

---

**THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/23**

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

**October/November 2015**

**1 hour 45 minutes**

No Additional Materials are required.

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

An answer booklet is provided inside this question paper. You should follow the instructions on the front cover of the answer booklet. If you need additional answer paper ask the invigilator for a continuation booklet.

Answer **all** the questions.

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

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages, **2** blank pages and **1** insert.



## 1 Study the evidence and answer the questions that follow.

**Source A****Evidence**

*from security officer*

I observed a well-dressed elderly couple behaving suspiciously in the store. I now know that they were Dr and Mrs Breslau. Dr Breslau kept picking items up, looking at them and then replacing them. When the couple left the store without buying anything, I followed them onto the pavement and asked to look in the shopping bag which Dr Breslau was carrying. I found four leisure shirts in the bag. When I asked if he had forgotten to pay for these items, Dr Breslau replied that he had not intended to buy the shirts and did not know how they got into his bag. At this point, I called the police.

I did not see Dr Breslau put the shirts into his bag, probably because I lost sight of the couple for a few seconds while they were looking round the store. When I examined the shirts, I discovered that they would not have fitted Dr Breslau.

**Source B****Evidence**

*from Dr Breslau*

My wife and I were looking round the store, without an intention of buying anything in particular. We did not see anything we wanted, and left without buying anything. I never wear leisure shirts, and the ones in my bag were not of my size. I have no idea how the shirts came to be in my shopping bag.

**Source C****Evidence**

*from Dr Charles Cameron*

I worked closely with Dr Breslau for twenty years until he retired five years ago, and I regard him as a personal friend. He was a conscientious and caring doctor, who was greatly loved by his patients. I have never heard any criticism of Dr Breslau in his professional or personal life. The suggestion that he might be guilty of theft is completely out of character.

**Source D****Confidential police report**

Neither Dr Breslau nor his wife has ever been convicted of any offence. Mrs Breslau was once accused of stealing a dress from a shop, but the shop decided not to press charges after Mrs Breslau explained that she had accidentally forgotten to pay for the dress. On several occasions she was a suspect when friends reported that items had been stolen from their houses, but there was no evidence to link Mrs Breslau with any of these thefts, and no action was taken.

- (a) Suggest **two** reasons why the evidence of the security officer (Source A) is reliable. [3]
- (b) Suggest **two** reasons why the evidence of Dr Cameron (Source C) is **not** very useful. [3]
- (c) How significant is the police report (Source D)? [3]
- (d) How do you think the shirts got into Dr Breslau's shopping bag?

Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and considering a plausible alternative conclusion. [6]

## 2 Study the evidence and answer the questions that follow.

**Source A****Advertisement**

Do you suffer from heart disease and are you taking Bradiloxx?  
Do you have a relative who has died of heart disease after taking Bradiloxx?

**You may be eligible for compensation of up to \$1 million – or even more!**

You will probably not even need to go to court.  
In other cases involving suspect medication, the manufacturers have paid compensation in order to avoid an expensive and damaging law case.

If you may have a claim, contact us now.  
You will not pay us a cent for our work on your behalf unless your claim is successful.

**Source B****News report****Shock Death of Opposition Senator**

Senator Bob Blodz died suddenly of a heart attack yesterday, while making a speech in the Senate. It was later revealed that he had been taking Bradiloxx to lower his cholesterol. Other opposition politicians criticised the government for failing to ban the medication despite fears that it might cause heart disease. “How many more healthy victims have to die before this dangerous product is withdrawn?” asked one of Senator Blodz’s colleagues.

**Source C****Medical Evidence**

Charles Crane died of heart failure at the age of 48. He weighed 145 kilos (320 pounds). Since becoming unemployed five years previously, he had rarely left the house and spent most of his time watching television. He was addicted to alcohol and his diet consisted mainly of fast-food takeaways. For more than ten years before his death, he was taking medication for high blood pressure, diabetes, hardening of the arteries and depression. He had also been taking Bradiloxx to lower his cholesterol for at least the last two years.

**Source D****Expert evidence**

My name is Donald Drek. I am Professor of Cardiac Medicine at the University of Newtown and consultant at the university hospital. I am also a paid adviser to the company which manufactures Bradiloxx. I prescribe Bradiloxx to all of my patients, because it has been proved to reduce the cholesterol in the body. I am convinced that some patients would die unnecessarily of heart disease if this valuable treatment were to cease to be available.

- (a) Does Source A contain an argument? Briefly justify your answer. [2]
- (b) Suggest and briefly explain **two** reasons why Source C gives only weak support for the claim that Bradiloxx causes heart disease. [3]
- (c) (i) Suggest one factor which **strengthens** the reliability of Professor Drek's evidence (Source D). Briefly explain your answer. [2]
- (ii) Suggest one factor which **weakens** the reliability of Professor Drek's evidence (Source D). Briefly explain your answer. [2]
- (d) How likely is it that Bradiloxx causes heart disease?

Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using and evaluating the information provided in Sources A–D. [6]

3 Read the passage and answer the questions below.

- 1 When the world's first professional police force was founded in London, in the nineteenth century, it was very unpopular, because members of the public thought the police would interfere in their private affairs. In fact, the breaches of the right to privacy by the police are far worse than anyone could have foreseen at that time. The use of surveillance cameras and computers, together with the insecure nature of modern methods of communication, enable the police to know where we go, what we do, what we say and even what we think.
- 2 The right to self-defence is even more important than the right to privacy, because it follows logically from the right to life and the right to ownership of private property, which are generally recognised as fundamental. Those rights would be meaningless if they did not include the right to defend them with as much force as necessary. Yet the introduction of a police force requires every citizen to hand over their right of self-defence to the police. This is too big a sacrifice.
- 3 Membership of a police force gives many opportunities for corruption, and it is these opportunities which attract some people to join the police. In fact, in some countries there are worse criminals inside the police force than outside. By removing many opportunities for criminal activity, the abolition of the police would make the world a safer place.
- 4 Some governments have tried to solve these problems, but without success. So the best thing to do with the police force is to abolish it.
- 5 There are also strong economic arguments for abolishing police forces. Governments have to pay police officers more than they are worth, in order to ensure their loyalty in times of social unrest. In addition, enormous sums of money have to be spent on computing, communications and surveillance equipment in order to keep pace with the increasingly sophisticated nature of crime. If there were no police force, this money could be spent in much better ways.

- (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 which directly support the main conclusion. [3]
- (c) Evaluate the strength of the reasoning in the argument. In your answer you should consider any flaws, unstated assumptions and other weaknesses. [5]
- (d) 'Everyone has the right to keep personal information private.'

Write your own short argument to support **or** challenge this claim. The conclusion of your argument must be stated. Credit will not be given for repeating ideas from the passage. [5]



**BLANK PAGE**

---

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.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk) after the live examination series.

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.