CLAT Gurukul — By Ready For Exam

Daily RC & CR Sheet — Answers, Skills & Examiner Notes — 7 November 2026

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

ANSWER KEY — 7 NOVEMBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 B Main idea MED

The thesis is announced in the first paragraph and developed through the rest: 'To tolerate something is, first, to object to it', and tolerance 'consists in the decision not to act on that disapproval'. The third paragraph adds that the reasons for restraint are 'distinct from the objection' and that tolerance is 'a second judgment that overrules the first'. The option combining an objection with a separate, overriding reason for restraint therefore states the central claim. The option calling tolerance a mild form of approval is the very view the author sets out to correct: the word 'deserves a harder reading'. The option declaring tolerance incoherent misreads the third paragraph, which raises the paradox only to answer it; acceptance, moreover, is described as a counterfeit of tolerance, not as its replacement. The option extending tolerance to every practice contradicts the fourth paragraph, which opens 'None of this means that everything must be tolerated' and sets harm as the boundary.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'paradoxical and incoherent' option tempts because the passage does raise a paradox, but the author raises it only to resolve it through the reasons for restraint.

Q2 D Inference HARD

The second paragraph names two counterfeits of tolerance. Acceptance 'abolishes the objection altogether and so leaves nothing to be tolerated'. A person who has come to approve fully of her neighbour's practice has abolished her objection; on the author's definition, 'Tolerance begins only where disapproval begins', so she is no longer tolerating the practice at all. The option saying she tolerates more completely reverses the logic: for the author, approval is not a higher degree of tolerance but its disappearance. The option labelling her attitude indifference confuses the two counterfeits. Indifference means not minding, like the neighbour who 'does not mind' the music, whereas full approval is a positive endorsement, which the passage calls acceptance. The option insisting that she must secretly retain an objection invents a psychological claim the passage never makes; the author takes acceptance at face value as the end of the objection, which is exactly why it leaves 'nothing to be tolerated'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The indifference option tempts because both counterfeits are introduced together and both 'look attractive', but full approval is acceptance; indifference is simply not minding.

Q3 A Vocabulary in context MED

The word appears in 'both of its counterfeits look attractive', immediately followed by indifference and acceptance. A counterfeit is something made to resemble the genuine article without being it. The author explains what each lacks: indifference 'feels generous but costs nothing' because there is no objection to overcome, and acceptance 'abolishes the objection altogether'. Each resembles tolerance, since both leave the neighbour alone, but each lacks the objection that tolerance requires. Hence 'attitudes that resemble tolerance while lacking one of its essential elements' fits the context. The option about forged documents takes the everyday sense of the word (fake currency or papers) and ignores the sentence it appears in; no state document is discussed. The option about philosophers' arguments borrows from the next paragraph, where philosophers 'worried' about a paradox, but those worries are not what 'counterfeits' refers to. The option about concealed disapproval inverts the meaning: both counterfeits are defined by the absence of any real disapproval.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The philosophers option tempts because it sits in the very next paragraph, but 'counterfeits' names indifference and acceptance, not any argument against tolerance.

Q4 C Function of a paragraph (Stretch) ELITE

The third paragraph opens with a paradox: 'If I am right that a practice is wrong, how can it be right for me to allow it?' It then says 'The answer lies in the reasons for restraint' and lists three: coerced belief is worthless, my own certainty may be mistaken, and a common life with dissenters matters more than winning. It closes: 'Each reason is distinct from the objection, and that is the point'. The list therefore resolves the paradox by showing that restraint rests on considerations separate from, and able to override, the objection. The option tying tolerance to self-doubt picks only the second reason and ignores the other two, which do not depend on doubting oneself at all. The option claiming the list proves coercion always fails and that objections should be abandoned overstates the first reason and

NAME: _____ ROLL NO: _____ BATCH: _____

contradicts the author's insistence that the objection survives ('Neither attitude cancels the other'). The option saying objectors are usually wrong is nowhere asserted; the author's point is that one may be right and still restrain oneself.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The self-doubt option is attractive because humility is a familiar case for tolerance, but it is only one of three reasons; the paragraph's job is to show restraint has grounds independent of the objection.

