

Candidate 1 evidence

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
2	<p>There are different arguments for intelligent design. Intelligent design is the argument to whether or not the earth has an actual designer or if it is all just by chance. In this essay I will discuss religious, philosophical and scientific responses to intelligent design, and argue the most important is scientific and how all arguments prove and do not prove evidence for God.</p> <p>Many religious people believe that God created the universe, the bible states "and on the seventh day God created the universe", showing that within seven days God created absolutely everything, all nature and everything we see was designed by God. God put detail and thought into everything. However this does not fully provide a convincing explanation for God's existence, if he really did want to create everything to perfection why are there so many flaws with the world. God is said to be omnipotent meaning he is the most powerful being to ever exist, he can do anything he wants as he is the designer and creator, to this day there are many imperfections, that an omnipotent God would not have, from people worldwide suffering, through natural disasters and poverty. Can evil and suffering exist in a world with a Good God, many people argue no. I agree that an omnibenevolent God would want to surround the universe with love and protection, he wouldn't want evil acts or people on earth and he has the power to not create any evil, the religious explanation for the design of the universe does not convince me. However religious people use Adam and Eve as the explanation for suffering. They believe Adam and Eve disobeyed God and ate fruit of the forbidden fruit tree, resulting in suffering. A consequence of this is everyone now suffers and feels pain, however I believe suffering already existed before this, with the bible stating "I will multiply pain during childbirth" multiply suggests there was already pain before this, meaning this is a weak argument. This is significant and does not prove that God exists as the world is imperfect and not designed perfectly, if he does exist he is not a good God like the bible states.</p> <p>Aquinas believes there is evidence for a designer of the universe through quod regularity, meaning the order of the universe. He believes that everything has an order. He believes there has to be someone guiding everything and uses the example of an arrow and an archer, just as an arrow cannot move on its own and is guided by an archer so too is the universe being guided by someone or something. Things without an actual mind are guided and given order by something, so he believes is God, this implies that everything was once created by God and everything had a beginning, this cycle of everything having a beginning would mean the universe is infinite and would result in infinite regress meaning there is no actual starting point of the universe. A consequence of this argument is if absolutely everything was once created and had a beginning then how does God exist, if he always just existed then humanity would have existed a lot sooner, making it a lot more complex and unexplainable. However Aquinas disagrees with this, he believes the universe did have a very beginning and the creator of the universe is God. Since he created everything it means everything is just developing and infinite regress does not happen, an implication of this is it makes it a more simpler argument</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>to comprehend, the argument is in its easiest form making it less complex. Aquinas believes God is the creator and the one powerful and supernatural being who is in control of everything including the past, present and future. However is this really the case, even if there is a creator who is greater and far beyond humans existence, how do we know that this is God, there is also the argument that there could be multiple creators and this could absolutely be true as there is no evidence for or against one or multiple creators. I don't think everything needs to have reasoning and not absolutely everything needs to have a beginning, just because humans have mothers does not mean everything needs to.</p> <p>Payley believes you can see evidence of a designer through everything and everything has a purpose, he uses the watch argument to explain this. He believes a watch was created for a purpose, the purpose of a watch is to allow people to tell the time, he sees further evidence for design in everything, God created everything on earth was created for a specific purpose. However does everything actually need to have a purpose, why can we not just let things exist without reasoning, just because we have seen people build and create things such as houses been built, does not mean we need evidence for the universe being created and built, maybe there actually is no beginning for the universe and it has just existed all along. I think the analogy of a watch makes the argument more simple to imagine and understand. The argument believes that God is in control and gave everything a purpose, yet there is still no proof for the existence of God, everything having purpose and being designed does not mean God was the one who gave them purpose or designed them, inventors and a machine is very different from God, these are the ones that create things and designate them a purpose.</p> <p>A scientific explanation for design is the big bang, the big bang happened millions of years ago, where an explosion of matter resulted in earth being created, scientists have been able to find evidence for the big bang making it a stronger argument as it provides a reasonable explanation for something that happened when no one was actually around to witness it. However this provides no proof for a designer, instead it shows how the universe was randomly created, this would make more sense for the imperfections in the universe. The big bang also allows room for religious view points, people can believe in the big bang and God as they can coexist. Maybe God was the reason for the big bang and it was his way of creating the universe, however there is no physical evidence for this belief.</p> <p>Another scientific explanation is evolution, Richard Dawkins discovered this theory, it is believed species have developed over time to adapt to the environment they live in, they make advantageous and disadvantageous mutations and over time species with the weaker mutations die out, leaving the animals with the disadvantageous mutations to stay and progress. He first discovered this through birds beaks, when he studied them he realised how they have changed throughout time, allowing the species as a whole to progress, I think this is a very strong argument as you can see photos and understand his theory in depth and detail. The universe as a whole may just be</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>developing through evolution, things are constantly changing and evolution may be why. This argument disregards the need to prove that God exists.</p> <p>In conclusion I think arguments from intellegent design fails to provide any proper evidence for the existence of God, instead i belive the strongest argument is Richard Dawkins theory of evolutuion. I think the religious view for intellegent design is weak, there is no physical evidence that can be studied and no one was around at the time to see it apart from 'the creator'. Although aquinas provides a clear explanation and we can see order throughout the universe, I dont think it provides evidence for God, just because there is some order does not mean God is the one who created the order, maybe its just happened gradually and throughout time, just as evolutuon explains.</p>	

