 2:24**

• For this is the will of God, your sanctification: that you abstain from fornication. **1 Thessalonians 4:3**

• Let marriage be held in honour by all and let the marriage bed be kept undefiled; for God will judge fornicators and adulterers. **Hebrews 13:4**

Apply Your Knowledge – page 73

**Look at the example of Iker, Mina and Jax again. Identify which principles have been missed out. How do they help to show whether or not the act of polyamory is loving in their situation?**

**Positivism** – One must trust that love is the best thing and then use reason to work out how we show love to the throuple.

**Relativism** – We should abandon laws to care for this group of people. Love is best shown to these three people by allowing them to continue their relationship because this is how they are most fulfilled. To forcibly break their relationship apart would be to cause them undue distress and is unnecessary since they are not depriving anyone else of love through their actions.
Only love – We must keep at the forefront, what is the most loving thing, not the rules. It shows them unconditional care or concern to allow them to continue with their own private and committed relationships.

Ruling norm – It is the most Christian thing to do to love them as Jesus would have done. They are not promoting any action that causes harm to any other person. Their relationship is private and does not prevent them from going to church or worshipping God if they chose to do so.

Specimen Exam Questions

Sample AO1 Questions – page 76

1. Outline the four working principles and the six fundamental propositions of Situation Ethics (AS Only)

   - The four working principles and six fundamental propositions of Situation Ethics were formulated by Joseph Fletcher as an alternative Christian ethic to enable moral agents to place the principle of agape over and above social and religious laws.
   - Agape – unconditional care or concern for others/altruistic behaviour/charity.
   - Boss principle – leading or fundamental principle.

   These principles were provided by Fletcher to guide people in how they can best be loving. They are not rules or laws, they describe how love should be applied.

   1. Pragmatism – (practicality) any action must be practically possible in working to serve a loving outcome
   2. Personalism – (people before law) the individual person is the priority and love for them is more important than the detail of any law.
   3. Positivism – (faith first) you cannot prove that love is the most important thing. We must just have faith that it is and then apply our reason afterwards to see how best to be loving.
   4. Relativism – (no set rules) all acts must be relative to a loving outcome. There are no fixed laws that apply universally except for love.

   These six principles are not laws or rules, they give guidance regarding how best to be loving when faced with a moral dilemma. They tell us how best to be loving.

   1. Only love – the only intrinsically good thing is love and nothing else.
   2. Ruling norm – love is the ruling norm of Christian decision making. For a Christian to make a moral decision, they must always assess if will produce love before they worry about whether it obeys laws like the ten commandments.
   3. Justice = love – love and justice are the same thing. Justice is love shared out fairly.
   4. Neighbourly love – you should love your neighbour as you love yourself.
   5. Ends justify the means – this means that if the outcome is loving, any action at all is permitted.
   6. Situation – acts should be decided situationally not prescriptively. This means we look to the situation and decide each individual case, rather than looking to a prefabricated set of rules and trying to make them fit the circumstances.

   This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.
2. Compare Fletchers’ Situation Ethics with the ethical approaches of legalism and antinomianism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legalism</th>
<th>Situation Ethics</th>
<th>Antinomianism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A strict set of prefabricated laws or rules that are absolute in nature and cannot be broken</td>
<td>Moral theory based on agape (selfless/unconditional care or concern for others) as a middle way between the approaches of legalism and antinomianism</td>
<td>Literally lawless. The lack of any rules or guidance at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| It is restrictive, rigid, binding and authoritative. | Contains the principle of agape as the one absolute principle but is prepared to put any other laws and principles to one side. | It is inconsistent and unprincipled literally allowing people to behave however they want. |

| It lacks compassion for the challenges people faced | Fletcher’s six fundamental principles give a structure that protects people from abuse: Justice = love – love and justice are the same thing. Justice is love shared out fairly. But shows compassion for others: Neighbourly love – you should love your neighbour as you love yourself | It did not protect the vulnerable members of society |

| It puts laws before people | Fletcher’s four working principles prioritise the needs of the person in front of you. Personalism – (people before law) the individual person is the priority and love for them is more important than the detail of any law. Relativism – (no set rules) all acts must be relative to a loving outcome. There are no fixed laws that apply universally except for love. But it avoids anarchy by the second fundamental principle: Ruling norm – love is the ruling norm of Christian decision making. For a Christian to make a moral decision, they must always assess if will produce love before they worry about whether it obeys laws like the ten commandments. | It would lead to chaos/anarchy |

| Leads to immorality by forcing people to obey laws even when it harmed them | In the case of a terminally ill person who is suffering and wants to die, situation ethics | It is ‘ad hoc’ or random in its approach |
would protect the patient from the harm of a literally lawless, random approach. Such an approach would abandon the patient to suffer or smother the patient with a pillow, with equal lack of concern. But would apply pragmatism – (practicality) any action must be practically possible in working to serve a loving outcome. It is not practical to love to obey laws forbidding euthanasia and forcing the patient to suffer when they need not.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

3. Examine how biblical teaching is used to support Situation Ethics

New Testament evidence for agape is plentiful. Good examples of Jesus showing agape could be:

- Jesus rescues a woman caught in adultery from being stoned. He forgives her – John 8:1-11

Fletcher’s four working principles include: personalism – (people before law) the individual person is the priority and love for them is more important than the detail of any law.

- Jesus heals a man with a withered hand on the Sabbath when it is forbidden to work – Mark 3:1-6

Fletcher’s six fundamental propositions include: ends justify the means – this means that if the outcome is loving, any action at all is permitted.

- Jesus teaches we should love our enemies – Luke 6:27-36

Fletcher’s six fundamental principles include: ruling norm – love is the ruling norm of Christian decision making. For a Christian to make a moral decision, they must always assess if will produce love before they worry about whether it obeys laws like the ten commandments.

Jesus teaches that agape is scripturally based. He tells a story in Luke 10:25-37 known as the Good Samaritan, to show that true obedience to this law of love may be unconventional in its application.

- A Levite man travelling from Jerusalem to Jericho was attacked by robbers, who left him for dead. A priest and, later, a Levite, saw him and passed by without helping. But a travelling Samaritan saw him and helped (Samaritans and Levites were enemies). He treated the victim’s wounds, found him an inn, cared for him, then paid the innkeeper to shelter the victim until he was well.

This story was told to show that the neighbourly behaviour is what is the most loving and what is required to inherit eternal life.
Fletcher’s six fundamental principles include: neighbourly love – you should love your neighbour as you love yourself.

In 1 Corinthians 13 Paul lists the qualities required by agape that are not about feelings so much as they are about charitable behaviour towards other people.

- Love is: patient, kind, greater than faith, greater than hope
- Love is not: envious, boastful, irritable, arrogant, rude, resentful
- Love does not: rejoice in wrongdoing, insist on its own way
- Love does: rejoice in the truth, bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things, never ends

Fletcher’s four working principles includes: positivism – (faith in love first) you cannot prove that love is the most important thing. We must just have faith that it is and then apply our reason afterwards to see how best to be loving.

*This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.*

4. Explain the teleological and consequentialist theory of Situation Ethics

Teleological theories focus upon the purpose or goal of an act. Situation Ethics is teleological because it is aims for love in its decision-making process.

Consequentialism assesses moral actions based on their outcome or results rather than the act itself. Situation Ethics, as a consequentialist theory, works out if the result of an act will be loving. If it is, then it is a good act. An act, such as sex between members of the same gender, is neither intrinsically good nor intrinsically bad. It is dependent upon the outcome of the act in each separate case.

*(N.B. the differentiation between goal and outcome is emphasised below to help with the definitions but this is a little artificial as the goal is the intended outcome, so there is not really a clear distinction)*

The four working principles were provided by Fletcher to guide people in how they can best be loving. They are not rules or laws, they describe how love should be applied.

1. Pragmatism – (practicality) any action must be practically possible in working to serve a loving outcome (teleological because the aim is to practically achieve love)
2. Personalism – (people before law) the individual person is the priority and love for them is more important than the detail of any law. (teleological because the goal is to provide love for this person)
3. Positivism – (faith first) you cannot prove that love is the most important thing. We must just have faith that it is and then apply our reason afterwards to see how best to be loving. (teleological because the purpose is to work out how to achieve love.)
4. Relativism – (no set rules) all acts must be relative to a loving outcome. There are no fixed laws that apply universally except for love. (Consequentialist because a loving outcome is the main aim).

Fletcher’s six fundamental propositions are not laws or rules, they give guidance regarding how best to be loving when faced with a moral dilemma. They tell us how best to be loving.
1. Only love – the only intrinsically good thing is love and nothing else. (Teleological because love is not a law as such but an intrinsically good thing to aim for as a goal.)

2. Ruling norm – love is the ruling norm of Christian decision making. For a Christian to make a moral decision, they must always assess if it will produce love (as a consequence) before they worry about whether it obeys laws like the ten commandments.

3. Justice = love – love and justice are the same thing. Justice is love shared out fairly. (Teleological because the goal is a fair distribution of love.)

4. Neighbourly love – you should love your neighbour as you love yourself. (Teleological because Love is a goal and an intention behind any action performed.)

5. Ends justify the means – this means that if the outcome is loving, any action at all is permitted. (Consequentialist because the focus is on the end or outcome not the act itself.)

6. Situation – acts should be decided situationally not prescriptively. This means we look to the situation and decide each individual case, rather than looking to a prefabricated set of rules and trying to make them fit the circumstances. (Teleological because in each situation the goal of love is considered and worked towards.)