Q5 B Application of the author's view HARD

Genuine tolerance, for the author, has two parts: an objection, and a separate reason for not acting on it. The councillor who thinks a sect's rituals foolish has the objection; opposing a ban because coerced belief is worthless supplies the reason for restraint, which is the first reason listed in the third paragraph ('beliefs forced on a person are worthless'). Both elements are present and the second overrules the first. The resident who has never noticed the processions shows indifference: there is nothing she dislikes, so, like the neighbour who 'does not mind' the music, she tolerates nothing. The teacher who stops objecting after deciding slang is legitimate has moved to acceptance, which 'leaves nothing to be tolerated'. The landlord acts on his disapproval rather than restraining it, and does so on the basis of distaste rather than harm, which the fourth paragraph says cannot mark the boundary of tolerance. Only one option keeps the objection and the restraint together.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The teacher option tempts because it sounds open-minded, but once the objection is gone the teacher has reached acceptance, which the author calls a counterfeit of tolerance.

Q6 C Primary purpose MED

The passage moves in four steps. It describes the reflex to cap prices after a flood; it argues that a price is 'a signal' whose suppression leaves the shortage in place; it concedes that the price system can be 'cruel' to the poor; and it answers that the real problem is 'a shortage of money among the poor', best met by 'direct cash or vouchers' and by free distribution of a few vital goods. The final paragraph states the purpose plainly: 'put money in the hands of those who need it and let prices summon the goods.' The option comparing cash support with price caps captures this. The option defending traders against the profiteering charge is too narrow; the author calls the public anger 'understandable' and never vindicates the shopkeepers. The option saying the state should never intervene contradicts the passage, which recommends vouchers and state purchase of water and medicines. The option blaming greedy shopkeepers for black markets inverts the author's account, which traces the black market to the cap itself.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'never intervene' option tempts readers who take the author for a free-market purist, but the passage itself proposes vouchers and free state distribution of vital goods.

Q7 A Detail inference HARD

The second paragraph describes the effects of a freeze directly: 'Demand stays as it was, supply arrives no faster, and the shortage that the high price was rationing does not disappear. It is rationed instead by queues, by connections and by whoever reaches the shop first.' The correct option paraphrases this: the shortage remains and its allocation shifts to non-price mechanisms. The option saying the freeze ends the shortage because hoarders stop gaining reverses the author's reasoning; it is the higher price that 'tells those holding stocks to release them', so a freeze removes that incentive rather than defeating hoarding. The option about traders risking flooded roads describes what the high price does, not what the freeze does; under a cap, the author says, that message 'is silenced'. The option promising the neediest household the last can of fuel states the cap's intended effect, which the author denies: allocation goes to whoever queues first or knows someone, and the black market that follows 'usually charges more' than the open market would have.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The hoarding option tempts because caps are often defended as anti-hoarding measures, but the author says the high price is what draws hoarded stocks out.

Q8 D Author's attitude HARD

In the third paragraph the author calls the defenders' objection 'the strongest one' and says it 'should be taken seriously', even rebuking economists who answer only half the question. That is respect. But the fourth paragraph opens: 'But the problem the objection identifies is a shortage of money among the poor, not a defect in the price', meaning the defenders have located the problem in the wrong place. The correct option captures both halves: respect for the objection and disagreement about its source. The option calling the author dismissive ignores the explicit concession and the criticism of glib economists. The option calling the author wholly sympathetic overlooks the rejection of the cap itself; the author accepts the defenders' concern but not their remedy, since 'A price cap is a promise of fairness that the empty shelf cannot keep.' The option calling the author hostile attributes a charge the passage never makes; the author says the black market follows from the cap, not that its defenders intend to protect anyone.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'wholly sympathetic' option tempts because the author praises the objection, but praising a concern is not endorsing the cap the defenders propose.

