

**ANSWER KEY — 11 JUNE 2026**

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

RC PASSAGES

**Q1 B**

The word 'quixotic' derives from Don Quixote and describes hopes or schemes that are idealistic to the point of impracticality. The context confirms this reading: the sentence introduces the critics' rebuttal of each of the proponents' three claims, and the paragraph that follows explains why those claims are unrealistic — the revived animal would be a novel organism rather than a true mammoth, the permafrost theory would need herds of hundreds of thousands rather than a handful of calves, and so on. The critics are thus painting the proponents' ambitions as noble-sounding but unworkable, which is exactly 'impractically idealistic' — option B. 'Maliciously deceptive' (A) imputes dishonesty the critics do not allege; 'scientifically meticulous' (C) is the opposite of their charge; 'financially prudent' (D) contradicts the funding objection that follows.

**Q2 D**

The passage is structured as a balanced survey: it opens with the mammoth project, sets out the proponents' three claims (ecosystem repair, spillover technology, restitution), then devotes two paragraphs to the critics' rebuttals (novel organism, contested models, moral hazard, diverted funds), and closes by observing the asymmetry of the debate. The centre of gravity is that the technology is striking but its conservation justifications are disputed and may impose hidden costs — precisely option D. Option A overstates the passage into a call for a ban it never makes. Option B asserts as certain the permafrost claim the passage explicitly labels contested. Option C declares the debate closed, while the final paragraph shows it very much alive. The supporting line is the closing remark that de-extinction 'may ultimately be less about the mammoth's return than about our own absolution'.

**Q3 A**

The passage defines the worry in its own words: conservation biologists fear that 'if the public comes to believe that extinction is a reversible inconvenience, the political urgency of preventing extinctions in the first place may quietly drain away.' Moral hazard, in this usage, is the danger that a perceived safety net (revival technology) weakens the incentive to avoid the underlying harm (extinction). Option A restates exactly this: belief in reversibility erodes support for prevention. Option B describes deliberate extinction-for-profit, a scenario the passage never raises. Option C concerns animal welfare in laboratories, which the passage does not discuss under moral hazard or elsewhere. Option D concerns the empirical fate of climate models, not the incentive effect on public and political behaviour that the term moral hazard captures.

**Q4 C**

The author reports the proponents' claims fairly and at length, then gives the critics' rebuttals in greater detail and with sharper language — 'quixotic', 'moral hazard', 'the sharpest objection' — and ends with an acid quotation suggesting de-extinction may be more about human absolution than about conservation. That final note, together with the observation that proponents need only one spectacular success while critics must defend a counterfactual, shows an author who is doubtful of the enterprise but who never descends into denunciation and concedes the debate is 'not symmetrical'. This is caution plus doubt: cautiously sceptical, option C. 'Breathlessly celebratory' (A) fits neither the structure nor the diction; 'bitterly hostile' (B) overstates the criticism, which remains measured; 'coldly indifferent' (D) is refuted by the evident care with which both sides are weighed.

**Q5 B**

The critics' funding objection is a zero-sum premise: 'every dollar spent gestating a mammoth is a dollar withheld' from rangers and habitat corridors. The objection works only if de-extinction money would otherwise have flowed to conventional conservation. Option B attacks precisely that premise: if the ventures are financed almost entirely by private investors who would never have donated to conservation, then the mammoth project diverts nothing — the counterfactual pool of money does not exist, and the dollar-for-dollar trade-off collapses. Option A is about government budgets rising, which neither confirms nor denies diversion of the private money at issue. Option C, falling technology costs, makes the project cheaper but says nothing about where the funds come from. Option D, ranger morale, is an incidental benefit irrelevant to the financial logic of the objection.

**Q6 C**

'Perennial' describes rivers 'that once flowed dependably through the year', as the sentence itself glosses: the passage contrasts perennial flow with rivers becoming 'increasingly seasonal in their upper reaches'. The opposition between perennial and seasonal fixes the meaning — flowing throughout the year, option C. Option A ('fed only by monsoon rain') describes the rain-fed rivers the passage distinguishes from meltwater-fed ones, and is closer to the cause of seasonality than to the meaning of perennial. Option B ('sacred to river communities') imports a cultural register the sentence does not carry. Option D ('prone to sudden flooding') belongs to the peak-water discussion in the previous paragraph, not to the durability of flow that perennial denotes. Vocabulary-in-context questions reward reading the contrast built into the very sentence at issue.

