



2010 Philosophy

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2010

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 purposes written permission must be obtained from the External Print Team, Centre Services, Dalkeith.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (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 centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's External Print Team, Centre Services, at Dalkeith may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

Marking a philosophy exam is not a purely mechanical exercise and it is important for markers to use their professional judgment within the framework laid down by these guidelines. In particular it is important to note the following:

1. The information indicating the points which a candidate might be expected to make in response to a question should be treated as a guideline: a candidate will not necessarily have to cover all the points listed in order to gain the available marks and credit should be given for additional valid points made by the candidate, even if they have not been listed.
2. Marking is positive not negative. That is to say marks are not deducted when an error is made. If a candidate makes an incorrect statement that does not impinge on anything else they have written then that statement can be ignored. However, it can often be the case, especially in the longer answers, that the marker will have to make a judgment about what a candidate means by a particular statement and how this illustrates their understanding of the material. Making these kinds of judgments requires the marker to consider the wider context. In these cases it can be legitimate to consider the incorrect statements when trying to form a judgment about what the candidate has written.
3. Each question (or sub-question) is marked holistically. That is to say the marker is not required to identify separate marks for KU and AE. The allocation of marks to KU or AE is there as a guide and a help to candidates; the distribution of KU and AE was never intended to be 'followed slavishly'. Similarly, the marker should use the distribution of marks as a guide when assessing an answer. In particular, markers should be aware that if a question is allocated AE marks then there must be evidence of analysis and/or evaluation in the candidate's answer. On the other hand, markers should also be aware that analysis and evaluation depends upon knowledge and understanding. For this reason credit should be given when additional KU points contribute to a candidate's AE answer.
4. Markers should be aware that the final mark awarded to a question does not necessarily have to correspond exactly to the number of substantive points that have been made. A fewer number of points that are developed, show insight or demonstrate a more sophisticated understanding of the material may carry more weight than a greater number of points that are superficial or are inaccurately or ambiguously expressed. This consideration is likely to be more relevant when marking questions that attract a higher number of marks.
5. If a candidate writes more in answer to one part of a question than is necessary to gain full marks and the additional content is relevant to the next part of that question then credit for what the candidate has written can be carried forward.
6. The following procedure should be used for marking:
 - a. As the answer is read all points relevantly made in accordance with the marking instructions for that question and the marker's own professional judgment will be ticked. (Markers must **not** write any comments on the scripts but may use ticks, crosses, question marks or underlining to assist with their marking.)
 - b. At the same time, or through a re-reading of the answer, an initial impression should be formed about the quality of an answer as indicated by the Grade Descriptions for an A and C. This is particularly relevant for questions that attract a higher number of marks.
 - c. Taking into account both a and b the total mark for that question is to be written at the end of the question and circled.

To assist with the final allocation of marks the following table should be consulted.

	Indicative of a grade C	Indicative of a grade A
30 mark question	15-17	21-30
20 mark question	10-11	14-20

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C

Skills	Grade C	Grade A
<p><i>Knowledge and Understanding</i></p>	<p>candidates have described some (but not all) of the features of argument, and the philosophical issues, theories and positions in relation to each Unit</p> <p>the descriptions are mainly clear and largely accurate</p>	<p>candidates have described the main features of argument, and the philosophical issues, theories and positions in relation to each Unit</p> <p>the descriptions are clear, accurate and presented in a well-structured manner</p> <p>the descriptions may provide evidence of the integration of knowledge and understanding across the Units of the Course</p>
<p><i>Critical Analysis and Evaluation</i></p>	<p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the stages of reasoning and the assumptions on which ordinary language arguments and philosophical positions, theories and accounts of knowledge are based</p> <p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the following: deductive and inductive reasoning; sound and unsound arguments; examples of fallacious reasoning when these are present (CTU)</p> <p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the implications, strengths and weaknesses of positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate and normative moral theories, the meta-ethical position of emotivism and an account of knowledge</p> <p>candidates have made attempts to assess, or reach conclusions on, the soundness of ordinary language arguments and the relative merits of normative moral theories, the meta-ethical position of emotivism and an account of knowledge</p>	<p>candidates have explained the main stages of reasoning and the assumptions on which ordinary language arguments and philosophical positions, theories and accounts of knowledge are based</p> <p>candidates have explained the following: deductive and inductive reasoning; sound and unsound arguments; examples of fallacious reasoning when these are present (CTU)</p> <p>candidates have explained the main implications, strengths and weaknesses of positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate and normative moral theories, the meta-ethical position of emotivism and an account of knowledge</p> <p>candidates have made assessments or reached conclusions on the soundness of ordinary language arguments and the relative merits of normative moral theories, the meta-ethical position of emotivism and an account of knowledge</p>