Q9 B Role of a statement ELITE

The sentence closes the paragraph in which the author presents the defenders' objection: price allocation gives the last can of fuel to 'the household that can pay most, not to the one that needs it most'. Having called this 'the strongest' objection, the author adds that an economist who says only 'let prices work' has answered half the question, that is, the efficiency half but not the fairness half. This is a concession: it grants that the price-signal argument on its own is incomplete. The next paragraph then supplies the missing half through cash transfers, vouchers and free distribution of vital goods. So the sentence concedes the force of the fairness objection and prepares the remedy. The option saying it withdraws the author's signal argument overreads it; the author keeps the signal and only adds a distributional answer ('It can be met without silencing the signal'). The option suggesting economists are unfit to advise is an

extreme generalisation from a criticism of one incomplete answer. The option reading 'half' literally, as half of the goods, mistakes a figure of speech for a quantity.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'withdraw' option tempts because a concession can look like a retreat, but the very next paragraph keeps the price signal and simply adds cash support for the poor.

Q10 A Application HARD

The author's remedy has two parts: keep the price signal working, and address poverty directly through 'direct cash or vouchers credited to affected households'. Vouchers for affected households combined with a freely rising fuel price match both parts: the poor can bid for scarce fuel while traders keep 'the incentive to bring more of them in'. Fixing fuel at pre-flood rates with police at the pumps is the very cap the author criticises, with enforcement added; it still silences the signal. Barring traders from neighbouring districts cuts off the supply the high price is supposed to 'summon' and would deepen the shortage. The option to buy fuel at pre-flood rates and sell through ration shops resembles the author's suggestion of state purchase but differs on two counts: the author proposes buying 'at the market price', and only for 'truly vital' items such as water and medicines, which are then distributed free. Buying at pre-flood rates is simply a cap by another route, and holders of stock would not sell at that price.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The ration-shop option tempts because the author does endorse state purchase, but at the market price and for water and medicines; buying at pre-flood rates reintroduces the cap.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 D Main conclusion MED

The argument's structure is: undertrials make up most of the prison population; bail refusals rest on forecasts that weaken with time; courts and Parliament have recognised delay, but only 'when it becomes extreme'; therefore 'Delay should instead be treated as a ground for bail in its own right, weighed at every hearing'; and, finally, an objection is answered. Everything before the fourth paragraph supports that recommendation and the last paragraph defends it, so the correct option restates the conclusion. The option on striking down stringent statutes goes beyond the passage, which says such statutes 'must yield' when trials stall, not that they are unconstitutional. The option calling most undertrials innocent confuses the presumption of innocence, a legal status, with a factual claim the author never makes, and the author does not ask for all of them to be released at once. The option restricting refusals to flight or witness risk merely paraphrases the grounds on which bail is currently refused; the author does not propose narrowing those grounds but adding delay as a counterweight to them.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The flight-or-witness option tempts because it echoes the second paragraph, but that paragraph describes existing grounds for refusal; the conclusion is to add delay as a ground for bail.

Q12 C Assumption HARD

The second paragraph argues that as time passes 'the weaker each ground becomes': recorded witnesses are harder to intimidate, sealed evidence is harder to destroy, and an accused who has served half his likely sentence has less reason to flee. For this to work, the risks that justify refusal must depend on where the case stands. If the danger came instead from the accused's character, for example a habitual intimidator or a well-connected gang leader, the passage of time and the progress of the case would not reduce it, and the argument would collapse. Hence the argument assumes these risks arise mainly from the stage of the case rather than from the person. The option saying most refused accused are innocent is not needed; the argument relies on the presumption of innocence, not on factual innocence. The option about prosecutors deliberately slowing trials attributes a motive; the author speaks only of 'the state's failure to proceed'. The option that witnesses are rarely intimidated is too strong; the author claims only that intimidation becomes harder once statements have been recorded.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'rarely intimidated' option is attractive because the passage mentions witness intimidation, but the argument needs only that the risk falls over time, not that it is low from the start.

