



# GCSE and GCE Examining Bodies

For examiner's use
Examiner's initials

(55) = Me

(53) = Examiner

- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Write the information required in the spaces above.
- Use both sides of the paper.
- Write the question number in the left-hand margin.
- Rule a line across the page after each answer.
- Do all your rough work in this answer book and cross through any work you do not want to be marked. Do not tear out any part of this book. All work must be handed in.
- Write the numbers of the questions you answer in the order attempted in the left-hand column of the boxes opposite.
- Check that you have written the information required on each additional sheet used and have attached each sheet to this book.

Write here how many additional sheets you have used (if any).

Question number

Leave blank

3	Free	Not Free	Hard Determinism
	Free will	Predestination	Darwin ?
	Hume ✓	Calvin	Ted Honderich ✓
	Swinburne	Catholicism	John Hospers ✓
	Nietzsche	St Augustine	Newton ✓
	Aquinas	St Paul	John Locke ?
	Soft Determinist ✓		Voltaire
	Frank / James Rachels		Spinoza ✓
	External		
	Jones ✓		
	Watson ✓		
	Dewhurst ✓		
	Megeath ✓		

Whether we are free or not may seem rather trivial, some may say, 'does it matter? Enjoy life' - however, it brings with it a more pressing issue - if we are mostly free, then we are mostly responsible. If we are not, and our lives are already determined, we cannot be held morally responsible for any of our actions. Thus grew the 'determinism' vs 'Libertarianism' argument.

Firstly, a libertarian would argue that we are completely free in all most decisions we make, and consequently morally responsible. Such arguments come from empiricist Hume who argued "choice of acting, or not acting". Hume goes on to argue nothing is determined, and there is no good reason to expect the sun to rise. Furthermore, he argued, because when ~~of~~ observed  $x$  preceded  $y$ , did not make this the rule, just that things have happened previously. This argument is supported by Sams, who argues, without freedom of choice, there is no meaning to life. This argument is also called 'incompatibilism' as it is completely incompatible with ~~the~~ a hard determinist approach. Michael Palmer goes on to argue, that determinism confuses contingent truths, with necessary truths. Palmer provides this example: three runners are about to race. In previous races, runner A has always beaten runner B, and runner B has always beaten runner C. This may be contingently true, but it is not necessarily true that runner A will beat runner C in the next race. Past events don't determine future events; runner A may trip and lose, or runner C may have their performance enhancing drug - nothing is determined, and consequently people are free to make ~~morally~~ decisions freely.

While many argue this is correct, it can be argued we are not completely free. Our culture, environment & education may alter our freedom, and circumstances beyond our control may

Remove the freedom to make moral decisions. James Rachels argues "your decision is free if it is caused by your own desires, rather than by mental disorder, or by someone forcing you." If forced to torture one person, to save many others, a soft determinist would argue their decision was not free & was determined, and so they are not morally responsible for their actions. In different circumstances, they may morally oppose torture. Kant argues a 'compatibilist' view - while we are independent thinkers & rational, and consequently free to make moral decisions, ~~we~~ who we are as a person has been externally determined, influencing our moral choices, preventing total freedom.

This 'soft determinism argument' has strength, as it is supported by many science based theories. Steven Pinker believes 'we are not morally free' - it is not our choice to be moral, & 'morality' is a result of evolution, & survival of the fittest - teamwork makes you stronger against predators, etc. Wilson argues a hard determinist view, arguing genetics and environment determine who we will be & what we will do. Dawkins arguments for biology support Pinker's views & give them strength, through his theory of 'the selfish gene' - we are moral to survive & pass on our DNA. Psychologist Freud supports this hard determinism view - believing our childhood to be key. Piaget argues until the age of 10, we are heteronomous, meaning we take our conscience from our parents - showing the influence upbringing has & how it can determine who we are & what we will do. This is further supported through 'sociological' views from Hegel, who believes the 'spirit' of an age e.g 'swinging sixties' defines who we will be, or Thomas Howell, who believes "man is infinitely plastic" - & is moulded by external forces, determining who we are, removing, to a certain extent, our freedom to make moral choices.

