



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
General Certificate of Education
Advanced Subsidiary Level and Advanced Level

THINKING SKILLS

9694/21

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

October/November 2011

1 hour 45 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet/Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

If you have been given an Answer Booklet, follow the instructions on the front cover of the booklet.

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

DO NOT WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.

Answer **all** the questions.

Start each question on a new answer sheet.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question.

This document consists of **6** printed pages and **2** blank pages.



1 Study the evidence and answer the questions that follow.

Source A**Newspaper Article***Daily News, 4 April*

The Prime Minister, Henry Burns, who has been under increasing pressure during the last few weeks following a succession of bad decisions, now faces further criticism. All sides of political opinion now wonder how long he can survive. Sources in Parliament claim that Mr Burns frequently indulges in fits of bad temper and has even hit members of his staff. He allegedly

smashed a laptop by throwing it at one of his aides.

Anonymous sources claim that a senior official has warned the PM about his behaviour on at least one occasion. The leader of the opposition party has argued that these reports show that the PM is psychologically unfit to lead the nation and he should resign.

Source B**Radio Interview***with Dr Gould, the Finance Minister, 5 April*

I have been a close friend and colleague of the Prime Minister for many years, and I can state categorically that he is not the kind of person who would ever commit violence against a member of his staff. It is true that in moments of extreme stress he has thrown objects, such as a newspaper, but they were not aimed at anyone. On one occasion the PM did accidentally drop a laptop, but he certainly did not throw it at anyone. No senior official has ever warned the PM about his behaviour, although it is part of their role to discuss with Mr Burns how to get the best out of his staff.

Source C**Extracts from website***Bullying Helpline, 7 April*

We offer free, confidential advice and counselling to people who are being bullied at work.
Remember: if you think you are being bullied, then you are!

Breaking news from our Organiser, Flora Nosworth: A newspaper has recently claimed that the Prime Minister is prone to outbursts of temper. I am able to give some additional information relevant to these serious allegations. Because of our policy of confidentiality, I cannot divulge any details, but I can reveal that members of Mr Burns' staff have telephoned our helpline to report that they were being bullied by him.

Source D**Newspaper Article***Daily News, 9 April*

A patron of a bullying helpline has resigned in protest at an alleged breach of confidentiality by its Organiser, Flora Nosworth.

Hilary Askam, who is a senior adviser to the Prime Minister, claims that Flora Nosworth has breached the helpline's promise of confidentiality by publicising the alleged reports from workers in the PM's office. "I was glad to lend my support to this organisation when I thought it was fulfilling an important social need, but Flora Nosworth has regrettably now allowed her own political motives

to overcome her integrity," Ms Askam told our reporter.

"It is now clear that anyone who is being bullied at work should not contact this helpline, because there is a real danger that their identity will be revealed." When asked to comment, Flora Nosworth said that she could give no further details of the telephone calls, but "more than one" member of the PM's personal staff had telephoned for help and the allegations included violent behaviour.

- (a) How reliable is Dr Gould's evidence (Source B)? Justify your answer. [3]
- (b) How useful is Flora Nosworth's evidence (Sources C and D)? Justify your answer. [3]
- (c) How reasonable is Hilary Askam's claim that "anyone who is being bullied at work should not contact this helpline, because there is a real danger that their identity will be revealed" (Source D)? [3]
- (d) How likely is it that Henry Burns has bullied members of his staff? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and considering plausible alternative scenarios. [6]

2 Study the evidence and answer the questions that follow.


Source A

Humans: The Biggest Cause of Extinctions

Nearly all biologists agree that species are becoming extinct at a faster rate than at any time since the dinosaurs were wiped out about 65 million years ago. The rate of extinction is roughly parallel to the rate of growth in energy used by the human population, which can be estimated by multiplying population growth by the growth in wealth.

Source B

Rate of species extinction



The acceleration in the extinction of species is alarming. The graph above is based on a mathematical model which estimates the number of species becoming extinct by measuring the loss of habitats. According to this model, 27 000 species are currently lost per year. By 2022, 22% of all species will be extinct if no action is taken. Moreover, some species even disappear before we know that they existed.