Q13 A Weaken HARD

The author's central premise is that 'the longer an accused waits, the weaker each ground becomes': with time, the risks of flight and of interference with witnesses decline. If accused persons freed after long detention abscond or threaten witnesses just as often as those freed early, that premise is empirically false, and the case for treating delay itself as a reason for bail loses its main support. That is the strongest weakener. The option about undertrials who cannot afford sureties identifies a different defect in the bail system; it neither supports nor undermines the claim about delay. The option about judge shortages might seem to excuse prosecutors, but the author speaks of 'the state's failure to proceed', and a shortage of judges is still a failure of the state; the burden on a presumed-innocent accused is unchanged. The option about the Supreme Court granting bail under anti-terror laws is consistent with the passage, which itself says even stringent statutes 'must yield' to delay, so it strengthens rather than weakens.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The judge-shortage option tempts because it shifts blame away from prosecutors, but the argument rests on the state's delay, whatever its source, not on prosecutorial fault.

Q14 B Strengthen ELITE

The author contrasts the proposal with the statutory rule. Parliament requires release on bond once an undertrial 'has served a specified share of the maximum sentence', but such steps 'treat delay as an exception to be noticed only when it becomes extreme'. The proposal would weigh delay at every hearing. The comparison favours the proposal most clearly if the statutory rule often comes too late. If many undertrials face long maximum sentences, a fixed share of a long maximum is itself a long wait, so they would spend years in custody before the rule helps them; a hearing-by-hearing consideration of delay would protect them far earlier. The option saying most

undertrials face short sentences and are freed quickly weakens the need for any reform. The option saying courts already treat delay as a factor in most cases also weakens it, because it suggests the proposal would add little. The option about convicted prisoners concerns convicts, not undertrials, and says nothing about either rule.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The option that courts already weigh delay tempts because it sounds supportive of the idea, but if courts already do so, the proposal is largely redundant.

Q15 D Method of reasoning HARD

The final paragraph names the objection, that the rule 'would release dangerous people', and says it 'misreads the proposal'. The reply is a clarification of scope: 'It does not oblige courts to free anyone; it obliges them to count time.' It then places responsibility on the prosecution: if the risk is grave, its remedy 'is to bring the case to trial'. The correct option captures this: the author answers by clarifying that the rule makes time a factor to be weighed, not a command to release. The option saying the author concedes some dangerous releases as an acceptable cost is the opposite of the reply; the author denies that the rule forces any release at all, so no cost is conceded. The option citing evidence about reoffending invents data; no statistics on released accused appear anywhere in the passage. The option about special courts introduces a reform the author never mentions; the author's remedy for a grave risk is a timely trial in the ordinary course, not a new forum.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'acceptable cost' option tempts because many defences of bail reform argue that way, but this author denies the premise: the rule obliges courts to count time, not to free anyone.

Q16 A Main conclusion HARD

The argument builds through three premises: planting drives count saplings, not survivors; compensatory plantations are often distant, single-species and slow to store carbon; and old forests perform functions that 'cannot be moved to another district'. From these the author infers that policy 'has its priorities reversed', and the final paragraph states the conclusion: a serious government 'would measure its record by the old forest it kept standing' and would treat planting elsewhere 'as a poor substitute for not cutting at all'. The correct option restates this. The option calling for drives to be abolished contradicts the concession that 'Planting has its place', especially in restoring lost land, and turns 'a large share' into 'most'. The option on locating plantations near the lost forest fixes only one of the defects the author lists and would not answer the point that a forest's functions take decades to develop. The option rejecting carbon as a measure overstates the author's point; carbon is 'the narrowest measure', not a useless one, and the author uses it to compare forests with plantations.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'abolish drives' option tempts because the passage is sharply critical of planting records, but the author explicitly concedes that planting has its place.