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C (continued)

Skills	Grade C	Grade A
<p><i>Critical Analysis and Evaluation (continued)</i></p>	<p>candidates have given at least one reason which supports the assessments or conclusions they have reached</p> <p>the points made are mainly clear and largely free from inaccuracy</p> <p>the points made relate to the question asked</p>	<p>candidates have given 2 or more developed reasons – based on evidence, aspects and, or sources previously discussed – which support the assessments or conclusions reached</p> <p>the points made are clear and free from inaccuracy</p> <p>the points made are presented in a well-structured manner and are used to support a conclusion that answers the question asked</p> <p>there may be evidence that the candidate is aware of the wider implications and/or relevance of the skills, theories, positions and issues they have studied</p> <p>there may be evidence of the integration of knowledge and skills across the Units of the Course</p>

SECTION 1 – CRITICAL THINKING IN PHILOSOPHY

Section 1 – Total Marks 20

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘*Critical Thinking in Philosophy*’.
- It has **one** structured question with **4-10** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-6** and requires either a short answer or restricted response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question.

There is no choice in Section 1 of the Question Paper.

Question 1

There is nothing beneficial about banning animal experimentation. This would only deprive the seriously ill of medical advances. Moreover, the only regime to support a ban on animal experiments was Nazi Germany. Don’t you realise that what you are saying makes you no better than them?

(a) Identify a premise and a conclusion in the above argument. 2 KU

- Premise: This (ie banning animal experimentation) would only deprive the seriously ill of medical advances
 - the only regime to support a ban on animal experiments was Nazi Germany
 - you don’t want to be like the Nazis (implied)
- Conclusion: There is nothing beneficial about banning animal experimentation.

(b) What is a ‘hidden’ premise and why are they often ‘hidden’? 2 KU

- An unstated assumption that is necessary to make the argument work as intended.
- Regarded as obvious. Therefore, does not need to be stated.
- Context of the argument makes it clear.
- Deliberately to conceal a dubious claim.
- The assumption that the person hearing/reading the argument knows what is in your mind.
- Appropriate example.

(c) Suggest 2 possible hidden premises assumed by this argument. 2AE

- It would be wrong to deprive the seriously ill of medical advances.
- Anything that the Nazis supported is wrong.
- You don’t want to be like the Nazis.
- Medical advances are beneficial.
- Depriving the seriously ill of medical advances is not beneficial.

Credit should be given for any assumption that the person is likely to hold and is germane to the argument.

(d) What is a fallacy? Give an example of your own to support your answer. 2KU

- A common error in reasoning.
- A flawed argument.
- Any appropriate example of common type of fallacy.

(e) Is a fallacy being committed in the above passage? Give reasons for your answer. 2AE

- Arguably an Ad Hominem. An appropriate reason, eg ‘The final sentence suggests the accusation that the proposition is false because the person thinks like a Nazi.’ Alternatively a candidate may say that although there is a reference to Nazis this does not mean that the person’s argument is being rejected on the basis of a personal attack.
- Appeal to consequences. There is no fallacious appeal to consequences in this argument because depriving the seriously ill of medical advances is a relevant consequence for determining the rightness and wrongness of the ban and also for evaluating the benefits of the ban. However, the Nazi argument arguably might be construed as an appeal to consequences.