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

5. Apply Fletcher’s Situation Ethics to the ethical issue of polyamorous relationships

- A polyamorous relationship is the idea that more than two people are willingly and knowledgably involved in a sexual and/or romantic relationship with each other.
- Traditional biblical laws appear to forbid such actions, although it is not always clear:
  - ‘For this is the will of God, your sanctification: that you abstain from fornication.’ 1 Thessalonians 4:3.
  - ‘Let marriage be held in honour by all and let the marriage bed be kept undefiled; for God will judge fornicators and adulterers.’ Hebrews 13:4.
- In Fletcher’s Situation Ethics any laws or rules about polyamorous relationships are of secondary importance to love (agape). He claimed we must start from a position where we trust that love is the good thing (positivism) and then work out how best to be loving. We need to assess the individual situation (relativism).
- If we take the example of three people, Iker, Mina and Jax who met and shared digs at university we can apply the principles of agape to their moral situation. Their friendship gradually became deeply emotional and sexual. Now each feel distressed at the thought of being apart. They wish to continue living together as sexual and romantic partners after university.
  - There are no strict rules that are applied here which means that different people may apply these principles in different ways.
  - Pragmatism – this relationship does not affect anyone else. It would ensure emotional and physical fulfilment for all three members of their group. But it would be very challenging to legislate for such a relationship. There is no way to protect people from being pressured into this kind of relationship.
  - Personalism/love decides situationally – in their situation, they are all consenting and desirous of the relationship, their needs must be put before law. However, they say there will be more love, but it is not the kind of love that Fletcher was talking about. This is eros not agape.
• Love = justice – We should treat them fairly. We don’t require a monogamous, heterosexual couple to give up their lives together, so it may be unfair to ask it of these people. However, we are not denying anyone a loving relationship. Fairness requires that each person gives their attention to one person at a time, regardless of sexual orientation.

• The ends justify the means – the outcome would be for happiness and emotional/sexual fulfilment. Resulting children will have three loving parents to care for them. However, the outcome is unpredictable. Any resulting children could lead to the exclusion of whichever person is not biologically related. This is not agapeic.

• Love your neighbour as yourself – if each of them feels that they can put the needs of the other two before their own, then agape can be served through the relationship. It is unkind to expect that they can all be equally important in a three-way relationship. Monogamous relationships are challenging enough.

• Ultimately, Fletcher felt that such relationships, conducted in private and fully consenting, were not the business of anyone else who remains unaffected by them. This would be true of any relationship. If our three people were in any way unhappy with the arrangement or did not have full knowledge of the other people’s intentions or wishes, this would be assessed differently and so might not be acceptable.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

N.B. An apply question can sometimes feel a lot like an AO2 question. It is different because it is not asking you to come to a judgement regarding whether Situation Ethics is effective or better than another approach, it is just asking you for different ways of applying the principles.

Sample AO2 Question – page 76

1. Evaluate the view that agape is a better approach to ethics than religious laws.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction:

• Better = subjective term. Might mean more practical, or more consistent? Alternatively, it might mean more in accordance with Christ’s teaching.

Paragraph one:

• Jesus set the precedent that we can put laws aside if it is loving to do so. He seems to suggest it is better. It seems in accordance with his teaching.

• God’s laws do not change, they are absolute. (Micah 3:6 – ‘I the Lord do not change’). Agape cannot be better than the law set out by God.

• Agape is useful for individuals but cannot run a society since it lacks the structure it needs to be practical or consistent for justice.

Paragraph two:
My Revision Notes: WJEC and Eduqas A level Religious Studies Religion and Ethics Answers

- Religious laws protect the vulnerable and preserve our relationship with God. This must be better as it is more consistent and means people are less likely to suffer.
- If we follow agape, then we will usually end up doing what the law suggests anyway provided the law is loving. The only time it will be broken is if it harms people, so it must be better when this happens.
- Agape is a useful personal ethic for when rules don’t address the situation. This makes it necessary to fuse religious laws and agape in some way so neither is better, both are needed.

**Paragraph three:**

- Focus on the law means we become like the Pharisees, Jesus preached against them, so it is better and more consistent with Christ to follow agape.
- Our reason is flawed, we cannot be trusted to know the best way to be loving. This means that laws are surely better as God is omniscient and set the rules in place as a gift for us.
- Agape can ensure that the rules don’t become too cold-hearted and so it may be better, or at least equal to the law.

**Conclusion:**

- Rules are useful for society to make sure vulnerable people are protected and so it is vital that they exist. However, situation ethics never denied this. To suggest one is better than the other is to over simplify. Agape is only needed when the law cannot do the job, so neither is better, both are needed to govern society and to direct a person in unusual or private situations that are not covered by the laws.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence**

2. ‘Situation Ethics promotes fair treatment for all people.’ Evaluate this view.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

**Introduction:**

- Fair treatment = could mean treating everyone the same or could mean giving people what they need in the situation they are in to succeed. Two different things.

**Paragraph one:**

- One of the six fundamental propositions is that justice and love are the same thing. Justice is often defined as fair treatment and so fairness is built right in.
- The agapeistic calculus disregards the minority to bring love to the majority. This is not fair treatment, it might be most practical, but some will not be included.
- Justice is impossible. We can’t show love to everyone even though Fletcher wants us to. This means that whilst Fletcher might promote fair treatment, he cannot provide it.
Paragraph two:

- If justice is equal treatment not the same outcome the same rules should apply to all. It is the only thing that we can realistically control as consequences are wild and unpredictable. We can never achieve fair treatment through consequentialism.
- Personalism accepts that circumstances make it easier for some to obey rules. This is fairer as it much easier not to steal when you are rich and much easier to avoid abortion when you are not pregnant and if you have not been raped.
- Situation Ethics is idealistic but not realistic. This means that regardless of whether it promotes fair treatment it will never achieve it because ethics is too complicated to treat everyone fairly.

Paragraph three:

- If justice is a fair outcome, people have diverse needs to reach the same goal and situation ethics provides for this.
- It is impossible to legislate for Situation Ethics in a society, so it cannot promote fairness. This is because it disregards laws and rules whenever it is convenient to do so.
- Some people are resistant to help and so we cannot provide love if they don’t want it. This means that situation ethics, for all its good intentions cannot provide fair treatment even when it is promoted.

Conclusion:

Situation Ethics encourages a free choice of behaviour which sounds wonderful on face value. However, this promotes anarchy, not justice. No vulnerable members of society are protected and so some will suffer. This is especially true when the majority must be considered over the majority. Situation Ethics does not recognise that the complexity of law is to ensure justice in unusual and difficult situations, so situation ethics does not promote fair treatment for all. It promotes a great outcome for some.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.
3 Teleological Ethics

3D Classical Utilitarianism – Jeremy Bentham’s Act Utilitarianism: happiness as the basis of morality

Now Test Yourself – page 77

1. Which scholar is most associated with Classical Utilitarianism?
   Jeremy Bentham

2. What did Hume call this kind of ethical theory?
   The theory of usefulness

Now Test Yourself – page 78

1. Copy out each letter of the acronym DR PRICE.
2. Shut the book and write out the words represented by each letter of the acronym.
   - **D**uration
   - **R**emoteness
   - **P**urity
   - **R**ichness
   - **I**ntensity
   - **C**ertainty
   - **E**xtent

3. Can you now define each one?
   - **D**uration – the amount of time that the happiness will last.
   - **R**ichness – how much more happiness this act will lead to in the future (fecundity).
   - **P**urity – how much the act will be contaminated by pain.
   - **R**emoteness – how long we will have to wait until the happiness starts (propinquity).
   - **I**ntensity – how strong the sensation of happiness will be.
   - **C**ertainty – how sure we are that the happiness will occur.
   - **E**xtent – how many other people the happiness will affect.

Now Test Yourself – page 79
1. Why would Utilitarianism be considered relativistic?
   - There are no absolutes, no rules formulated in advance.
   - No act is intrinsically good or bad.
   - The goodness or badness of an act is all relative to how much happiness is caused.
   - A bad act is only bad if it produces more pain than happiness.

2. Explain what Act Utilitarianism is.
   - Act Utilitarianism weighs up each individual act according to the situation that it occurs in.
   - No rules are applied in advance.
   - No attempt is made to look historically at the results of prior actions and formulate any kind of precedent.
   - Each situation is unique and should be weighed up according to the Hedonic Calculus.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 79

The Trolley Problem was posed by Phillipa Foot in 1967. The thought experiment states that you are the driver of a trolley which rounds a bend to reveal five workmen on the track. You must apply the breaks to prevent a collision, but they fail to work. You can turn the trolley to a side track, but there is one workman on that line too. No one can get out of the way in time.

- Apply Bentham’s version of the utility principle to this problem

  His principle of utility is sometimes known as the greatest happiness for the greatest number.
  The principle of utility aims to promote maximum happiness and to minimise pain in society.
  It seems to create more happiness/less pain to switch the trolley to the side track and kill one workman instead of the five.

- Use his hedonic calculus

  Duration – happiness for those that survive will have the potential to continue throughout their lives. There are more years of happiness available collectively for the five than would be available for the one.
  Richness – saving the five or the one does not directly lead to more happiness or pain, however, there is the potential for more happiness to be experienced simply because they are alive to experience it. Therefore, there is more richness possible for the five.
  Purity – there will be some pain achieved through the killing of the one person and there will be pain experienced by their relatives. This would be less than the pain experienced if the five are killed.
  Remoteness – happiness for the majority can continue immediately for those who have survived. Pain may be experienced immediately by the one workman, and a short time afterwards for his family.
  Intensity – this may vary for different people. There will be a strong sense of relief for those who have survived and for their relations. There will be the potential for intense happiness in the future. The intensity of the pain experienced by the loved ones of those who die will be significant.
Certainty – we can be sure that the five workmen will be happy to have survived and that their relatives and loved ones would have experienced pain had they died. We can be sure that those who love the one workman will experience pain. But we cannot be certain regarding how many people this will affect as we do not know the situation of workmen or anything about their characters.

Extent – this will affect the driver of the out of control trolley who would surely feel more pain from killing five then killing one. This will also affect all the friends and family of the people who have been killed or who have survived. They may also be witnesses who will be affected by the event. There would be many more people affected by the five being killed or saved.

What kind of difficulties do you see?
- There are many unknowns involved in weighing up each part of the calculus as we don’t know the lives of each person involved.
- We also do not know the ramifications of this event for the lives of people in the future, for example PTSD, lost jobs, suffering families, cancelled trains, future safety precautions. They can be good or bad.
- There would not be enough time to weigh this up in the moment of decision making.
- There is a difference between accidentally killing the five on an out of control trolley, and deliberately targeting the one.
- How do you practically quantify the feelings of the people involved?

