



National  
Qualifications  
EXEMPLAR PAPER ONLY

**EP30/AH/01**

**Religious, Moral and  
Philosophical Studies**

Date — Not applicable

Duration — 2 hours

**Total marks — 60**

**SECTION 1 — PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION — 30 marks**

Attempt **ONE** question.

**SECTION 2 — Part A — RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE — 30 marks**  
**Part B — MEDICAL ETHICS — 30 marks**

Attempt **ONE** question from the Part you have chosen.

Write your answers clearly in the answer booklet provided. In the answer booklet you must clearly identify the question number you are attempting.

Use **blue** or **black** ink.

Before leaving the examination room you must give your answer booklet to the Invigilator; if you do not, you may lose all the marks for this paper.



\* EP30AH01 \*

SECTION 1 — PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION — 30 marks

Attempt **ONE** question.

1. To what extent are the grounds for atheism convincing? 30
  
2. “If the concept of God is incoherent then such a God cannot exist.” Discuss. 30

## SECTION 2 — 30 marks

## Part A — RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

Attempt this Part if you have studied Religious Experience.

Attempt ONE question.

3. To what extent are claims of mystical experience credible if they cannot be fully described? 30
  
4. Critically evaluate the claim that conversion is the most important form of religious experience. 30

**Part B — MEDICAL ETHICS**

**Attempt this Part if you have studied Medical Ethics.**

Attempt **ONE** question.

- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 5. “All methods for the procurement of organs can be morally justified.” Discuss. | <b>30</b> |
| 6. Critically evaluate different perspectives on the value of life.               | <b>30</b> |

**[END OF EXEMPLAR QUESTION PAPER]**



National  
Qualifications  
EXEMPLAR PAPER ONLY

---

**EP30/AH/01**

**Religious, Moral and  
Philosophical Studies**

## Marking Instructions

---

These Marking Instructions have been provided to show how SQA would mark this Exemplar Question Paper.

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purpose, written permission must be obtained from SQA's Marketing team on [permissions@sqa.org.uk](mailto:permissions@sqa.org.uk).

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (ie secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the user's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance.

## General Marking Principles for Advanced Higher Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies

*This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this Paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the Detailed Marking Instructions, which identify the key features required in candidate responses.*

- (a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these General Marking Principles and the Detailed Marking Instructions for this assessment.
- (b) Marking should always be positive. This means that, for each candidate response, marks are accumulated for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding: they are not deducted from a maximum on the basis of errors or omissions.
- (c) Where a candidate violates the rubric of the paper and answers both optional 30-mark questions in a Section/Part, all responses should be marked and the better mark recorded.
- (d) Use the full range of marks available for each question.
- (e) The Detailed Marking Instructions are not an exhaustive list. Other relevant points should be credited.
- (f) For credit to be given, points must be relevant to the question asked.

In this Exemplar Paper the following skills are assessed:

- analysis
- evaluation
- structuring and sustaining a line of argument

All questions will require candidates to integrate these skills with their knowledge, in response to the question or statement. Questions will be based on the following command words:

- '[Statement].’ Discuss.
- 'Critically evaluate.’
- 'To what extent.’

