CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 17 October 2026

20 Qs · 0 Min
Answer key + skill tags + examiner notes

ANSWER KEY — 17 OCTOBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 A — Main argument [MED]

The passage traces the transformation of Bharatanatyam from a devadasi-stewarded temple ritual to a concert-stage art form, arguing that this process simultaneously preserved the form and dispossessed its original custodians. Option A captures both halves of this double movement precisely. Option B is wrong because the passage explicitly contests the idea of a smooth evolution, calling it contested and ideologically motivated. Option C is wrong because the passage presents Kalakshetra as an agent of codification and moral repackaging, not democratisation. Option D contradicts the passage, which ends by noting that engagement with devadasi repertoire remains genuinely contested and that full restoration has not occurred. The phrase 'central argument' asks for the claim the entire passage is built around, and A is the only option that integrates both preservation and dispossession — the two poles of the 'complex double movement' the author names.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The distractor trap is option B, which correctly notes the nationalist context but mischaracterises the transformation as 'smooth' — the passage calls it contested and ideologically motivated throughout.

Q2 B — Specific detail retrieval [MED]

The first paragraph states explicitly that devadasi performances were 'liturgical events, embedded in cycles of worship and inseparable from the sacred geography of the temple corridor' and that 'the art was not entertainment; it was offering.' Option B maps directly onto this language. Option A introduces a pedagogical function that is nowhere described in the passage. Option C introduces royal patrons and aristocratic visitors — the passage places devadasi practice in temples, not courts. Option D introduces commercial commissions from temple trustees — this directly contradicts the passage's framing of performance as a sacred act of offering, not a commercial transaction. Specific detail retrieval questions require anchoring the answer in the passage's own phrasing; here, 'the art was not entertainment; it was offering' is an almost verbatim signal.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the likely distractor: students familiar with Carnatic arts history may associate devadasis with royal court patronage, importing outside knowledge not supported by this passage.

Q3 C — Vocabulary in context [HARD]

The phrase 'pruned of its sensory ambiguity' appears in the sentence stating the art was 'retained, pruned of its sensory ambiguity, and repackaged as classical heritage.' Paragraph three provides the interpretive key: scholars identify the shift from 'erotically charged srngara to a devotional register' as a defining feature of the transformation. The 'sensory ambiguity' refers to the erotic and multi-register emotional content that the original tradition carried. Option A introduces physical demands reduced for accessibility — unsupported in the passage. Option B introduces offensive mythological narratives — a plausible distractor, but the passage specifically links the pruning to erotic register removal via the srngara reference. Option D introduces staging and acoustics — a separate point in paragraph three about venue, not about content. Option C is the only reading consistent with the passage's own explanatory language.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option B is the high-difficulty distractor — 'offensive to reformists' sounds consistent with the reform narrative, but the passage ties the pruning specifically to erotic content via the named shift from srngara to devotional register.

Q4 D — Author's tone and attitude [HARD]

The author describes the reform movement in analytical and critically aware terms. The phrase 'increasingly hostile lens' signals that reformers' approach was ideologically driven. The 'complex double movement' in which devadasis were 'divested of both their livelihood and their custodianship' while the art was retained and 'repackaged as classical heritage' conveys critical awareness of the dispossessive consequences. Yet the author does not wholesale dismiss reformers — the tone remains analytical. Option A misreads the passage; there is no celebration. Option B overstates: the passage does not call reformers ignorant of artistic depth, only ideologically motivated. Option C misreads the tone as neutral; evaluative words like 'divested,' 'hostile,' and 'repackaged' are not neutral. Option D accurately captures both the analytical stance and the critical foregrounding of dispossessive consequences.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option C — students who observe that the passage gives space to both reformers and devadasis may mistake structural balance for authorial neutrality, overlooking the evaluative vocabulary.

Q5 D — Structural purpose [ELITE]

The final paragraph introduces contemporary practitioners who engage with the 'Sadir archive' treating it 'not as a lost authentic origin but as a living provocation.' This illustrates a third possibility beyond binary narratives of loss or appropriation: creative dialogue that

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

holds the tension between heritage and invention productively open. The passage's closing statement — that 'contestation is itself evidence that the art form carries more historical weight than its concert-stage polish might suggest' — reinforces this: the archive functions not to resolve the argument but to demonstrate that fixed narratives are insufficient. Option A imposes a value judgement (devadasi work is superior) not made in the passage. Option B misreads the archive as newly validating scholarly claims — the scholars appear in paragraph three, not here. Option C directly contradicts the phrase 'alongside newer work' in the paragraph, which shows concert performance continues. Option D alone captures the archive's function as a conceptual provocation to fixed narratives.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option B — students may assume the final paragraph's devadasi engagement is meant to vindicate the scholars mentioned in paragraph three, but the archive's function here is to show that contestation itself is the point.