Does it make a difference if you know the workman on the side-track?
- Yes, if the person on the side-track is a friend or a relative, I suddenly know more about them and can weigh up their happiness or pain differently.
- Yes, I have emotional attachment to them and the personal experience of pain from killing them will be more intense.
- Yes, if the person is an enemy, I am more likely to make decisions based upon my own dislike and view of their worth from my own feelings.
- No, there is still one person being weighed against five.
- No, the calculus is non-emotional and so it makes no difference how I feel.

Does it make a difference if you are an observer rather than a driver and instead of diverting the trolley, you can derail it by pushing one person in front of the trolley thus killing them but saving the five?
- Yes, this is actively killing rather than making an emergency choice.
- Yes, as an observer, you are in a less immediate situation and are blameworthy for pushing rather than there being a certainty that your trolley will kill someone.
- No, one person is dying either way.

3E John Stuart Mills development of Utilitarianism: types of pleasure, the harm principle and the use of rules

Now Test Yourself – page 81
1. What kinds of happiness did Mill feel would be more important?

**Higher pleasure – intellectual | what makes us human rather than like other animals | superior to other pleasures.**

e.g. reading a book, engaging in philosophy, scientific study, visiting an art gallery, spirituality.

We must satisfy lower pleasures to exist but, higher pleasure can be worth sacrificing a lower pleasure for.

2. How do we choose between different types of happiness?

- When we make a moral decision, we should weigh up the value of the act based on whether there is a higher quality pleasure at stake or a lower quality one.
- We don’t always choose the higher pleasure over the lower one if we haven’t been educated and experienced the full range of pleasures properly.
- So, everyone should be exposed to the higher pleasures through education as it helps them to make better moral choices.

3. Why did he and Carlyle think Bentham’s Utilitarianism was animalistic?

- Thomas Carlyle had called Utilitarianism ‘pig philosophy’ because it appealed to basic, animalistic urges rather than more sophisticated human requirements.
- Mill agreed that what makes us human is that we want more out of life than the basic swinish pleasures.

Now Test Yourself – page 82

1. Close this book and then write out the harm principle. Open the book and check your answer.

We may never limit the freedom of others to act, except to prevent harm being done to other people.

2. Give three reasons why Mill would not allow the sadistic guards to torture the innocent prisoner.

   - The guards cannot harm another person just to achieve majority happiness (harm principle).
   - The happiness of the guards is a lower kind of pleasure and does not count for so much. (Mill only, not rule utilitarianism)
   - The prisoner is an unwilling victim and so is protected (by the harm principle).

Apply Your Knowledge – page 83

Using the following examples see if you can work out a rule that, if adopted, would lead to maximum happiness for society and for the individual:

1. Can homosexual couples be allowed to have sex?

   - All people may have sex with whomever they like provided all parties are consenting.
   - A consenting person is an adult of sound mind who says they would like to have sex.
• Sexual acts must only be performed in private so that no other people are adversely affected.

2. Is it acceptable for a woman to have an abortion?

It is hard to create a universal rule in this instance, except to say:
• A woman may choose what happens to her body at any time.

However, the problem is that this will only create maximum happiness if all women agree with this rule since there are many men and women that would not be happy with this rule and would argue that the unborn person still suffers at the woman’s expense and some would argue that the man/father should have some rights to decide.

An alternative might be:
• All people must consent to any acts that are performed upon their own bodies.
• All people may choose what happens to their own body at any time.

This might make a more equal sounding rule that makes men and women equal in the control that they have over their bodies, but of course the flaw here is that the unborn person cannot consent or choose what happens to their body. It depends on whether the unborn is a person or not.

Or:
• All vulnerable people must be protected from harm regardless of age, gender, race or social status.

This means that the foetus is protected if they are a person, but so is the woman and there may be a paradox in the case of pregnancy.

3. Can we punish a criminal with a lethal injection?

If we have established the rule above that all people must consent to any acts that are performed upon their own bodies and that they may choose what happens to their own body at any time, then the answer to the question above is no, we cannot formulate a rule to allow this. The harm principle appears to prevent capital punishment unless we say that a violent criminal cannot be contained within prison without harming other people. If, for some reason, the only way to protect others from harm would be to use capital punishment, then surely it would be acceptable. If we have established the rule that all vulnerable people must be protected from harm regardless of age, gender, race or social status, we might classify a violent criminal as a vulnerable person (if we accept that the life that may have led a person to a life of violence could help them become vulnerable).

3F Bentham’s Act Utilitarianism and Mill’s Rule Utilitarianism – application of the theory

Now Test Yourself – page 85

1. Give three reasons why Bentham’s hedonic calculus would reject animal testing.
**Extent** – millions of animals will be reared for testing and then for the procedure.

**Richness** – animal experimentation is unreliable, leading to minimal future happiness.

**Purity** – many animals suffer for a medical process to be developed.

2. Make a list of higher pleasures that only humans can experience

- Philosophy, literature, art.

3. Give two Utilitarian reasons to support a law for using animals in medical research
   - We should exercise our power to protect sick people from harm by testing.
   - It has been used since ancient Greece to improve medical understanding.

---

**Now Test Yourself – page 86**

1. Use three elements of the hedonic calculus to explain why the possession of nuclear weapons is morally acceptable.
   - Duration – Hiroshima and Nagasaki showed it would shorten any conflict considerably.
   - Intensity – survivors of an attack would experience severe pain for a lifetime.
   - Extent – possession of such weapons ensures safety from threats by other nations too.

2. Use a different three criteria of the calculus and explain why possession of nuclear weapons is unacceptable.
   - Richness – such weapons kill indiscriminately which would not lead to future happiness.
   - Certainty – activating such weapons will cause widespread destruction and genocide.
   - Purity – there are no geographical boundaries to the devastation caused by use.

---

**Specimen Exam Questions**

**Sample A01 Questions – page 90**

1. Outline Bentham’s hedonic calculus (AS only)
   - Utilitarianism is a secular moral theory championed by Jeremy Bentham.
   - His principle of utility is sometimes known as the greatest happiness for the greatest number.
   - So, the principle of utility aims to promote maximum happiness for society.
   - When judging the goodness or badness of an act we must weigh up the amount of overall happiness that will be caused.
   - We must balance this against the overall amount of pain that will result.
   - Bentham wanted to make the ethical calculations as scientific as possible. Consequently, he formulated the hedonic calculus which should be applied to each situation without using any prefabricated rules. The calculus was intended to measure the quantity of pleasure or pain produced in any given act, to decide if it is moral or not.
• The hedonic calculus is an attempt to calculate the balance between the pleasure and pain that results from any action.
• Bentham felt that we can weigh up pleasure quantitatively.
• This means he is more interested in how much happiness will occur and not concerned with the type of happiness or what kind of quality it has.
• He included seven criteria in his calculus:
  1. **Duration** – the amount of time that the happiness will last.
  2. **Richness** – how much more happiness this act will lead to in the future (fecundity).
  3. **Purity** – how much the act will be contaminated by pain.
  4. **Remoteness** – how long we will have to wait until the happiness starts (propinquity).
  5. **Intensity** – how strong the sensation of happiness will be.
  6. **Certainty** – how sure we are that the happiness will occur.
  7. **Extent** – how many other people the happiness will affect.
• He claimed that pleasure and pain can be measured in the same way as anything else. A unit of pleasure was called a hedon, a unit of pain was called a dolor.
• If candidates can use an example, this would supplement the outline, but is not essential for an outline.

**This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.**

2. Compare Act and Rule Utilitarianism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No attempt is made to look historically at the results of prior actions and formulate any kind of precedent</td>
<td>Historically, there are rules that have been established that will always lead to happiness regardless of the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Utilitarianism weighs up each individual act according to the situation that it occurs in</td>
<td>Not all actions need to be morally assessed as they are right if they conform to a historical rule that has demonstrated that it fulfils the principle of utility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rules are applied in advance</td>
<td>Mill’s harm principle is one of these rules that has been set for all circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each situation is unique and should be weighed up according to the hedonic calculus</td>
<td>What is right and wrong for one person is right and wrong for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relativistic – There are no absolutes, no rules formulated in advance No act is intrinsically good or bad</td>
<td>There are two versions of rule utilitarianism (weak and strong) <strong>Strong Rule</strong> – once the rules are set, they cannot be broken under any circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequentialist – All acts are assessed according to the possible outcome or result of the act</td>
<td>Consequentialist – <strong>Weak Rule</strong> – rules can be broken if necessary, to establish maximum happiness in an extreme situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleological – Telos is the Greek word for goal or end The goal of any act is to produce maximum happiness</td>
<td>Mill’s version of Utilitarianism is not so clearly teleological. It is teleological in the sense that when establishing a rule, this is done through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal of all moral actions is to produce happiness and avoid pain considering the goal of happiness or pleasure for the majority in general. It is deontological because, once a rule is established, it becomes a duty for us to uphold this law for the sake of majority happiness.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

3. Examine Mill’s development of Utilitarianism as a deontological/teleological hybrid

- Utilitarianism is a secular theory developed from the ancient Greeks by Jeremy Bentham
- The principle of utility is sometimes known as the greatest happiness for the greatest number. This is teleological because the purpose or goal of ethical action is to produce maximum happiness.
- A notable change made by Mill to Bentham’s Utilitarianism, was to focus on the claim that the goal/telos of ethical action was quality of pleasure instead of quantity.
- Higher pleasures are of greater value than lower pleasures.
- **Higher pleasure** – intellectual | what makes us human rather than like other animals | superior to other pleasures.
  
  e.g. reading a book, engaging in philosophy, scientific study, visiting an art gallery, spirituality.

- **Lower pleasures** – basic | physical | animalistic
  
  e.g. eating, drinking, sleeping, sex.

