

Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson
Edexcel GCE**

Centre Number

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--

General Studies

Advanced

**Unit 4: Beliefs, Values and Responsibilities
(including synoptic assessment)**

Friday 22 June 2018 – Afternoon

Time: 1 hour 30 minutes

Paper Reference

6GS04/01

You must have:

Insert (enclosed)

Total Marks

Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **all** questions in Sections A and B and **one** question in Section C.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided
 - *there may be more space than you need.*
- Do not return the insert with the question paper.

Information

- The total mark for this paper is 90.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets
 - *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*
- Quality of Written Communication will be taken into account in the marking of your answers
 - *you should take particular care on these questions with your spelling, punctuation and grammar, as well as the clarity of expression.*

Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ▶

P55679A

©2018 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1



Pearson

SECTION A**Answer ALL questions.****You should spend no more than 30 minutes on this section.****Read Source 1 on the separate insert and then answer questions 1–5.**

- 1 Source 1 is about two different social issues, euthanasia (Source 1a) and abortion (Source 1d), which have led to heated moral debate.

Name **three** contemporary scientific or technological developments which have led to moral debate.

1

.....

.....

2

.....

.....

3

.....

(Total for Question 1 = 3 marks)



- 2 Source 1d is an argument based on analogy. What are the strengths and weaknesses of this type of reasoning?

(Total for Question 2 = 3 marks)



P 5 5 6 7 9 A 0 3 2 0

- 3** Sources 1b and 1c argue in favour of legally allowing assisted suicide in the UK.

Which of these sources presents the stronger argument?

In your answer you should consider the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and arguments used.

(Total for Question 3 = 4 marks)

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



- 4 Using information from Sources 1a–1d and your own knowledge, construct an argument to explain why UK laws about assisted suicide should not be changed.

(Total for Question 4 = 6 marks)



P 5 5 6 7 9 A 0 5 2 0

- 5 'Many issues exist today which did not exist when moral codes were first established.'

Does this mean it is no longer possible to rely on such moral codes in order to distinguish between 'right' and 'wrong'?

(14)



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

(Quality of Written Communication = 4 marks)
(Total for Question 5 = 14 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS



P 5 5 6 7 9 A 0 7 2 0

SECTION B**Answer ALL questions.****You should aim to spend no more than 30 minutes on this section.****Read Source 2 on the separate insert and then answer questions 6–10.**

- 6** Paragraph 5 (Source 2) refers to 'many functions' of museums. State **two** such functions.

1

.....
.....

2

(Total for Question 6 = 2 marks)

- 7** (a) How does the author explain why local authority funding for the arts has been cut?

(2)

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....

.....
.....



- (b) From paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 (Source 2) give **two** possible outcomes of reduced funding for the arts.

(2)

1

.....

.....

2

.....

.....

(Total for Question 7 = 4 marks)

- 8** Paragraph 1 (Source 2) is about government funding of the arts. Give **three** other types of income available to arts organisations.

1

.....

.....

2

.....

.....

3

.....

.....

(Total for Question 8 = 3 marks)



P 5 5 6 7 9 A 0 9 2 0

- 9 (a) In paragraph 1 (Source 2) the Council spokesperson claimed that 'The arts are essential ... for the soul of the city'. From the source, give **two** statements which could be used to illustrate this claim.

(2)

1

2

- (b) Examine the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and arguments presented in Source 2 to support the claim that 'Reducing spending on the arts ... is economic stupidity' (paragraph 6).

(5)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

(Total for Question 9 = 7 marks)



- 10** 'Museums and art galleries should not keep artefacts that were obtained from abroad.' Discuss this statement.

(14)



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

(Quality of Written Communication = 4 marks)

(Total for Question 10 = 14 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 30 MARKS



SECTION C

There are two questions in this section. You should answer ONE of them.

You should aim to spend no more than 30 minutes on this section.

Write your answer in the space provided.

Use your knowledge and understanding from a range of disciplines to reach an appropriate conclusion.

EITHER

- 11** 'As people go through life they experience many crises which only religion can help them survive.'

Examine this statement from the perspective of both humanists and religious believers.

(Quality of Written Communication = 6 marks)
(Total for Question 11 = 30 marks)

OR

- 12** 'What an individual thinks and does is a learned response to society's demands.'

Consider arguments for and against this view.

(Quality of Written Communication = 6 marks)
(Total for Question 12 = 30 marks)



P 5 5 6 7 9 A 0 1 3 2 0

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☑ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑.

Chosen question number: **Question 11** **Question 12**



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

**TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 30 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 90 MARKS**



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

BLANK PAGE



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

BLANK PAGE



DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

BLANK PAGE



Pearson Edexcel GCE

General Studies

Advanced

**Unit 4: Beliefs, Values and Responsibilities
(including synoptic assessment)**

Friday 22 June 2018 – Afternoon
Insert

Paper Reference
6GS04/01

Do not return this insert with the question paper.

