

ANSWER KEY – 11 MAY 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
B	B	C	C	A	B	B	B	B	A
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
B	A	B	A	A	B	B	A	A	B
Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30
B	B	B	C	A	B	B	C	C	B
Q31	Q32	Q33							
C	B	C							

RC PASSAGES

Q1 B

The passage's central thesis, developed through the contrast between narrative and expository material and concluded in the final paragraph, is that reading and listening yield equivalent comprehension for narrative content but reading produces deeper comprehension for analytical material — and that this reflects the evolutionary history of reading as a 'hack' rather than any inherent superiority of one medium over the other in all contexts. Option A overstates listening's case; option C ignores the documented gap on expository prose; option D goes beyond what the text claims about audiobook narrative retention.

Q2 B

Within paragraph one, 'hack' is used in the technical sense common in cognitive science: an ingenious repurposing of brain regions originally evolved for other tasks — face and object recognition — to process the printed page. The passage explicitly notes that 'no part of our cortex evolved specifically for reading.' Option A connotes clumsiness and lack of elegance, missing the ingenuity emphasised by the author's word choice. Options C and D distort the meaning entirely, importing connotations the author does not invoke in the text.

Q3 C

The passage explicitly states that 'print allows the reader to slow down, reread a sentence, glance back at an earlier definition.' The natural inference is that legal judgments — paradigmatic dense expository prose with long defined terms and architectures of reasoning — would benefit from precisely this re-reading capability. Option A contradicts the passage. Option B is undermined by the passage's claim that narrative comprehension is roughly equivalent across modes. Option D is not addressed by the passage's argument structure.

Q4 C

The author neither attacks one medium nor mourns the decline of oral tradition; instead, the closing paragraph offers a pragmatic recommendation: 'choosing between them deliberately, rather than by habit, is a skill in itself.' The framing is non-polemical, acknowledges legitimate uses for both reading and listening depending on the material, and recommends conscious selection. The other options each impose an emotional register the passage does not adopt.

Q5 A

The author claims that for dense expository prose, reading produces deeper comprehension than listening because print uniquely allows pause and re-reading. Evidence that listeners actually retain more procedural legal detail at the same pace would directly contradict the empirical premise underpinning that claim. The other options are tangential to the central argument: B addresses narrative content where the passage concedes equivalence; C concerns a sub-population's preferences without bearing on comprehension; D speaks to market trends rather than to comprehension outcomes.

Q6 B

The passage carefully positions traditional ecological knowledge not as a replacement for scientific conservation but as a serious technical partner. The author cites empirical findings supporting indigenous stewardship — the 2023 review, Aboriginal Australian fire management — while explicitly engaging the romanticisation critique and concluding that 'science is one method among others' whose conclusions are 'strengthened, not weakened' when tested against indigenous experience. Option A inverts the historical premise the passage critiques. Options C and D each overstate the claim beyond what the author asserts.

Q7 B

Within the second paragraph, 'taboos' is grouped with 'stories, songs and customary law' as a vehicle through which traditional ecological knowledge is 'encoded' in indigenous communities. The customary prohibitions function ecologically — for example, banning the felling of certain trees or harvesting during breeding seasons. Option A confuses the modern political sense of the word; options C and D distort the customary-community context, importing religious or text-based meanings that the passage does not employ.

Q8 B

The passage states that 'modern remote-sensing techniques are now confirming what indigenous foresters have long maintained' regarding cool-burn savannas, and the Aboriginal fire-management example is offered as the lead instance. The inference that Aboriginal fire techniques are vindicated by remote sensing is therefore direct and textually warranted. Option A inverts the cited 2023 review's finding. Option C is unsupported by the passage. Option D contradicts the passage's explicit emphasis on prior informed consent governing pharmaceutical commercialisation.

Q9 B

The passage acknowledges that 'serious advocates of TEK do not deny' the romanticisation critique, and the author proceeds to engage it directly — arguing that imperfection of traditional practice is not the relevant question and reframing the issue as one of equal-partner collaboration. This is not dismissal (option A) nor hostility (option C) nor indifference (option D); the engagement is substantive and explicitly concedes some ground to the critics' concerns before answering them.

Q10 A

A study showing that joint management of fisheries by scientists and traditional fishers produced higher fish stocks than either approach alone would directly vindicate the passage's central recommendation: that science and indigenous knowledge should collaborate as equal partners. The finding would also illustrate the synergy mechanism the author argues for. Option B would contradict the passage's argument. Option C would undermine a piece of the supporting evidence. Option D is tangential to the central thesis about collaboration.

CR PASSAGES

Q11 B

The argument structure is three premises — rising inequality, income tax capturing only flow, public services underfunded — leading to one conclusion: that a modest wealth tax above a high threshold would slow concentration, generate revenue and avoid distortion. Option B states this conclusion in nearly the passage's own words. Options A and C are premises rather than the conclusion. Option D is the critics' objection. Distinguishing premise from conclusion is the core skill in critical-reasoning conclusion-identification questions.

Q12 A

For the argument to succeed, proponents must be able to identify and value the assets of the very wealthy reliably. If those assets cannot be measured, the tax cannot be levied and both the revenue and concentration-slowing effects vanish. The argument silently assumes administrability of identification and valuation. Options B (public opinion), C (cross-country trends) and D (universal entrepreneur behaviour) are not load-bearing for the conclusion as stated — the argument can proceed without any of them being true.

Q13 B

A finding that over half of taxable wealth migrates offshore within five years despite state-of-the-art enforcement would directly attack the proponents' reply to the critics — namely, that enforcement is a problem of design rather than principle. If even sophisticated enforcement design cannot retain the tax base, the revenue projection collapses and the central conclusion fails. Option A would support the proponents; option C is favourable opinion data; option D would undercut a premise rather than the conclusion.

Q14 A

A long-run study from two peer economies showing 1.5% of GDP in annual revenue with negligible capital flight after enforcement reforms would empirically validate the proponents' three central claims simultaneously: that the tax generates significant revenue, that it is administrable under design improvements, and that it does not trigger disruptive capital flight. The combined evidence would be powerful. Option B undermines the proposal; options C and D address tangential considerations that do not bear on the central argument's strength.

Q15 A

The proponents acknowledge that administrability is a real problem — conceding a substantial portion of the objection — but argue that design solutions such as digital registries, third-party reporting and exit-tax provisions substantially mitigate it. This is a 'concede-and-narrow' rhetorical move standard in policy debate. They neither deny the objection outright (B), nor ignore it (C), nor attempt to shift the burden of proof onto the critics (D). The reply is partial and constructive.

Q16 B

The principal conclusion explicitly emerges at the end of paragraph two: 'legislation imposing a clear, machine-readable disclosure requirement on AI-generated content is justified.' Options A, C and D are each premises of the argument — voluntary code failure, model capability, and technical feasibility of provenance metadata respectively — and not the conclusion. Identifying the conclusion accurately requires distinguishing the load-bearing terminal claim from the supporting facts that are marshalled to reach it.

Q17 B

For mandatory disclosure to be worth its compliance cost, audiences must actually adjust their reliance on content based on the disclosure label. If labels make no material difference to audience evaluation, the regulatory benefit evaporates while the cost remains. This assumption is implicit but indispensable to the chain from premises to conclusion. Options A, C and D are not necessary to the argument — the argument can succeed even if some users are honest, AI is creative, or enforcement capacity is finite.

Q18 A

Empirical research showing that audiences respond identically to labelled and unlabelled content would directly attack the assumption identified in the previous question — that labels meaningfully affect reception. Without that assumption holding, mandatory labelling imposes compliance cost on honest creators without delivering its intended public benefit. Option B is tangential to the labelling question. Option C marginally supports the voluntary-failure premise. Option D speaks to user preference rather than to the labelling rule's effectiveness.

Q19 A

Evidence that labelled-content audiences appropriately recalibrate their trust, and that overall information quality rises in labelled markets, supplies precisely the empirical chain the proponents need: a mechanism connecting labels to audience behaviour and audience behaviour to a public benefit. The finding would corroborate both the audience-response assumption and the market-quality conclusion. Options B, C and D each address peripheral issues that do not directly support the central case for mandatory disclosure.

Q20 B

The proponents' reply is structurally identical to the standard defence of speed limits: the rule is partially violated and partially over- or under-inclusive, but it nonetheless reduces the targeted harm on average and establishes a baseline of legal expectations against which honest actors can orient themselves. Option B captures precisely this defensive structure. Option A inverts the analogy and argues against speed limits — which is what the objector does, not what the proponent does. Options C and D are not parallel in structure.

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 B

Article 324 of the Constitution vests the superintendence, direction and control of elections to Parliament, State Legislatures, the offices of the President and the Vice-President in the Election Commission of India. The Commission is a multi-member body chaired by the Chief Election Commissioner and is one of the constitutional bulwarks of Indian democracy. Article 308 concerns general service rules; Article 343 deals with the official language of the Union; Article 356 covers President's Rule in states.

Q22 B

Kesavananda Bharati v State of Kerala (1973) is the seminal thirteen-judge bench decision in which the Supreme Court held by a 7-6 majority that Parliament could amend any part of the Constitution under Article 368 but could not alter its 'basic structure.' The doctrine has since been refined in *Indira Gandhi v Raj Narain*, *Minerva Mills v Union of India* and others, but its foundation is the *Kesavananda* judgment. *AK Gopalan* concerned preventive detention. *Maneka Gandhi* expanded Article 21 and the procedural-due-process notion.

Q23 B

'Inflammatory' means likely to inflame anger or strong feeling — exactly the connotation needed for remarks that 'damaged his reputation among moderates.' Moderates are by definition reluctant to associate with inflammatory rhetoric. 'Conciliatory' (reconciling) and 'deferential' (showing respect) would not damage a reputation. 'Pellucid' (transparently clear) is unrelated to political reputation. Vocabulary-in-context questions require matching connotation to consequence stated in the sentence.

Q24 C

'Abrogate' means to repeal or annul a law, treaty, or formal agreement. Its opposite is 'establish' (to enact, set up, or bring into operation). Options A, B and D are all synonyms of abrogate — cancel, repeal and annul each denote dismantling rather than establishing. The classic Indian legal usage: 'Article 370 was abrogated in August 2019' — i.e., its operation was set aside. The opposite movement would be to establish or enact a provision.

Q25 A

The idiom 'to call a spade a spade' means to speak plainly, directly and without euphemism — to use blunt rather than evasive language. It has its origin in classical Greek through Erasmus's Latin *Adagia* and has been current in English since the sixteenth century. Option B reverses the meaning; option C describes hyperbole; option D describes obfuscation through jargon. The idiom is most naturally invoked to praise a speaker's bluntness or call for honesty in discussion.

Q26 B

The Jnanpith Award is India's highest literary honour, conferred annually since 1965 by the Bharatiya Jnanpith trust to writers in any of the languages recognised in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. Past laureates include G. Sankara Kurup, Mahadevi Varma, U.R. Ananthamurthy and Girish Karnad. It is distinct from honours in science (the Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar Prize), cinema (the Dadasaheb Phalke Award) and sports (the Khel Ratna).

Q27 B

India won the 2024 ICC Men's T20 World Cup, defeating South Africa by seven runs in the final at Kensington Oval, Barbados, on 29 June 2024. The tournament was co-hosted by the West Indies and the United States. Captain Rohit Sharma lifted the trophy, and Virat Kohli's match-defining 76 in the final earned him the Player of the Match award. Both Rohit and Virat retired from T20 internationals after the win.

Q28 C

The 61st Constitutional Amendment Act, 1988, amended Article 326 of the Constitution to reduce the qualifying voting age in elections to the House of the People and to the Legislative Assemblies of the States from 21 years to 18 years. The amendment came into force on 28 March 1989 and is credited with adding roughly 50 million young voters to the electoral rolls in time for the 1989 General Elections. It is regarded as a major democratic-deepening reform.

Q29 C

The Tropic of Cancer, at approximately 23.5° N latitude, passes through eight Indian states: Gujarat, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, West Bengal, Tripura and Mizoram. The line enters India near the Rann of Kutch in the west and exits through Mizoram in the northeast. Roughly half of the country lies north of this latitude. The Tropic of Cancer is also a useful climatic divider between sub-tropical and tropical India.

Q30 B

The idiom 'to bite the bullet' means to accept an unpleasant or difficult situation with courage and stoic resolve, without complaint. The phrase is believed to derive from pre-anaesthetic surgical practice, in which patients were given a bullet or a piece of leather to bite on to endure the pain of an operation. The phrase is now used metaphorically for grit in any unpleasant circumstance. The other options misread the connotation of forced endurance.

Q31 C

'Ephemeral' means lasting a very short time, transient — etymologically from the Greek 'ephemeros,' meaning lasting only a day. Its antonym is 'enduring' (lasting long, permanent, persistent). Options A (fleeting), B (transient) and D (temporary) are all synonyms of ephemeral, denoting brief duration. The classic illustrative contrast: 'The fame of internet sensations is ephemeral, while the work of master craftsmen is enduring.'

Q32 B

Vishaka v State of Rajasthan (1997) is the Supreme Court of India's landmark judgment formulating guidelines against sexual harassment at the workplace, following the gang-rape of Bhanwari Devi, a social worker in Rajasthan. The Vishaka Guidelines remained binding until the enactment of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, which codified them with modifications and created mandatory Internal Complaints Committees. The case is often cited as an example of judicial legislation.

Q33 C

The Eighth Schedule of the Constitution lists the languages recognised by the Constitution. It originally included 14 languages and now contains 22, after successive amendments adding Sindhi (1967), Konkani, Manipuri and Nepali (1992), and Bodo, Dogri, Maithili and Santhali (2003). The Sixth Schedule deals with tribal areas in the North-East; the Seventh contains the legislative lists (Union, State, Concurrent); the Ninth contains laws immune from challenge under Part III.