

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component (Morality and Belief: Conflict).

Candidate 4

Question 41(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**.

Two types of war are identified. 2 marks were awarded for defining civil war and then giving an example. Only 1 mark was awarded for the definition of a World War as the description didn't go further.

Question 41(b)

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

The first issue was awarded 2 marks as it identifies the moral question of whether the reason for going to war is acceptable, and then gives the example of the debate over whether the allies were right to go to war against the Nazis to defend the innocent.

The second part of the answer was well developed by raising the issue (does risk outweigh rewards) for 1 mark, and then offering a range of negative impacts, and the specific impact of WW2 on Germany for an additional 2 marks.

Question 42

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

The candidate has given two developed points for 2 marks each. They don't get a mark for commenting on whether Germany's justification was a good one, but it is correct to say it is still an acceptable example.

Question 43

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

1 mark was awarded for the point that the Romans fought wars when they identified as Christian, and a second mark was given for the observation that they had rules for what could be classed as an acceptable war.

A third mark was awarded for pointing out that most religions are not pacifist, the final mark was awarded for the idea that most religions permit fighting as a form of self-defence.

Question 44

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The candidate was awarded 2 marks for the first 3 lines which develop the idea that some won't agree to diplomacy, meaning that other approaches need to be available. The second part then makes a case for the use of sanctions in combination with diplomacy, and outlines how that process would work, so this is also awarded 2 marks. The next point is also developed for 2 marks – arguing that diplomacy causes less harm to everyone than eg sanctions. The last sentence repeats a point already made by the candidate.