Centre Number			Candidate Number		
Surname					
Other Names					
Candidate Signature					



General Certificate of Education Advanced Subsidiary Examination January 2013

# **Critical Thinking**

CRIT1

## **Unit 1** Foundation Unit

Thursday 17 January 2013 9.00 am to 10.30 am

For this paper you must have:

a Source Booklet (enclosed).

#### Time allowed

1 hour 30 minutes

#### Instructions

- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Fill in the boxes at the top of this page.
- Answer all questions.
- You must answer the questions in the spaces provided. Do not write outside the box around each page or on blank pages.
- Do all rough work in this book. Cross through any work you do not want to be marked.

## Information

- The marks for questions are shown in brackets.
- The maximum mark for this paper is 70 (50 for Section A and 20 for Section B).
- You will be marked on your ability to:
  - use good English
  - organise information clearly
  - use specialist vocabulary where appropriate.

#### **Advice**

- The recommended time allocation for this examination is as follows:
  - Initial reading: 15 minutes
    Section A: 45 minutes
    Section B: 30 minutes.

For Examiner's Use					
Examiner's Initials					
Question	Mark				
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
TOTAL					

## Section A

Study **Documents A**, **B** and **C** before answering **all** the questions in the spaces provided.

There are **50 marks** available for this section.

Question	s 1 to 3 refer to Document A.
1	Whose side is the author, Dominic Lawson on; Mr Movahedi's or Ms Bahrami's? Justify your answer with reference to the text.
	(3 marks)



2	Identify <b>two</b> significant similarities and <b>three</b> significant differences between the punishment proposed for Mr Movahedi and the crime he committed against Ms Bahrami.	
	(5 marks)	
	With reference to <b>paragraph 3</b> , what implicit assumption is made in Amnesty International's argument that such a sentence on Mr Movahedi was not a proper punishment since it 'amounted to torture'?	
	International's argument that such a sentence on Mr Movahedi was not a proper	
	International's argument that such a sentence on Mr Movahedi was not a proper	
	International's argument that such a sentence on Mr Movahedi was not a proper	
	International's argument that such a sentence on Mr Movahedi was not a proper	

Turn over for the next question

Turn over ▶



i	Tom  Bev  Critically ass	Did you so blinding so he needs makes the me.  Why shouses the quantum sess the quantum ses	omeone his hea e whole Id we c	e is ok! ad exan world	It's ba nined. ( blind", a nat Gand	rbaric; t Gandhi h and wha dhi says	hat's what nimself s it Gandh :? He's l	at it is, a aid, "An i says is been de	and if you eye food good o	ou ask me r an eye enough fo
) (		·				·			ad ove	r 50 years
	Critically ass	sess the qua	llity of T	Γom's r	easonir	ng in this	s extract.			
										•••••
) (										
) (										(3 marl
	Critically ass	sess the qua	ility of E	Bev's re	easonin	g in this	extract.			
	•••••									(2 marl



5	Read th	e following extract from Document B.	
	Bev	[] And he's wrong anyway. Blinding one person won't make the whole world blind. Look, let's say each half of the world pokes out an eye of the other half. Then the first half pokes out the one remaining eye of the second half. It follows that the second half will now be blind; and that's why they won't be able to find the first half in order to do some eye-poking. So, at most, only half the world would be blind, with the remaining half being one-eyed. So there!	
	Analyse its struct	Bev's reasoning by identifying the reasons and conclusion(s), and outlining ure.	
	•••••		
		(7 marks)	

(7 marks

Turn over for the next question

Turn over ▶

Bev	[] None of those 7800 cases of women being deliberately burned by men would have happened if those men knew the same would be done to them in return. I know I would think twice about blinding someone if I knew I would be blinded as a punishment.
Explain t	he flaw in this argument.
	(3 ma
	,
	e following extract before answering question 7.  [ ] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong But
	e following extract before answering question 7.  [] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right, because two wrongs don't make a right.
Tom	[] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right,
Tom Outline to	[] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right, because two wrongs don't make a right.  ne structure of Tom's argument.
Tom Outline to	[] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right, because two wrongs don't make a right.  ne structure of Tom's argument.
Tom Outline to	[] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right, because two wrongs don't make a right.  ne structure of Tom's argument.
Tom Outline to	[] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right, because two wrongs don't make a right.  ne structure of Tom's argument.
Tom Outline to	[] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right, because two wrongs don't make a right.  ne structure of Tom's argument.
Tom Outline to	[] When Movahedi blinded Ms Bahrami what he did was wrong. But blinding him is an act of pure revenge, so blinding him is not right, because two wrongs don't make a right.



7 (b)	Identify an implicit assumption that Tom makes in this argument.	
	(2 marks)	Г
Questions	s 8 to 10 refer to Document C.	
8	Read paragraphs 1 and 2 before answering question 8.	
	In paragraph 1, the doctor says: "What happened to my patient could not be described as justice, except in the technical sense that it was the sentence passed by a judge."	
	The doctor refers to one sense of justice as the 'technical' sense.	
8 (a)	What other meaning could the word 'justice' have?	
	(3 marks)	
8 (b)	Identify the doctor's main conclusion (in paragraph 2).	
	(2 marks)	Г
		ιl

Turn over ▶

5



Consider the fo	ollowing two arg	guments befor	e answering qu	uestion 9.
	ibutive justice is s outive justice is w		he legal establis	shment.
	ce has a continui outive justice is riç		sentiments of th	ne public.
Explain the flaw	in each argumer	nt.		
				(6
				(-



Re-read the following paragraph from Document C before answering question 10.

The law of an 'eye for an eye', it is true, makes no attempt to deal with notions of forgiveness or rehabilitation, which are at the heart of modern systems of justice. Yet the state has no right to forgive an attacker on behalf of the victim – for it is uniquely the right of the victim to decide whether to forgive or not; as for rehabilitation, that is a valuable social tool, but it has absolutely nothing to do with justice, as commonly understood.
Comment critically on the quality of Lawson's reasoning.
(8 marks

**Turn over for Section B** 

Turn over ▶



10

# Section B

Answer this question in the space provided.

	There are 20 marks available for this question.
11	Write a reasoned argument in response to the following claim.  'An eye for an eye' is both wrong in principle and unworkable in practice.
	In your answer you should:
	<ul> <li>state your conclusion (or conclusions) clearly</li> <li>offer effective reasoning to support your conclusion(s)</li> <li>use the information and respond to issues or arguments in the source documents.</li> </ul>







(20 marks)

# **END OF QUESTIONS**

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.



20