Q17 C Assumption ELITE

The author writes that 'the few surveys of survival that exist suggest that a large share die within the first dry season', and uses this to characterise planting drives as a whole. Moving from a few surveys to drives in general requires that those surveys are representative. If they happened to cover unusually badly run drives, survival elsewhere might be high, and the premise that the saplings counted are not trees that survive would be much weaker. Negating the assumption (the surveys are unrepresentative) therefore damages the argument, which marks it as necessary. The option about governments deliberately inflating counts goes further than needed; the author's complaint is about what is counted, not about falsified numbers, and the argument holds even if every count is honest. The option comparing survival on degraded land with land beside old forests introduces a comparison the passage never draws; the point about degraded land concerns location and value, not survival. The option about training volunteers proposes a fix for low survival; whether or not training would help, the argument does not depend on it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The inflation option is tempting because the passage is sceptical of headline figures, but the author's point survives even if every count is accurate.

Q18 B Weaken HARD

A key strand of the argument is that compensatory planting is a 'poor substitute' because plantations are 'often raised on degraded land far from the forest that was lost, sometimes as single-species rows'. If compensation now requires restoring native, species-matched forest adjoining each diverted site, then it reproduces more of the lost forest's functions in the same watershed and for the same species, which undercuts the claim that a hectare lost and a hectare compensated 'are not the same asset'. It does not destroy the argument, since restored forest still takes decades to mature, but it weakens it more than any other option. The option on single-species exotic stands repeats a premise of the passage and so strengthens it. The option on media coverage supports the author's claim that planting is 'visible' and attracts the publicity. The option on mature forests storing more carbon restates the second paragraph ('a mature natural forest stores far more') and therefore also supports the author rather than weakening the argument.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** No option refutes the argument outright; the species-matched restoration option is right because it attacks the 'far away, single-species' premise, while the others restate premises.

Q19 D Role of a statement MED

The sentence follows the claim that money and publicity flow to planting, 'which is visible and quick', while the protection of existing forest 'is invisible precisely when it succeeds'. 'A forest that is not cut makes no photograph' compresses that point into an image: successful protection produces no event to record, no ceremony and no figure to announce. It therefore explains why protection is under-rewarded even though the author has argued, in the second and third paragraphs, that standing forest is the more valuable asset.

The option criticising volunteers misplaces the target; the passage criticises policy priorities, not the people holding spades, and nowhere says volunteers neglect survival. The option about photographs monitoring illegal felling reads the sentence literally and invents a proposal the passage never makes. The option conceding that protection is less valuable because unseen reverses the author's view: invisibility explains the neglect, it does not justify it, and the conclusion insists that kept forest is the right measure of a government's record.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'concede' option tempts because the sentence admits a weakness of protection, but the weakness is in its visibility, not its value; the author uses it to explain neglect.

Q20 C Parallel reasoning ELITE

The passage's reasoning has a recognisable shape: a programme is judged by a visible, easily counted input (saplings planted) instead of the outcome that matters (forest kept standing); this rewards the visible over the effective; so performance should be measured by the outcome. The health-ministry argument matches it step for step: judging by beds added rather than illness prevented rewards the visible, and the remedy is to measure prevention. The library argument says one input is wasted without a complementary input (staff); it concerns the sequencing of spending, not a misleading measure of success. The flyover argument is a simple causal claim, faster traffic means less pollution, leading straight to a recommendation; there is no contrast between a visible metric and a real outcome. The seeds argument says an input yields output only under a condition and recommends insurance against the risk; again, no measure of performance is criticised. Only the health-ministry argument faults a measurement that counts what is easy to see instead of what achieves the goal.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The library option tempts because it also criticises spending on visible things (buildings), but its logic is about a missing complementary input, not about measuring the wrong outcome.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. What, according to the author, is tolerance often mistaken for? — **A mild form of approval**