**Q7 A**

The passage advances in two movements. The first three paragraphs establish the physical threat: massive projected ice loss, the deceptive abundance of peak water, and uneven vulnerability across basins and mountain springs. The final two paragraphs add the institutional failure: riparian countries treat flow data as state secrets, and 'the ice is melting faster than the trust required to manage what its melting will unleash'. The main point therefore joins both halves — a grave threat to water security compounded by weak data-sharing institutions — which is option A. Option B asserts total drying of the three rivers, far beyond the projected one-third to two-thirds ice loss. Option C names hydropower as the principal cause, which the passage never claims. Option D says the monitoring network already exists, while the passage presents it as an unrealised proposal.

**Q8 D**

Peak water is defined in the second paragraph: as glaciers melt faster, 'rivers initially swell... bringing more floods', and 'only after this deceptive period of abundance do flows begin their long-term fall'. The inference is that near-term flows can rise even as the long-term trajectory points downward — exactly option D, and exactly why the passage warns that planning around present volumes is planning around 'a temporary illusion'. Option A claims the permanent decline has already begun in every basin, which contradicts the swelling phase the passage describes. Option B predicts steadily falling flood risk, the opposite of the stated surge in floods and outburst events. Option C reverses the basin comparison: the passage says the Indus, not the Ganga, depends more heavily on meltwater in the dry season.

**Q9 B**

The tone combines urgency with discipline. The author uses arresting images — the Third Pole, vanishing towers of ice, a narrowing window — and a sobering register ('sobering conclusion', 'the distribution of pain'), which signal alarm. Yet every alarming claim is tethered to assessments, scenarios and percentages, the uncertainty between optimistic and high-emissions pathways is preserved, and the closing paragraph turns to institutional remedies rather than catastrophe. Alarm expressed through evidence and proportion is 'measured alarm' — option B. 'Detached amusement' (A) is incompatible with the gravity of the subject and diction. 'Open despair' (C) fails because the author still argues for a cheap, feasible monitoring network, implying the situation is salvageable. 'Triumphant optimism' (D) inverts the warning that trust is being outpaced by the melting ice.

**Q10 D**

The author argues that a common monitoring network and open data protocols 'would cost little and benefit everyone, since floods and droughts do not respect frontiers'. The claim is strengthened by evidence that shared hydrological data actually delivers the promised benefit. Option D supplies precisely that: a flood early-warning system shared between two basin countries — a working instance of cross-border data sharing — sharply reduced downstream deaths during outburst events, demonstrating the payoff of cooperation in exactly the disaster scenarios the passage highlights. Option A celebrates village self-help that involves no data sharing between states. Option B describes demand-side adaptation by cities, again without transboundary cooperation. Option C, if anything, weakens the case: if satellites fully replaced ground measurement, countries would not need to share their jealously guarded gauge data at all.

## CR PASSAGES

**Q11 A**

A conclusion is the claim the rest of the argument exists to support. Here the premises — the cost of repeated elections, the governance freeze attributed to the Model Code of Conduct, and administrative fatigue — are all marshalled towards one proposition, announced early ('India should move to simultaneous elections') and restated at the close ('the cure is to vote less often, all at once'). Option A states exactly this and is the main conclusion. Option B, abolishing the Model Code, is never proposed; the reformers want fewer elections, not a weaker code. Option C, capping party spending, is a different reform the passage never advances; spending is cited only as evidence of cost. Option D, falling turnout, is one of the supporting premises (voter weariness), not the conclusion the premises are deployed to establish.

