

ANSWER KEY — 29 JUNE 2026

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

RC PASSAGES

Q1 B
The author calls light pollution "insidious" immediately after noting it is "a degradation we have been trained not to perceive," and elsewhere stresses that its harms are "quiet precisely because it occurs at night." The sense is of damage that advances unobtrusively, unregistered by those it affects—harm that works gradually and goes largely unnoticed. The contrast with overt aggression is wrong because the passage emphasises invisibility, not confrontation. Nothing suggests a deliberate cover-up by authorities; the problem is collective inattention, not concealment. Calling it trivial and reversible confuses two different ideas: reversibility is discussed only in the final paragraph as a consoling feature, whereas "insidious" describes the menacing, creeping nature of the harm itself. The word therefore captures something that is dangerous precisely because it escapes our notice. Hence, option (B) is correct.

Q2 A
The passage builds from the claim that we have "abolished darkness...with almost no deliberation" to the closing insistence that "the obstacle...is not technical but imaginative—a failure to recognise the night as something worth defending." The argument is thus that the harm is real and neglected, and that the true barrier is one of values. Abolishing lighting altogether overstates the case; the author proposes shielding and dimming, not eradication. Treating the problem as deferrable inverts the author's stance—reversibility is offered as encouragement to act now, not as licence to delay. Restoring navigation by stars echoes the opening imagery but is incidental nostalgia, not the thesis. Only the reading that fuses recognised harm with the imaginative obstacle reflects the passage's overall trajectory and emphatic conclusion. Hence, option (A) is correct.

Q3 C
The author writes that light "reads to us as an unambiguous good" but adds that "the very innocence of that assumption is what makes light pollution so insidious." Calling the equation "innocence" and an "assumption" we are "trained not to perceive" signals that it is an inherited, unexamined belief that hides genuine harm. The author is not endorsing it as validated—he treats it as a blind spot, not a finding. There is no suggestion it was manufactured cynically by an industry; the critique targets a broad cultural reflex, not a marketing conspiracy. Nor is it harmless: the whole passage argues the assumption has real consequences, since it lets ecological and health costs go unnoticed and unaddressed. The inference that best fits is that the equation is a comfortable but misleading habit of mind. Hence, option (C) is correct.

Q4 A
The final paragraph calls reversibility "the consoling feature of this particular catastrophe" and notes that a streetlight "can be shielded, dimmed, or extinguished, and the darkness returns within the hour." This optimism is real but measured: the author immediately identifies a lingering "imaginative" obstacle, so the hope is tempered by awareness of neglect. Resignation contradicts the explicit contrast drawn with irreversible carbon. Triumph is wrong because no reforms are described as already achieved—the author is urging a change of mind, not toasting a victory. Alarm overstates the gloom; while the harms are taken seriously, the closing tone is encouraging, insisting the fix is available. The blend of confidence in the solution and frustration at our failure to pursue it marks a cautiously hopeful attitude. Hence, option (A) is correct.

Q5 D
The author's tractability claim rests on the assertion that "the darkness returns within the hour" once a light is shielded or extinguished, contrasted with carbon that "lingers for centuries." A finding that even properly shielded lights leave a skyglow persisting for decades would directly undercut this, collapsing the very contrast on which the optimism depends and making light pollution look as stubborn as the harms it was said to differ from. Birds adapting their routes speaks to ecological resilience, not to how quickly darkness can be restored, and if anything softens the harm rather than the claim of reversibility. Cities adopting cheap shielding actually supports the author's optimism. Individual variation in melatonin response concerns the health argument, a different strand, and leaves the reversibility claim untouched. Only persistent skyglow attacks the load-bearing premise. Hence, option (D) is correct.

Q6 B

The passage calls money "the great solvent of indivisibility" and then explains the mechanism: "let the heir who keeps the violin compensate the other in cash until envy dissolves." The metaphor is chemical—money dissolves the lumpiness that blocks a fair split—so "solvent" means an agent that breaks down or dissolves a difficulty. The financial sense of being free from debt is a real meaning of the word but plays no role here; the sentence is about resolving a division problem, not about creditworthiness. A cleaning substance captures the literal chemistry but misses the figurative application to indivisibility. A binding agreement confuses the result the author is sceptical of with the metaphor itself. Context—"until envy dissolves"—pins the meaning to the dissolving sense. Hence, option (B) is correct.