2. To tolerate something is, first, to do what? — **To object to it**

3. Why does the indifferent neighbour not tolerate the music next door? — **She simply does not mind it**

4. Where does tolerance begin, per the passage? — **Where disapproval begins**

5. Tolerance consists in the decision not to act on what? — **One's disapproval**

6. Why is tolerance 'demanding'? — **It requires holding two attitudes at once**

7. What two judgments does the tolerant person hold together? — **That something is wrong, and that stopping it would be worse**

8. Whom does the tolerant believer refuse to enlist against her neighbour? — **The state, or the mob**

9. Name the two counterfeits of tolerance. — **Indifference and acceptance**

10. Why does indifference only 'feel generous'? — **It costs nothing**

11. What does acceptance do to the objection? — **Abolishes it altogether**

12. What paradox have philosophers worried about? — **How allowing a wrong practice can itself be right**

13. Why is coercion said to defeat its own aim? — **Beliefs forced on a person are worthless**

14. Which reason for restraint rests on self-doubt? — **Wanting others free to prove me wrong**

15. What may a person value more than winning any single dispute? — **A common life with people who disagree**

16. Tolerance is not a weaker disapproval but what? — **A second judgment that overrules the first**

17. What gives an objection a weight no restraint can match? — **A practice that injures others**

18. By what is the boundary of tolerance drawn? — **By harm, not by distaste**

19. What has a society lost if it expects approval of everything? — **The vocabulary for living with disagreement**

20. Meaning of 'counterfeit' in the tolerance passage? — **Something resembling the genuine article without being it**

21. Meaning of 'coercion'? — **Forcing someone to act or believe by threat or pressure**

22. Which three goods rise in price when floods cut off a town? — **Bottled water, candles and diesel**

23. What are shopkeepers denounced as after a flood? — **Profiteers**

24. What does the district administration typically order? — **That essentials be sold at pre-flood rates**

25. A price is not only a sum that changes hands; it is also what? — **A signal**

26. What does a higher diesel price tell households? — **To use less**

27. What does a higher price tell those holding stocks? — **To release them rather than hoard**

28. What does a higher price tell traders in neighbouring districts? — **A truck through flooded roads is worth the risk**

29. What happens to the price signals when the price is frozen? — **They are silenced**

30. Under a cap, by what three means is the shortage rationed? — **Queues, connections and arrival order at the shop**

31. How does the black-market price compare with the open market? — **It usually charges more**

32. Why do defenders call the price signal 'cruel'? — **It allocates goods to whoever can pay most, not who needs most**

33. How does the author rate the defenders' objection? — **The strongest one; to be taken seriously**

34. Which two people face a doubled price differently? — **A daily-wage labourer and a hotel owner**

35. An economist who says only 'let prices work' has answered how much? — **Half the question**

36. What problem does the objection really identify, per the author? — **A shortage of money among the poor**

37. What does the author propose for affected households? — **Direct cash or vouchers**

38. Which items may the state buy and distribute free? — **Truly vital ones, such as drinking water and medicines**

39. At what price should the state buy those vital items? — **At the market price**

40. Free distribution of bought goods adds supply rather than doing what? — **Merely relabelling it**

41. A price cap is a promise of fairness that what cannot keep? — **The empty shelf**

42. Meaning of 'profiteer'? — **One who makes excessive profit, especially in a crisis**

43. Meaning of 'ration' as used in the flood passage? — **To allocate a scarce supply among claimants**

44. What does the author want prices to do with goods? — **Summon them**

45. Roughly what share of prison inmates are undertrials, per the passage? — **About three of every four**

46. Who is an undertrial? — **A person accused by the state but not yet convicted**

47. What is 'the rule' in bail law, per the passage? — **Bail, not jail**

48. A refusal of bail rests on what kind of judgment? — **A forecast**

49. Name the three risks that bail refusals forecast. — **Flight, tampering with evidence, threatening witnesses**

50. What happens to each ground for refusal as time passes? — **It becomes weaker**

51. Why does long custody reduce the reason to flee? — **The accused may prefer to stay and be acquitted**

52. The speedy-trial right is part of which Article? — **Article 21**

53. What must even stringent bail statutes do when trials stall? — **Yield**

54. What has Parliament required for undertrials? — **Release on bond after serving a specified share of the maximum sentence**

