

ANSWER KEY — 5 OCTOBER 2026

Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
B	C	A	D	C	A	D	B	C	D
Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20
C	A	B	D	B	C	A	B	A	D

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Main idea - RC (Economics) MED

The passage builds everything on one definition: rent is 'the portion of any payment that exceeds what was necessary to call forth the service in question,' and the surgeon and the landholder are offered precisely to show that such surplus rewards holding, not doing, since 'the income flows not from doing but from holding.' Option B captures both halves, the surplus-over-necessary-reward and the holding-not-contributing point. The tenant-and-landlord option seizes the 'ordinary speech' sense the passage explicitly sets aside as narrower than 'the technical sense.' The natural-scarcities-only option contradicts the text, which says the scarcity 'may be artificial, conjured by a patent, a licence, or a zoning rule.' The classical-economists-were-mistaken option inverts the passage, which credits the classical school with the distinction rather than faulting it, and treats Henry George as extending the idea, not correcting an error in it.

Examiner's note — the trap: The tenant-and-landlord option is the trap: it is the everyday meaning of 'rent,' but the passage flags that meaning only to replace it with 'the technical sense' it then develops.

Q2 C Inference - RC HARD

The second paragraph locates the subversion in 'the wedge it drives between reward and contribution' and ends on the decisive clause: 'the holder's wealth rises with no answering increase in what society has to enjoy.' Option C restates exactly that severing of payment from contribution. The would-cease-if-paid-less option describes the opposite of rent, a payment only just sufficient to call the service forth, which by definition carries no rent at all. The every-fortune-is-wholly-rent option overstates wildly: the passage says 'part of what the fortunate receive is rent' and asks 'how much,' never claiming fortunes are entirely captured. The regulate-equally option imports a policy prescription the passage never makes; its only policy remark concerns taxing rent, and even that is raised as George's thread rather than endorsed. Only C reports what the text actually says is disturbing about the idea.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'wholly captured rent' option is attractive because it sounds like the radical punchline, but the passage carefully says 'part' and poses 'how much,' so the all-or-nothing version overshoots the text.

Q3 A Tone/attitude - RC HARD

The register is cool and expository, yet it carries a deliberate edge: the author says the point 'carries an edge the classical economists did not shrink from,' and closes that 'the question is uncomfortable precisely because, once asked, it cannot easily be unasked.' That is analysis that presses rather than merely describes, which is what 'analytical but pointed' names. The openly-indignant option mistakes the quiet edge for denunciation; nowhere are rent-holders called 'parasites' or accused of fraud, and the prose never raises its voice. The purely-detached option ignores the closing insistence that the question is uncomfortable and unavoidable, a plainly evaluative move. The nostalgic option invents a lament for lost classical clarity that the passage does not express; it treats the classical distinction as still alive and still biting, not as a vanished virtue to be mourned.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'detached and purely expository' option is tempting because the bulk of the passage is calm exposition, but the final sentences evaluate, calling the question uncomfortable and unavoidable, so pure detachment misreads the ending.

Q4 D Vocabulary-in-context - RC HARD

The phrase pairs 'effort' with 'abstinence' as two honest grounds of reward, set against rent. In classical political economy 'abstinence' is the saver's forgoing of present consumption, the sacrifice that justifies a return to capital, and the sentence confirms this by making both effort and abstinence things for which 'a payment that merely covers the next-best alternative' is legitimate. Option D states exactly that. The teetotal option takes the modern everyday sense of abstaining from drink, which is irrelevant to a sentence about payments and supply. The withdrawal-from-economic-life option is self-defeating, for one who withdrew entirely would supply nothing and so earn no honest price at all. The scarcity option actually defines rent, the thing 'abstinence' is being contrasted with, and so reverses the very opposition the sentence draws between honest reward and extracted surplus.

Examiner's note — the trap: The teetotal 'refusal to consume alcohol' option is the dictionary's first sense and therefore the trap; the question asks for the meaning in a sentence about effort and payment, where abstinence means forgoing present consumption.