Q6 B Main argument MED

The passage's central argument is that the 30x30 target, while ambitious, is ecologically meaningful only if accompanied by connectivity infrastructure, governance rights for indigenous communities, and functional-outcome metrics beyond mere acreage. The passage systematically identifies each of these as unresolved tensions. Option A misreads the passage as endorsing the framework — it is precisely not a wholesale endorsement. Option C misidentifies indigenous communities as obstacles; the passage presents their exclusion as a design flaw in the framework, not a problem they cause. Option D overstates the case for rewilding — the passage presents it as a different conceptual register, not a replacement for area-based targets. Option B correctly identifies the conditional structure of the argument: the framework can be meaningful, but only if supplemented by the dimensions the passage identifies.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option A, which paraphrases the opening sentences of the passage before the author introduces the unresolved tensions — students who stop reading early or skim for positivity may select it.

Q7 C Specific inference HARD

The passage states that India's Project Tiger demonstrated that 'tiger corridors linking forest patches have proved essential to genetic viability, yet corridor land sits almost entirely outside formal protected area boundaries and thus outside the accounting logic of 30x30.' This directly supports option C: connectivity corridors critical to species viability fall outside the framework's formal accounting, illustrating the gap between geometric targets and ecological effectiveness. Option A introduces a claim about unilateral national action that is not made. Option B inverts the passage — there is no claim that tiger populations declined inside reserves. Option D introduces a cost comparison entirely absent from the passage. The question tests the ability to extract the specific argumentative purpose of an example, not merely to note that the example is present.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the key distractor — students familiar with India's expanding protected area footprint may infer this, but the passage's point is specifically about what the formal accounting logic fails to capture.

Q8 D Vocabulary in context HARD

The passage defines 'fortress conservation models' in the clause immediately following the term: these are models that 'exclude human habitation from protected zones' and have a 'documented history of dispossession.' Option D — 'Protect biodiversity by excluding human habitation and use from designated conservation zones' — matches this definition precisely. Option A introduces surveillance and anti-poaching technology — the passage does not mention these. Option B introduces restrictions on developing nations' resource rights — a different concept not discussed here. Option C introduces criminal penalties on encroachment — a plausible-sounding but unsupported reading. Vocabulary-in-context questions require using the passage's own in-line definitional language rather than importing external connotations of the word 'fortress.'

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is designed to mislead students who associate 'fortress' with surveillance infrastructure and security apparatus; the passage's own defining clause clearly ties the term to human exclusion and documented dispossession.

Q9 A Author's attitude HARD

The author's attitude toward the 30x30 target is sceptical of its framing. The passage calls it 'ecologically meaningless' without connectivity, notes that governance provisions 'lack enforcement teeth,' and concludes that the GBF's 'emphasis on quantitative targets may, paradoxically, undermine' the more demanding standard of ecological function. Option A — 'Sceptical of its framing, arguing that quantitative targets may obscure deeper failures of ecological function and governance' — captures this precisely. Option B misreads the passage as unreserved support. Option C overstates the critique — the author identifies structural flaws but does not oppose the framework itself; there is no call for bilateral alternatives. Option D introduces 'cautiously optimistic' and presents a single fix (corridor accounting) as sufficient — the passage never endorses this as a complete solution. Only A accurately names both the sceptical stance and its specific grounds.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The trap is option D — 'cautiously optimistic, provided corridor land is incorporated' sounds like a nuanced, specific version of the author's position, but the passage presents multiple unresolved tensions, not a single correctable gap.

Q10 C Specific inference ELITE

The passage introduces the Yellowstone example to argue that 'ecological function, not acreage, is the true metric of success.' The wolf reintroduction 'demonstrably altered river morphology through behavioural changes in elk,' illustrating that restoring trophic cascades can transform ecosystem structure in ways that expanding protected area cannot. Option C correctly identifies this implication: function and trophic interaction may be a better conservation metric than land area. Option A overstates with 'always' — the passage does not claim universal transferability of the Yellowstone result. Option B imports a cost comparison entirely absent from the passage. Option D introduces a direct template for India that the passage does not suggest — Yellowstone serves as a conceptual illustration, not a policy prescription. Elite-level inference questions require drawing the intended implication without adding claims the passage does not make.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the primary trap: students who read 'demonstrably altered river morphology' as a general claim about apex predator reintroduction will select it, missing that 'always' makes it an unwarranted universal generalisation.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 C Conclusion identification MED

The conclusion is the claim the entire argument is built to support. The passage acknowledges the Finland pilot's mixed results and the fiscal challenges of UBI, but the final paragraph argues that UBI's 'insurance function' in the context of automation-driven labour disruption 'may justify its cost in ways that employment rate metrics cannot capture.' This qualified endorsement on insurance grounds is the conclusion. Option A describes a sub-premise — poverty trap elimination — not the ultimate conclusion. Option B misrepresents Finland as a definitive fiscal argument against UBI when the passage presents it as ambiguous evidence. Option C integrates all three elements: fiscal challenge, mixed employment evidence, and the insurance-function justification. Option D misreads the passage — the author does not conclude that categorical welfare is superior; the entire trajectory of the argument favours UBI on structural grounds.