**Table 1 – Detailed Marking Instructions for each question**

| <b>Synthesising information to structure and sustain lines of argument</b>                                 |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <b>0 marks</b>   | <b>1-2 marks</b>   | <b>3-4 marks</b>  | <b>5-6 marks</b>   | <b>7-8 marks</b>   |
| <p>Information has not been drawn together.</p> <p><i>or</i></p> <p>No evidence of a line of argument.</p> | <p>Candidates will draw together two relevant pieces of information or evidence into a conclusion on the question/issue.</p> <p>The conclusion will summarise the key elements or points and include an overall judgement.</p> <p>There will be no clear line of argument, or the line of argument may be limited.</p> | <p>Candidates will draw together two relevant pieces of information or evidence into a conclusion on the question/issue.</p> <p>The conclusion will clearly result from a line of argument and include an overall judgement on the question/issue.</p> <p>The candidate's response is more descriptive than analytical or evaluative.</p> | <p>Candidates will draw together two relevant points of analysis or evaluation supported with information or evidence into a conclusion on the question/issue.</p> <p>Candidates will develop a line of argument by organising, linking or sequencing ideas throughout their response.</p> <p>The conclusion will clearly result from a line of argument and include an overall judgement on the question/issue and a response to at least one relevant counter-argument.</p> <p>The conclusion will be supported by relevant and accurate use of information or evidence.</p> <p>Overall, the response will effectively analyse and evaluate most key points of the question.</p> | <p>Candidates will draw together more than two relevant points of analysis or evaluation supported with information or evidence into a conclusion on the question/issue</p> <p>Candidates will develop a line of argument by organising, linking or sequencing ideas throughout their response.</p> <p>The conclusion will clearly result from a line of argument and include an overall judgement on the question/issue and a response to at least one relevant counter-argument.</p> <p>The conclusion will be supported by relevant and accurate use of information or evidence and will be based on previous content contained within the response.</p> <p>Overall, the response will provide an in-depth analysis and evaluation of the question/issue.</p> |

| Using in-depth knowledge and understanding   |  |
|--|--|
| 0 marks  | 1-6 marks  |
| No accurate/relevant information is presented.   | <p>Up to a maximum of 6 marks can be awarded for relevant, accurate knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>This can include, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background information, support, reinforcement or explanation</li> <li>• information, ideas, arguments, etc, that are factually and theoretically accurate</li> </ul> <p>1 mark to be awarded for each relevant, accurate developed point. Developed points will include, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• examples</li> <li>• reasons</li> <li>• evidence</li> </ul> |
| <p>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p> <p>Analytical points will involve the candidate identifying at least two relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc) <b>and</b> clearly showing at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between different components</li> <li>• links between component(s) and the whole</li> <li>• links between component(s) and related concepts</li> <li>• similarities or contradictions</li> <li>• consistency or inconsistency</li> <li>• different views/interpretations</li> <li>• possible consequences/implications</li> <li>• relative importance</li> <li>• understanding of underlying order or structure</li> </ul> <p>For analytical comments to be relevant they must directly address either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the question asked <i>or</i></li> <li>• issue(s)/arguments/evidence which the question assesses</li> </ul> <p>Analysis can be asymmetrical, ie the candidate can make more analytical points about the question/issue, or about arguments or about evidence.</p> |  |

| 0 marks   | 1-2 marks  | 3-4 marks  | 5-6 marks  | 7-8 marks  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>There is no evidence of analysis, or analysis is not relevant to the question.</p> | <p>Candidates will make two relevant analytical comments on the question or issue. This can relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relevant arguments</li> <li>• evidence</li> <li>• the detail of the question/issue itself</li> </ul> | <p>Candidates will make four analytical comments on the question/issue and/or arguments/evidence.</p> <p>Analysis can be asymmetrical, ie the candidate can make more analytical points about the question/issue, or about arguments or about evidence.</p> <p>Analytical points can, but do not need to, refer to separate or discrete areas or aspects of the question/issue/arguments/evidence.</p> | <p>Candidates will make four analytical comments on the question/issue and/or arguments/evidence.</p> <p>Analysis can be asymmetrical, ie the candidate can make more analytical points about the question/issue, or about arguments or about evidence.</p> <p>Analytical points can, but do not need to, refer to separate or discrete areas or aspects of the question/issue/argument/evidence.</p> <p>Analysis will provide evidence of understanding the question/issue and its implications by inclusion of sufficient key/most relevant aspects.</p> | <p>Candidates will make four analytical comments on the question/issue and/or arguments/evidence.</p> <p>Analysis can be asymmetrical, ie the candidate can make more analytical points about the question/issue, or about arguments or about evidence.</p> <p>Analytical points can, but do not need to, refer to separate or discrete areas or aspects of the question/issue/arguments/evidence.</p> <p>Analysis provides evidence of understanding the question/issue and its implications, by inclusion of sufficient, key or most relevant aspects.</p> <p>The analysis will integrate others' ideas/arguments/evidence with the candidate's own.</p> |

Evaluation involves making a judgement based on criteria.