- Historically, there are rules that have been established that will always lead to happiness regardless of the situation.
- Not all actions need to be morally assessed as they are right if they conform to a historical rule that has demonstrated that it fulfils the principle of utility. This is deontological in appearance since once a rule is established it can be applied every time.
- The harm principle is one of these rules that has been set for all circumstances.
- The harm principle states that we may never limit the freedom of others to act, except to prevent harm being done to other people. This is universal and so deontological. We have a duty to allow people freedom unless it causes harm.
- What is right and wrong for one person is right and wrong for all.
- As a result, Mill’s version is retrospectively called Rule Utilitarianism.
- There are two versions of rule utilitarianism (weak and strong).
- **Strong rule** – once the rules are set, they cannot be broken under any circumstances (deontological – duty based).
- **Weak rule** – rules can be broken if necessary, to establish maximum happiness in an extreme situation (teleological – goal orientated).
- J.S. Mill’s version tends to be classified as weak rule because he accepted that there were times when rules may need to be set aside to achieve greatest happiness for the greatest number.
- Mill’s version of Utilitarianism is not clearly teleological.
- It is teleological in the sense that when establishing a rule, this is done through considering the goal of happiness or pleasure for the majority in general.
• It is deontological because, once a rule is established, it becomes a duty for us to uphold this law for the sake of majority happiness.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

4. Explain why Mill developed the idea that not all pleasures are the same.

• A common challenge used against Bentham’s Utilitarianism is the sadistic guards problem.
• There is an innocent man, wrongly imprisoned, being watched over by three sadistic guards who gain pleasure through torturing their charge. According to Bentham’s quantitative version of Utilitarianism, Mill argues that the torture is allowable because there is more pleasure than pain being produced by this act. Yet most of us would argue that the act is surely wrong.
• A notable change made by Mill to Bentham’s Utilitarianism, was to focus on the claim that pleasure was qualitative instead of quantitative.
• Thomas Carlyle had called Utilitarianism ‘pig philosophy’ because it appealed to basic, animalistic urges rather than more sophisticated human requirements.
• Mill agreed that what makes us human is that we want more out of life than the basic swinish pleasures.
• In the case of the sadistic guards, Mill would argue that the act of torture is wrong.
• Mill interpreted pleasure like Aristotle. Eudaemonia is the kind of happiness that we all seek.
• Mill claimed that pleasure could be analysed qualitatively. So, there are pleasures that could be deemed as higher pleasures and some that are lower.
• Higher pleasures are of greater value than lower pleasures.
• Higher pleasure – intellectual | what makes us human rather than like other animals | superior to other pleasures.
  e.g. reading a book, engaging in philosophy, scientific study, visiting an art gallery, spirituality.
• Lower pleasures – basic | physical | animalistic
  e.g. eating, drinking, sleeping, sex.
• We must satisfy lower pleasures to exist but, higher pleasure can be worth sacrificing a lower pleasure for.
• When we make a moral decision, we should weigh up the value of the act based on whether there is a higher quality pleasure at stake or a lower quality one.
• We don’t always choose the higher pleasure over the lower one if we haven’t been educated and experienced the full range of pleasures properly.
• So, everyone should be exposed to the higher pleasures through education as it helps them to make better moral choices.
• In the example of the sadistic guards, the kind of pleasure that the guards gain is very base and does not outweigh the severe pain experienced by the one prisoner, even though there are more of them. Therefore, the act of torture is not justified.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.
5. Apply Bentham’s Act Utilitarianism to the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent.

- **Act Utilitarianism** is a term that is applied retrospectively to Bentham. This means that we associate it with him, not that he created the term.
- The principle of utility is sometimes known as the greatest happiness for the greatest number.
- Act Utilitarianism weighs up each individual act according to the situation that it occurs in.
- No rules are applied in advance
- Each situation is evaluated according to the amount of happiness or pain resulting from each action so the issue of nuclear weapons as a deterrent cannot have a simple rule that applies in each case.
- Each situation is unique and should be weighed up according to the hedonic calculus
- Nine countries possess nuclear weapons intended to deter the other nations from attacking them. To establish whether this is acceptable we must weigh it up according to the calculus.
- **Duration:**
  - Hiroshima and Nagasaki showed it would shorten any conflict considerably.
  - Nuclear fallout and long-term consequences would be extensive.
- **Richness:**
  - Possessing weapons leads to a climate of fear and mistrust between countries.
  - Such weapons kill indiscriminately which would not lead to future happiness.
- **Purity:**
  - Weapons would only be used in proportion to the threat by an enemy
  - There are no geographical or environmental boundaries to the devastation caused by use.
- **Remoteness**
  - Pain experienced by detonating such weapons is far into the future.
  - Happiness is postponed by continual striving to develop superior weapons.
- **Intensity**
  - Survivors of an attack would experience severe pain for a lifetime.
  - The fear experienced by vulnerable, unprotected nations would be strong.
- **Certainty**
  - Animosity will increase between nations, escalating the threat of attack.
  - Activating such weapons will cause widespread destruction and genocide.
- **Extent**
  - Possession of such weapons ensures safety from threats by other nations too.
  - Possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) by competing countries has triggered wars in the past.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

Sample A02 Question – page 90

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

1. Evaluate the view that the harm principle works well in modern society.

   **Introduction**
The harm principle – we may never limit the freedom of others to act, except to prevent harm being done to other people.

‘Works well’ – suggests that it is effective in producing a happy outcome for the majority of people in today’s world.

**Paragraph one**
- The harm principle is a type of Rule Utilitarianism which preserves modern values of autonomy and protects the vulnerable therefore it works well to produce maximum happiness.
- The harm principle does not protect the vulnerable when they are a risk to themselves since it only protects from harming others.
- The harm principle is too limited to work well since it doesn’t give us a responsibility for those who have no impact upon the pain or happiness of other people.

**Paragraph two**
- The harm principle does not work well as cannot protect the environment, being only concerned with human happiness.
- Yet, in the long-term human happiness is dependent upon the environment being preserved for our well-being and happiness so it may work well.
- The harm principle is still dependent upon the idea that happiness is the most important thing, and some may feel that this is too limited as an ethical position in today’s world.

**Paragraph three**
- The harm principle effectively stops the egoistic abuse of others for personal gain and this is a problem that needs addressing in today’s world
- The harm principle also gives people the freedom to act according to what makes us happy as individuals since we are unique and flourish in different ways.
- Today’s focus on individual liberty and freedom to act allows people to be neglectful of others and the harm principle still allows this to take place.

**Conclusion**

Whilst the harm principle is a useful and simple way of ensuring some protection of the weak in a society that is in pursuit of happiness, there is no way to ensure that our acts cannot harm other people. There is always a risk that we will cause offence, cause physical or mental distress directly or indirectly from our actions because consequences are unpredictable and impossible to control so it does not work well in today’s world.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence**

2. ‘A religious believer could never follow a Utilitarian ethic.’ Evaluate this view.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.
Introduction

‘Could never’ implies that there cannot be any common ground for religious believers and Utilitarians.

Paragraph one

- The utility principle is universal regardless of whether someone is religious so there is no reason why a religious person couldn’t follow it.
- However, a non-believer has no better basis for moral decisions, but the believer has God who is an absolute and perfect authority.
- Ultimately, religious believers cannot in conscience put their own reasoning regarding happiness above God’s commands.

Paragraph two

- Believers can never be content with relying on flawed human desires over the will of God, so they could never follow Utilitarianism.
- However, Mill claimed that the utility principle is the godliest as it is equivalent to the golden rule. God only wants happiness for his creation since he loves us.
- The motivation behind Utilitarianism is different that that of a religious believer, even if the outcome is the same, so it is unlikely that a religious believer could follow Utilitarianism.

Paragraph three

- Utilitarianism approaches morality scientifically but believers prefer faith.
- Yet, it is also the aim of the ten commandments to create as much happiness as possible by avoiding harmful behaviour and promoting behaviour that causes happiness.
- But Utilitarianism is subjective and relative whereas religious ethics tend to be more deontological, considering God’s laws as absolute.

Conclusion

There is no direct reference to God, but this makes it inclusive and adaptable to any world view even a religious one. So, some religious believers may find themselves able to follow Utilitarianism as a practical way of creating happiness in God’s world.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.
4 Determinism and Free Will

4A Religious concepts of predestination

Now Test Yourself – page 92
1. What is concupiscence?
   Concupiscence – Intense longing directed away from God and towards the world. Characterised by sexual acts.

2. What is Christ’s role in Augustinian thinking?
   We cannot perform good works without God’s grace and Christ’s atonement. Christ came into the world and died for the atonement of the elect not the reprobates.

3. Describe our human nature
   Our essential human nature is free (liberum arbitrium). Our second nature is sinful and overrides our essential human nature.

Now Test Yourself – page 93
1. Which scholar argued against Calvinism?
   Arminius.

2. How are the elect chosen for eternal bliss?
   God exercises his sovereignty by choosing who is saved and who is damned.

3. What is double predestination?
   Double predestination – God predestines both the elect and the reprobates.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 93
1. Make a list of as many characteristics as possible of the Theistic God.
   Omniscient
   Omnibenevolent
   Omnipresent
   Omnipotent
   Transcendent
   Immanent
   Eternal
   Everlasting
   One
   Forgiving
   Just/judge

2. Which of these characteristics are upheld by the theology of Augustine and Calvin?
   Omniscient – God knows our ultimate destination and what we will ‘choose’.
Omnibenevolent – God allows redemption for some people, although redemption is not deserved.

Omnipotent – God is the supreme power who can decide the actions and destination of humanity.

Transcendent – God is outside time and so can see our future.

Immanent – God is active in the affairs of humanity in the present time.

One – there is no other power but God who can control the fate of humanity.

Forgiving – God forgives the elect whom he chooses.

Just/judge – God condemns the reprobates.

### 4B Concepts of determinism

**Now Test Yourself – page 96**

1. What is hard determinism?
   Hard determinism states that all human behaviour is caused by something external to us, so there are no free decisions. This is a materialist approach that operates according to the principle of universal causation – that every effect has an antecedent cause. This incompatibilist theory maintains free will to be illusory.