Q5 C Structure/purpose - RC ELITE

The passage opens by defining a 'slippery' technical category and illustrating it; the second paragraph identifies 'the wedge it drives between reward and contribution'; and the third turns analysis into a verdict, ending on 'a standing question put to every large fortune: how much of this was made, and how much merely captured?' Option C tracks that definition-to-wedge-to-question arc precisely. The

antiquity-to-present narrative option imposes a history the passage does not tell; only one aside, Henry George, is historical, and it is an illustration, not a chronology. The tax-proposal-and-three-objections option mistakes the piece for an advocacy essay with named rebuttals, but no proposal is defended and no objections are enumerated. The two-rival-schools option invents an adjudication between competing schools, whereas the passage works within a single inherited framework and never stages a contest to settle.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'tax proposal defended against three objections' option borrows the shape of a typical argument essay, but the passage advances no proposal and lists no numbered objections; it ends on a question, not a defence.

Q6 A Main idea - RC (Law & society) MED

The final sentence states the thesis outright: 'The law neither simply follows society nor simply leads it; it is one of the instruments through which a society argues with itself about what it is becoming.' Option A reproduces it. The faithful-mirror option is precisely the picture the passage sets up only to say it 'flatters the law by crediting it with a passivity it rarely shows.' The always-lags option takes one of the two illustrations, law outrunning behaviour and waiting, and treats it as the whole claim, ignoring the paired example in which a prosecution 'triggered' a change; the passage insists on 'in neither case.' The find-versus-make-is-honoured option directly contradicts the third paragraph, which says that distinction 'the practice of law does not honour.' Only A states the governing both-and claim rather than one of its subordinate cases.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'always lags behind sentiment' option is attractive because the dead-letter example really does show law waiting, but the passage pairs it with the opposite case and refuses to privilege either, so the one-directional reading is too narrow.

Q7 D Inference - RC HARD

The dead-letter case is introduced to show law that 'outruns society and waits, impotent, for behaviour to catch up,' a rule 'enacted with great ceremony' yet left unenforced. The inference the example licenses is that a law's mere existence on the books is no proof that attitudes have moved, which is Option D. The ceremony-reshapes-officials option says the reverse of the example, which turns on officials who do not change and so leave the rule dead. The sentiment-always-outpaces-law option generalises in the wrong direction and is refuted by the passage's companion example of law triggering sentiment. The prosecution-is-the-most-reliable-mechanism option belongs to the other illustration entirely, the tolerated practice ended by a single prosecution, and even there the text claims no ranking of reliability. Only D draws the lesson the dead-letter case is actually built to teach.

Examiner's note — the trap: The prosecution option is a real detail from the passage, which makes it tempting, but it belongs to the opposite illustration; the dead-letter example is about law sitting inert, not about prosecutions driving change.

Q8 B Tone/attitude - RC MED

The author treats the find-only camp as mistaken but not villainous: they 'are asking for a distinction the practice of law does not honour.' That is a measured correction, and crucially the same sentence corrects the opposite camp too, those 'who say judges merely impose their will,' showing even-handedness rather than hostility, which is 'gently corrective.' The warmly-approving option inverts the author's view, since the find-only position is being gently refused, not vindicated. The fiercely-contemptuous option overstates the temperature; contempt and the charge of a 'naked imposition' are nowhere in the prose, which stays calm and balanced. The wholly-indifferent option is contradicted by the fact that the author bothers to adjudicate the question at all and ends on a considered position, treating the find-versus-make debate as worth settling rather than as an idle quibble of no consequence.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'fiercely contemptuous' option mistakes a measured correction for an attack; the author disagrees with the find-only camp but in the same breath corrects their opponents, which signals balance, not contempt.

Q9 C Vocabulary-in-context - RC HARD

The sentence contrasts two things law does: it reflects attitudes and it 'work[s] to constitute them.' Given that reflecting is already the registering function, 'constitute' must name the active, creative function, bringing attitudes into being and shaping them, which the paragraph later glosses as the 'making' half of 'a finding and a making.' Option C states this. The tabulate-already-settled option simply repeats the reflecting function and so cannot be what 'constitute' adds. The formal-membership option takes the sense of 'constitute' in 'what constitutes a quorum,' which is irrelevant to attitudes. The authorise-an-official option imports the delegated-powers sense of the word, again foreign to a sentence about how law helps form public attitudes. Only C fits the active, formative role the contrast with 'reflect' requires the word to carry here.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'tabulate attitudes already settled' option is the trap because it sounds plausible for law, but it merely restates 'reflect'; 'constitute' is set against 'reflect' and so must mean actively forming, not recording.