Candidates will make reasoned evaluative comments on, for example:

- relevance/importance/usefulness
- positive and negative aspects
- strengths and weaknesses
- significance/impact of religious/non-religious views
- the validity or success of an argument/evidence
- any other relevant evaluative comment

For evaluative comments to be relevant they must directly address either:

- the question asked *or*
- issue(s)/arguments/ evidence which the question assesses

Evaluation can be asymmetrical, ie the candidate can make more evaluative comments about the question and/or arguments than evidence.

| 0 marks  | 1-2 marks  | 3-4 marks   | 5-6 marks   | 7-8 marks  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| There is no evidence of evaluation, or evaluation is not relevant. | Candidates will make two reasoned evaluative comments on the question/issue and/or relevant arguments/ evidence. | Candidates will make four evaluative comments on the question/issue and/or relevant arguments/evidence. | Candidates will make four relevant evaluative comments on the question/issue and/or arguments/ evidence.<br><br>Evaluative points will explicitly support an overall judgement in relation to the question/issue, including weighing-up alternatives. | Candidates will make four relevant evaluative comments on the question and/or arguments/evidence.<br><br>Evaluative comments will be supported with reference to sources.<br><br>Evaluative points will clearly support the overall judgement and include reasons for discounting or accepting alternatives. These will be used to clearly support the overall conclusion. |

SECTION 1 – PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

| Question | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   |
|----------|----------|---|
| 1        | 30       | <p><i>Example knowledge and analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An atheist is typically understood as someone who does not believe in God; however Antony Flew in his paper ‘The Presumption of Atheism’ urged that atheism is better understood by subdividing it into two categories – positive and negative. In his interpretation, a positive atheist is defined as someone who positively asserts the non-existence of God; a negative atheist is simply not a theist. Flew argued that the case for atheism should be treated like a court case; in court the defendant is assumed innocent until proven guilty, and the burden of proof is on the prosecution to prove guilt. Flew said that, like innocence, we should presume negative atheism until there were grounds for God’s existence. As negative atheism neither asserts that there is not a God or that there is a God, it can be counted as a neutral standpoint, free from bias.</li> <li>Theologians such as Alvin Plantinga have argued that theists are not the only ones to ‘affirm’ and atheists make just as many claims as theists and should therefore provide the same amount of evidence for their belief that God does not exist. The issue with this view is that all atheists are being treated the same; the negative atheist simply maintains that, to date, the theist has not provided enough evidence or reason to justify belief in theism, but by the same logic neither has the positive atheist.</li> </ul> <p><i>Example knowledge and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Someone could claim that evidence does not matter and that philosophical proof is irrelevant. After all, faith is based upon personal conviction; as Rabbi Jonathan Sachs said, ‘Faith isn’t certainty, it’s having the courage to believe despite uncertainty’. In the past, faith has been written away by Freud as illusion and Feuerbach as projection of self, but one could question whether anything is lost by belief. In Pascal’s famous wager, given the options available surely it is better to believe in the entity that could give eternal life in heaven? But when one considers the variety of gods on offer, this becomes much more difficult. The position of strong atheism is equally open to attack; it cannot be taken to be a philosophical proof and therefore needs to be constantly defended. Given all this uncertainty, perhaps it is easier to highlight the absence of certainty in either direction and just get on with living.</li> </ul> |