Candidate 2 evidence

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Section one- philosophy of religion</p> <p>1. the Kalam arguemnt fails to prove god exists how far do you agree.</p> <p>The kalam arguement is a version of the cosmological arguement for why God exists. It was originally developed by two muslim scholars, but later a modern version was composed by William lane Craig. Craig and the kalam arguement does not believe that the universe and subsequent world can be infinite. The arguement suggests that for an infinite universe, is impossible because this is suggesting that there is an infinite amount of past events all happening at once. The kalam arguement is against the idea of infinite regress as all of our past and history have chronologically created the present, thereofre if there was an infinite past of such history, there could be no present as there would be inifnite outcomes. A positive implication of this belief is that it makes sense, to believe in an infinitely happening past becomes confusing and impossible. we could not exist within the present if there was an infinite amount of things currently happening in the past as our present depends on the past. it simply is not admissable, so in that sense i agree with the Kalam arugment that there must be a cause for the universe, it cannot be infinite. However this does not make me personally jump to the conclusion of God as the Kalam arguement goes on to do.</p> <p>The argument explains that, the universe must have a cause as it is finite so has a beginning. Nothing can cause itself or be uncaused, therefore even the universe must have a first cause. This idea has been taken by the general cause and effect we see within the observable world. Things we see within our lives, have clear causes and effects, for example, humans cannot be their own cause in some way they have a cause and are the effect. Each human and animal have parents which are their cause. So due to this observable fact within nature, the Kalam arguement says the same rule must apply to the creation of the universe, there must have been a first creator which Craig and Kalam conclude is God. An implication of this belief is that it is taking an observable fact, and placing it on an unobservable theory. There is no way for us to conclude or prove how the universe was created, so to use science to back up a non-provable idea seems pointless. As they are using a scientific idea, to back up a theory, but the two are not directly connected it is simply two ideas being put together in the hope of proving a pre-existing belief. Even considering the Kalam arguement as true, and concluding that there is cause and effect in the universe therefore the universe must be cuased, to reach the conclusion of God does not seem linear with the theory. Craig is suggesting that simply becuase there must be a cause, that cause has to be God, without furthing supporting such idea. This makes the arguement less convincing as Craig is not attempting to prove that God exists but instead is creating a theory, and unjustifiably making God the conclusion. This has implications as it appears to someone using Kalam as proof that God exists, that Craig has simply</p>	g

