



## PAPER 3 – CONSERVATION

The following two passages focus on aspects of conservation.

In the first passage Magnus Linklater, writing in *The Times* newspaper in December 2008, discusses a plan to reintroduce beavers into the Scottish Highlands.

### Passage 1

There are times when the world of nature conservation lurches dangerously close to lunacy. Its real purpose should be to conserve our natural heritage. All too often, however, it finds itself inventing a heritage all of its own, forgetting the basic laws of natural history.

5 Some time next year, a colony of 17 beavers, imported from Norway, will be released in the Scottish Highlands, part of a pilot project to see whether they can be introduced more widely. The hope is that these nose-twitching, undoubtedly endearing creatures will become a familiar part of the Scottish countryside.

10 It is far from clear why this is being done. Scottish National Heritage (SNH), which is behind the project, argues that beavers were once common in Britain, and that it would be nice to have them back. It quotes European legislation in its support, saying that the EU Habitats Directive requires member states to reintroduce extinct species. 'The beaver is a charismatic species that would serve to raise wider biodiversity issues such as riparian woodland management, aspen restoration, wetland biodiversity and dead wood habitat,' says its website. The very language seems obscure, let alone the intent behind it.

15 Closer study of the beaver reveals that, while it may once have been familiar, it has been extinct in Britain for a very long time. The last records of it being found here date back to the 16th century. It appears to have been driven out as farming land extended and trees were cleared. Quite possibly, the managers of salmon rivers and lochs found its habit of gnawing through trees, building dams and burrowing into river banks a threat to local economies. 20 Conservation bodies did not exist in those days, so the beaver's fate was sealed.

I can understand the arguments for reintroducing a species that has only recently become extinct – the osprey, wiped out in the early part of the 20th century, is a good example. But taking this huge ecological leap back to the Middle Ages seems perverse, if not mildly insane. Then, Britain was clothed in forests, with wolves, bears and other wild animals 25 roaming the land. Today we have a land cleared for agriculture.

SNH, however, argues that beavers can have 'a positive impact upon local wildlife and can become significant wildlife tourism attractions for local economies'. It says that 73 per cent of the people of mid-Argyll support the idea, and that the project will be closely monitored. Quite who constitutes this 73 per cent is unclear. No local farmer, angler, landowner or 30 river manager, as far as I know, has ever supported the project. Anyone involved in the one industry that makes money in the Highlands – fishing – views the imminent arrival of the beavers with horror. Robin Malcolm, who farms 1000 acres in Knapdale, said he was baffled by wildlife organisations that seemed 'dedicated to a project that can only

→

35 damage the Scottish countryside'. He points to evidence from as far afield as Patagonia, New England, Norway and the upper reaches of the Danube which shows that beavers pose a significant threat to woodland and river banks, destroying trees such as aspen and oak, leading to the flooding of farmland and the disruption of salmon rivers.

40 What seems common to most conservation bodies is the way that they tend to discount objections from people who live in the countryside. In similar fashion, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds defends the reintroduction of sea eagles despite the objections of farmers who complain that these vast birds of prey have been seizing their lambs.

45 It seems perverse, at a time when rural economies are under such pressure, that conservation projects, whose objectives seem frivolous, should be pursued – and with such febrile logic. At a fierce meeting in Argyll to discuss the issue of sea eagles recently, an RSPB man came out with a startling argument: rejecting the suggestion that they took live lambs, he said that evidence from the nest sites showed they ate fulmars instead. Now, fulmars are a graceful and elegant species of seabird, whose own existence is by no means secure. Yet here was a conservation spokesman arguing that a native bird was little more than a larder for a newly introduced killer species. That strikes me not just as frivolous, 50 but irresponsible as well.

In the second passage, Libby Purves, writing in *The Times* newspaper in 2008, discusses a plan to reintroduce sea eagles to Suffolk in England.

## Passage 2

5 A new sight puzzles winter ramblers in East Suffolk: above the snowy fields that sweep down to the River Blyth, there stands a bold hand-lettered sign declaring 'Say no to sea eagles here'. Baffling, at first: not much point in saying 'no' to that flying fortress of the bird world, the white-tailed sea eagle. It wouldn't listen. It would just hang up there, 8ft wingspan spread on a thermal, taking your breath away.