| Question |  | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|----------|---|
|          |  |          | <p><i>Example analysis and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agnosticism maintains that since there is no conclusive proof as to whether God exists or not, it is better to reserve judgement. As Clifford stated, ‘it is wrong always, everywhere, and for anyone, to believe anything on insufficient evidence’. However, the negative atheist is doing just that – in the absence of evidence they disbelieve. Bertrand Russell’s analogy of a celestial teapot is often used to strengthen this argument – a lack of evidence is reason enough to disbelieve and the position of agnosticism is nonsensical. Russell said that whilst there was a possibility that a china teapot could be revolving around the sun, even though it could not be categorically disproved it should be regarded as nonsense. Whilst we could assume that the teapot exists – ie believing with no reason or argument – we could also apply logic and reason, highlight the lack of evidence for the teapot and presume that it does not exist: assumption defined as belief formed without reason, and presumption being the opposing position of belief formed with reason. This argument is very strong because if we applied the logic of agnosticism to everything, we would have to be agnostic about every issue on which there was no certainty. If this was the case, no-one would rightly leave the house in the morning. If someone wants to claim that something exists then it is up to them to provide evidence for such a belief – as Flew wrote, ‘The onus of proof lies on the man who affirms, not the man who denies’.</li> </ul>  |
| 2        |  | 30       | <p><i>Example knowledge and analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The atheist attacks the idea of omniscience, the attribute of being all-knowing. God is thought to be transcendent, ie outside the Universe which is timeless, which in turn means God can possess the knowledge of the past, present and future. However, God is also meant to be immanent too, existing within time, so one must question how God can know the future. The theist can argue that looking at omniscience this way is really just a miscomprehension of the nature of God. As God is transcendent, all things are present. As Calvin writes, ‘when we attribute foreknowledge to God, we mean that all things have ever been, and perpetually remain, before God’s eyes, so that to God’s knowledge nothing is future or past, but all things are present’. The atheist is constrained by time, thinking about past, present and future. God is immanent in all aspects of time; God knows the ‘future’ because for God, it is now.</li> <li>• If God is restricted by logic then theists may get to keep their belief in an omnipotent being, but that being is weakened. There are not a whole range of things that God cannot logically do because they contradict God’s other attributes: if God is ‘all-good’ then logically God cannot sin; if God is eternal then God cannot commit suicide. It follows that if there are all these things that God cannot do then the claim for omnipotence is redefined – rather than meaning a being who can do anything, it becomes a being that can only do things that are logically possible – closer to the traditional understanding of God.</li> </ul> |

| Question | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   |
|----------|----------|---|
|          |          | <p data-bbox="427 245 898 277"><i>Example knowledge and evaluation</i></p> <ul data-bbox="427 320 2078 555" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="427 320 2078 555">• One must question whether Irenaeus' theodicy really is sufficient to justify evil. Firstly, many people claim to be moral beings without ever experiencing any real level of suffering and those who have suffered often have become dehumanised and more evil as a consequence. Secondly, suffering seems to be entirely disproportionate to this benefit – is natural evil on the mass scale of earthquakes and tsunamis really necessary for the formation of moral virtue? What benefit would the death of an infant bring? Does the suffering of an individual really justify the development of another? Arguably, an all-loving, all-powerful God could have created a better system. If God could not then it seems that God's attributes once again are questionable.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="427 592 860 624"><i>Example analysis and evaluation</i></p> <ul data-bbox="427 667 2085 1002" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="427 667 2085 1002">• There is the question of why an omniscient, omnipotent and wholly good God would allow the suffering and evil we see in the world. Given the amount of suffering – on both a natural and moral level – can we really say that there is an omnibenevolent creator? Firstly, why would God create such a world and, secondly, why would God not seek to prevent it? Augustine's theodicy attempted to provide an answer to this problem by maintaining that we are all guilty of sin through Adam and therefore deserve to be punished through natural suffering; additionally we all have freewill and could therefore stop moral suffering. The only way God could stop such suffering would be to deny us freewill which would be wrong. This theodicy is clearly problematic: if God created the world then God must have allowed evil. Augustine also believed in Hell which indicates that God must have expected the world to go wrong at the moment of its creation. The question remains as to why an all-good God would have created such a world knowing that it would contain such suffering.</li> </ul> |

