8.3 Refugees and the Plight of Civilians Displaced by War: 30-minute Pack

AQA 8062 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions.

1 State one Christian teaching that supports welcoming strangers or refugees, naming a relevant New Testament reference such as Matthew or Luke and the context of hospitality.

(Total for Question 1 is 1 mark)

2 Explain two reasons why some people support stricter border controls and tighter refugee vetting, and evaluate how these reasons might conflict with religious teachings on hospitality.

(Total for Question 2 is 4 marks)

3 Explain two religious teachings about the treatment of refugees, drawing on one Christian source and one Muslim source of authority, and name those sources explicitly.

(Total for Question 3 is 4 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

4 Explain two contrasting beliefs about how nations should respond to incoming refugees, referring to the tension between compassion and national self-interest in public policy debates.

(Total for Question 4 is 5 marks)

5 'Religious individuals and communities have a special responsibility to welcome and support refugees, even if this makes life harder for the host country.' Evaluate this statement. In your answer you should give reasoned arguments to support this statement, give reasoned arguments to support a different point of view, refer to religious arguments, and reach a justified conclusion. This question carries up to 12 marks for quality of evaluation and up to 3 SPaG marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar.

(Total for Question 5 is 15 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 8.3 Refugees and the Plight of Civilians Displaced by War: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

reference to Matthew 25:35, Luke 10:25-37 or a clear statement of welcoming the stranger with an accompanying scripture citation, oe **B1**

Answer: For example, Matthew 25:35 says, 'I was a stranger and you welcomed me', supporting hospitality to refugees.

Question 2

point 1: security concerns, such as the need to prevent terrorists or criminals entering, oe **B1**

development: this can be linked to arguments for thorough vetting and tighter controls even if it limits immediate access for some refugees, oe **B1**

point 2: economic and resource concerns, such as pressure on housing, jobs and public services, oe **B1**

development: this view argues orderly admission preserves social cohesion but can conflict with immediate humanitarian duty, oe **B1**

Answer: E.g. security concerns require vetting; economic/resource limits require controlled intake, both of which can conflict with immediate religious calls to welcome and help refugees without delay.

Question 3

point 1: Christian teaching example, such as Matthew 25:35 supporting welcoming the stranger and offering care to refugees, oe **B1**

development: this is presented as an obligation to the needy and a sign of faith in practice, oe **B1**

point 2: Muslim teaching example, such as the concept of hijrah and Quran 9:6 supporting offering protection and sanctuary to those fleeing danger, oe **B1**

development: this can be linked to the Prophet Muhammad offering asylum and the idea that Muslims should care for those seeking refuge, oe **B1**

Answer: E.g. Matthew 25:35 teaches welcoming the stranger and offering care; Quran 9:6 and hijrah support offering protection and sanctuary.

Question 4

belief 1: some argue nations should welcome refugees out of compassion, moral duty and international obligation, oe **B1**

development: this view may cite human rights duties, religious teachings and the humanitarian need to protect those fleeing persecution, oe **B1**

belief 2: others argue that national self-interest requires strict border controls to protect security, public services and economic stability, oe **B1**

development: this view may point to concerns about vetting, integration costs and the need to prioritise citizens in scarce resources, oe **B1**

a reasoned contrast that recognises both perspectives as genuine policy considerations, oe **B1**

Answer: Contrast: welcome refugees for moral, humanitarian and legal duties vs limit refugee intake to protect security, services and national interest, with both sides offering legitimate concerns.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Question 5

Level 4 A well-developed, balanced evaluation that analyses both sides of the argument, refers to relevant religious teachings and examples, and reaches a justified conclusion. Clear reasoning and evidence of synthesis.	**10-12**
Level 3 A clear evaluation that gives arguments for and against, with some reference to religious teachings and a supported conclusion, but lacking some depth or balance.	**7-9**
Level 2 An attempt to evaluate with some reasoned points for and against, limited reference to religious teachings, and an obvious but unsupported conclusion.	**4-6**
Level 1 Simple assertions for or against with little development, limited or no reference to religious teachings, and no real conclusion.	**1-3**
Level 0 No relevant material.	**0**

Indicative content:

- Arguments supporting the statement: religious teachings such as Matthew 25:35 and the parable of the Good Samaritan emphasise welcoming strangers and helping those in need, suggesting a moral duty to refugees.
- Christian teachings about love of neighbour and bearing one anothers burdens could be used to argue for active support, even where it involves sacrifice by the host community.
- Muslim teachings such as the example of the Prophet's hijrah, Quran 9:6 and the general emphasis on charity and protecting the vulnerable support offering sanctuary and aid to refugees.
- Religious charities have a long history of providing humanitarian relief and moral leadership, which can justify a special responsibility for faith communities to act.
- Arguments against the statement: legitimate concerns about national security, economic pressures on housing, jobs and services, and the practical limits of absorption may justify prioritising citizens welfare.
- Some argue that voluntary religious action should not substitute for properly funded state systems and that governments must balance compassion with policy and public order.
- Possible reconciliation: religious communities can lead by example in offering support while still recognising the need for sustainable, regulated systems and sensible vetting; emphasis on charity can be balanced with respect for law and prudence.
- A strong conclusion will weigh religious obligations against practical consequences and may propose a balanced approach where religious groups provide support within lawful, collaborative frameworks with the state.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk