

ANSWER KEY – 22 MAY 2026

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

RC PASSAGES

Q1 B

The phrase 'unforgiving dependence on unpredictable labour supply' is followed in the next sentence by an example: 'when migrant workers returned home, projects across the country halted for months.' The phrase therefore describes the construction sector's structural fragility — when labour is unavailable, work stops completely. 'Unforgiving' modifies the dependence, meaning that the dependence is severe and admits no slack. Option B captures this — projects collapse easily when labour fluctuates. Option A misreads the author's tone, which is structural not personal. Option C is unrelated to the immediate sentence. Option D contradicts the passage, which actually emphasises how much the sector depends on (skilled) workers.

Q2 C

The passage devotes substantial space to both the promise of modular construction (paragraphs 1-2) and the obstacles in the Indian context (paragraph 3), closing with a measured conclusion about political will (paragraph 4). The author neither claims that modular will replace all conventional construction (A), nor calls for any ban (B), nor concludes that modular cannot work (D). The thread running through the passage is 'promising but constrained' — modular is a serious answer to Indian urbanisation but faces real obstacles, particularly in building codes, transport logistics, and capital investment. Option C captures this dual stance most accurately. The author is balanced, not absolutist.

Q3 C

Options A, B and D are all EXPLICITLY stated in the passage — Singapore in paragraph 1, the Indian housing deficit in paragraph 1, and the Chinese fifty-seven-storey tower in nineteen days in paragraph 1. Option C — that the Bengaluru start-up's modular schools are cheaper than conventionally built schools — is NOT explicitly stated. The passage merely says that 'the economics can work at scale', which implies the start-up is commercially viable, but does not specify that modular schools are cheaper. The inference about lower cost is reasonable but goes beyond what is in the text. Option C is correct.

Q4 B

The author's tone is best described as cautiously optimistic and analytical. The passage presents modular construction as a 'disruptive force' and 'one of the most disruptive forces in global construction' (positive framing) while also acknowledging that 'obstacles, however, are not trivial' and listing them in detail. The closing paragraph speaks of 'what may finally tip the balance' — measured speculation rather than triumphalism or doomsaying. Option B captures both elements. Option A misreads the optimism; option C overstates the political tone (the author refers to political will but does not engage in partisan polemic); option D is unsupported (no nostalgia for traditional methods is expressed).

Q5 A

The author's case rests partly on international evidence of modular construction's success (Singapore, Britain, China). If 'modular factories in Britain have begun closing due to falling demand for prefabricated housing', it would undermine the claim that the technique has proven itself globally — one of the load-bearing premises in the case for Indian adoption. Option A therefore most directly weakens the author's argument by contradicting the international-evidence pillar. Option B (highways widened) strengthens the case by removing a stated obstacle. Option C (subsidies for modular factories) strengthens. Option D (skilled labour easier to find) only modestly reduces the urgency for modular but does not contradict the international evidence. Option A is correct.

Q6 C

The author begins by acknowledging the early enthusiasm for microfinance, walks through the modulating evidence from large randomised trials, and then introduces qualitative research showing that microfinance does have meaningful non-economic effects — particularly on women's standing within the household. The concluding paragraph explicitly rejects both the triumphalist 'silver bullet' framing and the dismissive 'predatory trap' framing, settling on 'one of many imperfect instruments whose value depends critically on how it is regulated.' Option C captures this measured middle position most accurately. Option A overstates; option B understates; option D is one critic's view, not the author's.

Q7 B

'Tempered' in this context describes how more recent research has 'tempered the original enthusiasm' for microfinance. The verb 'to temper' (as in 'tempered steel' or 'tempered enthusiasm') means to moderate, to make less extreme, or to soften through balancing influence. The new evidence has moderated — not reinforced (A), not reversed (C), not ignored (D) — the earlier optimistic assessments. The word is used here in its standard English sense of bringing to a less extreme or more balanced state. Option B is correct. The choice 'reversed' is too strong; the passage shows research that qualifies but does not overturn the original enthusiasm entirely.

Q8 C

The author maintains a balanced, scholarly stance throughout: presenting evidence from multiple sides (early enthusiasm, randomised-trial critique, qualitative re-evaluation), and explicitly rejecting both triumphalism and dismissiveness in the closing paragraph. Option C — measured and reflective — captures this tone exactly. Option A (triumphalist) is contradicted by the cautious framing. Option B (cynical) overstates the negative view. Option D (sarcastic) misreads the author's earnestness — the passage carefully weighs evidence and refrains from any ironic distance.

Q9 A

The author's principal claim is that microfinance has modest economic effects but meaningful non-economic gains for women, particularly in intra-household power dynamics. A finding that microfinance group membership markedly increased women's household decision-making power, even where incomes did not rise, would directly strengthen this specific thesis. Option A captures exactly this evidence. Option B (microfinance phased out for lack of demand) is irrelevant to the author's claim about effects. Option C (consumption doubles in one year) would actually contradict the Banerjee-Duflo finding that the author cites. Option D (interest below five per cent) is unrelated to the empowerment claim.

Q10 D

Option D — 'even where economic effects are limited, intra-household power dynamics may shift in women's favour' — is explicitly supported in paragraph 4, which describes Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal evidence of women's greater mobility, increased participation in household financial decisions, and stronger collective bargaining. Option A misstates the trial evidence (the Banerjee-Duflo work found NO significant impact on schooling). Option B is contradicted by paragraph 2 (the Indian self-help group framework is explicitly described as having absorbed microfinance). Option C inverts the trial findings (no significant empowerment in three-to-five years). Option D is therefore the only one accurately supported by the passage.

CR PASSAGES

Q11 C

The author lays out the case for a wealth tax and the case against, then explicitly states in the closing paragraph that 'a decisive resolution turns less on ideology than on empirical specifics' — listing the elasticity of high-net-worth migration, administrative capacity, and political durability as the missing facts. The author concludes that 'without honest reckoning with these facts, the debate will continue to generate more heat than light.' This is exactly the position in option C: the question depends on empirical specifics not yet adequately examined. Option A misstates (author does not endorse immediate reintroduction); option B is the critics' claim; option D overstates the funding argument. Option C is correct.

Q12 B

The argument that social returns from spending on poor children's schooling and nutrition exceed returns from leaving the money with wealthy households presupposes that the government can actually deliver schooling and nutrition effectively to the poorest children. If government delivery is broken, the comparison collapses — the choice becomes 'wealth tax wasted in transit' versus 'wealth retained by households.' Option B identifies precisely this hidden assumption. Option A overstates (the argument does not need 'all' wealthy households to spend unproductively, only that the marginal social return is lower). Options C and D are factual claims in the passage, not unstated assumptions of the redistributive premise.

Q13 A

The case for a wealth tax rests partly on extreme wealth concentration being socially corrosive. If wealth concentration has been steadily falling since 2020, the urgency of the corrective is reduced — the problem the wealth tax is meant to solve has, by hypothesis, been moderating without it. Option A therefore most directly weakens the case. Option B strengthens (other countries embracing wealth tax). Option C strengthens (nutrition returns support the redistributive argument). Option D strengthens (administrative capacity rebuts an enforcement-failure objection). Option A is correct as the only option that undermines a load-bearing premise of the pro-wealth-tax argument.

Q14 A

The author's closing paragraph identifies three empirical preconditions whose resolution would change the debate: (i) the elasticity of high-net-worth migration in the Indian context, (ii) administrative capacity of the tax department, and (iii) political durability. Option A provides direct evidence on (i) and (ii) — both administrative capacity AND low migration response. This is therefore the option that most strengthens the case by resolving the author's own enumerated uncertainties favourably. Options B, C and D either don't address the Indian context or move in the wrong direction. Option A is correct.

Q15 C

The argument 'France, Switzerland and Norway have administered wealth taxes, so India should adopt one' is most vulnerable to the objection of false analogy — assuming that institutional, economic and administrative contexts transfer across very different settings. India's tax administration capacity, asset structures, capital mobility, and political institutions differ markedly from those of European countries with much stronger state capacity and different elite mobility patterns. Option C captures this logical weakness exactly. Option A (circular) misnames the flaw; option B (ad hominem) requires an attack on a person; option D (correlation/causation) is about inferring cause from correlation, which is not the structure here.

Q16 C

The closing paragraph of the passage explicitly states: 'the disagreement is not about whether religious endowments deserve regulation — both sides accept that they do — but about whether uniform regulation is the right kind of regulation.' This is precisely option C. Option A is one side's position (the proponents'), not the author's conclusion. Option B is contradicted by the passage. Option D is overstated — the author does not endorse the Article 14 argument as 'unambiguous' and in fact notes that opponents marshal substantive equality arguments against it. Option C is therefore the correct articulation of the author's main conclusion.

Q17 A

Article 25(2)(a) permits the state to regulate or restrict 'economic, financial, political or other secular activity which may be associated with religious practice.' To deploy this clause to justify uniform regulation of endowments, proponents must assume that managing endowments IS in fact a secular activity (rather than an integral religious one). If the activity were essentially religious — like ritual itself — Article 25(2)(a) would not apply and Article 25(1) protection would dominate. Option A correctly identifies this unstated assumption that the activity falls on the 'secular' side of the line. Option B is too sweeping; option C is contradicted by Puttaswamy and the original text; option D is factually false.

Q18 B

Opponents argue that the existing community-specific boards reflect historical evolution and that flattening them via uniform regulation would not produce equality. If a long study finds that the existing boards have nearly IDENTICAL and uniformly POOR governance scores regardless of community, the opponents' premise (that community-specific historical evolution matters and serves the communities differently) is weakened — the variation they appeal to apparently does not affect outcomes. Option B captures this rebuttal. Option A would strengthen opponents (showing existing boards work well). Option C would strengthen opponents (removing the constitutional foundation for uniform regulation). Option D supports opponents' political-capture concern. Option B is correct.

Q19 A

The proponents' case rests on the claim that uniform regulation can improve transparency and accountability without violating denominational autonomy. Comparative empirical evidence from another federal democracy that has done exactly this — improved transparency under uniform regulation without provoking communal backlash — would directly support the feasibility claim. Option A provides exactly this. Option B (number of endowments falling) is irrelevant. Option C (Article 14 never applied to religious institutions) would weaken proponents. Option D (Waqf Act repealed) is a procedural fact, not evidence of better governance. Option A is correct as the strongest available strengthener.

Q20 B

The opponents' argument is that formal equality (uniform regulation) can produce substantive inequality (flattening that benefits the majority). This is a classic and recognised argument in equal-protection jurisprudence: treating differently situated communities identically can entrench rather than remove inequality. Option B correctly classifies the argument as a substantive-equality point. Option A (ad hominem) requires a personal attack, which is absent. Option C (circular) misreads the argument's structure. Option D (factual claim about populations) understates the conceptual nature of the argument. Option B is correct.

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 B

The South Korean Won (symbol ₩, ISO code KRW) is the official currency of the Republic of Korea, divided into 100 jeon. The Yen (¥) is the official currency of Japan; the Yuan or Renminbi (¥) belongs to the People's Republic of China; and the Ringgit (RM) is the currency of Malaysia. Option B is correct. This is a standard static-GK question testing currency-country pairings — a high-frequency topic in CLAT and other competitive exams. A useful memory aid: Won-Korea, Yen-Japan, Yuan-China, Baht-Thailand, Ringgit-Malaysia, Rupiah-Indonesia.

Q22 A

The Nobel Prize in Literature 2025 was awarded to the Hungarian writer László Krasznahorkai, recognised for his 'compelling and visionary oeuvre that in the midst of apocalyptic terror reaffirms the power of art.' Han Kang won in 2024; Jon Fosse in 2023; Annie Ernaux in 2022. Option A is correct. The Nobel Prize in Literature is announced annually in October by the Swedish Academy.

