Centre Number			Candidate Number		
Surname					
Other Names					
Candidate Signature					



General Certificate of Education Advanced Subsidiary Examination June 2010

Critical Thinking

CRIT2

Unit 2 Information, Inference and Explanation

Thursday 20 May 1.30 pm to 3.00 pm

For this paper you must have:

• a Source Booklet (enclosed)

You may use a calculator.

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 (40 for Section A and 30 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 minutesSection A: 35-40 minutesSection B: 35 minutes.

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

Section A

Study **Documents A** to **D** before answering **all** the questions in the spaces provided.

There are 40 marks for this section.

Questions 1 to 5 refer to Document A				
1	The author clearly approves of the proposed coastal path.			
	Identify two of the reasons he gives in paragraphs 1 to 3 in support of the path.			
	(4 marks)			
	(Timane)			
		4		
2	With reference to paragraphs 4 to 7, how justified is the author's claim that the plan to throw open the coast to the public is 'a revolution'?			
	(3 marks)			



Refer to paragraphs 8 and 9 and comment critically on the argument attributed to 'Members of the House of Lords' in response to the Right to Roam Act, 2000. (3 marks) The National Farmers Union and others have called for voluntary agreements between landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	Defends a second to a control of the
The National Farmers Union and others have called for voluntary agreements between landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	
The National Farmers Union and others have called for voluntary agreements between landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	
The National Farmers Union and others have called for voluntary agreements between landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	
The National Farmers Union and others have called for voluntary agreements between landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	
The National Farmers Union and others have called for voluntary agreements between landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	
The National Farmers Union and others have called for voluntary agreements between landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	/2 morks
landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	(3 Marks)
landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation. Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.	
(2 marks)	
(2 marks)	

Turn over ▶



5		Consider the argument Maxine Fox presents, which is quoted in the final paragraph of Document A .	
		Her clearly implied conclusion is that the public should not be given access to privately owned beaches.	
5	(a)	Briefly summarise Fox's reasoning for this conclusion.	
		(2 marks)	
5	(b)	Comment critically on the quality of Fox's reasoning, and assess any assumptions she makes.	
		(4 marks)	



	'The dispute over the plans for a coastal path is all about conflicting princ	iples.'
	To what extent do you agree with this comment?	
	Briefly explain your answer with reference to Document B .	
		(3 marks
	on 7 refers to Document C: the flow diagram and notes	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'.	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition?	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition? a necessary condition? both necessary and sufficient?	d to decide
estio (a)	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition? a necessary condition? both necessary and sufficient? neither necessary nor sufficient?	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition? a necessary condition? both necessary and sufficient?	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition? a necessary condition? both necessary and sufficient? neither necessary nor sufficient?	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition? a necessary condition? both necessary and sufficient? neither necessary nor sufficient?	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition? a necessary condition? both necessary and sufficient? neither necessary nor sufficient?	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition? a necessary condition? both necessary and sufficient? neither necessary nor sufficient?	d to decide
	'Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years' is one of the conditions use whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way'. Is it: a sufficient condition? a necessary condition? both necessary and sufficient? neither necessary nor sufficient?	d to decide

Turn over ▶



7	(b)	Using the flow diagram and/or the text identify two conditions which are sufficient but not necessary for the existence of a Public Right of Way.
		(2 marks)
7	(c)	Explain why a path cannot be presumed to be a Public Right of Way if it has been used with the landowner's express permission.
		(2 marks)



Qι	Question 8 refers to Document D					
8		Examine the facts and estimates in Document D and assess the support they give for each of the following claims.				
		Briefly explain the reasoning for your answers.				
8	(a)	Given the population of the UK, there would be approximately 1 acre (0.004 km²) of land per person if all of it were shared equally.				
		(2 marks)				
8	(b)	There is an average of 2.5 persons per household in the UK.				
		(3 marks)				
8	(c)	The average density of population in residential areas of the UK is at least 16 times higher than the average density in the UK as a whole.				
		(3 marks)				
		(3 marks)				

Turn over ▶



9	It's all very well to talk about the right to roam if you are just thinking about other people's property. There is a good name for it – the politics of envy. That's all it is: "I can't have it. I can't afford it, so you shouldn't either." But just think if someone came in your living room and said, "This is nice, I think I'll have a picnic." You'd soon change your tune. It's right-to-home that matters not right-to-roam.	
	Suggest two ways in which the above argument could be assessed as weak or flawed.	
	(4 marks)	Γ



Section B

Answer this question.

There are 30 marks for this question.

10 Construct a reasoned case for or against the following statement.

'All open land should be public land. There is no case for protecting landowners or compensating them for public access to their property.'

In presenting your case you should:

- produce a structured argument with a clearly stated conclusion or conclusions
- draw on relevant information and evidence found in the source documents; you may also draw on your own knowledge and experience if relevant
- consider any general principles that may apply

consider and respond to possible counter-arguments.





••	



 (30 marks)

30

END OF QUESTIONS