**Q12 C**

The governance-paralysis premise asserts that because the Model Code of Conduct restrains announcements in poll-bound territory and some election is nearly always imminent, ministries operate under a near-continuous freeze. For this to support the conclusion, it must be true that the code's restraint actually and materially delays decisions governments would otherwise have taken — option C. Apply the negation test: if the code's restraint did not materially delay any real decision (because it is narrow, brief, or routinely worked around), the paralysis premise would collapse and with it a third of the argument. Option A concerns the willingness of security forces, which touches cost and logistics, not paralysis. Option B concerns how voters weigh issues, relevant to the federalism objection rather than to this premise. Option D concerns the price of voting machines, again a cost-side matter.

**Q13 B**

Option B strikes directly at the governance-paralysis premise, the argument's load-bearing wall. If the Model Code of Conduct binds only the poll-bound state, lasts only a few weeks, and expressly exempts ongoing schemes, then the claimed 'near-continuous freeze' across ministries is an exaggeration: most of the government, most of the time, is unaffected, and ongoing work never stops. With paralysis gone, the case reduces to cost savings and convenience, far too thin for so large a constitutional change. Option A, that mature democracies stagger elections, is mild counter-evidence by analogy but rebuts no premise. Option C, party opposition, is an appeal to popularity in reverse and says nothing about the argument's truth. Option D, cheaper voting machines, marginally weakens only the cost premise, the least essential of the three.

**Q14 D**

The reformers face two main vulnerabilities: the federalism worry that simultaneous voting blurs state issues into national waves, and the need to show real savings. Option D supplies empirical support on both fronts at once — in states that happened to vote alongside national elections, attention to state issues did not decline (rebutting the chief objection the reformers had waved away as a design detail) and spending per voter halved (confirming the cost premise with data rather than assertion). Evidence from actual aligned elections is the strongest form of support the argument could receive. Option A, that a constitutional amendment is needed, raises an obstacle rather than support. Option B, evenly divided opinion, is neutral at best. Option C, that committees have studied the question for decades, shows attention, not merit — study without endorsement strengthens nothing.

**Q15 A**

The flaw lies in the final paragraph's manoeuvre. The reformers concede that critics raise objections 'about federalism and the fate of governments that fall mid-term', yet brush these aside as 'design details: questions of how to synchronise, not whether to'. That is not refutation but reclassification: the democratic costs of curtailing or extending elected assemblies' terms, and of national waves swamping state-level accountability, bear directly on whether the reform is desirable, not merely on its mechanics. Weighing cost and convenience while defining the countervailing values out of the ledger is one-sided assessment — option A. Option B fails because the argument never claims uniqueness among democracies. Option C invents an application to private companies the passage never makes. Option D alleges a contradiction that does not exist: frequent elections and falling turnout are compatible and indeed causally linked in the argument.

**Q16 D**

The argument funnels towards a policy demand. Every earlier claim — minors are harmed, self-declared birth dates are a fiction, physical-world age-gating is accepted, platforms will not police themselves — functions as a premise, and the passage itself signals the inference: 'The conclusion follows: mandatory ID-based age verification should be enacted, and platforms that fail to comply should face penalties calibrated to their revenues.' Option D reproduces this and is the main conclusion. Option A (self-declaration is unreliable) is a premise about the failure of the status quo. Option B (harms to adolescents) is the opening empirical premise. Option C (age-gating is accepted for alcohol, tobacco and casinos) is the analogical premise. Each of A, B and C is offered as a reason for D, which is the test that separates a conclusion from its supports.

**Q17 B**

The argument moves from 'self-declaration has failed' to 'only verification against government identity documents can make the age limit real', and concludes that mandating such verification will protect minors. The unstated bridge is that ID-based verification will actually work — that it will, in practice, prevent most minors from gaining access rather than being circumvented as easily as the self-declared birth date it replaces. Option B states this assumption. Negate it and the argument collapses: if ID checks do not stop minors, the mandate delivers privacy costs without the promised protection, and the conclusion loses its footing. Option A (voluntary reduction by adolescents) is unnecessary — the scheme relies on exclusion, not self-restraint. Option C (platform revenue from minors) is irrelevant to whether verification protects them. Option D (parental incapacity) is nowhere required; the argument is about platform-level gating, whatever parents do.