Q7 C

The passage moves from the claim that fairness "fractures into rival meanings that cannot all be honoured at once" to the closing counsel that "the honest task is not to conjure a perfect split but to choose, openly and with reasons, which version of fairness we are willing to sacrifice." That arc—impossibility plus the duty to choose—is the thesis. Treating envy-freeness as the sole standard contradicts the passage, which lists it alongside proportionality and efficiency as competing claims. Saying compensation reliably works inverts the author's point that money "merely relocates the disagreement." Claiming the mathematics is irrelevant reverses the entire framing, since the author opens with inheritances and coalitions precisely to show its relevance. Only the reading uniting structural impossibility with conscious sacrifice matches the passage's purpose. Hence, option (C) is correct.

Q8 B

The protocol appears in the sentence "For continuously divisible goods—a cake, a tract of land—envy-free divisions can always be engineered, and the celebrated 'I cut, you choose' protocol is the humblest instance." It is introduced precisely to illustrate the easy case: divisible goods, where envy-freeness is guaranteed. Applying it to indivisible heirlooms reverses the point, since the next sentences explain that with a single violin envy-freeness "can simply evaporate." Calling it the most sophisticated tool contradicts the word "humblest," which marks it as the simplest instance, not the pinnacle. Saying it removes the need to value goods in money confuses this protocol with the later, separately criticised cash-compensation manoeuvre. The inference the passage licenses is that the protocol works only because the cake is divisible. Hence, option (B) is correct.

Q9 A

The author explicitly weighs the reactions: "Some will read this as cause for despair. The more useful response is humility," and frames the impossibility theorems as "statements about the structure of the problem itself" rather than defects to be fixed. The tone is one of sober acceptance that turns limitation into a call for openly reasoned trade-offs. Despair is the very reaction the author names and rejects in favour of humility. Dismissiveness is excluded because the author insists these results are "not failures of cleverness, to be dissolved by a better algorithm"—they are taken seriously, not waved away. Indifference contradicts the passage's evident stakes, drawn from inheritances, governments, and divorces. The attitude is therefore an unflinching acknowledgement that converts a hard truth into practical guidance. Hence, option (A) is correct.

Q10 D

The author contends that compensation "merely relocates the disagreement," because "for a sentimental object...no sum may exist that both regard as just." Evidence that heirs in practice reject any cash figure for a sentimentally valued heirloom directly corroborates this, showing the supposed solution fails exactly where the author predicts. That courts widely use cash settlements would, if anything, cut against the author by suggesting money does work. The point that divisible goods need no money is irrelevant to the indivisible case under discussion. The guarantee of envy-freeness for divisible goods concerns the easy scenario the author already concedes and says nothing about whether money fixes the hard one. Only the finding that real parties refuse monetary compensation reinforces the claim that money relocates rather than resolves the dispute. Hence, option (D) is correct.

CR PASSAGES

Q11 D

The argument's final paragraph states the thesis explicitly: personhood for AI is justified as a tool for allocating accountability, not as moral recognition. The correct choice restates that allocation claim, and the closing line—"Personhood, on this view, is a tool of allocation"—confirms it is the destination rather than a step. The dignity option is the very position the passage disowns ("not that AI deserves rights in any moral sense"), so it inverts the author's stance and would be a classic reversal trap. The designer-unfairness claim is a supporting premise about responsibility tracking control, used to motivate the conclusion rather than being it; it answers "why" the present law fails, not "what we should do." The corporation observation is a sub-premise within the analogy, evidence offered en route to the conclusion, not the conclusion itself. A conclusion is the proposition the other statements are marshalled to support; here every premise—loss of human control, the unfairness of designer liability, the corporate-fiction analogy—feeds the single normative recommendation about how the legal system should assign accountability. Hence, option (D) is correct.

Q12 B

The analogy reasons: because corporate personhood works instrumentally, AI personhood can too. That inference only goes through if the relevant useful features—a stable named defendant, a liability-bearing fund—can actually exist for an AI. The correct choice names exactly this bridging assumption, and if you negate it (those features cannot transfer) the analogy collapses, which is the test of a genuine assumption. The "identical in every respect" option is too strong: an analogy needs likeness only in the relevant respects, not total identity, so the argument does not require it and would not be wounded by some difference. The claim about the law never granting personhood elsewhere is out of scope; the existence of other legal fictions neither helps nor undermines this inference. The "only viable mechanism" option overstates: the argument offers the insurance fund as one illustration, not as a premise that no alternative compensation route exists. An assumption is the unstated link on which the conclusion silently depends; here relevant comparability between corporation and AI is precisely that load-bearing link. Hence, option (B) is correct.