10 That, however, is not what the 'no' is about. It is a cry raised by farmers, landowners and level-headed bird-lovers who are horrified at a plan hatched by the quango Natural England and the RSPB, who want to spend more than £600,000 to introduce the birds to Suffolk. They claim 'vast' popular support – though you could doubt the validity of a sample of 500 people asked some saccharine question about whether they fancy seeing one. Mark Avery, of the RSPB, says with that familiar tone of scorn for his own species: 'Man is the reason they are missing, and it is for us to put that right.'

15 Enthusiasts insist that it is a 'reintroduction', on the grounds that sea eagles once lived here. Nobody has actually proved that Suffolk is their ancestral homeland – there are some uncertain eighteenth-century bones – and the RSPB, indeed, was last quoted as saying feebly that 'sea eagles must have been here in Roman times'. In Roman times, however, Suffolk was a wild, boggy, scantily occupied place; and if a passing eagle threatened to starve your family by nicking a piglet or cleaning out your fishpond, you were allowed to chuck things at it and chase it off to fish the vast acres for which humans had no use.

20 Things have changed. Suffolk – still beautifully lonely in parts – supports as many people as the whole of England did two thousand years ago. They farm land, raise stock, drive vehicles, gather, and generally get on with their lives. And many of these are horrified at this piece of meddling, scenting a PR exercise more concerned with quango prestige.

- Some fear for livestock, especially lambs, and endangered birds such as terns. Others talk more wildly of the threat to dogs and cats. But even discounting that, there are snags. Sea eagles have the highest category of legal protection. Exclusion zones can be declared around any nest, so that in a radius of 100m or more nobody can do anything at all. Not drive a tractor and trailer, not maintain a fence, not hold a long-advertised event or festival. Basically, if a sea eagle moves in on you, it is like having a member of the royal family with his protection and surveillance team buy the house next door. Suffolk is roomy, but not like the Hebrides, or the vast fjords and marshes of continental Europe in which the eagles have resettled. It's a daft idea.

- They know that, really. They're just showing off. An internal email from Natural England hails a 'major opportunity for Natural England to lead a high-profile "flagship species" project that will highlight the organisation at the forefront of a major biodiversity delivery initiative ... There is a small risk of conflict with both socioeconomic and nature conservation interests, but these would be effectively managed by risk assessment and contingency planning ... A thoroughly planned and well-executed public relations strategy will maximise the potential positive publicity for the organisation.'

- See? It's a greater white-tailed gimmick. Expensive, vainglorious and typical of a growing trend in the 'conservation' industry. Many of the bodies that claim that title are not preserving at all: they are fiddling, initiating, interfering. That is not conservation: it is gardening, on a large scale. Put a woodland here – oops, no, make it a heath – tell you what, let's build a wetland and bring some classy creatures in by van. Punters will like that.

- And that's fine. There are many artfully designed wilderness reserves that nourish the spirit and provide grand walks on signposted paths. Good luck to them. Many fine birds owe it all to the RSPB. But in a largely man-made rural environment, 'conservation' is a euphemism for landscape gardening. And the two should have different rules.

## Questions

### Passage 1 Questions

1. Analyse how the writer's use of language in lines 1–3 creates a negative impression of 'the world of nature conservation'. 3
2. Re-read lines 4–25.
  - a) In your own words, identify two reasons given by SNH for the reintroduction of the beavers. 2
  - b) Explain in your own words why the writer does not approve of the project. 4
  - c) Analyse how the writer's use of language in lines 21–25 emphasises his disagreement. 4
3. Identify in your own words the key differences in point of view between SNH and local people given in lines 26–37. 4
4. Explain ways in which, according to the writer, the RSPB is behaving like 'most conservation bodies'. Use your own words in your answer. 2
5. a) Explain how the example of the RSPB man's 'fulmars' speech is used to develop the writer's argument. 2
- b) Analyse how the writer's use of language in lines 42–50 makes clear his contempt for conservation projects and the people behind them. 4

### Passage 2 Question

6. Both writers express their views about the behaviour of nature conservation organisations. Identify key areas on which they agree. In your answer, you should refer in detail to both passages. You may answer this question in continuous prose or in a series of developed bullet points. 5