(f) Is every appeal to authority a fallacy? Give a reason for your answer. 2AE

- No. This fallacy is committed if a conclusion *c* is inferred from the fact that some person or group asserts *c*, without justifying the right of that person or group to be regarded as authoritative in this matter. (The candidate does not necessarily have to give such a precise answer and may give an example of a non-fallacious appeal to authority.)

1 mark for ‘no’; 1 mark for an appropriate reason; 0 marks for ‘no’ without a reason.

(g) State whether the following claims about sound arguments are true or false. 4 KU

1. **A sound argument can have a false conclusion.**
2. **A sound argument can have a false premise.**
3. **An unsound argument can be valid.**
4. **An unsound argument can have true premises and a true conclusion.**

- 1F 2F 3T 4T

(h) Is it possible for a circular argument to be sound? Explain your answer. 2 AE

- Yes. Although it may be uninformative if the premise is true then the conclusion will also necessarily be true so it meets the definition of soundness.

1 mark for ‘yes’; 1 mark for an appropriate reason; 0 marks for ‘yes’ without a reason.

(i) What are the limitations of inductive arguments? 2 AE

- Do not guarantee the truth of the conclusion.
- Based on limited observations.
- Conclusion is probable rather than certain.
- Future observations may reveal counter examples.

(20)

SECTION 2 – METAPHYSICS

Section 2 – total marks 20

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘*Metaphysics*’.
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** related parts.
- Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **4-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response.

Candidates answer **all** parts of the **one** structured question which relates to the option they have studied.

Question 2

How successful is the cosmological argument in proving the existence of God?

**10 KU
10 AE**

A candidate may gain full marks by giving a detailed discussion of just one version of the cosmological argument or may refer to any of the standard versions of the argument, ie the first cause argument; the argument from contingency: the Kalaam argument.

- A posteriori
- Chain of cause and effect requires an ultimate cause
- Reference to classical statements of the argument, eg
 - Aristotle (prime mover)
 - Aquinas (first cause)
- Distinction between necessary and contingent existence
- Leibniz: the principle of sufficient reason – since everything requires an explanation the universe requires an explanation
- Answer to the problem of infinite regress
- Problems
 - who/what caused God
 - Russell
 - the cosmos is a brute fact
 - the fallacy of composition
 - Hume/Kant – can the ‘principle of sufficient reason’ be applied to the whole universe
 - Kant – collapses into the ontological argument
 - leads to a narrow definition of God
 - natural forces may meet the requirement of a first cause.

In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 10 marks; if the answer is indicative of a ‘B’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 12 marks; if the answer is indicative of an ‘A’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 14 marks.

Section 2 – Total Marks 20

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘*Metaphysics*’.
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** related parts.
- Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **4-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response.

Candidates answer **all** parts of the **one** structured question which relates to the option they have studied.

Question 3

Is Compatibilism a successful response to the problems raised by the theory of determinism?

**10 KU
10 AE**

- Explanation of what is meant by determinism:
 - explanation of necessity – causal determinism
 - every event, including human actions, has a sufficient set of causes.
- Explanation of ‘the problem raised by the theory of determinism’:
 - counter-intuitive – the psychological sense of being free
 - no place for moral responsibility
 - no place for human dignity – reductivist.
- Discussion of the compatibilist definition of freedom:
 - the lack of coercion/constraint
 - the freedom to do what you desire
 - we have free will when we can bring our will into line with our second-order volitions.

Discussion of the compatibilist response to the problems:

Counter intuitive:

- people have a strong sense of when they are acting according to their desires and this is the only freedom that really matters to most people.
 - A critic of compatibilism would say that we are still not free because we cannot choose our desires.
- Frankfurt’s version of compatibilism draws a distinction between first and second order desires.

Moral responsibility:

- Compatibilists can justify praise, blame and punishment by emphasizing the role of the person.
- Still has difficulty justifying retributive punishment.