2. Why is John Locke considered by some to be a hard determinist?
   Locke says that our action is preceded by our will which comes from a desire for pleasure. The sleeping man desires pleasure so decides to stay. Once he has decided to stay, provided no one forcibly evicts him, he will necessarily stay. His action is necessarily determined by his will. For the man’s desire to be free, it must be within his control. If it leads back to a first cause, external to the man then he is not free.

3. Why would biological determinism suggest we are not free beings?
   The mapping of the human genome has given rise to the idea of genetic fixity, that is that our personality and characteristics are determined by our genes which are inherited from our parents and are outside of our control.

**Now Test Yourself – page 97**

1. What is compatibilism?
   Compatibilism – the notion that free will and determinism can both be accepted without logical paradox.

2. What example does Hobbes give to demonstrate the difference between internal and external causes?
   A man throws his belongings into the sea because the boat lurches – external cause (not free).
   A man throws his belongings into the sea because he is frightened that otherwise it will sink – internal cause of fear (free).
3. Why does Ayer say that there is a difference between cause and constraint?
   Free will should not be contrasted with determinism. Instead it should be contrasted with force or constraint. All acts are clearly caused, not uncaused, but a forced or constrained act will be one that occurs regardless of a person’s resolve. A free act is caused by the will of the agent.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 97

Consider the following scenario:

A mother of a one-year old child calls the police and confesses to harming her daughter. When the police arrive, the child is dead and there is evidence that she has been shaken.

What would each of the five determinist approaches say regarding the mother’s responsibility for her actions?

1. Locke – the mother was not free because her decision to shake her child came about as a result of precedent causes that were external to her. She only has the illusion of freedom to choose.
2. Scientific determinism – her genes gave her a predisposition to react with violence and rage when feeling frustrated and out of control.
3. Pavlov – the mother’s behaviour was trained into her by society or her family because her prior experiences taught her to respond violently when frustrated.
4. Hobbes – If the cause of the mother’s behaviour was internal rather than external, then we can call her free.
5. Ayer – Provided she has the choice not to shake her child, and provided that she wanted to do so, we can call her free, even though we might say that she was caused to do so by her nature or her nurture.

4C The implications of predestination/determinism

Now Test Yourself – page 99

1. Give three reasons why a hard determinist might reject the idea of moral responsibility
   - The blame for any action, good or bad, lies back of the agent performing it. There is no sense in holding an agent morally responsible. (Darrow)
   - If an agent is violent because they have a gene predisposing them to this behaviour, blaming them will not affect their genetics.
   - We are conditioned to believe that some things are good and others bad. The conditioning stimulus is from family and society. (Freud)

2. Give three reasons why a soft determinist might reject moral responsibility
   A person’s will is brought about by antecedent causes, so we might call it free, but it is more a consciousness of necessity. (Ayer)

3. Give three reasons why moral responsibility might be accepted by a determinist as reasonable.
   - Blaming is part of the conditioning stimulus needed to create a being who is useful to society. (Skinner)
Recognising the causes that operate upon us, might help us redirect them. Concepts of right or wrong provide incentives to do so.

Ethical standards are not intrinsically worthy, but they help to keep society in order. This is valuable in its practicality. (Freud)

Now Test Yourself – page 100

1. Who should be blamed for evil if we are predestined and why?
   - God – he predestined us for heaven or hell and foreknew that the fall would take place
   - Us – prior to the fall our human nature was free and so Adam freely chose to eat from the tree.

2. Explain with an example, why Augustine and Calvin might consider prayer to be useful.
   Prayer is evidence that someone is a member of the elect that is enabled by God. For example, if I pray for forgiveness for my sins, it is only because God’s grace allows me to do so and so it is a sign that God has chosen me. It does not affect his decision at all, it is evidence of his decision beforehand.

3. Give three reasons why God might not be considered all-loving if we are predestined.
   - If God predestines some for hell and creates them knowing that they will spend eternity in damnation, then he is malevolent.
   - If God only elects some to heaven, then he is not all-loving. In this case he is loving only to some.
   - A God who creates hell when he is creating all things does not have love in mind as a response to humanity.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 101

There are many synoptic links to be made with other parts of the Ethics and the Philosophy papers. Make a list of all the other areas where our being predestined or determined have an impact. For example:

- the problem of evil – the free will defence
- Divine Command Theory – the meaningfulness of ethical language if we are not free.
- Ethical theories and applied ethics – Our ability to freely follow any of these theories if we are determined or predestined.
- Religious experience – conversion, to what extent is a conversion possible or even genuine if our decisions are decreed by God in advance or caused by a material cause external to us.
- Miracles – the extent to which we are ever able to analyse arguments and accept or reject them based on reason. These events may have a material cause.
- Arguments against religion – Freud – The extent to which each person is controlled but their Oedipus complex and the superego.

Specimen Exam Questions

Sample AO1 Questions – page 104

1. Compare the teachings on predestination from Calvin and Augustine
2. Examine the concept of hard determinism

- Hard determinism states that all human behaviour is caused by something external to us, so there are no free decisions.
  - A materialist approach (non-religious, matter is all there is)
  - Universal causation (everything is subject to cause)
  - Every effect has an antecedent cause
  - Incompatibilist theory (says that free will and determinism are not compatible)
  - Free will is illusory.
- Philosophical determinism: John Locke’s thinking is used to support the theory of universal causation. He claims that it is our ignorance of the causes of our actions that makes us think we are free.
- Locke analyses the requirements for us to claim someone has the power of freedom. He concludes that a person must have:
  - The power of thought
  - The ability to act according to our thoughts
- E.g. A sleeping man is carried into a room where there is a person whom he longs to speak with. The room is locked and when the man awakes, he decides to stay and talk to the person he has been wishing to see.
- The man can think and act in accordance with his thoughts so his action seems free. But his freedom is illusory.
  - The sleeping man, on awakening desires to stay.
o For the desire to be free, it must be within his control.
o To be in his control, the desire must be formed by his will.
o That will must be formed by his will to remain free.
o This leads to a logical regress.

- If it leads back to a first cause, external to the man then he is not free.
- Once he has decided to stay, provided no one forcibly evicts him, he will necessarily stay. His action is necessarily determined by his will.
- This idea is supported by science and psychology.
- Scientific determinism treats every feature of the world as mechanistic, so for every physical action there is a physical cause. This is the principle of universal causation.
- Biological determinism has its roots in the work of Darwinism and claims that all beings have a genetic formula. The discovery of DNA and the mapping of the human genome have given rise to the concept of genetic fixity.
- Both physical and mental features are passed from parent to child at conception meaning that all traits have a physical nature. In the study of genetics, some genes have been identified that are responsible for:
  o Religious experience
  o Sexuality
  o Addiction
  o Violence.
- Within the discipline of psychology, Pavlov noticed that a natural reaction of a dog to food is to salivate and produce stomach acid. This reaction appears to be unconscious and not something that the dog wills. He discovered through experimentation that he could train such a response into a dog with the use of external stimuli.
- When offering food to a dog, Pavlov rang a bell. The dog, as expected had an unconditioned response of salivation. However, eventually the response of salivation would then occur when there was neither sight nor smell of food and even when the dog was not hungry. This depends on the psychological mechanism of association and was a conditioned response.
- If applied to human beings it means that our behaviour is conditioned rather than free.

**This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.**

3. Explain The implications of predestination on religious belief.

If we are predestined by God, this means that our ultimate destination is controlled and decided by Him without reference to our actions or choices at all. This has implications for the character of God and for the authority of scripture.

The work of Augustine may lead a believer to conclude:

- God created eternal damnation, suggesting that he planned for the fact that we would fall.
- God is a passive excuser of evil by failing to elect some for heaven.
- God is omniscient and so foreknew the evil humans would cause when he created us.
- God cannot be all loving if he only elects some to heaven and not all of us.
- God’s power is limited if he sits back and allows us to be damned by the actions of Adam.
- God’s power is limited if his creation can go wrong and become damaged.
Alternatively, Augustinian idea of predestination can imply:

- God did not make evil as he created only good things.
- Humanity’s essential nature was free, so it is our fault that we allowed evil to prevail.
- God allows evil to stay so that we can understand good as something different.
- God is uninfluenced by human activity. This means that he retains his power.
- Since God has provided salvation for the elect; no human action is necessary.
- God’s creation was a perfect gift for humanity. He loves us.

Calvin could also lead us to believe that:

- God is responsible for evil as he created all things.
- God actively reprobated some, so he condemns them to hell regardless of their actions.
- The elect are still sinful. God saves them anyway, apparently condoning evil deeds.
- By predestining us, God performs evil acts, condemned by scripture. (e.g. killing)
- God is malevolent if he actively pre-reprobates people but still creates them anyway.
- If God is all-loving but does not save us all, then maybe he lacks the power to do so.