Q10 D Structure/purpose - RC ELITE

The argument first 'unsettles a familiar image,' the mirror, calling it flattering; then the middle paragraph gives the two-way evidence, law 'outruns society and waits' and then law that 'triggered' a change; and the third paragraph deepens the case to the claim that 'reflecting and constituting... cannot be cleanly separated even in principle.' Option D maps that unsettle-illustrate-both-ways-then-deepen movement exactly. The thesis-then-concede-it-fails option is wrong: the passage never withdraws its thesis but drives it home. The two-periods-in-sequence option misreads the mirror and current examples as successive historical eras, when they are two simultaneous tendencies. The question-answered-then-rebut-a-named-critic option invents a single named opponent and a point-by-point rebuttal; the third paragraph corrects two unnamed camps briefly and then states a positive conclusion rather than conducting a sustained rebuttal.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'two historical periods in sequence' option misreads the mirror and the current as successive eras; the passage presents them as two directions the same law moves in, not a chronology.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 C Conclusion - CR (Political economy) MED

The thesis is stated at the end of the first paragraph, that 'on its own terms the law is likely to deepen the very shortage it deplores,' and is restated in the close as a policy 'that feels like protection and functions like prohibition.' Everything between, the price-as-signal argument and the reply to the fairness objection, supports that verdict, which Option C captures. The no-profit-ever option states the motive the author grants ('its motive is decent') but not the conclusion; the author criticises the law, not profit as such. The rationing-by-price-is-wholly-just option overstates the author's position, which actually concedes the fairness 'objection has force.' The state-has-no-role option is explicitly denied: 'None of this denies... that the state has a role when disaster strikes.' Only C names the targeted conclusion, that this particular instrument backfires.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'state has no role' option is the trap for readers who equate criticising one policy with opposing all intervention, but the author expressly affirms that the state has a role and faults only the price ceiling.

Q12 **A** Assumption - CR **HARD**

The deepening-the-shortage claim rests on the mechanism that 'a price is... a signal and an incentive': the high price makes buyers 'take only what they truly need' and makes distant suppliers judge it 'worth the long haul to bring more in,' so that freezing the price silences both responses. That reasoning works only if those responses are real, if a higher price genuinely calls forth more supply and more sparing use. Option A is that assumption. The morally-indifferent-sellers option is irrelevant; the argument turns on incentives, not on the sellers' feelings. The public-distribution-impossible option actually runs against the author, who recommends 'vouchers, a stockpile' as the better remedy and so must think they are possible. The buyers-cannot-distinguish-need-from-want option contradicts the author's own example of the insulin buyer outbidding the convenience buyer, which assumes buyers can and do distinguish.

Examiner's note — the trap: The buyers-cannot-distinguish option looks like an assumption about rationing, but it is the opposite of what the passage needs; the insulin-versus-convenience example assumes buyers DO sort need from want.

Q13 **B** Weaken - CR **HARD**

The author's engine is that a higher price would draw in supply from 'those three states away with a truckload to spare,' so a ceiling, by removing the premium, suppresses supply that would otherwise arrive. If 'the roads are impassable for weeks, so no additional supply can physically reach the area no matter what price sellers are permitted to charge,' then the premium calls forth nothing extra and the ceiling suppresses no real inflow, directly cutting the central causal claim. Option B is that weakener. The condemned-in-the-press option speaks to reputation, not to whether price draws supply. The some-buyers-had-medical-needs option is consistent with the author and does nothing to show the ceiling fails to worsen the shortage. The neighbouring-state-retained-the-law option reports popularity and persistence, not effects on supply, and popularity is exactly what the author warns is 'not the same as efficacy.'

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'neighbouring state kept the law with approval' option tempts by sounding like real-world vindication, but approval is not efficacy; only the impassable-roads option attacks the supply-response mechanism the argument runs on.