Human dignity:

- Emphasizing the role of the person restores human dignity.
 - Arguably collapses into hard determinism.
- Frankfurt clearly distinguishes between human freedom and the freedom of animals.

In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 10 marks; if the answer is indicative of a 'B' then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 12 marks; if the answer is indicative of an 'A' then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 14 marks.

(20)

SECTION 3 – EPISTEMOLOGY

Section 3 – total marks 40

- This section examines the content of the unit ‘*Epistemology*’.
- It has **two** parts.
- Candidates answer **one** structured question in **both parts** of this section.

The nature of each question is outlined below:

Part 1 – total marks 10

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section One of the Epistemology Unit.
- It has **one** structured question with **2-4** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-6** and requires a restricted response (**KU only**).

Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question.

Question 4

(a) **In what ways might experience be limited as a source of knowledge?** **3 KU**

- 1 mark for making a link to empiricism.
- Relevant examples (optical illusions, etc).
- Particularly a problem for empiricists who wish to ground knowledge in sense experience.

(b) **In what ways might reason be limited as a source of knowledge?** **3 KU**

- 1 mark for making a link to rationalism.
- Relevant examples of how reason might be unreliable (brain in vat, etc).
- Particularly a problem for rationalists who wish to ground knowledge in the reliability of human reason.

(c) **Explain the infinite regress argument as used by sceptics.** **4 KU**

- Explanation of what is meant by ‘sceptic’.
- Mention of the tri-partite theory of knowledge.
- Attacks the justification criterion.
- Every supporting reason for a knowledge claim needs its own justification.
- Appropriate examples.

(10)

Part 2 – total marks 30

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit.
- It has **two** structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit.
- Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-8** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **3-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of the **one** structured question which examines the option they have studied.

Question 5

Read the following extract and answer the questions that follow.

“And thus I now seem able to posit as a general rule that everything I very clearly and distinctly perceive is true.”

(a) Give three examples of what Descartes might regard as clear and distinct perceptions.

3 KU

- The cogito.
- God’s existence.
- $3 + 2 = 5$.
- Any other relevant point.

NB the candidate should offer at least two different types of example.

(b) What does Descartes mean by seeing something ‘clearly and distinctly’?

3 KU

- Perceptions which are so self-evident that, while they are held in the mind, they cannot logically be doubted.
- Something that gives rise to irresistible certainty.
- Clear = present to the attentive mind.
- Distinct = not confused with anything that is not clear.
- Known by the ‘light of nature’.

(c) Explain how Descartes employs the idea of clear and distinct perceptions in his attempt to establish certain knowledge.

8 AE

- Does not build directly on the cogito of Meditation 2.
- Establishes a rule by which certain knowledge can be recognised.
- Looks back to the cogito and observes that he is certain of this.
- This knowledge is perceived clearly and distinctly.
- This now becomes a bench mark against which other propositions can be measured.
- Uses this to establish the existence of God.
- God is no deceiver and therefore guarantees C&DPs.
- God guarantees the reliability of those things perceived clearly and distinctly when they are no longer present to the mind.

NB the candidate can gain a maximum of two marks for explaining the cogito and two marks for detailing the trademark argument.

(d) What problems are there with Descartes' use of the clear and distinct rule? 6 AE

- The Cartesian circle and explanation.
- Subjective criterion of truth and explanation.
- Is the clear and distinct rule known clearly and distinctly?

**(e) What evidence is there in the *Meditations* that Descartes is a rationalist? 4 KU
Give examples to illustrate your answer. 6 AE**

- Purely *a priori* approach.
- His use of thought experiments as opposed to empirical observation.
- Using mathematical certainty as a model for reliable knowledge.
- His rejection of sense experience in Med 1.
- The knowledge of self existence arrived at through reason.
- The trademark argument – an *a priori* argument.
- The mind contains innate ideas – idea of God and of his own existence.
- No *a posteriori*/empirical propositions in his arguments – reason alone applied to self evident truths.
- His total reliance on reason.
- Truths about the world can be grasped by the mind without reference to the world.
- Sense experience accepted when qualified by reason (Med 6).