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>taken his own beliefs, and made a theory that fits with little to no evidence in support of it. He has not taken an unbiased stand point to prove his theory, simply jumped straight for his own beliefs to be justified. This makes the argument less convincing, and hence fails to prove that God exists because it makes the idea appear far fetched if Craig cannot apply any form of justification or proof behind his belief.</p> <p>To follow, I also believe that the Kalam argument is less convincing, as there are other theories that provide proof as to there being a first cause within the universe and it not being God. One example of this is the big bang theory, a scientific theory for the beginning of the universe. This theory suggests that, the universe was caused from a spark, and then that spark just began heating up and cooling down, expanding, simply put, creating the universe and all within it. So the big bang theory suggests that instead of a God created the universe, the universe came from small particles that then became the universe and all that within it. There are many different scientific evidence put forward to suggest this theory, one being radiation. It simply suggests that the reason we have some form of radiation is because of this first spark, during which radiation was produced and proceeded to essentially bounce around the universe as it expanded, and because of this, it does bounce back to earth hence why we see evidence of such radiation. An implication of this belief however is that it does not explain where this first spark came from, the universe cannot come from nothing therefore these initial sparks must have been from something. It does not make sense for something to simply exist before the universe with no explanation. However, science does not provide such explanation so the theory to some becomes dismissable. Alongside this a consequence of this belief is that it does not dismiss the idea of God entirely. Following the Kalam argument and William Craig's version completely, it does not suggest how God created the universe, so some may argue that that initial spark did come from God so he did create the universe just not in the same way that religion does imply. Despite this, I believe that the big bang theory among other scientific theories, provide enough evidence in themselves to be believable, but the religious aspects and additions to them do not have enough evidence to suggest they must be true. Even though the big bang theory does still have questions within it, I think it is more believable as evidence as to why God doesn't exist as it provides a clear scientific explanation as to how the universe exists which works without the addition of God.</p> <p>As a response to the scientific responses as to how the universe could have a first cause and that not be an eternal being such as God. Craig and the Kalam argument goes on to explain that when the universe was first created billions of years ago, before the universe there was no nature. They describe that the universe being finite, must either be caused or uncaused. This means, the universe was either uncaused and used nature and was created itself. Or an external source caused it. And since the universe was before the laws of nature as the Kalam argument suggests, it must instead have been created by God. The argument is essentially saying that because the universe was</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>created before any laws of nature could be applied, it itself did not have to obey by the laws of nature and science. so to apply modern science and thinking to the belief in such sense as the big bang theory does not make sense as these things simply didnt exist at that time. A consequence of this beleif is that it does allow for science ideas such as the big bang theory to exist, but simply with the addition of God to essentially fill in the gaps within science. I disagree with this however, and do not see it as an equally believable form of proof as to why God exists as it is simply applying religion to a foundation belief with no form of evidence to suggest why. Within the Kalam arguement, Craig is simply suggesting that since there was no universe there were no rules, hence forth god could have been the creator. As to have a creation such as our finite universe, there must have been an infinite eternal being creating it, as they must have existed out with the laws of our universe, so to be able to create it. This belief has the implication that previously, modern science and beliefs could be comprehended alongside the Kalam arguement in most aspects however with this beleif, it can't. it is simply suggesting that the laws of phycis and nature did not apply, and therefore it would not make sense for science to have created the universe if God could simply be all powerful and create it themself. i personally do not agree with this belief as i think science provides a valid explanantion to suggest why our laws of nature and physics would still be admissable before the universe existed. I do not think the Kalam arguement provides enough evidence to prove that God exists and instead provides evidence as to why there has to be a first cause, but not evidence as to why that first cause had to be a creator.</p> <p>However, philosopher David Hume goes on to suggest why the arguement for cause and effect itself is also wrong. Hume suggests that the idea of cause and effect is simply allowing the human imagination to make connections between unconnected things. By this he essentially means, the human mind will naturally make connections between things because that is how it is designed to function it makes connections to fill gaps. Therefore, Hume believes we are not actually witnessing cause and effect, we are instead witnessing two separate events and our minds are connecting then without any real reason. An implication of such belief is that there is often evidence for the cause and effect that is being witnessed, such as the previous example of parents. it is evident to witness that two parents are the cause of a child. So i disagree with Hume as he argues that all of our cause and effect beliefs are invalid as i think there are some admissable examples of cause and effect within our world and outer universe that have scientifci evidence to prove them as such. However, despite this i do agree with Humes overall ideas, that we use our imagination to seek the connections between things we want to see. I think overall that is why the Kalam argument fais to prove that God exists, as to me personally it simply seems like a vague connection of imagination between a provable theory and a belief. Due to this i think that the Kalam arguement fails to prove that God exists as it simply does not provide enough evidence as to why God must be the first cause and not some other thing such as science, or even perhaps multiple gods.</p>	

Candidate 3 evidence

religious experience
question 4.