Q23 B

Article 23 of the Constitution of India guarantees the Right against Exploitation by prohibiting traffic in human beings, begar, and other similar forms of forced labour. Article 24 supplements this by prohibiting the employment of children below 14 in factories and hazardous occupations. Article 21 covers right to life; Article 25 covers freedom of religion; Article 29 covers protection of interests of minorities. Option B is correct.

Q24 B

'Perfunctory' means done routinely and without care, mechanical, hasty, superficial — performed merely as a formality. The closest synonym among the options is 'cursory', which similarly means hasty and superficial, done with minimal attention to detail. Both words describe an act performed quickly and without genuine engagement or thoroughness. 'Thorough' is the opposite of perfunctory; 'eager' implies enthusiasm and keenness, the opposite mental state; 'stubborn' implies obstinacy and is unrelated to the manner of performance. Option B is correct. The cursory/perfunctory pairing is a frequently tested vocabulary item in CLAT verbal sections and competitive English papers generally.

Q25 C

'Ephemeral' means lasting for a very short time, fleeting, transitory, momentary — as in 'the ephemeral beauty of a sunset'. The direct antonym among the options is 'permanent', meaning lasting indefinitely, enduring without change. 'Brief' and 'temporary' are both synonyms of ephemeral (they describe shortness of duration), not antonyms. 'Fragile' refers to physical breakability or vulnerability, not to duration in time, and is therefore not the correct semantic opposite. Option C is correct. Recognising synonyms-antonyms cleanly requires noting whether each option moves in the same or opposite direction along the specific semantic axis being tested by the headword.

Q26 B

The idiom 'to bury the hatchet' means to make peace, to settle a dispute, to end a quarrel, to forgive past disagreements between two parties. The phrase originates in a Native American practice of literally burying weapons of war to symbolise the formal cessation of hostilities between tribes. Option B is correct. The idiom does not refer to winning a battle (A is a misreading of the violent imagery), hiding a weapon in the literal sense (C misses the figurative use), or forgetting a name (D is wholly unrelated). Idiomatic English questions test recognition of conventional figurative meanings rather than the literal sense of the constituent words.

Q27 B

Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973) 4 SCC 225 is the foundational case in which a thirteen-judge Bench of the Supreme Court, by a 7-6 majority, articulated the basic structure doctrine — that Parliament's power to amend the Constitution under Article 368 does not extend to altering its basic structure. Maneka Gandhi (1978) is the due-process case; Indra Sawhney (1992) is the reservations case; Golaknath (1967) preceded Kesavananda and was overruled on the amendment question. Option B is correct.

Q28 C

Maharashtra has consistently recorded the highest Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP) at current prices among Indian states, with FY25 estimates placing it ahead of Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, and Karnataka. Maharashtra's economic primacy is driven by Mumbai (financial services, ports, manufacturing) and Pune (IT, automotive). Option C is correct. The ranking of the top four states in GSDP has been broadly stable in recent years, with Maharashtra leading and Tamil Nadu and Gujarat in close competition for second.

Q29 A

The Bharat Ratna 2025 was conferred on the former Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao posthumously, in recognition of his contributions to economic liberalisation, foreign policy, and constitutional law. He was Prime Minister from 1991 to 1996 and is credited with inaugurating the 1991 reforms alongside then Finance Minister Manmohan Singh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee received the Bharat Ratna in 2015; Chaudhary Charan Singh was honoured in 2024. Option A is correct.

Q30 D

Manu Bhaker won bronze medals (not gold) in the 10m air pistol individual event and the 10m air pistol mixed team event at the 2024 Paris Olympics, becoming the first Indian woman to win an Olympic shooting medal. No Indian woman won a gold medal in this event in Paris 2024. Option D is correct as the precise factual answer. Bhaker's bronze was historic but not gold; Heena Sidhu and Apurvi Chandela did not medal in Paris 2024.