Examiner's note — the trap: The trap is option A, which identifies a stated advantage of UBI (eliminating means-testing) but represents a supporting premise rather than the conclusion the passage's final paragraph builds toward.

Q12 D Assumption identification HARD

An assumption is an unstated premise the argument requires to hold. The final paragraph's claim that UBI provides necessary insurance against labour disruption depends critically on the premise that gig economy expansion and AI-driven automation will continue or intensify. If these disruptions were temporary or self-correcting, categorical welfare could simply be reformed incrementally as the labour market stabilised, and the insurance argument would lose its force. Option D correctly identifies this as the key unstated assumption. Option A is wrong — the passage explicitly acknowledges Finland's limited transferability, so it does not assume transferability; it concedes the limitation. Option B introduces a welfare-transition assumption too specific to the argument and not logically required by the final paragraph. Option C inverts the passage's logic — the passage argues categorical welfare cannot adapt, not that governments have adequate data infrastructure for means-testing.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the primary distractor: students often mistake an explicitly conceded empirical limitation (Finland's transferability) for a hidden assumption the passage makes, confusing a concession with a premise.

Q13 D Weaken HARD

The final paragraph argues that UBI is necessary because automation and gig work are structurally incompatible with categorical welfare's design for stable employment relationships. A weakener must attack a specific premise. Option D — 'Long-term evidence from multiple countries shows that workers displaced by automation retrain and find equivalent employment within eighteen months' — directly attacks the labour-disruption severity claim that underpins the insurance argument: if disruption is rapid and temporary, the case for a permanent unconditional floor is greatly reduced. Option A strengthens the UBI case by showing cash transfers drive entrepreneurship. Option B strengthens the UBI case by undermining in-kind transfers as the alternative. Option C strengthens the UBI case by pointing to the administrative inefficiency of existing schemes. Only D attacks the key premise that automation disruption is durable and structural rather than temporary.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option B is the main trap: students may reason that leaky in-kind transfers suggest cash alternatives (UBI) are also problematic — but this actually strengthens the case for UBI by discrediting the primary competitor.

Q14 B Strengthen ELITE

The final paragraph argues that UBI is needed as an insurance floor because automation concentrates capital returns while reducing labour's share, and because gig platforms are structurally replacing stable employment relationships faster than categorical welfare can adapt. A strengthener must directly support this automation-severity premise. Option B — a projection that AI-driven automation will displace 30 percent of jobs while creating only 15 percent — quantifies the net labour market loss, making the structural floor argument more urgent. Option A notes that platform work is marginal across OECD economies — this weakens the argument. Option C concerns school enrolment from a conditional cash transfer — relevant to welfare design but not to the automation-and-labour-share argument. Option D concerns infant mortality in an Indian UBI pilot — relevant to wellbeing but not to the specific insurance-against-automation case the final paragraph makes.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option D is the trap: Indian-context evidence supporting UBI outcomes appears compelling, but it supports a wellbeing argument distinct from the automation-insurance argument the question specifically targets.

Q15 D Definition in argument MED

The passage defines the poverty trap explicitly in paragraph one: 'the perverse incentive structure in which earning marginally more income causes a disproportionate loss of benefits.' Option D matches this definition exactly — it is the perverse incentive in means-tested welfare whereby earning marginally more triggers a disproportionate loss of benefits. Option A describes labour market withdrawal among UBI recipients — a different effect discussed implicitly in the Finland pilot context (the 'substitution effect remains inert'). Option B describes the fiscal impossibility of funding universal transfers — a challenge discussed in paragraph three, not the poverty trap. Option C describes capital concentration from automation — a separate structural argument in paragraph four. Definition-in-argument questions require matching the passage's explicit definition, not importing the phrase's general usage.

Examiner's note — the trap: Option A is the trap: students who associate 'poverty trap' with the labour-supply disincentive of welfare receipt may select it, confusing a general usage of the phrase with the passage's specific technical definition.

Q16 B Conclusion identification MED

The passage's main conclusion is stated in the final paragraph: 'Regulatory frameworks built on use-case declarations will systematically underestimate capability risk, leaving the most consequential governance gap precisely at the frontier where oversight matters most.' This identifies the AI Act's structural classification flaw as the author's ultimate claim, which is captured by option B.