William James has expressed many ideas surrounding religious experience as a whole and specific religious experiences like mysticism in particular. His ideas are widely known and regarded as significant though it is up for debate whether they are central in our understanding of religious experience. Whether they are or not is important for us to consider because it may give us deeper insight into the why we validate certain religious experiences and not others, and it could potentially expose if whether the widely known and accepted religious experiences have been chosen in particular due to their nature working with the rules set by James.

One of James's beliefs surrounding religious experiences is his idea of Anhedonia. Anhedonia of 'the sick soul' refers to a state of feeling joylessness, dejection, and dreariness. James believed that being in this state can help to trigger a religious experience in a person – moving them from a state of 'help help!' into a state of 'happiness, happiness'. A religious experience that fulfills this trait is that of St Teresa. St Teresa lived with the weight of shame and guilt as she believed she was a guilty sinner. This continued until she began seeing visions, and through these visions was forced to accept that God sacrificed Jesus for her and that despite her inability to be perfect (as is the human condition) God loves her. This experience appears to be one of anhedonia as she was previously suffering from guilt and due to her experience, instead accepted God's love and likely felt the weight of her guilt lift off of her. Her experience not only links to James but also Otto. Rudolf Otto was another significant philosopher and he believed in what he called experiences of Numinous Consciousness – which is a state of feeling or knowing about The Holy (God). He believed that this experience was characterised by *mysterium tremendum et facinans*, which refers to a simultaneous experience of awe and wonder, and fear and terror. This certainly appears to apply to Teresa's experience as while she enjoyed positive end results, going through the actual experiences was difficult for her. She was troubled by the vision repeatedly, and God also caused her levitations, during which she would beg to be put down out of embarrassment. A strength of her experience was

that it was witnessed by multiple nuns who swore that they truthfully witnessed the levitations – with one even saying that she passed her hand under Teresa’s floating body soon after Teresa died. the fact that they are nuns is significant as they take swearing on anything very seriously, so the idea that they would all lie is quite unlikely. I agree that James’s ideas appear central in our understanding of religious experience as St Teresa is a very famous example of a religious experience and very clearly possesses parts of James’s beliefs. Considering that this is a famous example people will shape their understanding of what religious experiences are to it, causing our society’s general understanding of religious experiences to encompass James’s ideas.

another one of James’s beliefs is his 4 marks of mysticism. James though mystical experiences were characterised by 4 traits: being noetic, transient, passive, and ineffable. meaning these experienced involved a sense of significant and knowing about God; was short lived; was involuntary; and was impossible to put into words afterwards – respectfully. a famous religious experience that fulfills these traits is that of Julian of Norwich’s. Julian lived as an anchoress – meaning she lived a life of solitude in prayer, in a cell attached to the church, where she could give advice to passerbys on the street through a small window. Julian experienced a intense illness, getting so sick she was given the last rites (which are only given before death). however, she then proceeded to have 16 revelations in only a few hours whilst still bedridden, saying she saw visions of the virgin mary and of christ’s suffering. she reported feeling a intense closeness with God – which helps define this as a mystical experience. after she miraculously healed. her experience was noetic as she felt a significant with God during the closeness, and gained more knowledge of God as she saw visions revealing him as the protector and carer of the world. it was somewhat transient as it passed and never returned, it was passive as it was entirely involuntary, and it was ineffable as she struggled to explain the oneness with God. julian not only fulfilled the 4 marks of mysticism but she also achieved anhedonia as she was suffering beforehand with the illness and then recieved a positive religious experience. additionally, she described that she realised that she would never feel true happiness or rest until she was able to union with God – meaning the experience also gave her a path to and hope for far greater happiness than she has ever known. her experience lines up with Otto’s belief that religious experiences can be induced as hers happened as she was given the last rites, with some visions being triggered at the holding a crucifix in front of her during the process – meaning visions were triggered with religious art. Overall, her experience like Teresa’s is a well known one, so the fact that it is an experience that strongly possesses traits that match James’s ideas is significant and suggests that our understanding of religious experiences largely agrees with his idea which may be because his ideas are central to our understanding of religious experiences. I think his ideas are central to our understanding of religious experiences even today in a less religious society because James was a pragmatist, meaning that he was concerned with whether the experience impacted the person rather than if it was genuine. This appears to reflect many beliefs today and the more current way many would look as experiences like Julian’s – being concerned with her reactions and how the experience impacted her rather than whether or not it was really God.