# PAPER 3 – CONSERVATION

## MARKING INSTRUCTIONS FOR EACH QUESTION

Question	Expected response	Max mark	Additional guidance
1.	<p><b>Analyse how the writer's use of language in lines 1–3 creates a negative impression of 'the world of nature conservation'.</b></p> <p>Candidates should analyse how the writer's use of language creates a negative impression of 'the world of nature conservation'.</p> <p>Marks will depend on the quality of comment on appropriate language feature(s).</p> <p>2 marks may be awarded for reference plus detailed/insightful comment; 1 mark for reference plus more basic comment; 0 marks for reference alone.</p> <p><i>Possible answers are shown in the 'Additional guidance' column.</i></p>	3	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'lurches' suggests movement that is uncontrolled, unplanned</li> <li>• 'dangerously' suggests hazardous, risky</li> <li>• 'lunacy' suggests extreme stupidity</li> <li>• contrast between '(should be to) conserve' and '(All too often ...) inventing' reveals deviation from correct purpose</li> <li>• 'inventing' suggests creating something false, misleading</li> <li>• repetition of 'heritage' (balance between 'our natural heritage' and 'heritage all of its own') emphasises how wrong their approach is</li> <li>• 'it finds itself' suggests it happens almost randomly, without planning</li> <li>• 'all of its own' suggests they think/live apart from the real world</li> </ul> <p>or any other acceptable answer.</p>
2. a)	<p><b>Re-read lines 4–25. In your own words, identify two reasons given by SNH for the reintroduction of the beavers.</b></p> <p>Candidates should identify the reasons given by SNH for the reintroduction of the beavers.</p> <p>Candidates must use their own words. No marks are awarded for verbatim quotations from the passage.</p> <p><i>1 mark for each point from the 'Additional guidance' column.</i></p>	2	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• because it wants to establish whether or not it is a viable idea that could be extended (explanation of 'pilot project to see whether they can be introduced more widely')</li> <li>• because they used to be native to Britain and should be restored (explanation of 'once common in Britain, and that it would be nice to have them back')</li> <li>• because it is following an EU rule about reintroducing animals that have died out (explanation of 'requires member states to reintroduce extinct species.')</li> <li>• because it wants to promote the idea of increasing the range of wildlife in an area (explanation of 'serve to raise wider biodiversity issues')</li> </ul> <p>or any other acceptable answer.</p>

2.	b)	<p><b>Re-read lines 4–25. Explain in your own words why the writer does not approve of the project.</b></p> <p>Candidates should explain in their own words why the writer does not approve of the project.</p> <p>Candidates must use their own words. No marks are awarded for verbatim quotations from the passage.</p> <p><i>1 mark for each point from the 'Additional guidance' column.</i></p>	4	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• he finds the EU rule unconvincing and hard to follow (explanation of 'language seems obscure, let alone the intent behind it')</li> <li>• there may be some sense in restoring animals that disappeared in recent times (explanation of 'I can understand the arguments ... extinct') ...</li> <li>• ... but it is a long time since there have been beavers in Britain (explanation of 'date back to the 16th century')</li> <li>• its demise was for understandable, practical reasons (explanation of 'a threat to local economies')</li> <li>• since beavers were last common, the ecology of Britain has changed beyond recognition (explanation of 'clothed in forests, with wolves, bears and other wild animals roaming the land')</li> <li>• bringing them back now would be too extreme a step (explanation of 'huge ecological leap back')</li> </ul> <p>or any other acceptable answer.</p>
2.	c)	<p><b>Re-read lines 4–25. Analyse how the writer's use of language in lines 21–25 emphasises his disagreement.</b></p> <p>Candidates should analyse how the writer's use of language emphasises his disagreement.</p> <p>Marks will depend on the quality of comment on appropriate language feature(s).</p> <p>2 marks may be awarded for reference plus detailed/insightful comment; 1 mark for reference plus more basic comment; 0 marks for reference alone. Thus 4 marks could be gained as 2 + 2 or 2 + 1 + 1 or 1 + 1 + 1 + 1.</p> <p><i>Possible answers are shown in the 'Additional guidance' column.</i></p>	4	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dash introduces a specific example of the kind of reintroduction he thinks is acceptable</li> <li>• 'But' at the start of the sentence flags up opposing argument about the unacceptability of the beavers scheme</li> <li>• 'huge' suggests he thinks it is massive, unacceptably big</li> <li>• 'leap' suggests a movement that is unnecessarily extreme, possibly dangerous (hint of 'leap in the dark')</li> <li>• 'perverse' suggests it is unreasonable, wilful, abnormal</li> <li>• structure of 'seems ... if not ...' shows he thinks it is even worse than the first description</li> <li>• 'insane' suggests utterly senseless, deranged</li> <li>• contrast/balance of 'Then ... Today' highlights the changes in landscape/wildlife that make this scheme so unsuitable</li> </ul> <p>or any other acceptable answer.</p>
3.		<p><b>Identify in your own words the key differences in point of view between SNH and local people given in lines 26–37.</b></p> <p>Candidates should identify in their own words the key differences in point of view between SNH and local people.</p> <p>Candidates must use their own words. No marks are awarded for verbatim quotations from the passage.</p> <p><i>1 mark for each point from the 'Additional guidance' column.</i></p>	4	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <p><b>SNH:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it will be good for the animals and birds of the area (explanation of 'positive impact upon local wildlife')</li> <li>• it will generate visitors and bring income to the area (explanation of 'tourism attractions for local economies')</li> <li>• it is supported by the local community (explanation of '73 per cent of the people of mid-Argyll support the idea')</li> </ul>



