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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) If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed marking instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your team leader.

(d) 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.

(e) Use the full range of marks available for each question.

(f) The detailed marking instructions are not an exhaustive list. Other relevant points should be credited.

(g) For credit to be given, points must be relevant to the question asked.

In the question paper the following skills are assessed:
- analysis
- evaluation.

All questions will require candidates to integrate these skills with their knowledge, in response to the question or statement.
Marking instructions for each question

SECTION 1 — Philosophy of Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Max marks</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.       | 30        | Purpose  
The purpose of this question is to debate the issue of presumption when discussing the existence of God. |

Specific instructions

Knowledge and Understanding may include:
- explanation of presumption of atheism
- explanation of the presumption of theism
- explanation of the presumption of agnosticism
- explanation of a priori and a posteriori arguments.

Analysis may include:
- WK Clifford in his essay, ‘The Ethics of Belief’, suggests that ‘...it is wrong always, everywhere, and for anyone, to believe anything upon insufficient evidence.’ This idea can be applied to both the theist and the atheist
- the implications of Pascal’s Wager, suggest it is in one’s own best interest to behave as if God exists, since the possibility of eternal punishment in hell outweighs any advantage in believing otherwise
- Richard Dawkins argues that: ‘...there is something infantile in the presumption that somebody else has a responsibility to give your life meaning and point...our life is as meaningful, as full and as wonderful as we make it’
- the consequences of a world spoiled by evil and suffering is used by many atheists to argue against God. First used by Epicurus, it suggests that the theist interpretation of God being all powerful, all knowing and all loving is flawed as if this was the case, God would have both the power and the knowledge to put an end to the problem of evil.

Evaluation may include:
- the grounds for atheism
- the grounds for theism
- criticisms and support of a posteriori and a priori knowledge
- criticisms and support of arguments for the existence of God.
### Question 2

**Max marks**: 30

The purpose of this question is to debate the extent to which the apparent design of the universe is evidence of a designer.

**Specific instructions**

**Knowledge and Understanding may include:**
- The basic argument from design indicates that: the universe has order, regularity and purpose; it is sufficiently complex to show evidence of design; this kind of design infers a designer; the designer of the universe is God.
- Aquinas’s 5th way: ‘...things that lack intelligence cannot move towards their end unless they are directed by someone with knowledge and intelligence’
- William Paley’s Watchmaker analogy. Design qua purpose - the argument that the Universe appears to have been designed to fulfil some purpose eg bees pollinating flower or the human eye. Design qua regularity - the argument that the Universe appears to behave according to some order or rule.
- Weak and strong Anthropic Principle.

**Analysis may include:**
- Darwin’s Theory of Evolution challenges the argument from design as it changed the way people thought about how human beings had developed. Darwin’s theory provides an alternative explanation of the world without specific reference to design by God.
- Hume states that the world is imperfect and finite and full of suffering, surely an all loving, all powerful God didn’t design it in this way?
- The argument is not necessarily incompatible with evolution: this processes could be part of the design of the universe.
- John Stuart Mill claims there is no intelligent design apparent in the universe and if there is a designer he is either an incompetent or cruel designer: ‘Either there is no God or there exists an incompetent or immoral God’.

**Evaluation may include:**
- The strength of the argument from Design fits in with human reason; it encourages and deepens the study of nature; it suggests purpose in the universe; it strengthens faith for those who are religious.
- David Hume suggests that there is no evidence that the universe needs a designer and is it not possible that the universe could have happened by chance, rather than design? This was later supported by the works of Darwin on the Theory of Evolution.
- The Freewill Defence Argument, widely acknowledged by Philosophers, addresses the problem of moral evil, not natural evil. The world has evidence of design and the bad design comes from the concept that God gave humans freewill and as a result, cause suffering.
- Richard Dawkins supported Darwin by arguing that random mutations in DNA alone give rise to variation in the world and the illusion of design.
### Purpose
The purpose of the question is to debate whether researchers have managed to successfully define what religious experience is.

**Specific instructions**

**Knowledge and Understanding may include:**
- features of religious experience, eg James relates most religious experiences to the *sick soul*, conversion unifying the divided self
- Otto said people who were having a religious experience were in a state of numinous consciousness
- Hardy’s research suggested there is a core religious experience as most experiences are positive and bring feelings of safety, security, love and contentment
- Hay claimed the most frequent religious experiences were all transcedent experiences
- Hay said the most common categories included an awareness of the presence of God, an awareness of receiving help in answer to prayer, and awareness of a guiding presence.