Source C

Only 869 extinctions have been formally recorded since the year 1500, but the actual number is much higher. Knowledge about species and extinction rates remains very poor. Scientists have identified less than 2 million of an estimated 5–30 million species around the world, and only assessed the extinction risk of 3% of those they have identified. The global rate of extinction is calculated from the rate of loss among species which are known.

Source D

Fossil records suggest that for most of the planet's 3.5 billion-year history the steady rate of loss of species has been about one in every million species each year. At this rate, new species replace those lost in a sustainable fashion. If the total number of species is 10 million, the 'background extinction rate' (the natural rate of extinction without interference from humans) is ten species per year.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) is the body which officially declares species threatened and extinct. It calculated in 2004 that the rate of loss was up to 1000 times faster than the natural 'background' rate. At that time, nearly 16 000 species were listed as under threat or disappearing, with more than 200 already described as "possibly extinct" and almost 3000 "critically endangered". This calculation may well have been an underestimate, because relatively few of the world's plants, fungi and insects have yet been formally recorded and assessed.

The IUCN concluded that the world was in the midst of an irreversible large-scale extinction of species, which was being caused by natural habitat destruction, hunting, increasing number of alien predators, disease and climate change. No formal calculations have been published since then, but experts say that rates have almost certainly increased.

- (a) According to the evidence presented in Source A, how reasonable is the claim that humans are "the biggest cause of extinctions"? [3]
- (b) How well does Source B support its claim that "By 2022, 22% of all species will be extinct if no action is taken"? [3]
- (c) 'Extinction is part of the constant evolution of life.'
To what extent does this statement contradict the claim of Source D that the world is "...in the midst of an irreversible large-scale extinction of species"? [3]
- (d) 'Urgent action is required to prevent an irreversible large-scale extinction of species.'
Write a short, reasoned argument to support or challenge this claim, using and evaluating the information provided in Sources A – D. [6]

3 *Read the passage and answer the questions below.*

- 1 It is very widely accepted that a right to health is one of the fundamental human rights, but this view is seriously mistaken. We have only limited control over health. If someone is struck down by an unpreventable and incurable cancer, they and their friends and relatives can reasonably regard it as bad luck – possibly even tragic – but it would make no sense for them to claim that their rights had been violated. It is impossible for us to have a duty to preserve health, since in many cases there is nothing we can do to fulfil such a duty.
- 2 A right to health would claim too much. Common colds, for example – while they may be inconvenient and uncomfortable – do not threaten any basic human good. So we should not expect to escape them.
- 3 If there were a right to health, it would encompass all the kinds of welfare provision that support health, including not only medicines, surgery and nursing care, but also sanitation, education of women, and health advice. Every day, these worthy causes compete with one another for the limited funds available. They are too diverse to be brought together as a single entitlement.
- 4 The United Nations International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (UNIC), which has been followed by many other international documents, claims that we have a human right to “the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health”, which it defines as the standard a state can achieve “to the maximum of its available resources”. But that is ridiculous. No government provides, or even aims to provide, the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health; nor do they dedicate the maximum of their available resources to health care. They have many other calls on those resources, such as education, defence, law and order and the environment, and they do not infringe anyone’s rights when they limit their spending on health.

- (a) Using the exact words from the passage as far as possible, identify the main conclusion. [2]
- (b) Using the exact words from the passage as far as possible, identify **three** reasons used to support the main conclusion. [3]
- (c) Evaluate the reasoning in the argument. In your answer you should consider any strengths, weaknesses, flaws and unstated assumptions. [5]
- (d) ‘The first priority of any government should be preserving the health of its citizens.’
Write your own short argument to support **or** challenge this claim. The conclusion of your argument must be stated. [5]

BLANK PAGE

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Question 2 Source B © <http://www.whole-systems.org/extinctions.html>

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.