**Q18 C**

Option C undermines the argument at both of its critical joints. First, efficacy: if minors in adopting countries routinely borrowed adult documents, then ID verification fails at exactly the task for which it was proposed, and the claim that 'only verification can make the age limit real' is falsified by experience. Second, the privacy dismissal: the defenders waved away the objection by promising that identity documents would be deleted after verification, but repeated breaches of verification databases show the safeguard failing in practice, converting a 'brisk' dismissal into a live harm. An argument weakened on both its central premise and its handling of the chief objection is gravely damaged. Option A (screen-time reminders) addresses a different, milder intervention. Option B (adults would not mind) mildly helps the defenders. Option D (penalty comparisons with competition law) is administrative trivia.

**Q19 A**

The defenders' conclusion rests on a prediction: mandate ID verification and minors will be kept out, at acceptable cost to adults. Option A reports a year-long pilot in which verified platforms saw under-age accounts fall by ninety per cent with no decline in adult usage — direct empirical confirmation of both halves of the prediction. It proves efficacy (the verification works where self-declaration failed) and rebuts the chief practical objection (that adults would abandon platforms rather than verify, or be wrongly excluded). Real-world trial evidence is the strongest support a policy argument can receive. Option B, legislative endorsement, is an appeal to authority that leaves the merits untouched. Option C, platform lobbying against the draft, at most hints that platforms fear the rule, which is oblique and double-edged. Option D, celebrity account deletions, is anecdote unconnected to verification.

**Q20 C**

The analogy treats proving age to buy alcohol and proving age to use social media as the same kind of act. The strongest criticism is the structural disanalogy in option C: buying alcohol involves a momentary check at a physical point of sale, after which the buyer walks away unrecorded, whereas ID-verified social media ties a citizen's legal identity to a continuing space of speech, association and political expression — a standing linkage with chilling effects and surveillance risks that a one-time purchase check never creates. Because the burdens differ in kind, acceptance of the first practice does not commit society to the second; this is the classic false-analogy objection. Option A merely quibbles about relative danger, conceding the analogy's form. Option B raises an irrelevant detail about whose database is consulted. Option D, even if true, describes lax enforcement, not a defect in the analogy itself.

## SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK &amp; CURRENT AFFAIRS

**Q21 B**

The official currency of South Korea is the won (KRW), issued by the Bank of Korea. The distractors are the currencies of neighbouring economies that examiners habitually shuffle: the yen (option A) is the currency of Japan, the yuan or renminbi (option C) is the currency of China, and the ringgit (option D) is the currency of Malaysia. North Korea also calls its currency the won, but it is a separate, non-convertible currency issued by Pyongyang; the question asks about South Korea, whose won is the one traded internationally. Hence option B.

**Q22 D**

'The Discovery of India' was written by Jawaharlal Nehru during his imprisonment at Ahmednagar Fort between 1942 and 1946, in the wake of the Quit India movement. The book surveys India's history, philosophy and composite culture from the Indus Valley Civilisation to the freedom struggle, and it later inspired Shyam Benegal's television series 'Bharat Ek Khoj'. Mahatma Gandhi (option A) wrote 'Hind Swaraj' and his autobiography 'The Story of My Experiments with Truth'; Rabindranath Tagore (option B) wrote 'Gitanjali'; S. Radhakrishnan (option C) wrote 'Indian Philosophy'. Hence option D.

**Q23 A**

Justice M. Fathima Beevi became the first woman judge of the Supreme Court of India on her appointment in 1989, capping a career that began in the Kerala judicial service; she later served as Governor of Tamil Nadu. The distractors are eminent but distinct firsts: Justice Anna Chandy (option C) was the first woman judge of a High Court in India (Kerala, 1959) and indeed among the first in the Commonwealth; Justice Leila Seth (option B) was the first woman Chief Justice of a state High Court (Himachal Pradesh); Justice Sujata Vasant Manohar (option D) reached the Supreme Court later, in 1994. Hence option A.