				<p><b>Locals:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no evidence of support, widespread objections (explanation of 'Quite who constitutes ... is unclear' or 'No local ... has ever supported the project')</li> <li>• dismayed, shocked at the prospect of it (explanation of 'views the imminent arrival of the beavers with horror')</li> <li>• can't understand SNH's thinking (explanation of 'baffled')</li> <li>• convinced/can prove that it will be detrimental to the environment (explanation of 'can only damage' or reference to extensive evidence provided)</li> </ul> <p>or any other acceptable answer.</p>
4.		<p><b>Explain ways in which, according to the writer, the RSPB is behaving like 'most conservation bodies'. Use your own words in your answer.</b></p> <p>Candidates should explain in their own words in what ways, according to the writer, the RSPB is behaving like 'most conservation bodies'.</p> <p>Candidates must use their own words. No marks are awarded for verbatim quotations from the passage.</p> <p><i>1 mark for each point from the 'Additional guidance' column.</i></p>	2	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they pay no attention to any opposition (explanation of 'discount objections from people who live in the countryside')</li> <li>• even the protests of people directly involved are ignored (explanation of 'despite the objections of farmers ... lambs')</li> <li>• they are unconcerned that the countryside is facing financial problems (explanation of 'when rural economies are under such pressure')</li> <li>• they go ahead with schemes that are or appear trivial (explanation of 'conservation projects, whose objectives seem frivolous, should be pursued')</li> <li>• their defence of their projects can be irrational, hard to follow (reference to 'febrile logic') ...</li> <li>• ... such that what they say can appear not just silly but reckless (explanation of 'frivolous, but irresponsible as well')</li> </ul> <p>or any other acceptable answer.</p>
5	a)	<p><b>Explain how the example of the RSPB man's 'fulmars' speech is used to develop the writer's argument.</b></p> <p>Candidates should explain how the example of the RSPB man's 'fulmar' speech is used to develop the writer's argument.</p> <p>Candidates must use their own words. No marks are awarded for verbatim quotations from the passage.</p> <p>2 marks may be awarded for detailed/insightful comment; 1 mark for more basic comment; 0 marks for reference alone.</p> <p><i>Possible answers are shown in the 'Additional Guidance' column.</i></p>	2	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the writer's argument that the conservationists are illogical/misguided is illustrated by the 'fulmar' example: irony that the RSPB man seems to be suggesting that the death of fulmars is acceptable (when they need/deserve to be protected) in his eagerness to defend the sea eagles against farmers' accusations about lambs</li> <li>• the writer's argument that conservationists' aims make no sense: fulmars, beautiful native birds, are expendable in order to provide food for incomer predators</li> </ul> <p>or any other acceptable answer.</p>