Alternatively, Calvin could lead to us believe that:

- God is benevolent, allowing the sinner to be forgiven through Christ and so saved from evil.
- God’s damnation of some is a divine mystery. We can trust in his authoritative judgement.
- God is linked to evil through his rejection of it. By reprobating, he demonstrates his total power.
- God is fully omnipotent because he controls all actions and outcomes.
- God is good and powerful because once we are predestined as the elect, we cannot fall away.
- Justice demanded human punishment. God did not have to save anyone, but he did out of love.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

Compare the concepts of hard and soft determinism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hard determinism</th>
<th>Soft determinism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materialist</td>
<td>Materialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal causation</td>
<td>Universal Causation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibilist – freedom and universal causation cannot co-exist</td>
<td>Compatibilist – freedom and universal causation can co-exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All events are caused and therefore no event can be free</td>
<td>All events are caused but logically it is still possible to consider a moral being capable of free decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one can be blamed for their actions because they are not responsible for them if they are caused</td>
<td>People may still be blamed for their actions even though they are caused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free will and determinism are opposites</td>
<td>Free will cannot be contrasted with determinism, it is instead contrasted with constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Locke (philosophical determinism) is used to show that free will is an illusion because we cannot will what we will</td>
<td>Thomas Hobbes (compatibilism) argues that there is a difference between internal and external causes. An internal cause retains our freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sleeping man analogy shows that he cannot get out of the room even if he tried to</td>
<td>The analogy of the man throwing his belongings overboard shows that a constrained action is not in accordance with a person’s will, but a free action, whilst caused, is caused by desires internal to the agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreover, he cannot try to leave because he necessarily is caused to stay by his desire to speak to the other man.</td>
<td>If we possess the liberty of spontaneity — the ability to act as we choose without constraint. Then we can be called free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Pavlov (psychological determinism) Demonstrated through his dogs that we can be conditioned to behave in certain ways</td>
<td>A.J. Ayer (compatibilist) says all events must be caused for us to be morally responsible. If they are random then they are not our fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In his experiment, it was shown that dogs could be taught to salivate at the sound of a bell. They are unable to control when or why they salivate.</td>
<td>In his example of the kleptomaniac, he is constrained or forced because he cannot choose not to steal even if he wants to, but the ordinary thief is caused by his will but not forced against his will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific determinism says that our genes are responsible for our actions as well as our physical appearance</td>
<td>Compatibilism agrees that our genes are one of the causal factors that operate upon us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They give us a tendency for religious belief, violence, sexuality and addiction for example</td>
<td>Genes are not the only causal factor, causes are many and varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic fixity says we cannot do anything different</td>
<td>When we cannot do anything differently we are not free, but when there is a choice for us to make and we can make it in accordance with what we want, we can be called free.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

   - Soft determinism, also known as compatibilism, accepts that both determinism and free will can simultaneously be true.
   - Compatibilism is defined as the notion that free will and determinism can both be accepted without logical paradox.
   - Soft determinists propose that we possess only the liberty of spontaneity.
   - Liberty of spontaneity means the ability to act as we choose without constraint.
   - Supported by the work of Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679)
   - There is no such thing as an agent whose action is uncaused. But there are different types of causes. Free will does not mean we are uncaused. It means we are free from constraint.
   - An external cause comes from outside the self, it is a constraint of will and part of a causal chain. It is necessary – it cannot not occur/must occur
   - An internal cause comes from within the self, it is in accordance with the will yet still part of a causal chain. It is also necessary.
   - For example, a man throws his belongings into the sea because the boat lurches - external cause (not free).
But a man throws his belongings into the sea because he is frightened that otherwise it will sink – internal cause of fear (free).

Every action has an antecedent cause and so both the above acts are necessarily caused. The one act that is unconstrained, originating from an internal cause, is free.

A.J. Ayer was a compatibility scholar. He offers us two options. Either:

1. An act is uncaused – such events are random accidents and so not free.
2. An act is caused – this leads us back to determinism.

Free will should not be contrasted with determinism. Instead it should be contrasted with force or constraint. All acts are clearly caused, not uncaused, but a forced or constrained act will be one that occurs regardless of a person’s resolve. A free act is caused by the will of the agent.

For example, the kleptomaniac steals even if he resolves not to. He is constrained. The regular thief’s action is caused by a lack of money or a desire for a thrill, but he is not constrained and if he decides not to steal, then he won’t. One can act in accordance with his desires, the other cannot.

Provided that:

1. There is a choice in how to act
2. I can act according to my own desires
3. I am not constrained/forced

I am acting freely. Being caused just provides an explanation for my actions.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

Sample AO2 Question – page 104

1. Evaluate the view that there is no value in blaming people for immoral action if determinism is correct.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction: ‘No value’ Is a universal, sweeping statement that says that there is nothing positive at all to be gained from praise or blame.

Paragraph one

- There is a lot of value because blame is a way of conditioning people to behave in a certain way.
- The way that we want people to behave has no universal value, it is just an opinion conditioned in us, so it has no inherent value.
- There may be some value, because it may allow us to condition people to step in line with society’s subjective values and this allows that society to function.

Paragraph two

- We need both praise and blame to ensure that our actions have meaning. Without this nothing matters.
• Even if we try to accept soft determinism, we cannot choose our desires so every decision we make is formed for us by something external, our actions have no value.
• Praise and blame are motivators to give us a reason for making choices, even if that choice is ultimately illusory. It is a necessary illusion.

**Paragraph three**

• Provided our behaviour has not been forced, praise or blame is a reasonable step that allows a group of people to function together.
• It makes no logical sense to do so, if the reason for it lies external to the agent, so it has no value. It only appears free.
• Maybe the value of blame is simply to indicate how useful an individual is as a member of a society rather than to indicate an objective standard.

**Conclusion**

Praise and blame have some value, rather than no value at all. It does not necessarily make rational sense to blame a person who had no choice in their behaviour. However, a society requires structure to function coherently and individual require purpose to function healthily. Therefore, blame is needed to enable society and individuals to function.

**Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence**

2. ‘The strengths of soft determinism outweigh its weaknesses.’ Evaluate this view.

**There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.**

**Introduction:** ‘outweigh’ could mean that the strengths offer a more powerful argument, or it could mean that quantitatively there are more of them.

**Paragraph one**

• Soft determinism is a strong argument because it combines evidence of causation with our experience of choice making.
• However, hard determinism is stronger as it has more evidence from every discipline.
• Shared human experience of freedom is powerful in both quality of evidence and quantity.

**Paragraph two**

• We cannot know all the interrelated causes for every human action. It is equally possible that soft determinism, hard determinism or libertarianism could true.
• Soft determinism rests upon that shared experience of deliberating so is consistent with all the evidence that we have freedom.
• Soft determinism is rather circular as it results in a necessary cause eventually, it just takes longer to get there.

**Paragraph three**
- Soft determinism is an exercise in semantics, it just redefines the definitions of the key terms until we can call ourselves free, but it is no different from hard determinism.
- Libertarianism relies too much on us being uncaused causers or independent of any external influences, whereas soft determinism recognises how we are part of the world.
- Hard determinism generalises based upon evidence, but it is practically impossible to conclusively verify. There only needs to be one case where something is uncaused for the whole theory to fall apart.

Conclusion

Soft determinism is stronger than the other approaches in that its arguments are more powerful because it resorts to a combination of human experience and scientific understanding of causation. However, the arguments and evidence for hard determinism are quantitatively more in its favour as there is so much evidence that shows a link because events from many disciplines.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.
4 Determinism and free will

4D Religious concepts of free will

Now Test Yourself – page 106

1. What did Pelagius say about the role of original sin?
   - Adam’s sin only affected Adam.
   - Even before the fall, Adam would have been subject to death.
   - Human nature was modified but not corrupted by sin.
   - Adam set a bad example, he did not condemn us.
   - Christ set a good example, he did not save us.
   - Children are born innocent of Adam’s sin in the same state as Adam before the fall.
   - Baptism is not required for forgiveness of original sin, and children who die unbaptised can still go to heaven.
   - Participation in a fallen world leads to sin, not inherited sinfulness.
   - Rich baptised people will not inherit eternal life unless they give it all up.
   - It is possible for some to die innocent if they never commit a sin, even before Christ.

2. Does it matter how we behave in this life?
   - Yes, it does.
   - We can choose both good and bad acts.
   - It is our action that makes us fit for salvation or condemnation, not faith alone.
   - The fall enabled the possibility for humans to grow to maturity through learning to make good choices.
   - It is necessary for humans to make an effort to reject sin if they are truly repentant.
   - God requires us to put effort into trying to act in a perfect way.

3. What does Pelagius think grace is?
   God’s grace will help humans achieve salvation but does not dictate it. Pelagian grace appears in three forms:
   - **Original/natural grace** – given to all at birth, it is the natural, God given, gift of free will. Grace from God gives us the ability to do good if we choose to. This allows us to choose God for ourselves, avoid sin and save ourselves.
   - **Grace of revelation** – given by God through reason and scripture. It is law or guidance, to inform us of God’s will. We can then choose whether to obey.
   - **The grace of pardon** – God’s gift of forgiveness for us. This means that Christ’s actions on the cross do not save us, but make forgiveness, if we seek it, possible.

Now Test Yourself – page 108

1. Who presented the five articles of remonstrance?
   Followers of Jacobus Arminius at the Synod of Dort, after the death of Arminius.

2. How does Arminius combine free will and predestination?
   - Christ is the foundation and power behind salvation, reprobation is distance from him.
   - Election and reprobation are conditional upon human faith.
• Election and reprobation occur with God’s foreknowledge.
• Grace is given by God through the holy spirit, but is utilised by humanity.
• This gift of prevenient grace or common grace is given, regardless of any action of mankind. Nothing else is needed.
• Humanity is tainted by original sin. This deprives us of goodness, so we cannot choose God by ourselves. Free choice is only possible because the cross empowers us with the gift of grace to all, allowing us to freely choose Christ.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 108

1. Imagine your best friend must decide between going to a party or sitting down to revise. Can you say you know which (s)he will choose? Not according to Pelagius or Arminius. However, God, according to Arminius, does know, even though he doesn’t cause the decision himself.

2. If you know, is (s)he free to choose it? Yes, (s)he is free to choose because thought God’s grace we are free to choose.

3. Is this example adequate to illustrate conditional election? Why / Why not? Yes – it demonstrates the genuineness of human freedom and ability to go for or against God’s will. No – this example is trivial and not concerning the belief or faith in God or the ultimate destination.

4 Concepts of libertarianism

Now Test Yourself – page 110

1. What does ‘existence precedes essence’ mean? We come into existence first and take on personality, individual nature and purpose later.

2. How do we make ourselves? From moment to moment through the making of our own free choices.

3. Why is freedom negative? It is a burden rather than a privilege as we are solely responsible for our actions and can blame no one but ourselves.

Now Test Yourself – page 111

1. Which part of the brain gave patients the sensation that they had moved? The parietal cortex

2. What was the other part of the brain responsible for once stimulated? Feeds back the results of the instructions to the parietal cortex
3. Why has this been interpreted to mean we have free will?
   The parietal cortex is responsible for ‘selecting’ behaviour from a range of choices.