James also carried beliefs about conversion experiences. He thought that conversions were generally positive experiences for people. James is quoted saying "God is real because he produces real effects" which means he would judge the experience on the strength of the impact it was able to have on the person, rather than the believability of the experience itself. One conversion experience that fits James's ideas well is Malcolm X's. Malcolm X was a leader of the American Civil Rights Movement and believed that black and white people could not coexist, and a separate black state needed to be created. He was a member of the Nation of Islam but left after discovering corruption in it, going on a pilgrimage to Mecca as part of the Hajj soon after as he still believed in Allah. He reported being shocked during this experience as he met "Blond-haired blue-eyed men I could call my brothers" which is to say that he, to his surprise, met white men who he was able to talk to and get along with despite the barriers of race he was used to. He awed at the sense of oneness of man during the Hajj. Along with this experience he also converted to Sunni Islam during the Hajj, and returned to America as a new man with different beliefs and going by a different name. He changed his beliefs to be that white and black Americans can live together peacefully without barriers of race as the Muslims on the Hajj do. Malcolm X obviously fits James's ideal conversion experience as it not only brought him positive change as he changed his beliefs after being taken out of the false idea that people of different races cannot coexist, but it also brought a massive change to his life: as he changed his fundamental beliefs he had been campaigning for years, and also changed his literal identity as he converted – much like how Saul changed his name to Paul after he converted from Judaism to Christianity. Overall, I agree that James's ideas are again central to our understanding of religious experiences as they are heavily present in both a famous modern example of conversion, and a famous historical one (Paul, as his identity transition from Saul to Paul easily achieved James's ideas just like Malcolm X's transition) and also in the general expectations that most hold for conversion experiences, as it is assumed that it will have a life-changing impact on you and will be for the better, because if you convert it's expected you will feel better as you've now moved into a religion you better connect with.

Overall, James's ideas are heavily present through some of the most famous historical and modern religious experiences. This may have been due to the presence of James's ideas shaping how we originally chose to sort through claims of religious experience. Either way his ideas are clearly heavily embraced by religious experience as a whole which will cause the public's understanding of religious experience to be significantly influenced by him. However, I do not entirely agree that his ideas are central to our understanding of religious experiences, as there is a good chance the opposite is true. James may have simply observed already famous cases and noticed common themes between religious experiences and reported those as being his beliefs, and then later belief would continue to fulfil his ideas because it doesn't make sense that the nature of religious experiences would fundamentally change. This would mean that James's ideas would have no impact on and would not be central to our understanding of religious experience, and that theoretically, if James didn't come up with or announce his ideas it would've had no impact on the general understanding of religious experiences.

Candidate 4 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

7) The treatment and use of embryos refers to the medical and clinical practice, and research with ~~the~~ the earliest stages of life. This includes common practices like IVF, and screening for conditions, but can also extend to gene editing and genetic modification. It is regulated by the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority, who oversees all types of treatment and use of embryos. It is the aim of this essay to show that the treatment and use of embryos is generally acceptable, but some types are unacceptable.

Many, such as Roman Catholics, believe that the treatment and use of embryos is morally unacceptable because of the rights of the embryo. Roman Catholics like John Noonan believe that life begins

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>right if it promotes the greatest happiness for the greatest number. They would therefore be happy with screening as it gives the greatest happiness to the parents. A roman catholic still</p> <p>I believe that we should take the embryos rights into account, but that if we are treating the embryos to benefit the child that's going to be born, then that's the best thing to do. Noonan would argue, however, that screening often involves choosing ^{in a lab} which particular embryos to carry forward and letting any others die, so that isn't treating them with any respect. I believe this is partially true but that an embryo that's going to die before getting any further doesn't have the same rights as one that's going to go to birth, so as long as that one is treated with respect</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN	
	<p>then its fine, I believe that the rights of the foetus are still relevant, but any other ^{embryos} don't have the same rights. Therefore when it comes to screening embryos and choosing the best ^{that's} one, if ^{morally} ^{we} ^{accept} that is what the parents wish to do then its morally acceptable.</p>	
	<p>For the other embryos that aren't going to get carried through to birth, current law allows testing of them until 14 days. Noonan again, wouldn't like this as its tampering tampering with a creature God created, but someone like medical ethicist Jeremy Fisher would. He believes that this allows us to gain huge information into embryos, and will allow us to improve our practices with them immensely. He campaigns for the time allowed to experiment on them to be increased to 28 days, saying</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>'the benefits to medical research would be immense'. However, here I believe it may be stretching it, at 28 days the foetus is twice as formed, and is becoming more human-like. I believe the 14 day cutoff allows for testing that will benefit our understanding of the first stages of life, but is still morally acceptable. After that, I would agree that it's starting to be morally unacceptable given the lack of dignity the now 28 day embryos would have. A Kantian deontologist would probably agree here, given that they believe we should act always in a way which treats others never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end in themselves. This means they wouldn't like using embryos to research any more than we absolutely need.</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

