

The author's main conclusion is that we need thoughtful cautious analysis rather than entertaining illogical calls for radical change. He acknowledges the call that many make for more radical action, before exposing the illogical bases of calls for radical action. On this basis, he concludes that such illogical calls for radical change should not be entertained, and that we should favour more evidence-based analyses. Ultimately, the author's argument perplexingly oscillates between a thoughtful call to consider the complexities of issues and a dismissive strawmanning of alternative perspectives, rendering it weak overall.

To the author's credit, he correctly recognises that some calls to radical action might be prone to oversimplifying issues, making such calls undesirable. His example of gun control is a largely apt one — it is true that while gun control laws might address the issue of gun violence in the States, there are other factors that must be examined. For instance, guns might be crucial for self-defence in rural communities where land enforcement might be over half an hour away. Additionally, gun control might not solve the root causes of gun violence — the causes of school shooters' disillusionment should be tackled. Thus, the author's overall point — that thoughtful, cautious consideration of many perspectives is needed to solve complex problems — is a fair and compelling one.

However, it is less clear whether the author is consistently successful in supporting this conclusion, when he lapses into dismissive critiques of other points of view. For instance, he dismisses calls for radical change by claiming its proponents contradict themselves when they criticise caution — sometimes they claim that radical change can save the world and sometimes it can ruin it. This is, perhaps, an excessively harsh judgement — of course, there is no obligation for advocates of 'radical' action to defend every kind of radical reform. Climate activists might demand the shutting down of coal power plants but they would certainly not defend radical action for the opposite purpose — to tear down all wind farms. The author's argumentative move here — to show that if advocates of

radical action want only the right kinds of action, that they should advocate for prudent consideration — is perhaps too simplistic, insofar as the author conflates the call for radical action with the dismissal of all caution — perhaps many of these advocates have cautiously considered these issues but still decided that radical action is necessary. Hence, a large change does not have to be a hastily drawn conclusion — radical action is not the same as imprudence.

Hence, the author's overall conflation of two distinct concepts — radical change and throwing caution to the wind — makes his argument dismissive of those who advocate radical change, rendering his argument weak.

AO2: 10/10 AO3: 5/5 Total: 15/15

### **Examiner's Comments**

NIL