The "complicated" view of soft determinism is much less extreme than that of <sup>hard</sup> determinism, and consequently, more widely accepted, as many find it hard to believe while they weigh up outcomes of their decisions, that they are not morally free to make them. This however, is countered by Spinoza - "man thinks himself in control for this reason alone, that he is conscious of his actions and ignorant of their causes". We may believe we are in control, but this is an "illusion", as argued by Baron D'Holbach. A modern example of this in practice, is illusionist & magician Derren Brown, who through subliminal messaging and repetition influences and controls our thought process, without us realising, creating an illusion of being able to read minds.

Determinists go on to argue & support their argument & give it strength, from its scientific foundation - Newton. Newton, discoverer of gravity, argued ~~we~~ our lives are controlled by a set of "ungovernable laws" such as gravity. We may want to fly, but gravity prevents this - removing our freedom. Ted Honderich ~~also~~ goes on to argue, in an universe of cause & effect, something 'urges' us to make a choice - past events cause our future choices & events, as argued further by John Hospers - "our choices are nothing more than effects of other equally necessitated events". If a man's ~~best~~ wife was raped, & he saw another woman being raped, he would intervene and stop the attack, as an "effect of other equally necessitated events", and therefore was not a moral decision to save the woman, but a predetermined effect of previous events.

John Locke further developed this, and holds the counter-argument of consciousness equating freedom, with his analogy of a man sleeping in a locked room. The man may wake, and

decide to remain where he is, but in reality, this was not a free choice, as he did not know the room was locked, preventing any other choice. Clarence Darrow puts this 'hard determinist' argument into practice. In 1921, Darrow defended two young men, Loeb & Leopold, for the murder of Bobby Frank - 14 yr. His defence sprang from the hard determinist view that Loeb & Leopold's upbringing had led them to believe they were superior to the rest of society & the law, and that they could commit the perfect crime - which, evidently, they did not. Darrow argued they weren't morally responsible, as they had not made a free moral decision. The murder was a result of their upbringing, and their upbringing was a result of their parents' upbringing, and so on. As a result of this hard determinist defence, Loeb & Leopold received life imprisonment, rather than death penalty.

Finally, within the 'libertarianist' against 'determinist' argument, there are also theistic divides, between free will & predestination, put forward by Calvin, who argued 'man is inherently evil' & without predestination, nobody would be saved. Furthermore, St Paul argued "For those God foreknew, he also predestined to be conformed to the likeness of his son" (Romans 8) & furthermore, St Augustine argued "the potter has authority over clay from the same lump to make one a vessel for honour & one for contempt". Predestination denied from foreknowledge - the concept that if God is omniscient, he knows my future & what I will do, making it necessary & removing free will.

Boethius's argument of God being "eternally present" & outside of time counters this, however, and argues for free will. Swinburne argues we have free will also, the freedom to do

ourselves. Niebuhr supports this with arguments that "Divine providence ~~of~~ over human destiny does not remove free will but gives it meaning"; and Aquinas uses the example of the Fall to support the 'free will' argument, that "Man chose not of necessity, but freely" and God justly punished Adam & Eve for the morally free decision to do it, as God is benevolent and cannot be unjust. Modern arguments from Sidgwick argue 'conscientiousness' show free will, however, the arguments for free will & ~~the~~ predestination rely on a theistic belief.

In conclusion, it can be argued to varying degrees that man is free to make moral decisions, ranging from completely free, to determinism - no moral choice & no moral responsibility. While libertarianism supports conscientiousness, determinism both in science arguably making it stronger, as we observe no control if external influences do, however such an extreme view fails to fit with 'conscientiousness' & beliefs of many, so consequently I believe a soft determinist approach is the strongest, allowing freedom & moral responsibility, and so laws & punishment & society, but who no one & our choices ~~do~~ do have external influences.