so wouldn't want the time extended to 28 days. As the current law stands, however, I believe the research into embryos until 14 days is morally acceptable.

Another issue with the treatment and use of embryos is genetic modification. This takes screening, which I believe is morally acceptable, and goes further, by altering the genetic makeup of the embryo to select gender and enhance characteristics such as height, intelligence and looks. This raises moral issues because it is an expensive procedure, meaning only the wealthy can do it, then ~~the~~ being able to have children who are genetically superior and more likely to be successful. Many, like deontologists, would worry this would exacerbate

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>inequality and increase the gap between the rich and the poor. This I believe therefore obviously isn't morally acceptable, as it simply isn't fair as it will make life worse for those already struggling when the next generation is even more unequal. A utilitarian would therefore not be happy with this as the vast majority wouldn't be happy and only the elite would be, so it therefore is morally unacceptable. I therefore agree that genetic modification of embryos is morally unacceptable because of the issues it would bring about.</p>	
<p>Overall, I believe disagree that the treatment and use of embryos is morally unacceptable across the board, and that some cases such as screening</p>	

Candidate 5 evidence

8

There is palliative care and on the other hand there is euthanasia/ assisted dying. Euthanasia means good death, meaning merciful death. Assisted dying is where people request to have assistance in death, this is usually for terminally ill people or mentally incompetent adults. Depending on where you are in the world there are different legislations and laws on assisted dying. In some countries like the UK it's illegal and you can be seen as murderous, and can even get life imprisonment. However according to the Dignity in Dying website it shows that 44% of people are willing to break the law to help someone die. 80% of people in the UK support an assisted dying law. An implication is that the majority of the public support an assisted dying law and nearly half would break the law in order to help someone die because of what they believe. So in my opinion it's a moral issue that needs to get a law change in the UK to make it legal. Dignity in Dying is an organisation that campaigns for assisted dying to be legalised in the UK. Currently people have to go to places like Dignitas in Switzerland to receive assistance to die. 1 Brit every 8 days travels to Dignitas according to the Dignity in Dying website. An implication of this is that this is an extreme measure in order to grant their wish of dying, surely it's easier if we just legalise it in the UK. In my opinion we should allow it to be legalised in the UK so it allows people a chance to be in control to an extent of where, how and when they die instead of allowing the condition to control them. In my opinion it's a big moral issue that we don't let animals and pets suffer but we are humans, why are humans any different, why are we making us humans suffer it doesn't make any sense.