Q14 **D** Strengthen - CR **MED**

The claim the author most needs corroborated is that a permitted price rise actually pulls in outside supply. Evidence that 'in regions that allowed prices to rise after past storms, out-of-state suppliers arrived with trucked-in goods several days sooner than in regions that had capped prices' is a direct natural experiment confirming the supplier-response mechanism, so Option D strengthens the argument most. The residents-found-tripling-offensive option supports the law's motive, not its effects, and if anything cuts against the author's policy conclusion. The weeks-of-debate-and-economists option speaks to the care of the process, not to whether the ceiling worsens shortages. The modest-penalty option suggests the law may be evaded, which would blunt its effects and so weaken, not strengthen, the claim that the ceiling deepens the shortage. Only D supplies positive evidence for the causal chain on which the argument depends.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'modest penalty, easily paid' option seems to help by undercutting the law, but a law easily evaded would cause less of the harm the author predicts, so it weakens rather than strengthens the case.

Q15 **B** Parallel reasoning - CR **ELITE**

The author's structure is: a well-meant control fixes a price below its market level to protect a sympathetic group, but by doing so it suppresses the supply that group actually needs and so defeats its own aim, confusing 'the symbol of fairness with its substance.' Option B reproduces this exactly: a rent cap 'imposed to protect tenants' is 'self-defeating' because 'by holding rents below the market level it discourages new building and shrinks the very housing supply tenants need.' Same instrument (a price ceiling), same backfire (reduced supply), same irony. The famine-charity option praises relief regardless of long-term effects, the opposite of the author's long-term supply worry. The steel-tariff option raises a price to help producers, not a ceiling to help buyers, so the mechanism is inverted. The speed-limit option is a straightforward cost-benefit defence with no self-defeating supply effect at all.

Examiner's note — the trap: The steel-tariff option mentions prices and protection, which draws the eye, but it raises a price to shield sellers rather than capping one to shield buyers; the self-defeating supply collapse is absent, so it is not parallel.

Q16 **C** Main point - CR (Science & technology policy) **EASY**

The first paragraph announces the target, the proposal's 'weakness, for the analogy on which it rests does not hold where it matters most,' and the closing paragraph states the verdict: 'a regime built to certify a stable object at a single moment is poorly suited to a shifting one.' Option C states precisely that, the medicine model is the wrong instrument because it certifies a stable object at one moment. The no-risks-at-all option is flatly contradicted by a passage preoccupied with real harms such as 'the automation of discrimination.' The abolish-drug-approval option misreads the piece, which criticises borrowing the drug model for AI, not the drug model for drugs. The leave-developers-free option is explicitly rejected in the last paragraph: 'is not to say that nothing should be done.' Only C matches the actual conclusion about instrument-fit.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'leave developers free to release anything' option is the trap for readers who assume a critic of one regulatory scheme must oppose regulation itself; the passage explicitly says something should be done.

Q17 A Assumption - CR HARD

The inadequacy claim is that approving a system 'once, at the moment of release, is to certify a snapshot of something that will not stand still,' a product 'whose risks mostly emerge in use.' That objection bites only if the risks really do arise largely after release, from continued updating and real-world use, rather than being fixed and visible at the point of certification. Option A is that assumption. The regulators-more-competent option concerns the skill of personnel, not the timing of harms, which is the author's actual axis. The developers-always-act-in-bad-faith option imports a motive the passage never alleges; the problem is structural (a moving target), not dishonesty. The diffuse-harms-are-less-serious option reverses the author, who treats those harms as serious enough to worry about precisely because a single-moment trial cannot catch them; downplaying their gravity would undercut, not support, the critique.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'regulators are more competent' option sounds relevant because it compares the two regimes, but the author's point is about WHEN harms arise, not about the ability of the people judging; competence is beside the structural objection.