**Q24 C**

'Ephemeral' means lasting for a very short time — the word descends from the Greek ephemerous, 'lasting only a day', originally used of insects that live for a single day. 'Short-lived' (option C) is therefore the closest synonym. 'Imperishable' (option A) means lasting forever and is an antonym, not a synonym. 'Robust' (option B) concerns strength and sturdiness, not duration. 'Hidden' (option D) concerns visibility, not duration. Typical usage confirms the sense: ephemeral fame, an ephemeral fashion, ephemeral streams that flow only after rain. Hence option C.

**Q25 D**

The idiom 'to let the cat out of the bag' means to reveal a secret, usually inadvertently or carelessly. Its popular origin story comes from medieval markets, where a dishonest seller might substitute a cat for a piglet in a sack; opening the bag — letting the cat out — exposed the deception. Option D captures this meaning. Option A (creating panic) confuses it with idioms like 'to cry wolf'; option B (abandoning a project) resembles 'to throw in the towel'; option C (punishing publicly) matches nothing in the idiom's sense. A sample sentence: 'The minister let the cat out of the bag about the cabinet reshuffle a day before the official announcement.' Hence option D.

**Q26 A**

Mandamus is a Latin word meaning 'we command'. The writ of mandamus is issued by the Supreme Court under Article 32 or a High Court under Article 226 to command a public authority to perform a public or statutory duty it has failed or refused to perform. The other options translate the other writs: 'to be certified' (option B) is certiorari, by which a superior court calls up the record of an inferior court or tribunal; 'by what authority' (option C) is quo warranto, which questions a person's right to hold a public office; 'you may have the body' (option D) is habeas corpus, the remedy against unlawful detention. Hence option A.

**Q27 B**

The Palk Strait separates the south-eastern coast of Tamil Nadu in India from the northern coast of Sri Lanka, joining the Bay of Bengal with the Palk Bay; it is named after Robert Palk, a Governor of Madras. The chain of shoals known as Adam's Bridge or Ram Setu lies in this region, between Rameswaram and Mannar Island. The distractors guard other waters: the Strait of Hormuz (option A) connects the Persian Gulf with the Gulf of Oman; the Strait of Malacca (option C) runs between the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra; the Sunda Strait (option D) separates Java from Sumatra. Hence option B.

**Q28 C**

The Jnanpith Award is India's oldest and highest literary award, instituted in 1961 by the Bharatiya Jnanpith trust and first conferred in 1965 on the Malayalam poet G. Sankara Kurup. It honours an outstanding contribution to literature by an author writing in any of the languages of the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution or in English, and carries a citation, a cash prize and a bronze replica of Vagdevi (Saraswati). It is therefore conferred for literature — option C. Classical music (option A) is honoured by awards such as the Sangeet Natak Akademi fellowships; scientific research (option B) by the Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar Prize; social service (option D) by honours like the Jannalal Bajaj Award.

---

**Q29 A**

'Parsimonious' means excessively unwilling to spend money — stingy or tight-fisted. The question asks for the word most nearly opposite, which is 'extravagant' (option A): spending freely, indeed wastefully. Options B and C are traps that test whether the candidate has read the direction of the question: 'miserly' is a near-synonym of parsimonious, and 'frugal' is its milder, approving cousin — careful with money rather than mean about it. 'Overcautious' (option D) concerns excessive prudence in general, not spending, and is neither synonym nor antonym. The synonym-antonym inversion trap is the most common error pattern in vocabulary questions: candidates skim, recognise the meaning, and pick the matching rather than the opposing word. Hence option A.

---

**Q30 B**

Article 110 of the Constitution defines a Money Bill: a Bill is a Money Bill if it contains only provisions dealing with the matters enumerated in clauses (a) to (g) — taxation, government borrowing, custody of the Consolidated Fund and Contingency Fund, appropriation, expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund, receipt of money on its account, and matters incidental thereto. The Speaker's certification on the question is final. The distractors are neighbouring financial articles: Article 109 (option A) lays down the special procedure for passing Money Bills, restricting the Rajya Sabha's role; Article 112 (option C) provides for the Annual Financial Statement, the Union Budget; Article 117 (option D) deals with Financial Bills. Hence option B.