SECTION 2 – Part A: RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

| Question | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question  |
|----------|----------|--|
| 3        | 30       | <p><i>Example knowledge and analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘We believe the man who has seen things through the telescope that we have never seen; why then, they ask, should we not believe them when they report things that seem to them equally unquestionable.’ In this statement, Bertrand Russell highlights the difficulty of accepting claims that cannot be subjected to ordinary tests. A scientific experiment can be repeated and the result confirmed but a mystical experience is difficult to repeat and confirm the same result. Russell argues that if we are asked to believe the claims of a mystic then we should be able to believe those claims on the same basis as a person who claims to have been to the North Pole, ie evidenced scientifically. Claiming ‘to know’ that one has had a mystical experience is not proving it.</li> <li>• William James described mystical experiences as both ineffable and noetic. This means that the experiences are beyond verbal description and the knowledge gained is beyond normal intellect or reason. Mystics claim insight through intuition or perception or sensation but it is beyond the description of ordinary language. Tennyson, describing ‘a kind of waking trance’, stated, ‘I am ashamed of my feeble description. Have I not said the state is utterly beyond words?’ Tennyson’s frequent trances may or not have been mystical but his difficulty in describing the experiences fits with how other people (eg James) have described religious experiences as ‘ineffable’ or ‘noetic’.</li> </ul> <p><i>Example knowledge and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ayer dismissed claims of mystical experience as logically unsound. He famously said, ‘If a mystic admits that the object of his vision is something which cannot be described, then he must also admit that he is bound to talk nonsense when he describes it’. If the nature of God or reality is beyond human understanding or is mysterious in some way, then it is unintelligible. If it is unintelligible then it cannot be understood, thus making it impossible for it to be described. So Ayer claims that, not only are mystical claims empirically unverifiable, but also unintelligible. As it is not possible for the mystic to show how his claims can be empirically tested, and as it is not possible to prove that his intuition is a genuine cognitive or rational state, then what is left is simply ‘...the condition of his own mind’ and any ‘revealed truths’ have no literal significance.</li> </ul> |

| Question |  | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|----------|---|
|          |  |          | <p><i>Example analysis and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Ayer's empirical approach it is easy to dismiss mystical claims as lacking credibility. However, James' view is that different types of judgements about mystical experiences can be made, one of which is a value judgement. This is concerned with the meaning, importance or significance of the experience to the experiencer. Asking what the experience means is not the same as proving that it happened. James defended the credibility of mystical experiences because of the certainty of the testimonies of those who had them: 'These feelings of reality...are as convincing to those who have them as any direct sensible experiences can be, and they are, as a rule, much more convincing than results established by mere logic ever are.' So mystical experiences are not dismissed as the product of a 'faulty mind' or illogical argument, but accepted as private and spiritual. Being unable to provide a fully coherent description is due to a problem of language, rather than a problem with the experience itself.</li> </ul>  |
| 4        |  | 30       | <p><i>Example knowledge and analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conversion is traditionally understood as a form of religious experience which results in a change in a person's spiritual beliefs. A person may be converted from no religion to religious belief, or from one religion to another, or from religious belief to no religious belief. Conversion experiences tend to have some common characteristics, eg people experience tensions in their lives, people seek solutions to problems, the convert experiences a loss of worry or perceives 'truths about reality', some feel they undergo a moral or intellectual change. The key question is whether the conversion experience is caused by an external influence, eg God, or by an internal influence, eg psychological processes that take place in the brain.</li> <li>The transformation of the individual is a core element of conversion which can be instant and dramatic or slow to develop. This type of religious experience is usually passive – something or someone acts upon the person. This appears in contrast to other types of religious experiences where the individual actively seeks 'a supreme reality' through ascetic and meditative practices, eg Sufi Muslims. William James argues that even if a person actively seeks a mystical state of consciousness, once it begins the experience seems to happen without their will and must still be deemed passive. The person cannot control the experience which is sometimes interpreted as a gift from God.</li> </ul> <p><i>Example knowledge and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conversion experiences are as important as other forms of religious experience. Conversion experiences have had remarkable life-changing effects on those who have them, eg Davey Falcus and Saul. Taken together they provide examples of intellectual, moral and social conversion but the question is whether they are more important than, say, the</li> </ul> |