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Assisted dying is arguably very good because it relieves people of their suffering and pain. In my opinion how can it be a moral issue that you need to question, if it takes away ones suffering and pain, surely thats all thats important and so its a simple answer of yes it should be legal. People are sometimes physically reduced because of a condition they have. An example of this is Tony Nicklinson, he had locked in syndrome and couldn't move apart from his head and his eyes, he couldn't speak and had to communicate by blinking. He couldn't commit suicide because his condition couldn't allow him to so campaigned for assisted dying but wasn't allowed to. An implication of this is that he didn't want to be remembered in that state, he simply wanted to die rather than be like that. In my opinion cases like these show that ending ones life is morally justifiable because because surely its better to die than to live in a dead mans body like Tony Nicklinson was. In my opinion its a massive moral issue that needs to be talked about because how can someone like Tony had to live in that state where he couldn't speak, nothing worked only his mind and his mind said that he wanted to die which wasn't allowed, its not fair. Theres also the moral issue of people having dementia or alzheimers and if they should be allowed to die. People dont always want to have to be looked after like a baby, they will start to feel like a burden and don't want their friends and family to see them like that and have to care for them. People dont want to be an emotional, financial and physical burden on their families. An implication of this is that people dont want their families to see them in such a state where they may not even remember your name, this can be very overwhelming and having to look after them can take alot out of you. In my opinion with an ageing population this is going to become more and more of a moral issue because there will be an increase in already elderly children looking after their very elderly and fragile parents and their should be the option to end your life with dignity before being seen in that state. Terry Pratchett campaigned for assisted dying to be legal when he found out he had alzheimer's, he said 'my life, my death, my choice'. An implication of this is that the issue of autonomy is a big moral issue when discussing assisted dying, the idea that everyone should be able to decide their death. In my opinion autonomy is crucial when disucssing end of life care because i think people must have the right to choose how they die.</p> <p>However end of life care is also a moral issue because it can go wrong. The drugs used in death penalty are the same ones used sometimes in assisted dying. An implication of this is the moral issue is that it doesn't sound humane and peaceful. In my opinion when hearing that the drugs used in injections for assisted dying are the same as capital punishment, i thought that is barbaric, not humane at all and doesn't make assisted dying seem morally right. There are also sometimes issues when being euthanised, there is throwing up, prolongation of death by as much as 7 days. 1 in 3 assisted dying deaths are 30 hours long. An implication of this is its not humane and peaceful but instead excruciatingly long and can go wrong. The main moral issue when discussing euthanasia is the slippery slope argument. Nicola Sturgen says 'I worry about the thin end of the wedge'. An implication of this is that once legalising assisted dying for terminal illnesses its too easy to legalise non terminal illnesses. In Belgium terminally ill children are now allowed to have assisted dying. The Netherlands allow peopple with tinnitus, autism, depression and theres even talk about healthy over 75s being allowed to be euthanised. An implication of this is all it takes is a shift in collective mindset and it can mean</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>a tightly drawn legislation can be expanded further and further. Daniel James was a rugby player who paralysed his spine and so became miserable and wanted to be euthanased. His parents reluctantly took him to a hospital where he died. An implication of this is Daniel did not have a terminal condition he could have lived a perfectly healthy long life but instead had assisted death. In my opinion it's just too easy to take advantage of assisted dying, it may become dangerous and become a default answer for many cases like Daniel James who was not going to die any time soon.</p> <p>Palliative care is the other option for end of life care. This helps people and their families who have problems associated with limited life. Cicely Saunders the founder of the hospice movement said she wants dying people to feel confident and doesn't want to abandon people in their greatest hour of need. Palliative care helps with physical, spiritual and emotional needs. There are specialists within palliative care which help reduce pain suffering. An implication of this is it helps dying people have the best quality of life possible up to their dying day. In my opinion whilst palliative care is a wonderful thing that society should be built on, it ultimately doesn't take away 'total pain' which only euthanasia can really do so euthanasia will always give a compelling case. In my opinion it's arguably selfish to not let people die when people are suffering to such an extent physically or emotionally.</p> <p>A religious moral issue to do with end of life care is the sanctity of life. Roman Catholics say 'thou shall not kill' and that we should sustain life. An implication of this is that they believe it's an unforgivable sin to let people die so are against euthanasia and assisted dying. They believe that God gives and takes away life. An implication of this is that we should not interfere by playing God and ending life. There is the idea that we are made in the image of God, so our life is meaningful and valuable. An implication of this is that we should protect life because it's sacred and valuable. However in my opinion the religious moral issue argument is not strong because not everyone is religious and so it shouldn't count as an argument because why should others suffer when they don't believe in the sanctity of life, it shouldn't count towards anything. However the new testament follows Jesus's teachings on love and care and compassion, 'love thy neighbour'. An implication of this is that surely euthanasia would be seen as compassionate because it's taking away suffering. In my opinion surely taking away one's total suffering is the most compassionate act one can do, it's unselfish and surely that's what Jesus would have wanted.</p> <p>Dignity in dying pressure group campaign for change in legislation. 300 dying people a year commit suicide in the UK. An implication of this is because euthanasia is not available they turn to self suicide. In my opinion this is shocking and a massive moral issue that we sit and allow people to commit suicide and continue to not change the law allowing for it to be legal in the UK.</p> <p>The Hippocratic oath would agree with palliative care and how we should help reduce one's suffering and quality of life till one's dying day.</p>	