Now Test Yourself – page 112

1. In what way does Rogers accept conditioning?
   Rogers acknowledges that conditioning affects us, especially during our childhood experiences. Without:
   - Genuineness (permission to explore their own ideas)
   - Acceptance (unconditional love)
   - Empathy (understanding)
   A child conforms to conditioning.

2. How can we overcome our conditioning?
   Becoming a fully functioning person and being given the permission to explore our own ideas.

3. What is meant by Self-actualisation?
   To fulfil our potential by getting our self-image to reflect our ideal self.

Apply Your Knowledge – page 112

Hinterland is a Welsh ‘whodunnit’ series. In episode one, Helen Jenkins is murdered after having supervised children at a care home in Devil’s Bridge. Watch the first episode/series then answer the questions below. (Or use any ‘whodunnit’ of your choice) (Season 1, Episode 1)

1. Does any character act in bad faith during the murder enquiry?
   Byron Rodgers – caretaker and partner in crime against the children. Seeing himself as pressured into choosing not to protect the children.
   Catrin John – acting the part of a good citizen and mother. Hiding her true choices regarding Helen. Pretending that she was never taught morals and that she didn’t know any better. Posing as Emma Jones. Blaming her terrible circumstances when really, she had a choice whether to kill or to lie.
   Jenny James – pretending to be Helen’s killer. Pretending not to be able to control her actions because she was frightened. Blaming her terrible circumstances when really, she could choose whether to kill or lie.
   DCI Tom Matthias – appears dethatched and distant from everyone. Acting the part of the professional police investigator, unwilling to reveal his true desires or concerns.
   N.B. bad faith is not simply lying to someone or hiding a bad action. It is play acting in the sense that a person pretends that they have no choice in how they act rather than that they have a choice.

2. How can Sirigu’s research explain the murderer’s actions?
   Catrin John’s parietal cortex selected an option and sent the message to her premotor cortex, instructing it how to act. The premotor cortex then reported back that the action had happened.

3. How would Rogers account for the behaviour of the children in care?
Their upbringing did not contain genuineness, acceptance or empathy. This means that they were unable to escape their conditioning. Their desire to self-actualise was unable to be realised because their self-image was damaged, and their ideal self was unrealistic.

4. Does the libertarian position allow us to punish Helen Jenkins’ killer?
   - Yes – each person is fully responsible for their own behaviour
   - No – everyone needs to be allowed genuineness, acceptance and empathy

**4F The implications of libertarianism and free will**

**Now Test Yourself – page 114**

1. Why does Sartre reject human ideas of right and wrong?
   - Ethics and religion try to make rational sense of a senseless universe.
   - But the absurd universe is characterised by suffering and death.

2. How does Sirigu’s research suggest that praise and blame could be valuable?
   If this research has accurately identified free will in our brains, it is valuable to praise or blame people for their acts as their choices to act do come from within them.

3. Why might Rogers find normative ethics useful?
   He may not because it prevents us from being free to explore our own ideas. But overriding this conditioning is how we self-actualise. Relativist ethics give us the chance to make our own decisions in the moment according to our needs.

**Apply Your Knowledge – page 115**

Watch an episode of *The 100*. In each episode the characters are forced to make difficult moral choices in extreme situations. *(Season 2 Episode 8)*

1. Where do the characters get their moral values from?
   From their society in space when they were orbiting the earth and from their current situation as they fight for their lives.

2. If Clarke and the others are free, do they need any normative ethics?
   No – they need to decide how to live from moment to moment and take responsibility for their decisions. Normative ethics provide excessive constraints. Yes – Situation Ethics for example, provides a frame work for free decision but also a heathy self-concept. It was loving of Clarke to kill Finn to prevent further suffering at the hands of the grounders but ensured that the grounders sense of justice was also served due to Finn’s prior actions against the villagers.

3. What do you think it would say about God, if he allowed these kinds of actions as part of his creation?
   These actions are not consistent with the biblical understanding of God as loving to all people since the whole series contains huge amounts of killing and torment. However, such behaviour is the result of decision making in the moment by people who are free to do either good or evil.
God could be malevolent if he creates humanity capable of causing such suffering. Or he may be distant or unable to help. It brings us back to the problem of evil.

Now Test Yourself – page 116

1. How could Arminius defend God from being the author of evil?
   Humanity is tainted by original sin. This means that evil was brought into the world through human free will, not by God.

2. How does Pelagius retain God’s goodness if humans are free?
   We do not inherit original sin means divine reward or punishment is based on our own free actions. God is good not arbitrary; he allows salvation to all deserving people.

3. Why might prayer be seen as useless if humans are free beings?
   There is no point in praying if God avoids answering to preserve our freedom. There is also a logical contradiction in a God who answers prayers for people who could pray opposing things.

Sample AO1 Questions – page 119

1. Compare the religious concepts of free will from Pelagius and Arminius.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pelagius</th>
<th>Arminius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam’s sin only affected Adam.</td>
<td>Humanity is tainted by original sin. This deprives us of goodness, so we cannot choose God by ourselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human nature was modified but not corrupted by sin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam set a bad example, he did not condemn us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are born innocent of Adam’s sin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ set a good example, he did not save us. It is our actions that save us</td>
<td>Christ is the foundation and power behind salvation, reprobation is distance from him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fall enabled the possibility for humans to grow to maturity through learning to make good choices</td>
<td>The fall caused original sin. We can only exercise free will because it was provided through Christ’s death on the cross for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God requires us to put effort into trying to act in a perfect way</td>
<td>Election and reprobation are conditional upon human faith. Salvation depends on our own efforts in cooperation with God. We need, God’s assistance to strive against evil, but it is still our own effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture contains God’s law. We can apply our free will and choose to follow his laws. We are saved by our acts, not simply by our faith alone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are three types of grace given to us:</td>
<td>God give the unconditional gift of prevenient grace or common grace. Nothing else is needed for salvation. Prevenient grace = the gift of freedom to choose good, given through the Holy Spirit via Christ’s death on the cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original/natural grace – the gift of free will, given to all at birth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace of revelation – reason and scripture given by God that informs us of God’s will.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grace of pardon – God’s gift of forgiveness for us. Christ’s actions do not save us but makes forgiveness possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can do good works through free will but need divine help. All humans have this power of free will, but only Christians receive God’s help through grace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human freedom given by Christ’s atonement is genuine, God plans to save everyone, but we can thwart his plans and be lost in hell. The sinner chooses God through grace, but God does not force the sinner.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predestination is God’s foreknowledge not his direction of our action. God knows in advance who will seek pardon and salvation for their sins but does not cause our salvation or damnation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predestination is God’s foreknowledge (middle knowledge) not coercive power. God knows who will freely accept or reject Christ and rewards or condemns them accordingly as stated in scripture. This is decided by the omniscient God from the beginning of time based on what he foresees we will do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

2. Examine the philosophical defence of libertarianism from Sartre

- Libertarianism is a non-religious stance that asserts free decision making.
- Incompatibilist – claims our minds are unaffected by causation.
- Libertarians argue for both the liberty of spontaneity (the ability to act as we choose without constraint) and the liberty of indifference (a being is uncaused in their actions, but still somehow responsible).
- As an existentialist, Jean Paul Sartre argued that humans make ourselves.
- There is no God or objective dogma to guide us.
- Ethics and religion try to make rational sense of a senseless universe.
- The absurd universe is characterised by suffering and death.
- The agent alone is responsible for their decisions and actions.
- Sartre said that existence precedes essence. Our identity is not fixed before we exist. We are born tabula rasa (a blank slate). This contradicts the Bible’s claim that our soul pre-exists earthly life.
- We make ourselves from moment to moment, through free decision making and action, evidenced by our self-conscious experience of deliberation before we act. There is no reason to assume that one decision is better than another.
- There is a distance between the human mind and the external world (the gap). Cause and effect does not operate on our minds as it does on the world. We cannot override our physical restrictions, but being human involves freely forming our own ideals and taking responsibility for them.
  - We make decisions and then act to bring about consequences.
  - We see the consequences, then set our own ideals.
  - We make further choices according to the ideals we invent.
  - We are constantly aware we could choose differently.
  - We thus make ourselves.
  - This responsibility is a burden.
  - We have no choice but to choose.
- In claiming that our actions are caused by external influences, we deny our freedom and act in bad faith. This means we give in to social forces and adopt external values. We do this when the alternative of accepting responsibility in an absurd world is too painful for us.
- Sartre gives the illustration of a waiter:
Imagine a pretentious waiter. His voice pompous, his actions ostentatious and overly keen. He is play-acting as an automaton rather than a human. He knows deep down he is not purely a waiter, he is consciously deceiving himself.

The waiter acts in bad faith (Mauvais Fois) by denying his own freedom and adopting the role dictated by society. He adopts false values. When we complain of our situations and how we are restricted by societal expectations, we act in bad faith. We are free to be authentically whatever we want to be.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

3. Explain the main arguments for libertarianism

Libertarianism is a non-religious stance that asserts free decision making. This philosophical position is incompatibilist since it claims our minds are unaffected by causation.

Libertarians argue for both the liberty of spontaneity (the ability to act as we choose without constraint) and the liberty of indifference (a being is uncaused in their actions, but still somehow responsible).

