ANSWER KEY — 16 NOVEMBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 **B** ***Primary purpose*** MED

The passage moves in two stages. The first three paragraphs explain the puzzle and its resolution: in an infinite, unchanging universe 'every direction you looked would end on the surface of a star', and the sky is dark because 'light travels at a finite speed and the stars have not been shining for ever'. The fourth paragraph then announces what the whole account was for: 'What deserves attention is not the cosmology but the method.' The author's point is that the decisive observation 'needed no telescope, only a refusal to treat the obvious as self-explaining', and that the dark sky 'was the evidence'. The keyed option joins the example to this lesson. The expansion option names one sentence of the third paragraph, a detail that only 'deepens the darkness further'. The poets option inflates the mention of Poe into a ranking the author never makes. The history option describes the second paragraph but stops before the resolution and the lesson, which are the point of the passage.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The history option is attractive because Kepler and Olbers are named, but the author explicitly sets the history and cosmology aside in favour of 'the method'.

Q2 **D** ***Meaning of a phrase in context*** HARD

The phrase describes what the decisive observation required. The author says it 'needed no telescope, only a refusal to treat the obvious as self-explaining'. Something 'self-explaining' needs no further account; to refuse to treat the obvious that way is to demand an explanation for a fact everyone already accepts. The first paragraph shows the attitude being refused: asked why the sky is dark, most people answer 'The sun has set; that is the whole answer.' The last sentence confirms the reading: the dark sky was 'waiting for someone to ask why it was there'. The keyed option captures exactly this: asking why a familiar fact holds rather than taking it for granted. The telescope option reverses the sentence, which says no telescope was needed. The poets option seizes on Poe but the phrase is about method, not about whose explanation is better. The doubt option misreads the refusal: the author never questions whether the sky is dark, only why it is.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The doubt option is tempting because 'refusal' sounds like scepticism, but the scepticism is aimed at the easy explanation, not at the observation itself.

Q3 **A** ***Inference from a stated model*** HARD

The second paragraph states the consequence directly for an infinite, unchanging, evenly filled universe: 'every direction you looked would end on the surface of a star, and the whole sky would blaze as brightly as the face of the sun.' The third paragraph adds the condition of age: the dark arises only because 'the stars have not been shining for ever', so that light has had a limited time to travel. Remove that limit, as the stem does by making the universe infinitely old, and nothing stops the light of every star from arriving; the bright sky follows. The faintness option is ruled out in so many words: 'A far star looks fainter, but there are proportionally more stars at that distance, and the two effects cancel.' The dark-sky option borrows the finite-age explanation but applies it to a universe that is stipulated to be infinitely old, where light from any distance has had time to arrive. The nearest-stars option repeats the same faintness error as the second option.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The dark-sky option is attractive because it echoes the passage's actual resolution, but that resolution depends on a finite age, which the stem removes.

Q4 **C** ***Structure / paragraph function*** MED

The first paragraph raises the question and promises a remarkable answer. The second paragraph builds the puzzle: the forest analogy shows that in an endless forest 'every line of sight will sooner or later meet a trunk', and the same reasoning applied to stars makes the whole sky blaze. It then blocks the obvious way out: 'Distance does not rescue the argument,' because fainter stars are offset by more of them. Finally it gives the puzzle its history with Kepler and Olbers. That is the keyed option: the paragraph makes the darkness puzzling and closes off one escape. The resolution option is wrong because the second paragraph offers no resolution at all; the resolution arrives in the third paragraph and is accepted, not rejected. The uneven-spread option invents evidence the paragraph never gives. The astronomer-versus-poet option belongs to the third paragraph, which mentions Poe, and even there no contrast of views is drawn.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The resolution option is attractive because the paragraph does argue towards a conclusion, but that conclusion is the puzzle, not its answer.

Q5 **A** ***Application of the author's principle (Stretch)*** ELITE

The final paragraph contrasts two pictures of science. One is 'the discovery of hidden things, of particles too small or galaxies too distant to see'. The other, which the author praises, is 'the patient interrogation of things in plain view, which went unexamined precisely because

everyone could see them'; the dark-sky case 'needed no telescope'. The right answer must therefore begin from an everyday sight that people take for granted and ask why it is so. The bent stick at a pond fits exactly: it is visible to anyone, it is usually dismissed as a trick of the eye, and asking why it happens leads to the bending of light between water and air. The particle and the distant galaxy are the very examples the author gives of the other kind of science, the hidden and the remote. The predicted planet is a triumph of calculation, but it depends on a telescope and on a target no ordinary observer could see, so it also fails the 'plain view' test.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The planet option is attractive because it involves reasoning rather than mere equipment, but the thing found was hidden from ordinary sight, which is what the author's method excludes.