55. How do current steps treat delay, says the author? — **As an exception noticed only when extreme**

56. What does the author want delay to become? — **A ground for bail in its own right, weighed at every hearing**

57. What may the state's failure to proceed turn custody into? — **Punishment**

58. Detention without a verdict punishes whom? — **A person the law still presumes innocent**

59. What objection does the final paragraph answer? — **That the rule would release dangerous people**

60. The proposal obliges courts to do what, not to free anyone? — **To count time**

61. If risk is grave, what is the prosecution's remedy? — **To bring the case to trial**

62. What record does every monsoon bring, per the passage? — **Crores of saplings planted in a single day**

63. For what is forest diversion approved, in the example? — **A mine or a highway**

64. On what condition is the diversion approved? — **The developer pays for trees to be planted elsewhere**

65. On paper the two events cancel out; where do they not? — **In the ground**

66. What do planting drives report? — **Saplings put into the soil, not trees alive years later**

67. When do many saplings die, per the surveys? — **Within the first dry season**

68. On what land are compensatory plantations often raised? — **Degraded land far from the forest lost**

69. Why are single-species rows favoured? — **Easy to plant and easy to audit**

70. When does a mature forest store carbon, compared with a plantation? — **Now, not in thirty years**

71. Carbon is called what kind of measure of a forest's work? — **The narrowest measure**

72. Name three functions of an old forest given in the passage. — **Holds soil, recharges springs, shelters species**

73. Why can forest functions not be moved by an accountant's transfer? — **They take decades to develop**

74. A standing hectare and a planted hectare share a unit but are not the same what? — **Asset**

75. Why does planting get money and publicity? — **It is visible and quick**

76. Forest protection is invisible precisely when it does what? — **Succeeds**

77. Complete: 'A forest that is not cut makes no ___.' — **Photograph**

78. Where does the author concede planting has a place? — **In restoring land already lost**

79. By what should a serious government measure its forest record? — **The old forest it kept standing**

80. Meaning of 'diverted' forest land? — **Forest land released for non-forest use**

81. Is the tolerant believer said to change her view of her neighbour's faith? — **No; she still thinks it mistaken**

82. Is the flood passage's author against all state intervention? — **No; it backs vouchers and free vital goods**

83. Why is collected and sealed evidence harder to destroy? — **It has already been secured**

84. Meaning of 'on bond' in the bail passage? — **Released on a written undertaking to appear**

85. What is the presumption of innocence? — **An accused is treated as innocent until proven guilty**

86. Meaning of 'compensatory' in the forest passage? — **Offered to make up for a loss**

87. Why are witnesses whose statements were recorded long ago harder to intimidate? — **Their evidence is already on record**

88. Tolerance is easily mistaken because its counterfeits look how? — **Attractive**

89. Does the tolerance author say everything must be tolerated? — **No; harm sets the limit**

90. What must whoever draws tolerance's boundary be honest about? — **Whether the objection rests on harm or distaste**

91. Tolerance withholds what action against a disliked practice? — **Suppressing it**

92. How many reasons for restraint does the tolerance passage list? — **Three**

93. Meaning of 'distaste' in the tolerance passage? — **Mere dislike, not a judgment of harm**

94. How fast do essential prices climb when floods cut off a town? — **Within hours**

95. How does the author describe the public anger at profiteers? — **Understandable**

96. Under a price freeze, what happens to demand? — **It stays as it was**

97. Under a price freeze, how fast does supply arrive? — **No faster than before**