Q13 B

The argument's payoff is that AI personhood better allocates accountability and protects victims' recoveries. The correct choice attacks that payoff directly: if personhood instead lets makers offload foreseeable harm onto an underfunded shell, the proposal worsens the very allocation problem it claims to solve, turning the instrument against its own purpose. The moral-personhood objection misses the mark, because the author already concedes AI lacks moral status and rests the entire case on instrumental, not dignitarian, grounds; refuting a claim never made is no rebuttal. The capital-raising observation is neutral-to-supportive, reinforcing that the corporate fiction is useful and so quietly helping the analogy. The existing-regulation point is out of scope; sector-specific rules govern conduct but do not address who bears liability when an opaque system causes harm. A weakener undermines the link between premises and conclusion, and showing the proposed mechanism backfires for victims does precisely that—whereas the other options either change the subject or actually aid the author's instrumental case. Hence, option (B) is correct.

Q14 B

The argument predicts that AI personhood would better allocate accountability—compensating victims and sparing designers liability for outcomes they could not control. The correct choice supplies real-world confirmation of exactly those two predicted effects in jurisdictions that adopted a dedicated fund, so it strengthens by showing the proposed mechanism actually delivers its promised benefits rather than merely promising them. The public-discomfort option is irrelevant to whether the instrumental case holds; the author explicitly disclaims any dignity-based defence, so attitudes toward calling software a "person" cannot bear on it. The executive-shielding point arguably cuts against the proposal by spotlighting how the fiction enables abuse, so it weakens rather than helps. The rising-deployment fact establishes that the problem is growing but says nothing about whether personhood solves it; greater urgency is not greater efficacy, a common strengthen trap. A strengthener confirms the premise-to-conclusion link, and direct evidence that the liability-fund mechanism worked in comparable jurisdictions does that more forcefully than any of the alternatives. Hence, option (B) is correct.

Q15 C

The core move is: the corporate fiction is instrumentally useful, therefore an AI fiction is justified. That slides from one fiction's success to another's warrant without establishing that the conditions making corporate personhood work—capitalisation, identifiable principals, a funded balance sheet, human agents who direct it—carry over to a self-modifying system. The correct choice names this gap precisely: usefulness in one case is treated as sufficient for a different case the conditions may not fit. The small-sample charge misfires; the argument is not a statistical generalisation from a handful of observed machines, so there is no sample to be too small. The is-to-ought framing "technologically possible therefore obligatory" misreads the reasoning, which argues from instrumental usefulness, not from mere possibility. The final option attributes a moral-dignity conclusion the author expressly rejects, so it attacks a claim never made and is a tempting but inaccurate flaw label. A flaw question rewards identifying the actual defective inference; here it is the untransferred analogy, not a sampling error or a moral overreach. Hence, option (C) is correct.

Q16 B

The reformers state their thesis at the close of the second paragraph and reaffirm it in the third: India should abolish the income tax and switch wholly to a consumption tax. The correct choice restates exactly that policy recommendation, which is what all the surrounding material is built to support. The growth-from-rewarding-saving statement is the driving premise behind the first strand of the case, not the conclusion it supports; it explains why the switch would help, not what should be done. The claim that consumption is harder to conceal is the key premise of the compliance sub-argument, again evidence feeding the recommendation rather than the recommendation itself. The rebate point is a rebuttal to the fairness objection, defending the conclusion against a critic rather than being it. A conclusion is what the premises are assembled to establish; here the growth premise, the compliance premise, and the fairness rebuttal are all marshalled toward the single policy recommendation to replace the income tax entirely. Hence, option (B) is correct.

