



GCSE and GCE Examining Bodies

For office use

Question number	Mark
03	
04	
Total	

- Use black ink or 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 it through without making it illegible. 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.

38 =
Examiner

Write here how many supplementary sheets you have used (if any). 1

Question number

03	The question was to whether we are free to make moral decisions. It puts two concepts together - free will and the idea that we are free to act without external coercion and determinism. The idea that our lives and actions are determined by various conditions and forces.
----	---

Leave blank

Charles Darrow once famously defended two young men ~~who~~ convicted of murder under the grounds that they were a product of their wealthy upbringing & that they were determined by their family, genetics and social status - and were therefore not morally responsible for their actions.

The defence used by Darrow is an example of Hard Determinism, an ~~and~~ approach that suggests that all ~~actions~~ actions, thoughts etc are determined, ~~and~~ thus alleviating any moral responsibility from actions. Honderich supported this theory, writing that everything we do, ~~and~~ experience, think and want is a ~~and~~ culmination of prior events that ultimately determine our lives. This idea is grounded in Newton's law of physics that every action has a reaction. A famous analogy is that of snooker balls on a table - if they were to bounce around eternally, abiding by the laws of physics, a computer would be able to theoretically determine the paths the balls would follow; to someone ~~and~~ watching prediction may be impossible but every movement could be attributed to a prior one, ~~and~~ with every future movement predicted also. Hard Determinists apply this idea to the world, ~~and~~ that our actions may seem unpredictable

but are in fact determined by a prior event. This level of determinism implies that we are not free to make moral decisions, as our decisions are effectively made for us.

In contrast to this, Libertarians hold that our actions are not determined to any extent, but rather we are fully able to act as we wish with external coercion - this view is also referred to as ~~incompatibilism~~ incompatibilism, due to its obvious conflict with hard determinism.

Have said that, although Act 2 ^{usually} ~~follows~~ follows Act 1, it is not logical that ~~Act 1~~ Act 1 causes Act 2; ~~if~~ ~~Act 2~~ Act 2 is not determined by Act 1, the ^{whole} ~~whole~~ involved ~~Libertarianism~~ Libertarians' rejection of any determining factors, results in the full moral responsibility for all actions, and ~~therefore~~ maintains that we are free to make ethical decisions.

Although many disagree with hard determinism for its complete rejection of free will, Libertarians can also be considered weak in that it fully rejects the influence of any external factors; it implies our actions are not at all motivated by experience or values - this criticism leads into the ~~hard~~ compatibilist approach: Soft determinism

Soft determinism is seen as a midway between hard determinism and libertarianism. Like ~~the~~ hard determinism, it recognises the role of prior events in influencing decisions, however it also suggests that the variables are too expansive to be considered as complete determining of action. To answer this, it borrows the free will element of libertarianism, suggesting we have the ability to make moral decisions, but that our will can be influenced - although not wholly - by external forces. This approach would also find that we are morally responsible for action, and thus able to make moral decisions.

But which approach is correct? Many reject ~~the~~ hard determinism because they feel that they have free will, however philosopher John Locke suggested that the feeling of free will is an illusion. Using the analogy of a man being in a locked room - he may choose to stay in the room or what he feels is free will, but in reality he is determined to do so by the locked door.

Hard determinism rejection of moral responsibility provides practical issues! If no one is responsible for their actions, do we have

the fight to imprison those that break the law? Does law serve a just purpose if none is responsible? Free will is at the root of society and, as Kant said, an integral part of whether we are able to act as moral agents - without it, morality is redundant, but is that reason for it to exist?

Soft determinism provides a much more practical approach - but shouldn't ~~practically~~ practically overshadow truth? Theists may argue that we do have free will as it was given to us by God - they would most likely adopt a soft-deterministic view, as again free will is integral to their faith.

The truth as to whether or not people are free to make moral decisions is debatable, however the conscious appearance is that we are able, and considering the importance it holds within society, I would conclude that, although it may not be wholly true, it is important to act as if it is.

15/9
ME (24) / 14/9
(23) Examiner

04

Different ethical theories will provide different maxims regarding human sexuality, but ~~are~~ in how far are they helpful when considering the issues?