| Question | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   |
|----------|----------|---|
|          |          | <p>mystical experience of St Teresa of Avila. Falcus and Saul recognised the error of their ways and changed their behaviour in light of their experience. In James' view, they transformed from an imperfect self (conscious of being wrong) to a more unified self (knowing right). Falcus renounced drugs and alcohol and Saul, now Paul, became a Christian. Although St Teresa's visions were the result of her own contemplations, the effect was similar to that of Falcus and Paul in that, ultimately, they all submitted to the Will of God.</p> <p><i>Example analysis and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To determine whether conversion is the most important category of religious experience requires some consideration of how the experience occurs and what it is for. People who decide to live their life differently, or who have a new set of values, could come to this change through many means, including near-death experiences. Changes in the brain, even if these are the result of oxygen deprivation, do not invalidate the experience a person has or detract from the person's subsequent life changes. To be classed as a religious experience, the change has to be seen within a religious context. If the conversion experience is to prove that God exists, then it fails because, as Kant argues, God is not part of the phenomenal world. If, however, the conversion experience is about increased self-awareness then it becomes important because it results in a new way of seeing things. The importance of conversion is its experiential nature through which the experiencer gains a first-hand understanding of God or reality which contrasts with mundane everyday experiences or beliefs. As it is the most powerful of the certainty-experiences (James), then it can be argued to be the most important.</li> </ul> |

SECTION 2 – Part B: MEDICAL ETHICS

| Question | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question  |
|----------|----------|--|
| 5        | 30       | <p><i>Example knowledge and analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Roman Catholic Church supports the idea of procuring organs by donation. Indeed, Pope Benedict XVI signed himself up as an organ donor, saying it was ‘an act of love’. The catechism of the Catholic Church states that ‘donation of organs after death is a noble and meritorious act and is to be encouraged as a manifestation of generous solidarity’. It is added, though, that ‘it is not morally acceptable if the donor or those who legitimately speak for him have not given their explicit consent’. One could argue that failing to ‘opt-out’ is not the same as giving explicit consent and therefore the terms of an ‘opt-out’ system would need to be clear or it may not be fully endorsed by the Roman Catholic Church.</li> <li>A thriving market exists in many countries such as Pakistan, the Philippines, India and Egypt among others. On the one hand, procuring an organ in this way can be seen as a simple transaction between buyer and seller. The buyer obtains a much-needed organ and the seller receives payment for it. The freedom to sell a kidney can help alleviate poverty. On the other hand, because donors in these countries are more likely to be part of a black market, this transaction is often deemed to be exploitative because it plays on desperation and poverty and undermines altruistic donation. The illegality of organ trafficking and transplant tourism is denounced in the Declaration of Istanbul as violations to equity, justice and human dignity.</li> </ul> <p><i>Example knowledge and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gilbert Meilaender suggests that the focus on procuring organs by whatever means misses the point. Human beings have a natural tendency to see death as an evil to be combatted. He writes, ‘The receiving of an organ does not rescue the living from the need to die. It only defers the day when they will have to do their own dying’. This is the truth of the human condition. ‘If we turn organ procurement into a crusade, we make death simply a problem to be solved.’ The underlying issue is our refusal to accept the limitations of our finite lives and this leads to the grief, despair and frustration we feel when a loved one is dying of organ failure. We desperately seek new sources of organs and this is the slippery slope: planning the death of patients to procure organs or using brain-dead bodies as banks of organs is a step too far. We are better served by moderating our expectations and accepting our limited fragile selves.</li> </ul> <p><i>Example analysis and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Libertarians propose that all people should have full ownership of their bodies in the same sense as property. Rothbard argues that ‘the full ownership of the body is the only possible law which can apply to everyone and thus fit with the</li> </ul> |

