

# Candidate Marks Report

*Series : 6 2018*

This candidate's script has been assessed using On-Screen Marking. The marks are therefore not shown on the script itself, but are summarised in the table below.

---

Centre No :	Assessment Code :	H573
Candidate No :	Component Code :	02
Candidate Name :		

---

Total Marks :

In the table below 'Total Mark' records the mark scored by this candidate.  
'Max Mark' records the Maximum Mark available for the question.

Question Part

3		<p>1) Intro to NML, define euthanasia</p> <p>2) Explain moral <del>natural</del> law, divine spark, natural inclinations, primary precepts, sanctity of life</p> <p>3) Euthanasia contradicts preservation of life. Right to die <del>vs</del> VS. right to live <del>Both</del> NML doesn't take into account details of situation - very rigid and inconsiderate of cases.</p> <p>4) Situation ethics, the most loving thing to do.</p> <p>5) Categorical imperative - we should then kill all those who want to die, even depressed teens? Conc. Situation ethics</p>
3		<p>Natural Moral Law is a theory first founded by the Stoics, ancient Greek philosophers, who believed humans had a divine spark from a supernatural being to help us flourish on earth.</p> <p>St. Aquinas developed this theory further, arguing that morality is known from within and we should abide according to our natural law.</p> <p>However, applying this theory onto euthanasia may create issues due to the deep Christian essence found in the natural law theory, leading to ask - is this theory truly useful with regards to euthanasia.</p>



Question Part

Euthanasia is when a terminally ill individual decides they want to end their own life, whether it be passively (refusing treatment) or actively (a lethal injection, for example). The idea that an individual wants to end their life contradicts the concept of the sanctity of life. Sanctity is the belief that humans have been given the breath of God, thus making every life valuable.

Natural Moral Law states that each human has been created with ~~these~~ inclinations instilled within them, a moral guide to help us live. Aquinas calls them the primary precepts: the preservation of life, reproduction, living peacefully in society, ~~and~~ nurturing the young and worshipping God.

Clearly, ~~Natural moral law~~ <sup>euthanasia</sup> would ~~prohibit~~ violate the precept of preservation of life, therefore it is considered immoral and sinful.

One may argue that this theory is useless as it disregards the true suffering of those requesting to die. As it is an absolutist theory, no exceptions to the rule can be made thus ~~also~~ making this theory impractical for those who advocate for euthanasia and those who don't believe in God. Another theory that helps the case of those requesting euthanasia is situation ethics, which takes the concept of agape beyond any



Question Part

other rule. When founding 'Situation Ethics' in 1966, Joseph Fletcher was a Christian who aimed to create an ethical theory between the strict, rigid laws in legalism and the unprincipled, irregular system of antinomianism. Situation ethics is simply, doing the most loving action that upholds 'agape' - unconditional love, and violating a law if it means to fulfil it.

Despite being a priest, Fletcher took another view to Aquinas' natural law, which he deemed to be too legalistic and disregards Jesus' teachings of love.

According to situationists, euthanasia, euthanasia would be morally correct as it fulfils agape and understands that sometimes, this is the right thing to do. This is contrary to the legalistic view of natural law as it allows flexibility and takes into consideration of the situation. For example, if someone who is paralysed, unable to speak and is agonising pain requests to die, applying love to the situation would mean this is morally correct.

It also fulfils all four of Fletcher's working principles: it's pragmatic as it eventually ends the suffering, it's personalistic as it places the person before any rule, it's relative to Christian love and positivist.

This theory may be more satisfactory to advocates for euthanasia, a bit not to those who advocate for



the dignity of human by lives. The fluctuating morality that 'Situation ethics' leads to due to the endless situations that can exist ~~may be~~ will be an issue for Immanuel Kant.

Immanuel Kant believed ~~in the~~ that morality is knowable and should be abided by in all situations through his categorical imperative.

His theory, much like Natural Moral Law, is legalistic and absolutist and stresses the importance of the action rather than the outcome. One of the formulations of the ~~the~~ categorical imperative is universalisability - the idea that a maxim should be adhered to consistently in every situation, by every one. So if one were to say 'killing is wrong', this would mean euthanasia is wrong, using the universal law.

This theory opposes Fletcher's 'agape', as agape has no real moral truth behind it, rather it's an abstract, subjective term.

The idea that all cases of euthanasia would be seen as 'wrong', also means we cannot make exceptions even with the most severe of cases.

Another important aspect of Kant's theory is his belief that humans should not be used as a means to an end. This upholds the valuable nature of human life and places them first.