Q18 B Weaken - CR HARD

The core objection is that one-time approval 'certif[ies] a snapshot of something that will not stand still.' If 'the proposed licensing regime would in fact require a fresh approval after every significant update and would subject each system to continuous post-release monitoring,' then the regime is not a single-moment snapshot at all; it tracks the moving target, dissolving the author's central complaint. Option B is therefore the strongest weakener. The pharma-firms-oppose-it option reports industry sentiment, which says nothing about whether the model fits. The panel-includes-scientists option speaks to the proposers' credentials, not to the snapshot problem. The systems-updated-less-often-than-marketed option partially concedes the author's premise that systems change, merely disputing the frequency, and even a slow-moving target still escapes a one-time gate, so it does little to rescue the proposal. Only B removes the 'single moment' feature the whole argument attacks.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'updated less often than marketed' option seems to cut against the author by questioning how fast systems change, but even infrequent change defeats a one-time gate, so it barely helps; only the re-approval-and-monitoring option answers the snapshot objection.

Q19 A Detail/paraphrase - CR MED

The third paragraph sets drug-trial outcomes, 'measurable within the trial and against a placebo,' against the panel's harms, which it calls 'diffuse, contested, and realised over years across whole populations,' arising 'from how millions of deployments interact with institutions the trial cannot contain.' Option A paraphrases that contrast faithfully. The entirely-imaginary option contradicts the author, who takes the harms seriously as the reason the pre-market trial is the wrong tool. The so-immediate-and-sharply-defined option asserts the opposite of 'diffuse... realised over years,' making the harms easy to catch when the author's whole point is that they are not. The confined-to-a-small-group option likewise reverses 'across whole populations' and adds an easy-compensation claim the passage never makes. Only A reports the disanalogy the paragraph actually draws, that these harms are not trial-measurable the way a recovery or a shrinking tumour is.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'so immediate and sharply defined' option is the inversion trap: it describes exactly the kind of measurable outcome drug trials catch, which is the opposite of the diffuse, slow harms the author says escape a pre-market trial.

Q20 D Role of statement - CR ELITE

By writing that rejecting the medicine model 'is not to say that nothing should be done,' the author blocks the natural rejoinder that criticising this regulatory scheme amounts to opposing regulation altogether. The sentence then narrows the target, 'a regime built to certify a stable object at a single moment is poorly suited to a shifting one,' isolating the specific objection to one instrument. Option D states that pre-emptive, scope-limiting role. The concedes-the-model-is-correct option reads the sentence as surrender, but it is followed by a restated attack on the single-moment gate, not a withdrawal. The introduces-fresh-evidence option invents empirical data the author never supplies; the sentence is a clarification, not evidence. The proves-monitoring-would-succeed option overclaims: the author says the gate is ill-suited and 'may even do harm,' but never proves any rival regime certain to work. Only D names what the concession actually does for the argument.

Examiner's note — the trap: The 'concedes the model is correct' option misreads a scope-limiting concession as capitulation; the very next clause resumes the attack on the single-moment gate, so the author is narrowing the critique, not abandoning it.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. 'Economic rent' rewards the holder of what? — **Something scarce (not effort)**
2. Henry George is associated with a tax on? — **Land value**
3. A 'moot' point is one that is? — **Open to debate / of no practical effect**
4. 'Ostensible' authority means authority that is? — **Apparent, not actual**
5. Name the fallacy: attacking the person, not the argument. — **Ad hominem**
6. 'Price gouging' laws cap prices during? — **Emergencies / shortages**
7. One who studies the origin of words? — **Etymologist**
8. 'Salutary' means? — **Beneficial / producing good effects**
9. The fallacy of assuming a cause from mere sequence? — **Post hoc ergo propter hoc**
10. 'Perfunctory' effort is? — **Done carelessly, as a routine**
11. A 'regressive' tax falls hardest on? — **Lower incomes**
12. 'Redress' means? — **Remedy / set right a wrong**
13. Idiom: 'a level playing field' means? — **Fair, equal conditions**
14. One-word: a government by the few. — **Oligarchy**
15. 'Equitable' distribution is one that is? — **Fair / just**
16. Fallacy: only two options offered when more exist? — **False dilemma**
17. 'Onerous' terms are? — **Burdensome / heavy**
18. 'Augment' means? — **Increase / add to**
19. A 'subsidy' is a payment to? — **Lower a cost / encourage activity**
20. 'Justiciable' means capable of being? — **Decided by a court**