Q17 C

The sub-argument claims a consumption tax improves compliance because spending is harder to hide than income. That inference holds only if consumption cannot itself be evaded on a comparable scale; otherwise the promised compliance gain simply migrates to a new dodge and disappears. The correct choice supplies this load-bearing assumption, and negating it—consumption is just as evadable—destroys the case, the hallmark of a true assumption. The "flawless technology" option is too strong: the argument needs spending to be merely harder to conceal, not captured with perfect, error-free fidelity, so demanding perfection is a too-strong trap. The accountants'-employment claim is irrelevant; whether displaced accountants find other work has no bearing on whether the new tax is harder to evade. The "lowest among all developing economies" comparison is a stronger empirical claim than the argument needs, which requires only that Indian income-tax compliance be poor, not literally the world's poorest. An assumption is the unstated premise the inference silently needs; comparable un-evadability of consumption is exactly that premise. Hence, option (C) is correct.

Q18 C

A central premise is that consumption is harder to evade, so the switch widens the base and lets the rate fall for everyone. The correct choice attacks that premise with empirical evidence that, in practice, a broad consumption tax drives large transactions into cash and the informal sector, shrinking rather than widening the base—the precise opposite of what the reformers promise. The hybrid-preference option merely reports that some economists favour a different design; a rival opinion does not show the reformers' premises false. The receipt-keeping point is a minor administrative wrinkle attached to the rebate, not a blow to the growth or compliance case. The wealthy-already-save observation is ambiguous and, if anything, supports the reformers, since high savers would benefit most from a system that spares saving. A weakener falsifies or undercuts a premise or the premise-conclusion link; showing the base actually erodes in practice directly defeats the compliance rationale on which the entire recommendation rests, which the rival-opinion and minor-friction options never touch. Hence, option (C) is correct.

Q19 D

The argument rests on two premises: the switch spurs growth by sparing saving, and it improves compliance by taxing visible spending. The correct choice confirms both at once with matched real-world outcomes—higher saving and investment, lower collection costs, and no rise in evasion—so it strengthens the whole case directly by showing each promised effect actually materialised. The relief-from-filing point is psychological and does not show the policy delivers growth or revenue; taxpayers feeling unburdened is not the same as the economy performing better. The ever-lengthening-code observation supports only the narrow claim that the income tax is messy, not the positive claim that the consumption-tax alternative works as promised; diagnosing the old system is not validating the new one. The fact that consumption taxes already raise some indirect revenue nearly everywhere is too weak: partial existing use says nothing about whether a full replacement of income tax would succeed. A strengthener confirms the premise-to-conclusion link, and matched-case evidence that both promised effects occurred does so most powerfully. Hence, option (D) is correct.

Q20 A

The reformers reason: tax the visible, hard-to-hide act (spending) rather than the concealable thing (income), because doing so is both more efficient and harder to evade, so replace the latter levy with the former. The correct choice mirrors this skeleton exactly—tax the visible, hard-to-fake act (road use captured at exits) instead of the concealable annual vehicle charge, and replace one levy with the other for the very same efficiency-and-evasion reasons. The sugar option argues for a ban over a tax, a different move with no replace-a-tax-with-a-better-tax structure, so its logical shape diverges. The library option charges the heaviest users more, which echoes a usage-based or regressivity theme, not the visible-versus-concealable logic that drives the original. The transport option rewards existing good behaviour with a rebate, which is unrelated to swapping one levy for a more collectible one. Parallel-reasoning questions reward matching the inferential skeleton rather than the surface topic, and only the toll case reproduces the "tax the visible act, scrap the hidden one" structure that defines the reformers' argument. Hence, option (A) is correct.

SECTION C — RAPID-FIRE GK & CURRENT AFFAIRS

Q21 D

The Yen (symbol ¥; ISO code JPY) is the official currency of Japan and one of the most traded currencies in global foreign exchange markets, alongside the US Dollar and the Euro. The Won (KRW) is the currency of South Korea; the Baht (THB) is used in Thailand; and the Ringgit (MYR) is Malaysia's currency. Confusing Asian currencies is a common error in GK questions, and the Yen's distinctive ¥ symbol helps distinguish it from the Yuan (CNY) of China. Hence, option (D) is correct.

Q22 A

Laconic means expressing much in very few words — terse, succinct, brief and to the point. The word derives from Laconia, the region of ancient Greece that included Sparta, whose inhabitants were famous for their extremely terse speech. The antonym of laconic is verbose or elaborate. In legal contexts, a laconic judgment states its conclusion with minimal supporting reasoning, which may itself be grounds for challenge. 'Vague' and 'ambiguous' imply unclear meaning, not brevity. Hence, option (A) is correct.