(30)

Part 2 – total marks 30

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit.
- It has **two** structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit.
- Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-8** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **3-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of the **one** structured question which examines the option they have studied.

Question 6

Read the following extract and answer the questions that follow.

“All the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, Relations of Ideas, and Matters of Fact.”

(a) Give three examples of what Hume might regard as a ‘Relation of Ideas’. **3 KU**

- Geometry – Pythagoras’ Theorem.
- Algebra – $a + a = 2a$.
- Arithmetic – three times five is equal to the half of thirty.
- Candidates may also refer to examples such as necessary, analytic and a *priori* ideas.

NB the candidate should offer at least two different types of example.

(b) What does Hume mean by ‘Matters of Fact’? **3 KU**

- Examples from Hume, eg my friend is in France.
- Anything empirically observable.
- Anything where the contrary is conceivable.
- Anything where the contrary is logically possible.
- Candidates may also refer to examples such as contingent, synthetic and a *posteriori* ideas.

(c) Explain the purpose of ‘Hume’s Fork’. **8 AE**

- To define the limits of human knowledge.
- To support his empiricist approach to knowledge.
- To justify his mitigated scepticism.
- All knowledge worthy of philosophical consideration falls within these two categories.
- Relations of ideas says nothing about what actually exists.
- Matters of fact are genuinely informative and are therefore the source of knowledge about the world.
- Rules out metaphysical claims which then become metaphysical nonsense and should be ‘cast unto the flames’. Appropriate examples.

NB credit can be given for drawing the ‘matters of fact’/‘relation of ideas’ distinction as long as new information is introduced.

(d) What problems are there with ‘Hume’s Fork’?

6 AE

- Hume’s distinction seems to conflate the epistemological distinction of how we come to know something – be it *a priori* or *a posteriori* – with the semantic distinction (introduced by Kant) of whether it is true by definition or not – be it analytic or synthetic.
- The possibility of synthetic *a priori*, eg the shortest distance between two points is a straight line.
- The possibility of the necessary *a posteriori*, eg water is H₂O.
- The possibility that all analytic statements can be reduced to synthetic statements (Quine).
- The problem of knowing whether the ‘fork’ is itself a matter of fact or a relation of ideas.
- It is not clear whether some propositions are matters of fact or are relations of ideas, eg the existence of God.
- Can Hume write off whole areas of philosophy as nonsense? Any discussion of God, the souls, the self and the metaphysical notion of substance are cast outside the realm of philosophical study.
- Hume applies the tool to our concept of causation which leads to the conclusion that our belief in necessary connection is in fact the product of custom and habit and is not derived (directly) from empirical observation or from logical deduction.

(e) What evidence is there in the *Enquiries* that Hume is an empiricist? Give examples to illustrate your answer.

**4 KU
6 AE**

The candidate should give a clear account of Hume’s empiricist approach to knowledge and may mention:

- The aim of the Enquiry is to undergo a study of man.
- All knowledge is gained from sense experience:
 - impressions and ideas
 - clear explanation of the relationship between the two
 - simple and complex impressions and ideas, including appropriate examples
 - Humes’ arguments supporting his claim.
- Rejects innate ideas.
- Account of causation based custom and habit rather than ‘demonstration’.
- Sceptical of the ability of reason to justify scientific knowledge.
- Builds on previous empiricist approach, Locke.
- Based on inductive reasoning rather than deductive reasoning. Appropriate examples – causation, reason of animals.

SECTION 4 – MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Section 4 – total marks 40

- This section examines the content of the Unit ‘*Moral Philosophy*’.
- It has **two** parts.
- Candidates answer **one** structured question in **both parts** of this section.