Evidently, euthanasia would violate this



Question Part

formulation as well as the universal law formulation. Kant believes the maxim should be strictly abided by as 'morally' this is the right thing to do.

Those who are terminally ill may have a different experience and reject the final formulation as they do not believe they are ~~undermining~~ undermining human dignity by wanting to die, rather it is the contrary, and want to ~~die~~ die in a dignified way.

To conclude, Natural Moral Law will pose issues especially for those who don't believe in God or the sanctity of life. As well as pose issues for those who prefer consequential theories over absolutist theories - that means also ~~and~~ rejecting Kant's approach. However, it is a clear approach unlike situation ethics. Situation ethics is far more preferable due to the consideration of context which may euthanise advocates want to ~~bring~~ bring to light. In summary, situation ethics provides greater help to ~~those who~~ the issue of euthanasia than natural moral law.



1) Business  $\rightarrow$  generating profit, capitalism, usually an institution which lacks morals as they put money first.  
Kant's ethics can help tackle the issues to business.

2) Kant - empirical, moral truths are knowable  
by hypothetical imperatives, a categorical:  
one, humans just.

3) Compare to Utilitarianism

4. Businesses' main priority in a capitalistic capitalist society, is to generate profit and to compete against other businesses. The emphasis on such ideals may lead to businesses finding immoral ways to meet their goals. Ethical theories can be applied to this topic and Kant's theory may arguably tackle it best.

Immanuel Kant is a prolific philosopher who derived Kantian ethics on the belief that morality is a priori synthetic - knowable with experience (empirical evidence). And due to



Question Part

his belief that morality is knowable, he stated we must ~~always~~ always do the right thing, even if it brings about the a bad outcome, stressing on duty rather than consequence.

~~This hypothetical imperative~~ This categorical imperative is essential to know what our duty is in terms of morality. One of the formulations is humans not being used as a means to an end. This is very relevant to business ethics ~~as~~ <sup>as</sup> businesses evidently exploit people to increase profits. This is prevalent in South and East whereby poor people are recruited to essentially be 'slaves' for popular brands such as Nike. The horrendous living conditions they live in and the extremely low pay, in order to maximise profits, completely violates the formulation. Humans are not being treated with respect, rather they are exploited in the name of 'capitalism'.

The second formulation of universalizability is also violated ~~to a great~~ greatly in business. It is a moral fact that one would not like to be harmed thus a maxim of 'one must not harm others' is conceived. If one does not want to be exploited, then they should not exploit others, without exception. This is now a universal law.





This maxim is violated many times in many cases throughout the world, however, the concept of universal law provides a good approach to business. It creates feelings of empathy for those being exploited thus making people more aware of the businesses they support. For example, the consumer is now aware that H&M mistreats workers in Bangladesh, thanks to journalism and investigations, and so, they have the knowledge to stop buying from that shop in protest - a boycott essentially. This will effect the sales of the business as people become more and more aware of the exploitation abroad.

Kantian ethics provides a ~~new~~ reasonable view to business and heavily emphasises on equality of humans and the idea that no one is an exception.

Kantian ethics can be counter-argued by Utilitarianism, in particular, Jeremy Bentham's act utilitarianism. This theory is relevant in law and politics and one of the greatest theories businesses follow in order to see what the best consequence is. As aforementioned, Kant places duty before the consequence whereas Bentham places the consequence before the action, in the name of pleasure.



Question Part

Bentham believes as humans, we have to key ~~down~~ driving factors - pain and pleasure. We gain pleasure from many things, including materialistic items, hence why this theory is based on hedonism.

The hedonistic calculus helps us measure the principle of utility: the greatest good for the greatest number, and the results ~~that~~ would go against Kant's argument. For example, ~~the~~ people like shoes - they like shoes so much that they would happily purchase it from a company that mistreats workers. The majority overwhelmingly ~~at~~ outnumber the minority thus according to Bentham - being immoral in business is accepted as it brings the highest ~~number~~ greatest number of pleasure for the greatest people.

A huge issue with this theory is that ~~it~~ it ignores minorities in order to please the majority which would conflict with Kant's formulation of 'humans should not be used as a means to an end'. Utilitarianism is the most popular theory when it comes to businesses because of the criminogenic nature of businesses. We live in a capitalist society meaning we must abide to the most popular ~~one~~ theory.



Natural Moral Law, much like Kantian ethics, stresses the importance of upholding human dignity. Aquinas believed we as humans had natural inclinations instilled within us, the relevant precepts being: the preservation of life and living peacefully in society.