| Question |  |  | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|--|----------|---|
|          |  |  |          | <p>idea that all individuals are equal'. It can be argued that procurement by presumed consent infringes on the right to individual autonomy because it takes a choice for granted. Even if it is possible to withdraw from the system, should an individual be forced to reveal their thoughts? Does the state have a right to demand an individual's preference? Surely the right to life, and the duty to preserve life that pervades our society, would outweigh the inconvenience of sharing one's thoughts? This issue leads into the problem of altruism being taken away, which additionally ties into the Catholic imperative that, for a donation to be morally acceptable, it must be accompanied by 'explicit consent'. To opt-out of organ donation, an individual has to partake in an act of selfishness – in that they have to think they do not want to give another the chance of life and seek to withdraw their name from the register, whilst the current system enables someone to engage in a caring act by signing up.</p>  |
| 6        |  |  | 30       | <p><i>Example knowledge and analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In his book <i>The Value of Life</i> John Harris asks when does life begin to matter morally and when does life cease to matter morally. In short, “when does life begin to have that special value we believe attaches to human life and when does it cease to have that value?” Harris claims that our interest in the value of life is not just a question of life and death. We show how we value others by the way we treat them, the price we are prepared to pay and the efforts we are prepared to make to save lives. This introduces uncomfortable questions, for example, is it fair to allocate finite financial resources to specific treatments knowing that some will benefit whilst others will not? Is it worthwhile saving the life of a senile geriatric patient? How much money is too much for potentially life-saving technology?</li> <li>• While Judaism espouses the infinite value of human life, it also recognises that all life is finite. Treatments which are not potentially curative may be refused. Similarly, the Ethical and Religious Directives of the Roman Catholic Church acknowledge that a person can forgo disproportionate means of preserving their life where treatment will not provide reasonable benefit or will impose excessive expense on the family or community (Directive 57). Medicine and technology used to preserve life can be the wrong option. In such circumstances, choosing not to pursue aggressive medical intervention does not mean that the life at risk is of any less value, or that another life has more value. It means that patient choice is being respected.</li> </ul> <p><i>Example knowledge and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent can or should healthcare be provided where the gains (which could be minimal) simply cost too much? American political philosopher John Rawls argues that financial thresholds for medical treatment need to keep with principles of social justice, ie including protecting the most vulnerable in society. To some extent, European healthcare systems succeed in providing this protection. They manage medical costs using price controls, negotiated fees for</li> </ul> |

| Question | Max mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   |
|----------|----------|---|
|          |          | <p>specialists, hospital budgets with limits on expenditures and policies on the use of new technologies. In the UK, for example, healthcare is free at the point of use, including to the most vulnerable in society, but it also means that treatment deemed excessively expensive may not be available and forces some patients to forgo treatment they may need. This leaves us in the position that the healthcare provided in the UK tries to value life in a way that is socially just but also economically expedient.</p> <p><i>Example analysis and evaluation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perspectives on the value of life tend to be ingrained and unchallenged. In 2001, Dr Joseph Kaufert of the University of Manitoba analysed a case involving a patient who wished to discontinue use of a ventilator. The patient had progressive disability and it was his own decision to discontinue this form of medical support. It appeared that the medical (and legal) consultants had carried out their discussions with the patient sympathetically and clearly and the patient's wish was granted. However, Dr Kaufert noticed that the medical and legal support the patient received only supported negative assumptions, ie 'poor' quality of life of persons living with disability who need medical intervention. The doctors thought that they had acted in a benevolent and pragmatic way. Instead, they were challenged on their awareness of living with a disability and their own cultural biases of quality of life. This case highlights the danger of too readily acquiescing to patient requests, especially where the request fits with one's own view. Other options about how this patient might have lived his life were unexplored, or not explored to the same extent as the implications of discontinuing the use of the ventilator. It appeared that the doctors proceeded on the basis of respect for autonomy and beneficence but, in reality, the case revealed an attitude within the medical community that life with a disability was a devalued life and one perhaps not worth living.</li> </ul> |

[END OF EXEMPLAR MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]