Absolutist ethical theories, namely natural law, Kantian ethics and Rule Utilitarianism, are helpful in providing a single maxim to apply to the morality of such an issue. The three theories are also deontological, meaning that they consider the morality of an action to lie in its adherence to rule or duty, rather than its specific consequence.

Natural law may be more helpful to theorists, namely former Catholics, as it links closely with divine law.

Aquinas' natural law is concerned with purpose, ~~that~~ that of humanity, to ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~with~~ ^{by} ~~the~~ ^{the} use of reason. Using reason, Aquinas developed ~~the~~ primary precepts ~~of~~ which are purposes of actions should strive to be one of such primary precepts is to procreate, whilst another is to worship God. From this primary precept, secondary absolute laws can be formulated, specifically in this case it could be determined that sex, if not for the ~~purpose~~ ^{purpose} of procreation, is immoral - ~~is~~ a sin. ~~is~~ Homosexuality must, therefore, also be seen as sinful as it does not have the ~~purpose~~ ^{purpose} of procreation, nor does it adhere to other primary precepts (ordered society, education, or ^{protecting} ~~the~~ ~~state~~ ~~the~~ ~~unborn~~).

This secondary precept against homosexuality

is absolute, therefore providing a universal maxim on the issue - this may be helpful in some ways - it leaves no grey area - it ~~is~~ loses 'authority' over those who aren't utilitarians.

Rule utilitarianism seeks to create absolute deontological laws based on the principle of utility: the greatest good for the greatest number. Formulated by ~~John~~ John Stuart Mill, the principle of good is determined by pleasure. The issue of homosexuality would pose this issue, does the acceptance of homosexuality cause more pleasure than it does pain? Mill considered bodily pleasures to be below intellectual pleasures, however homosexuality will not affect intellectual pleasure negatively, therefore it could be considered that under act utilitarianism homosexuality would be considered moral as the pleasure it provides for homosexuals ~~is~~ would generally outweigh the pain provided for those ~~to~~ who dispute the idea. This approach is very similar to that of our legal system, and thus can explain why homosexuality is legal in the most of western societies, whilst also demonstrating the practicality of ~~act~~ ^{rule} utilitarianism.

Some, however, may disagree with the use of pleasure as a means of determining morality. Emmanuel Kant's

approach to ethics is based on the idea that the only moral action is that based on a good will - just which is out of respect of the moral law: our duty. The action, in order to be moral, must therefore be out of one's duty whilst also adhering to the categorical imperative: desirably universal as a law and as a law of nature, whilst not acting anyone as an means to an end.

As for sexuality, most liberals would not be considered as a desirably universal law - the maxim ~~that~~ "you should be homosexual" is not one that would be adopted by all rational beings, therefore Kant would consider it to be immoral. It also goes against our duty to procreate, providing further cause for Catholic rejection of homosexuality.

The helpfulness of this approach can be judged on one's ~~adherence~~ ^{compliance} with the idea that duty is ~~based on~~ ^{to} the moral law in the form of duties. ~~Some~~ ^{Fletcher} would argue that the situation should be considered with the ~~decision~~ ^{decision} being based on the amount of love an action involves - if homosexuality is the most loving thing for the person, ~~then~~ ^{then} that is moral.

GCSE and GCE Examining Bodies

Examining body		Centre number				
Candidate name		Candidate number				
Paper reference				Sheet number		

Question number

Leave blank

This concept of agape ~~to~~ puts one's duty to love before all, is this a more helpful approach to determining the morality of homosexuality?

Relativist approaches such as Act utilitarianism, situation ethics and virtue ethics are not as helpful in considering the issue of homosexuality as a whole, as they seek to determine each circumstance individually. This may provide greater justice, as the focus on outcome or purpose allows ~~for consequences~~ ~~to be positive~~ positive consequences to be the general aim of action. This approach is teleological, ~~however~~ an issue being that it loses integrity and does not provide definitive responses to ethical queries, namely its usefulness in ~~not~~ considering such ethical issues as homosexuality.

14/10
 (24) ME / 9/6 (15)
 Examiner

Team leader = Level 3 = 12/8 - (20)