Philosophical libertarianism: (Jean Paul Sartre)

- Sartre said that existence precedes essence. Our identity is not fixed before we exist. We are born tabula rasa (a blank slate).
- We make ourselves from moment to moment, through free decision making and action, evidenced by our self-conscious experience of deliberation before we act. There is no reason to assume that one decision is better than another.
- There is a distance between the human mind and the external world (the gap). Cause and effect does not operate on our minds as it does on the world. We cannot override our physical restrictions, but being human involves freely forming our own ideals and taking responsibility for them.
  - We make decisions and then act to bring about consequences.
  - We see the consequences, then set our own ideals.
  - We make further choices according to the ideals we invent.
  - We are constantly aware we could choose differently.
  - We thus make ourselves.
  - This responsibility is a burden.
  - We have no choice but to choose.
- In claiming that our actions are caused by external influences, we deny our freedom and act in bad faith (Mauvaise Fois). This means we give in to social forces and adopt external values. Sartre gives the illustration of a waiter:
  - Imagine a pretentious waiter. His voice pompous, his actions ostentatious and overly keen. He is play-acting as an automaton rather than a human. He knows deep down he is not purely a waiter, he is consciously deceiving himself.
  - When we complain of our situations and how we are restricted by societal expectations, we act in bad faith. We are free to be authentically whatever we want to be.
Scientific libertarianism: (Angela Sirigu)

- Sirigu led a study in 2009 for the Cognitive Neuroscience Centre in Bron, France, that investigated the functions of different areas of the brain. The research involved experimentation on seven patients who were undergoing brain surgery to remove tumours. These patients were conscious and were able to report their experiences.
- Sirigu and her team stimulated two areas of the brain with probes:
  - Premotor cortex: When stimulated involuntary movement occurred and patients were unaware or even denied having moved.
  - Parietal cortex: With weak stimulation: patient felt the desire to move (roll their tongue, move fingers or arms) With strong stimulation: patient reported having moved yet researchers witnessed no movement.
- The discoveries demonstrated that the two regions work together in bringing about movement. The parietal cortex generates predictions about possible movements and selects and sends instructions to the premotor cortex. The premotor cortex feeds back the results of the instructions to the parietal cortex. It also might imply several things about our free will:
  - That the place in the brain where the free decision can be made to act, has been identified.
  - That the parietal cortex is responsible for ‘selecting’ behaviour from a range of choices.

Psychological determinism: (Carl Rogers)

- Rogers acknowledges that conditioning affects us, especially during our childhood experiences. A developing child requires:
  - Genuineness (permission to explore their own ideas)
  - Acceptance (unconditional love)
  - Empathy (understanding)
- Without these three things a child conforms to conditioning.
- But Rogers rejected behaviourism and any necessary determinism. Our behaviour emerges from our own unique perception of ourselves and our situation. His humanistic concept of ‘the self’ refers to who we really are as a person.
- Each person is unique.
- We all develop differently according to our personality.
- The self is composed of three unique concepts:
  - Self-worth – our value
  - Self-image – what we think we are like
  - Ideal self – our constantly changing goals
- We want to behave in line with our self-image
- We have one basic motive – the desire to self-actualise. This means to fulfil our potential by getting our self-image to reflect our ideal self.
- This requires:
  - Overriding the conditioning we received in early life
  - Becoming fully functioning persons
  - Being completely in touch with our feelings and experiences in the present moment.
- Becoming a fully functioning person is a continuous journey, not a destination.
- Freedom is necessary to be a fully functioning human being. People are unique, unpredictable and reactive and free.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.
4. Explain the implications of libertarianism on moral responsibility

- Libertarianism influences belief regarding the responsibility of human beings for moral decisions and behaviour. But it is not a clear case that if we are free we are responsible.
- Sartre claimed that the only ideas of right or wrong and moral value that matter, are yours. There are no objective rules or guidance that we can fall back on. His conclusion was that, you and only you are responsible for the actions and choices that you make – you have ultimate responsibility.
- My human ideas of right and wrong mean that I can create a decision by myself for myself. It is an act of creation and its value is intrinsic as it comes from me alone.
- However, moral value, community ideas of right and wrong hold no power over us and we act in bad faith when we behave as though they are authoritative.
- The scientist Francis Collins rejects what he calls ‘Genes R Us’ biological determinism. The genetic evidence presented through twin and gender studies demonstrate that we are all very different despite our genetic make-up. We are free and thus if society tells us we have performed an action that contravenes what is acceptable then we must take responsibility for that.
- Sirigu’s research may have demonstrated where free will is located in the human brain. She makes no judgement from this in terms of whether moral agents can be blamed or praised for their actions.
- But we can infer meaning from her work in either direction: If this research has accurately identified free will in our brains, it is valuable to praise or blame people for their acts as their choices to act do come from within them. However, Sirigu’s research does not demonstrate free will. Scientists could control decisions made in the parietal cortex, thus causing action. There is no value in blaming an agent for caused acts.
- Rogers maintained that we behave as we do because of the way we perceive our situation. No-one else can know how we perceive, so we are the best experts on ourselves. If a child is raised in a nurturing environment, or if we are given the opportunity to self-actualise, we are free.
- Normative ethical theories like Situation Ethics or Egoism provide individuals with a good environment, a healthy self-concept and freedom in their decision making so they can realise their full potential, and this makes us morally responsible for our actions.
- Natural Law or divine command instil excessive constraints. They prevent an agent from becoming fully functioning, the ideal self being at odds with their actual behaviour. These approaches work to condition us and remove our freedom and thus our responsibility.

*This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.*

5. Examine why Arminius rejected the Calvinist view of predestination

Arminius rejected Calvinistic predestination. He argued that this teaching made humanity automatons and God the author of sin. He amended his understanding of predestination rather than denying it, to allow room for both predestination and free will.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calvin taught:</th>
<th>Arminius taught:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The fall of Adam was the result of an absolute and positive decree by God</td>
<td>This teaching makes God the author of sin. Original sin taints us and deprives us of goodness but is not as a result of God’s decree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s predestination is both his foreknowledge and his active decree.</td>
<td>Calvinistic teaching makes God arbitrary or partisan. Predestination is God’s foreknowledge (middle knowledge) not coercive power. God knows who will freely accept or reject Christ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and rewards or condemns them accordingly as stated in scripture. This is decided by the omniscient God from the beginning of time based on what he foresees we will do. This preserves God’s power but also his benevolence by allowing us to choose him.

Humans are totally depraved/tainted by sin in every way because of the fall. We are therefore incapable of doing a good act apart from God’s grace.

Humanity is tainted by original sin. This deprives us of goodness, so we cannot choose God by ourselves. But, free choice is possible because the cross empowers us with the gift of grace to everyone, allowing us to freely choose Christ.

God exercises his sovereignty by choosing who is saved and who is damned. No one can resist God’s grace and commit apostacy. God has chosen, and nothing can be done to change this.

Apostasy is possible, allowing us to freely turn away, otherwise reward or punishment is meaningless.

Humans are not equal. Some are determined for election, others damnation and this is determined by God before our birth. We cannot choose God unless God has decreed it.

Christ’s death on the cross was for everyone allowing us to exercise our free will despite original sin. This gift of prevenient grace or common grace is given, regardless of any action of mankind. Nothing else is needed for salvation. Thus God is both omnipotent and omnibenevolent.

We can only be saved through God’s grace, not our works. God’s grace allows some to have faith and this was decided before creation by God.

Salvation is for all who choose God. It depends on our own efforts in cooperation with God. We need, and should desire, God’s assistance to strive against evil, but it is still our own effort. This gives people the protection of his grace not to be pulled away from him towards evil.

This is not a checklist. Any valid alternatives may be credited.

Sample AO2 Questions – page 119

1. Evaluate the view that prayer is pointless if humans are completely free.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction – Pointless = without purpose. Need to consider why people pray – worship, repentance, thanks, petition. Can any of these purposes be met if we are free beings?

Paragraph one

- God cannot answer our petitionary prayers without compromising some part of human freedom.
- However, a freely made prayer is one which consents to God’s interference.
- Yet, prayers concerning other people necessarily require the use of force by God if he is to answer. If we are free, this makes such prayers pointless.
Paragraph two

- Real communication requires both parties to respond to, not control each other. Real worship is communication with God.
- However, real freedom requires distance from knowledge of God, so he cannot respond to prayer.
- But this point is weak because distance from knowledge of God does not require us to be distant from his knowledge of us. It does mean that the knowledge we can gain is limited, but it is still reaching out to him which is valuable.

Paragraph three

- Petitionary prayer cannot be used to control God’s actions as he is not determined either.
- This kind of prayer reduces the world to a toy, where poor decisions are moot as God will fix them.
- Yet some argue that prayer is about freely changing ourselves, not others, to make us become more like God. This kind of meditative prayer has value as it affects our decisions and our actions.

Conclusion

Prayer is deliberation about our place in the world, not asking God to take over or fulfil our shopping lists. The purpose of prayer maybe more about a relationship between the divine and humanity, a deliberation about our place and role on earth and our relationships with others, than about making God our slave, or making us dependent upon him for our actions. This kind of prayer seems purposeful rather than pointless.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence

2. ‘Human beings have complete free choice.’ Evaluate this view.

There are so many acceptable ways to answer this question. The suggestion below is an acceptable method but not the only one.

Introduction – Complete free choice = suggests that nothing is determined at all within our decision making. To conclude about this question would require us to demonstrate that no aspect of our decision making is outside of our control.

Paragraph one

- Science tells us that are products of programming by genes and society. Nothing we do is free.
- Yet, Sartre claims that we make our own choices without control from any external agencies. This is certainly consistent with our human experience of decision making.
- Clearly, we cannot be said to be completely free since we cannot sprout wings and fly. Sartre does not recognise that there are certainly influences and controls that operate upon our nature.

Paragraph two
• Moral exhortations only make sense if we have the power to reject them or obey them, so we must have complete free choice for morality to make sense.
• However, psychology suggests we only reject or obey moral commands because we are programmed to do so.
• It seems that our complex brains can utilise a wide range of influences to make ‘free’ decisions. Maybe humans make free choices, but we must accept that there are complex influences too.

Paragraph three
• Religious teaching suggests that we lack freedom. If God is truly God, he must have the power over us that Calvin taught.
• Yet, Pelagius may be correct, and we can be said to be completely free to choose God or not.
• There is no real way to know which religious approach is true. If there is a God maybe we can be free to choose the mundane in life, but it makes no difference in the end.

Conclusion
To freely choose something necessarily requires the limitation of some other possibilities. I cannot have my cake and eat it, so to claim that we are completely free is nonsense. However, the soft determinist position allows for causation and lack of constraint and maybe this is the closest we can come to an account of freedom that makes sense in the face of science.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a conclusion about the question that has been supported with evidence.