Q6 **C** *Main point* MED

The author grants the usual lesson, 'The comfort is real', but says it 'hides the more interesting half of the finding'. The second paragraph traces the effect to anchoring on our own vivid experience; the third shows the same error running 'in other directions', so that people overrate how plainly their anxiety, bluffs, feelings and instructions show. The fourth draws the conclusion: 'reassurance alone is a poor remedy', because we are 'less visible than we fear, and less legible than we assume'. The keyed option states this double claim. The vanity option contradicts the text: 'The error does not come from vanity.' The social-anxiety option is only the comfort the author calls incomplete, and 'most social anxiety is groundless' overreaches. The indifference option is rejected directly: 'The better lesson is not that others are indifferent but that they are occupied.' Only the keyed option joins visibility and clarity and draws the author's conclusion about reassurance.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The social-anxiety option is attractive because it repeats the familiar message of the first paragraph, which the author accepts only as the less interesting half.

Q7 **A** *Inference from a causal account* HARD

The second paragraph locates the cause in anchoring: we 'begin from our own experience' and adjust too little, and we 'cannot switch off the part of the mind that is living in it'. If the anchor is our own unavoidable point of view, knowing that the bias exists does not remove the anchor; it can at most prompt a further, still partial adjustment. The fourth paragraph confirms the implication: reassurance 'leaves the underlying habit untouched'. That is the keyed option. The vanity option directly contradicts the paragraph, which says 'The error does not come from vanity', so vain people are not singled out. The small-detail option goes beyond the text: the stain is described as vivid to the wearer, but nothing suggests that a small detail would remove the anchor or the effect. The large-group option invents a reversal the passage never discusses; the account predicts overestimation, not its opposite, whatever the size of the room.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The vanity option is attractive because the spotlight effect sounds like self-absorption, but the author explicitly replaces vanity with anchoring as the cause.

Q8 **D** *Meaning of a figurative expression* HARD

'Legible' literally describes writing that can be read; here it is used figuratively of people. The phrase pairs with 'less visible than we fear': visibility concerns appearance, legibility concerns what we mean. The third paragraph supplies the content: people believe their anxiety, bluff, feelings or instructions are 'perfectly clear', yet 'what was loud inside their own head' was not 'audible outside it'. The fourth paragraph adds the vague email that seemed to say 'everything it needed to say'. So the phrase means that our intentions and meanings come across less clearly than they feel from inside, as the keyed option says. The handwriting option takes 'legible' literally and mixes in appearance, which belongs to the first half of the sentence. The deliberate-misreading option adds intent the passage denies; others are 'occupied', not hostile. The hiding option reverses the claim, since the author says others read us less, not more, easily.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The handwriting option is attractive because it gives the dictionary sense of 'legible', but the context makes the word a metaphor for how clearly our meanings come across.

Q9 **B** *Function of examples* HARD

The third paragraph opens with a conditional prediction: 'If that is the cause, the same error should run in other directions, and it does.' 'That' refers to the anchoring explanation of the second paragraph. The examples that follow, the nervous speaker, the bluffing negotiator, the manager and the hurt friend, all concern inner states and messages, not shirts or stains. They show the error the account predicts turning up beyond appearance, which is what the keyed option says. The limitation option reverses the point: the examples widen the effect beyond embarrassment, since a negotiator's bluff and a manager's deadline are not embarrassments. The comparison option invents a ranking among groups that the passage never makes. The 'entirely mistaken' option overstates the author's position; the second paragraph begins 'The comfort is real', and the author's complaint is only that the comfort is incomplete. The examples extend the finding; they do not overturn its familiar half.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The 'entirely mistaken' option is attractive because the author criticises reassurance, but the passage says the comfort is real and only insufficient.