The nature of each question is outlined below:

Part 1 – total marks 30

- This part of Section 4 samples across the mandatory content of Section 1 of the Unit.
- It has **one** essay question which may be divided into **two** related parts.
- It may contain a short case study or stimulus.

The question requires an extended response of **500-600** words.

Question 7

Your close friend says she wants to tell you a secret but before telling you makes you promise to tell nobody. She then explains that the previous night she had been out with her friends stealing and had nearly been caught. The police are now asking questions and your friend says she needs an alibi. Your friend tells you that unless you lie to the police she will get a criminal record.

Explain and evaluate the advice Kantians would give to you in this situation.

15 KU

15 AE

Knowledge and Understanding may include:

- Deontological ethics.
- Intention not consequences.
- Motives/duty versus inclination/desires.
- The Good Will.
- Self-legislators/moral agency/rational beings/autonomy.
- Hypothetical Imperative compared to Categorical Imperative.
- Maxims.
- Components of Categorical Imperative – how it works.
- Universalisation/Ends not Means.

Analysis of example and Evaluation:

- Kant’s focus on how rational beings behave – duty to tell the truth, regardless of consequences.
- The example should undergo the Categorical Imperative test.
- An appropriate maxim should be identified and stated. Possible contradiction in conception and/or the will.
- Does it pass the Universalisation test?
- How does the maxim survive Ends not Means?
- Problem of conflicting duties – telling the truth and protecting a friend.
- Difficulty of ignoring consequences – intuition to consider consequences.
- Problem of ignoring emotions/attachment to your friend.
- Kantianism distinguishes between duty and inclination which is particularly required when a friend is involved.
- Kantianism fits in with our wish for justice/intuitive sense of right and wrong.
- Not considering consequences “frees us” to do our duty.

In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 15 marks; if the answer is indicative of a 'B' then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 18 marks; if the answer is indicative of an 'A' then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 21 marks.

NB no more than 20 marks can be awarded if there is no clear account of Kant's categorical imperative even if there is other high quality descriptive material.

(30)

Part 2 – total marks 10

- This part of Section 4 samples across the mandatory content of Section 2 of the Unit.
- It has **one** structured question with **1-4** related parts.
- It may contain a short stimulus.
- The related parts have a possible mark range of **2-10** and require either a restricted or extended response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question.

There is no choice of questions in Section 4 of the Question Paper.

Question 8

Explain and evaluate Emotivism.

**5 KU
5 AE**

Explanation may include:

- Meta-ethical theory dealing with the nature of moral statements rather than the way in which moral judgements are made – contrast to normative ethics.
- Theory about what we are doing when we describe an action as right or wrong.
- Moral statements for the Emotivist have no factual content/contain no moral truths/are not propositions.

Candidates may answer this with particular reference to a philosopher they have studied or they may simply address the main claims of Emotivism.

Ayer

- Explanation of Ayer's view of meaningfulness.
- Possible reference to "Language, Truth and Logic".
- Meaningful putative propositions are either analytic or capable of empirical verification.
- According to Ayer, 4 types of moral statements: 1) definitions of ethical terms, 2) descriptions of moral phenomena, 3) "exhortations to moral virtue" and 4) "actual ethical judgements".
- 1 and 2 pass his criteria but not 3 and 4 therefore meaningless – simply expressions of emotion.

C.L Stevenson's approach

- Possible reference to "The Emotive Meaning of Ethical Terms".
- Explanation of descriptive and dynamic use of language.
- Moral statements have emotive meaning.
- Moral statements to persuade others.

Evaluation may include:

- Emotivism makes moral arguments impossible.
- Reduces serious moral issues to level of discussing trivial matters in the context of a “matter of taste”.
- Difficulty of articulating moral values in the manner understood by most people.
- We seem to use the language of facts when discussing moral issues.
- Reduces moral debate to an exchange of emotional attitudes.
- Objectively right moral answers seem important to us.
- Logical positivism/verification principle is in itself flawed as it fails its own test of what is a meaningful statement.

(10)

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]