**Analysis may include:**
- James found it easier to define religion than religious experience
- James failed to outline a theory as such, he relied on a descriptive approach and used examples from different faiths to make observations
- Otto also uses a descriptive method to try and define religious experience
- Hardy’s conclusions are similar to James’ in that they both claim religious experiences have evidential value.

**Evaluation may include:**
- James was very honest and open in stressing that any definition of mystical experiences needed to be value-neutral. While some researchers would ignore experiences that were negative and did not point to a good God, James acknowledged whether they were positive or negative they all deserved equal recognition as real states of consciousness
- Otto’s definition may be criticised by many because it suggests the divine being behind religious experiences is totally separate from this world, yet most religious people would believe in a personal God
- Hay’s finding can be seen as flawed because they do not actually point to any particular religion, God or Gods
- James, Hardy and Hay all take a scientific approach which could be problematic. It means they are more likely to be concerned with studying data that can be observed, whereas religious experiences also cross into an area with unobservable causes.
Specific marking instructions for this question

4. 30

Purpose

The purpose of the question is to explore how effectively psychology challenges the case for religious experience.

Specific instructions

Knowledge and Understanding may include:
- Feuerbach’s idea of God as a human projection influenced many psychologists
- Freud dismissed religious experiences as wish-fulfilment
- Freud saw conversion as a way of resolving inner conflict and neurosis
- Freud claimed mystical experiences create an ‘oceanic feeling’ where people regress to their childhood to escape the threatening world
- Jung saw religious experiences as an indirect encounter with archetypes in our collective unconscious
- Maslow draws parallels between mystics and peak experiences, which can occur once people’s lower needs have been satisfied.

Analysis may include:
- both Feuerbach and Freud believed God was a mere projection of human attributes and desires
- not all psychological conclusions challenge the case for religious experience. For example, though Freud linked them to neurotic behaviour, Jung thought they helped prevent it
- Jung drew similar conclusions to James’ idea of the sick soul and that religious experiences could have a positive outcome
- both Freud and Jung agreed that religious experience is a normal phenomenon and both identified psychological mechanisms to explain them.

Evaluation may include:
- Freud’s arguments are limited as they do not address polytheistic religions or faiths where worship focuses on the feminine
- there are weaknesses in Freud’s wish-fulfilment argument. For example, just because people may wish for a God it does not mean God is not real
- Jung’s findings can be seen as more credible because he consulted a wider range of religions in his research than Freud did
- Jung’s work is open to criticism because though he acknowledged religious experience is a real phenomena he stopped short of saying any more than it occurs within the mind; he failed to give an objective answer to the fundamental question of whether God actually exists
- Swinburne’s principles of credulity and testimony can challenge psychological explanations.
**SECTION 2 — PART B — Medical Ethics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Max marks</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.       | 30        | Purpose<br>The purpose of the question is to give candidates the opportunity to discuss the allocation of organs.  
**Specific instructions**
Knowledge and Understanding may include:  
- UK policy on organ allocation  
- the value of life  
- the sanctity of life  
- equality  
- ageism.  
Analysis may include:  
- practical difficulties  
- relationship to organ donation  
- determining criteria for the value of life  
- case studies.  
Evaluation may include:  
- protection of the vulnerable  
- personal responsibility for health  
- equality  
- the deserving and undeserving  
- the role of prognosis  
- the role of age and circumstances  
- other relevant evaluative comments. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Max marks</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.       | 30        | Purpose
The purpose of the question is to give candidates the opportunity to discuss the moral issues surrounding different types of embryo research.

**Specific instructions**

Knowledge and Understanding may include:
- HFEA rules and regulations
- types of embryo research
- status of the embryo.

Analysis may include:
- religious positions on the status of the embryo
- consequences of embryo research
- problematic forms of research.

Evaluation may include:
- importance of protecting the vulnerable
- importance of scientific progress
- the balance between the use of embryos and human benefit
- importance of the sanctity of life
- the drawing of the line in embryo research
- other methods of research to get the same progress.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]