Some businesses violate these precepts as evident in the Bangladesh clothing factory collapse whereby 1,400 people died. ~~Business~~ Businesses have little to no concern for human life, thus violating the first precept. The second is violated as business owners create unstable ~~the~~ living ~~area~~ conditions as well as harming the area where workers live in. For example, in Indonesia, those living by clothing factories have their water and food polluted with toxic fabric materials dumped into rivers. This lack of human care by businesses means they go against their God-given inclinations thus they are immoral. Natural Moral Law is not concerned with hedonism or quantitative methods of ~~measuring~~ measuring 'goodness' rather they try to understand goodness by what God has given us - our inclinations.

To conclude, it's evident that Kantian Ethics holds a strong view on what is our duty towards



Question Part

others which is a good way to understand what a businessman should do and to see whether it fulfils the formulation. Similarly, natural moral law has precepts which must be abided by, making both strong absolutist theories.

Consequentialist theories are more suitable for businesses as money is the main aim, therefore in terms of the theory that helps business achieve these aims is Utilitarianism. However the ideal approach would be Kantian ethics.

2

'God is meaningful'

- 1) Describe meta ethics and normative ethics
- 2) What does meaningful mean?
- 3) Emotivism Ayer. ... Boon hurray
- 4) Utilitarianism G. E. Moore.
- 5) ~~The~~ Ethical relativism: moral truths can be made true observing the new natural world.

Meta-ethics differs from normative ethics as it does not provide theories to dictate what is right and wrong, rather aims to understand what one means when we use the words 'right' 'wrong' or 'good' and 'bad'.



2796206475

Unit code	H	S	7	3	/	0	2
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Write here how many booklets you have used in total	2
---	---

## 4 PAGE CONTINUATION BOOKLET

Write the information required clearly in the boxes above using capital letters.

Question Part

2		<p>What does meaningful mean? Meaningful could mean how relevant the use of the word 'good' is to our daily lives or perhaps whether the word 'good' should be used in my context at all, as it has such contrasting definitions.</p> <p>Intuitionism is the concept that one simply knows what goodness is without the use of a definition. G. E. Moore believed that 'good' was indescribable, and describing 'good' is far more complex than we can understand, thus giving one definition is meaningless. There is no need to describe goodness because we just intuitively know what it is - like a</p>

This document consists of 4 pages



Question Part

sixth sense or a gut instinct. He compares the word 'good' to the color yellow: we cannot define yellow yet we know what it is. For example, we simply know that giving charity is good without having a clear-cut definition. This means 'goodness' is not empirical thus we cannot make moral facts. But intuitionism does allow a lot of flexibility with what we mean by good, possibly making it highly subjective. Nevertheless, we can agree on particular moral statements despite the subjectivity.

Does intuitionism regard 'good' as meaningful? Yes because he agrees it is a ~~true~~ true concept, knowable to humans. But whether the word is meaningful, G.E. Moore would argue it is not because it does not hold any definition.

Emotivism, a theory by Ayer agrees to some extent with ~~emo~~ intuitionism. He argues that there are no moral truths behind statements and that all statements are merely an expression of our emotions and attitudes towards that particular subject hence the term 'emotivism'. This is also known as the 'Boothroy' theory and as the name suggests, it is



Question Part

one based on what we perceive as good. A ~~good~~ popular example is the one of the Holocaust: many people, in fact, majority, would argue that the Holocaust was an atrocity that is highly disliked, one can ever say it 'bad'. For Ayer, this is not a moral truth but simply an opinion on a matter, because if we look back in history, Hitler evidently did have millions of Nazis supporting him. Therefore your argument that the Holocaust was 'bad' is void because this is only a projection of your own perception of what is good. For Ayer, 'good' is meaningless because what we perceive as good is for you fact - it's our emotion.

However, intuitionists would say ~~that~~, even though they agree that 'good' is indefinable, one can simply know that the Holocaust was bad without the need to define 'goodness'.

Both intuitionism and emotivism have subjectivity as both an advantage and disadvantage. As Hume stated, humans will inevitably involve emotions in their understanding of morality because it's within our nature.

For both ethicists, 'good' is meaningless but for Moore, 'good' is knowable intuitively.

~~A~~ Ethical Naturalism differs from the two



Question Part

views. It is a cognitive approach which states that observing the world can lead to conclude on moral statements. ~~Natural~~ Ethical Naturalism includes natural moral law and Utilitarianism.