5.	b)	<p><b>Re-read lines 38–50. Analyse how the writer's use of language in lines 42–50 makes clear his contempt for conservation projects and the people behind them.</b></p> <p>Candidates should analyse how the writer's use of language makes clear his contempt for conservation projects and the people behind them.</p> <p>Marks will depend on the quality of comment on appropriate language feature(s).</p> <p>2 marks may be awarded for reference plus detailed/insightful comment; 1 mark for reference plus more basic comment; 0 marks for reference alone. Thus 4 marks could be gained as 2 + 2 or 2 + 1 + 1 or 1 + 1 + 1 + 1.</p> <p><i>Possible answers are shown in the 'Additional guidance' column.</i></p>	4	<p>Possible answers include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'perverse' suggests unreasonable, wilful, abnormal</li> <li>• 'frivolous' suggests trivial, lacking substance</li> <li>• 'pursued' (though it can be used in a neutral way) suggests a determination to press ahead regardless</li> <li>• dash creates dramatic pause before additional condemnation, this time of the weak thinking behind the idea</li> <li>• 'febrile' suggests crazed, twisted</li> <li>• 'came out with' suggests a clever trick, introducing unexpected arguments</li> <li>• 'startling' suggests the argument was bizarre, almost incredible</li> <li>• colon introduces detailed explanation of what made the argument 'startling' – the way it dismissed claims that one species was at risk while admitting another one was being attacked</li> <li>• incredulous tone in 'Yet here was ...', as if to say 'Believe it or not ...'</li> <li>• contemptuous tone in 'little more than a larder', as if the RSPB had no concern for fulmars</li> <li>• structure 'not just ... but ... as well' suggests they are doubly wrong</li> <li>• 'irresponsible' suggests thoughtless, reckless, foolish</li> </ul> <p>or any other acceptable answer.</p>
6.		<p><b>Both writers express their views about the behaviour of nature conservation organisations. Identify key areas on which they agree. In your answer, you should refer in detail to both passages. You may answer this question in continuous prose or in a series of developed bullet points.</b></p> <p>Candidates should identify key areas of agreement in the two passages.</p> <p>There may be some overlap among the areas of agreement. Markers will have to judge the extent to which a candidate has covered two points or one.</p> <p>Candidates can use bullet points in this final question, or write a number of linked statements.</p> <p>Evidence from the passage may include quotations, but these should be supported by explanations.</p> <p><i>Approach to marking is shown in the 'Additional guidance' column.</i></p> <p><i>Key areas of agreement are shown in the grid below. Other answers are possible.</i></p>	5	<p>The mark for this question should reflect the quality of response in two areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identification of the key areas of agreement in attitude/ideas</li> <li>• level of detail given in support</li> </ul> <p>The following guidelines should be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>5 marks</b> – identification of three key areas of agreement with insightful use of supporting evidence</li> <li>• <b>4 marks</b> – identification of three key areas of agreement with appropriate use of supporting evidence</li> <li>• <b>3 marks</b> – identification of three key areas of agreement</li> <li>• <b>2 marks</b> – identification of two key areas of agreement</li> <li>• <b>1 mark</b> – identification of one key area of agreement</li> <li>• <b>0 marks</b> – failure to identify one key area of agreement and/or misunderstanding of task</li> </ul>

	Area of agreement	Magnus Linklater	Libby Purves
1.	<b>Not genuinely pursuing conservation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>they are ignoring their proper purpose, imposing their version of heritage ('inventing a heritage all of its own')</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>they are not conserving, they are directing things, setting their own agenda, getting in the way ('fiddling, initiating, interfering')</li> </ul>
2.	<b>Their projects are based on a false premise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>beavers long extinct in Scotland – last recorded here 500 years ago</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sea eagles long extinct in Britain – maybe since 18th century, maybe since Roman times</li> </ul>
3.	<b>Disregard of environmental changes since extinction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>at the time beavers last lived here there was extensive forestation, wild animals; now cleared for farming</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>at the time of extinction Britain 'was a wild, boggy, scantily occupied place'; now much more populated</li> </ul>
4.	<b>Original extinction came about for logical reasons applicable at the time</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>beavers' destruction of trees and river banks threatened local economy, so they were killed off, driven out as farming land extended and trees cleared</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sea eagles posed a threat to farmers' livelihoods so were killed or driven to unpopulated areas</li> </ul>
5.	<b>Dismissal of local objections</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>those with close connections to the land are far from enthusiastic about the scheme, yet SNC is deaf to objections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strong local objections to the plan; fears for livestock, etc., yet Natural England seems determined to counter any objections</li> </ul>
6.	<b>Self-serving use of statistics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>figure of '73 per cent' seems not to have any basis in fact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the claim of 'vast' popular support has little validity without knowing what question was asked</li> </ul>
7.	<b>Suspicion that motives are to promote the organisation to the public</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the references to 'nose-twitching, undoubtedly endearing creatures' and 'it would be nice to have them back'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contents of the email show it is about PR for Natural England: 'flagship species', 'highlight the organisation'</li> </ul>