18/10  
(28)

18/11  
(29)

20/12  
(32)

1. Weaknesses  
Wolf  
Louden  
anyway goes  
no clear way  
What are virtues?  
When is virtue & vice

Strengths  
friendship

~~The~~ All ethical theories have 'pro's & con's' strengths & weaknesses, however to what extent the weaknesses of virtue ethics outweigh the strengths, I believe, ~~are~~ ultimately subjective, but objectively assessable. ☹

Virtue Ethics, created by Aristotle, is 'agent-centred' and so arguably selfish & self-motivated. It focuses on self-improvement through virtues & avoiding vices. It stresses the importance of friendships & 'the good' which help us to grow, and 'the doctrine of the mean' - avoiding the vice of deficiency, and the vice of excess - for example, the vice of deficiency of courage is cowardice, & excess is rashness. The virtue we want is courage. Aristotle also made clear four 'cardinal virtues' which were the most important - 'Temperance', 'Justice', 'Courage' and 'Prudence'.

The weaknesses of this particular ethical theory, can be found in its selfish, self-motivated 'agent-centred' roots. Furthermore, ~~the~~ it is arguably outdated, and that the four cardinal virtues are outdated & sexist, with 'courage' instead of, for example 'compassion'. The theory itself has many weaknesses. It is unclear, as to when a virtue becomes a vice, and what exactly, are the virtues? Because of the lack of clarity, it is argued that 'Virtue Ethics' is ~~useless~~ useless, as we cannot all follow it effectively and so we cannot follow it & progress as a society, as it argues is its aim. These weaknesses show that 'Virtue Ethics' is not a practical, usable, theory in modern society.

Criticisms of 'Virtue Ethics' come from Wolf, who argues that, were everyone to follow Virtue Ethics (providing they understand how to follow it), then surely everyone would become the same? Virtue Ethics would remove variety, and ~~and~~ arguably variety is necessary to allow for virtuous role models. We need the vices to admire the virtues - but Virtue Ethics is self-defeating in removing variety - it removes virtuous role models & vices.

~~Another~~ Another criticism comes from Louder, who argues, some things, such as rape, are morally wrong, however, virtue ethics has no moral wrongs, and could potentially justify anything, providing it leads to moral self development.

The strengths of virtue ethics are argued by many modern philosophers. Firstly, it accepts society through 'Friendships of the good' & growing together. Anscombe argues that Virtue Ethics does not rely on reward + punishment, and so our actions become intrinsically good. Foot argues that its strength is in its relativist approach, teaching us how to think morally, and our actions will consequently follow. Keenan ~~argues~~ illustrates the simplicity, and ease of virtue ethics through his '3 questions' approach: "Who am I? Who do I want to be? How do I get there?" Furthermore Keenan points out the tenability of this ethical theory, as anyone can find a virtuous role model, and aspire to be like them, from Jesus and 'WWJD' (What would Jesus do?) with hands to Harry Potter.

MacIntyre goes on to argue that this is what society needs, and that society has lost its way trying to follow different



GCSE, GCE, VCE and GNVQ Examining Bodies

Question  
number

Leave  
blank

1. sets of rules, and arguing which one is right. Taylor goes on to compare virtue ethics with one of the most followed beliefs - Christianity - arguing Christianity, along with other religions preaches of 'self-negating' equality - sticking to the 'status-quo' and not striving to excellent people in ourselves. These beliefs clearly illustrate the ease & practicality of virtue ethics - ~~in each~~ it needn't be as extreme as Taylor view & replace religion, but encourage all, regardless of culture to become virtuous.

In conclusion, ~~do the~~ <sup>do the</sup> Virtue Eth do the weaknesses of virtue ethics outweigh the strengths? A follower of virtue ethics would argue no, and all ethical theories have their ~~benefit~~ ~~weakness~~. A critic would argue yes - it is impractical, unclear & outdated. I believe the evaluation can be objective, but the view is subjective. I believe while yes, there are many strengths, such as becoming good societies, and practicality as Keenan argues, Wolf & Loucheux make strong criticisms, the necessity of variety & the necessity of certain acts to always be morally wrong.

17/10  
27

13/8  
21

Level  
3