Option A misreads the passage — the author never endorses the AI Act; 'a sensible structural choice' is immediately qualified with 'but the framework contains a systemic flaw.' Option C overstates the pessimism — the author proposes capability-based licensing as a concrete alternative, not resignation about all regulation. Option D introduces a factual claim about evaluation benchmarks that the passage neither makes nor requires. Conclusion identification in CR requires finding the claim all the premises converge to establish.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the primary distractor: the passage calls the risk-tiered structure 'a sensible structural choice,' and students who stop reading at that concession may mistake the acknowledged virtue for the author's final verdict.

Q17 D Assumption identification HARD

The author's central argument is that the AI Act's use-case classification is structurally defective because the risk unit is capability, not declared application. This argument requires assuming that foundation models' capabilities in fact extend meaningfully beyond any single declared use — otherwise, regulating the declared use would be sufficient to capture the real risk. Option D states this assumption precisely. Without it being true, the gap the author identifies between 'regulatory unit' (declared application) and 'risk unit' (underlying capability) would not exist. Option A concerns EU jurisdictional authority — not an assumption the capability-risk classification argument requires. Option B concerns open-weights versus API danger — relevant to a sub-point but not the load-bearing assumption. Option C concerns penalty insufficiency — a separate sub-argument about enforcement efficacy, not the structural classification premise.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the trap: the passage does discuss whether penalties will deter non-compliance, and students may conflate this enforcement sub-argument with the core assumption on which the use-case/capability classification-gap argument depends.

Q18 A Weaken HARD

The author argues that use-case classification is structurally flawed because models proliferate beyond their declared use cases once deployed, creating a risk gap. A weakener must undermine this empirical claim. Option D — 'A comprehensive audit of AI deployments in Europe finds that 95 percent of commercial models remain within their declared use cases throughout their operational lifespan' — directly attacks the premise: if models almost never escape their declared uses, the classification gap the author identifies almost never materialises, and use-case regulation would be largely sufficient. Option A concerns GDPR fines — this shows EU enforcement credibility but does not address whether models stay within their declared uses. Option B concerns voluntary safety evaluations — relevant to a different part of the argument (self-classification incentives) but does not attack the use-case divergence premise. Option C notes the US rejection of capability licensing — irrelevant to whether the EU Act's approach is flawed.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option A is the main trap: GDPR enforcement success appears to weaken a critique of EU AI regulation, but the passage's argument is about structural classification design, not enforcement capacity — and GDPR fines say nothing about whether AI models stay within declared uses.

Q19 C Strengthen HARD

The author argues for capability-based licensing because use-case frameworks miss risk at the frontier when models are repurposed beyond their declared use cases. Option D — 'Research shows that a language model trained for weather prediction was repurposed, without modification, to automate fraudulent financial claims within six months of its release' — provides the most direct empirical support: it is a real-world instance of exactly the divergence between declared use case (weather) and actual deployed capability (fraud automation) that the author identifies as the core structural flaw. Option A concerns regulator staffing levels — relevant to an enforcement-lag sub-argument but does not strengthen the capability-divergence claim. Option B suggests incumbents endorse capability licensing for competitive reasons — this may actually raise doubts about the motives of capability licensing advocates. Option C concerns the open-source exemption — a genuine weakness of the Act, but identifying another flaw does not strengthen the specific case for capability-based licensing.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option C is the distractor: the open-source exemption is a real AI Act weakness that students familiar with the regulation may seize on, but the question asks what strengthens the case for capability-based licensing as the solution, not what exposes another flaw in the current approach.

Q20 C Responding to objection ELITE

The final paragraph presents the objection that capability-based licensing would 'freeze innovation in the hands of incumbents who can absorb compliance costs.' The author's rebuttal follows immediately: 'But the asymmetry of risk runs the other direction. Regulatory frameworks built on use-case declarations will systematically underestimate capability risk, leaving the most consequential governance gap precisely at the frontier where oversight matters most.' This is a risk-asymmetry rebuttal: even if capability licensing creates competitive disadvantage for smaller entrants, the alternative — systematic underestimation of frontier risk — is the worse outcome. Option C correctly captures this. Option A introduces a hybrid framework the author never proposes. Option B introduces a claim that incumbents should be scrutinised more heavily because they can absorb costs — not the author's argument. Option D says the author dismisses the concern as lobbying, but the text explicitly takes the incumbency objection seriously before rebutting it on risk-asymmetry grounds.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Option D is the elite trap: the passage opens by identifying a conflict of interest between developers and regulators, so students may infer the author would dismiss developer-favourable arguments as self-interested — but the text engages the incumbency objection on its merits before rebutting with risk asymmetry.