P55679A

©2018 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1/1



Turn over ▶

Pearson

SOURCE 1 (FOR SECTION A)

Living and dying well

This source consists of four items. Source 1a is part of an article by Professor Lady Ilora Finlay published in *The Guardian* newspaper in July 2016. Sources 1b, 1c, and 1d are different responses to her article.

Source 1a

In 1997 the US state of Oregon's 'death with dignity' law licensed doctors to supply lethal drugs to terminally-ill patients with less than six months to live, who had mental capacity and were acting voluntarily. Until 2013 there was a steady upward trend in assisted suicide deaths, but from 2013 a marked upturn with an 80% increase. Now there are more than eight times the number recorded in 1997.

Another concern is 'doctor shopping'. People whose doctors won't participate seek lethal drugs from willing doctors who may never have previously met them.

Prognosis is difficult. Some people, supplied with lethal drugs on the basis of a prognosis of six months or less, lived for up to three years before taking them. How long otherwise they might have lived is anybody's guess. Any doctor faced with the question: 'how long have I got?' can only guess. Accurate prognosis is essential but it is not a scientific tool.

UK assisted dying campaigners claim they only want Oregon-style, physician-assisted dying for the terminally ill. This looks like an unpacking of assisted dying in an attempt to get it through a sceptical parliament. But the Oregon criteria are arbitrary and limited.

We should learn from the experience of others rather than from our own mistakes.

(Source: adapted from an article by Professor Lady Ilora Finlay)

Source 1b

Assisted suicide already exists. Medical colleagues I know, who have facilitated someone's death, justify their actions by saying:

- A patient in agonising pain asks for higher doses of opiates.
- The physician complies, giving a dose high enough to kill or gives the patient control of the dosage pump.
- The physician claims the pain treatment worked, but unfortunately the patient died.

I can't see a problem with formalising in law what already happens.

Source 1c

Uptake of assisted suicide may initially be low, but will increase as folk become aware of availability and realise that it can be an excellent choice for some patients. Until assisted suicide is legalised we will continue to see patients suffering in torment, quite unnecessarily.

Although 80% of the UK population consistently support euthanasia, progress has been thwarted by a small but shrill religious lobby.

Source 1d

As a GP, I feel that relaxation of criteria always happens. The abortion rules offer the most obvious example. People think that anyone who wants an abortion can have one.

The law – written when public opinion about women's choices was less clear cut – allows abortions only if continuing with a pregnancy risks a woman's physical or mental health. Doctors know that pregnancies always provide some risk to the pregnant woman. On that basis, they effectively allow women to choose an abortion.

This was not the law's original intention. This situation is probably acceptable to the majority – and is far less complicated than re-writing the law. If assisted suicide is legalised there will be a gradual but inevitable expansion of the criteria. It will become routine.

(Source: adapted from Professor Dame Irena Finlay, Co-chair, Living and Dying Well, Tuesday 12 July 2016 10.15 BST. <https://www.theguardian.com/healthcare-network/2016/jul/12/assisted-dying-uk-learn-places-legal-oregon-netherlands> accessed 22 July 2016)

SOURCE 2 (FOR SECTION B)

Local government spending cuts undermine culture and demonstrate economic stupidity

Last week a Birmingham City Council spokesperson claimed: 'The arts are essential not just for the local economy but also for the soul of the city' at the same time as announcing a 25% cut in arts funding. This affects cultural organisations of national importance, including the city's renowned Birmingham Repertory Theatre (The Rep). This isn't the first hit the arts have taken in Britain's second city. In 2013 the cut was 20%; in 2010, 17%. But how far can arts organisations stretch themselves without losing their local identity and core creativity?

The arts have an interdependent relationship with the places where they operate. When business goes well, arts flourish as they attract attention, signal prosperity, and encourage investors. The artistic impact of The Rep is not confined to Birmingham itself. The company's work enhances the city's artistic reputation around the country.

Funding the arts can have a payoff, not just in terms of reputation, but in hard cash. Culture is credited as a significant draw attracting tourists and their welcome spending money.

Chancellor George Osborne recognised the importance of the arts to the economy in his 2015 spending review. But when local authorities are having their income from the government reduced, the chancellor cannot be surprised that they have to cut spending on the arts to concentrate spending on essentials.

It is not just theatres that are feeling the cultural pinch. Sharon Heal, director of the Museums Association, is concerned about the impact of local authority budget cuts on civic museums, and on the huge number of visitors. She argues that museums across the country, particularly in less well-off areas, will face real difficulties because of local authority funding cuts, claiming: 'Our museums fulfil many functions and play a vital role at the heart of their communities.'

Every arts organisation is finding it harder and harder to get funding. Innovative artists have little time or opportunity to challenge cuts publicly. But today, more and more are finding the energy to speak out. Reducing spending on the arts not only undermines culture – it is also economic stupidity.

(Source: adapted from Clare Brennan <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/dec/13/arts-funding-cuts-regions-badly-affected-economic-stupidity>)