Q23 C

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar described Article 32 as 'the heart and soul of the Constitution' because it provides a guaranteed constitutional remedy: the right to move the Supreme Court directly when a Fundamental Right is violated. Without this enforcement mechanism, the rights in Part III would be merely declaratory and unenforceable. The Supreme Court issues five writs — habeas corpus, mandamus, prohibition, certiorari, and quo warranto — under this Article to enforce those rights. Hence, option (C) is correct.

Q24 A

Canberra is the capital city of Australia. It was purpose-designed and purpose-built as a compromise capital after federation in 1901, when Sydney and Melbourne both claimed the honour. The Australian Capital Territory (ACT) was established, and Canberra became the national capital in 1913. Sydney, despite being Australia's largest and best-known city, is the capital of New South Wales; Melbourne is the capital of Victoria; Brisbane is the capital of Queensland. Hence, option (A) is correct.

Q25 D

Benevolent means well-intentioned, kind, and generous in spirit. Its antonym is malevolent, which means having or displaying a wish to do evil or cause harm to others. The contrast lies in the Latin prefixes: 'bene-' means good, while 'male-' means bad. All three distractors — generous, charitable, and philanthropic — are synonyms of benevolent, not opposites. Choosing one of them would mean picking a word with the same meaning, which is the opposite of what the question asks. Hence, option (D) is correct.

Q26 A

In *Kesavananda Bharati* (1973), a 13-judge constitution bench held by a 7:6 majority that Parliament's power to amend the Constitution under Article 368 is not unlimited — it cannot alter or destroy the 'basic structure' of the Constitution. This limits even constitutional amendments. The Doctrine of Colourable Legislation concerns disguised legislative competence violations; Severability deals with separating valid from invalid parts of a statute; Pith and Substance identifies the true nature and character of a law for legislative competence purposes. Hence, option (A) is correct.

Q27 D

The pituitary gland is called the 'master gland' because the hormones it secretes regulate the activity of most other endocrine glands in the body, including the thyroid, adrenal glands, and gonads. Located at the base of the brain within a bony recess called the sella turcica, it has two lobes — the anterior lobe secretes hormones such as growth hormone and TSH, while the posterior lobe releases ADH and oxytocin. The thyroid, adrenal, and pineal glands are themselves regulated, not the regulators. Hence, option (D) is correct.

Q28 B

Before the advent of electric lighting, people depended on oil lamps to see after dark. 'Burning the midnight oil' therefore meant staying up very late working or studying by the light of an oil lamp. In modern usage the phrase describes anyone — especially a student before exams or a professional facing a deadline — who works hard into the late hours of the night. The phrase carries a connotation of diligence and effort rather than wastefulness, anger, or financial risk. Hence, option (B) is correct.

Q29 D

The Directive Principles of State Policy are enshrined in Part IV of the Indian Constitution, spanning Articles 36 to 51. Borrowed from the Irish Constitution of 1937, they are non-justiciable guidelines — courts cannot enforce them directly — but the state is expected to apply them in making laws and policies. Part III (Articles 12–35) contains the justiciable Fundamental Rights; Part V (Articles 52–151) deals with the Union executive and legislature; Part VI covers the States. Hence, option (D) is correct.

Q30 C

This phrase is a proverb — a short, traditional saying that expresses a widely accepted truth or practical piece of advice. Proverbs are culturally transmitted and carry moral or experiential wisdom in a pithy form. An extended metaphor sustains a comparison across multiple sentences or an entire passage; a simile makes a direct comparison using 'like' or 'as'; hyperbole uses deliberate exaggeration for effect, such as 'I've told you a million times.' None of these devices applies to this straightforward, literal piece of financial wisdom. Hence, option (C) is correct.

Q31 C

Mount Everest (8,848.86 m above sea level) straddles the border between Nepal and the Tibet Autonomous Region of China. It is called Sagarmatha in Nepali and Chomolungma in Tibetan. Sir Edmund Hillary of New Zealand and Tenzing Norgay Sherpa of Nepal first reached the summit on 29 May 1953. The peak is entirely outside India — the closest Indian border is hundreds of kilometres away. It is not solely in Tibet (China), as Nepal also claims and exercises sovereignty over the southern approach and summit ridge. Hence, option (C) is correct.