Q10 **D** *Weaken a causal explanation (Stretch)* ELITE

The author's account is that the error 'comes from anchoring': we start from our own vivid experience, 'full of the stain', and fail to adjust enough towards others' viewpoints. The account therefore predicts that the overestimate depends on having the wearer's own perspective. If onlookers, who have no such anchor because the shirt is not theirs, overestimate by exactly as much as the wearers, then the wearer's own experience cannot be what produces the error; some other cause, common to everyone, would be at work. That makes the keyed option the strongest weakener. The first option is consistent with the account, and even supports it: the fourth paragraph predicts that knowledge or reassurance 'leaves the underlying habit untouched'. The speaker option repeats the paragraph's own example of the same

bias, so it fits the account. The manager option is likewise one of the author's illustrations. Only the onlooker finding separates the effect from the egocentric anchor.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The first option is attractive because a bias that survives being explained can look stubborn and mysterious, but the author's account predicts exactly that persistence.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 **A** ***Main conclusion*** MED

The recommendation in the final paragraph is the point the whole argument serves: 'India should adopt day-fines for offences now punished by fixed sums, beginning with traffic violations.' Each earlier paragraph supports it. The first shows that a fixed sum is equal 'in form' but unequal 'in substance'. The second answers the defence of fixed fines by redefining equality: a penalty should 'take a comparable bite from each person'. The third offers Finland as a working model. The final paragraph meets the objection about assessing income and closes with the claim that a fine the rich do not feel is 'not a penalty but a fee'. The equality option is a premise used to rebut the usual defence, not the conclusion. The Finland option is evidence offered for feasibility and acceptance. The deterrence option restates the first paragraph's observation that the wealthy are 'least deterred'; it is a reason for the change, not the change itself. Only the keyed option states what the author wants done.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The deterrence option is attractive because it is the argument's opening claim, but it is offered as a reason for reform rather than as the reform itself.

Q12 **C** ***Necessary assumption*** HARD

The first paragraph claims that under fixed fines 'the person most able to bear the penalty is the person least deterred by it', and the last paragraph says a fine that 'costs the rich nothing is not a penalty but a fee'. Both claims require that deterrence turns on how much a fine hurts relative to one's means, not on its face value. Negate the keyed option, so that a rupee deters a director as much as a worker, and the inequality in deterrence disappears, taking much of the case for scaling with it. The high-income option is not needed: the author says the gap between offenders' means is widest in traffic cases, which requires variety of income, not that most offenders are rich. The Finnish option concerns hypothetical higher fines in Finland, which nothing in the argument relies on. The courts option is not required either; the author's reply on feasibility concerns available records of income, not whether judges would welcome the work.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The high-income option is attractive because the argument targets wealthy offenders, but the case for scaling needs only a wide spread of incomes, not a majority of rich offenders.

Q13 **B** ***Weaken*** HARD

The author picks traffic violations because there 'the gap between offenders' means is widest and the volume of cases largest', and answers the feasibility objection by pointing to 'tax returns, salary records and the declarations already made in maintenance proceedings'. A day-fine needs a step at which the offender's income is assessed. If most traffic fines are settled on the spot or online without any hearing, the very feature that makes traffic attractive, its huge volume handled quickly, means there is no occasion to apply those records, so traffic becomes the hardest place to start. That is the keyed option. The volume option repeats one of the author's own reasons, so it supports the choice. The Finnish complaints option is weak: complaints from those who pay large fines are expected and do not show the public finds them unjust. The raised-fines option suggests that higher flat fines failed, which, if anything, supports a different design such as scaling to income.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The raised-fines option is attractive because it shows a past reform failing, but its failure is consistent with the author's view that flat sums deter the wrong people.

Q14 **D** ***Role of an analogy*** ELITE

The second paragraph answers 'the usual defence of fixed fines', namely that equality before the law requires the same rule for all. The author says that equality 'has never meant identical treatment regardless of circumstance' and offers two parallels: compensation fixed by reference to lost earnings, and income tax that 'rises with income without anyone thinking that the wealthy are denied equal treatment'. The tax example works by analogy: we already accept a burden graded by means as compatible with equality, so a fine graded by means should be acceptable too. That is the keyed option. The fair-share option reads a complaint about over-taxation into the text; the author says nothing about whether the wealthy pay too much. The collection option confuses two different points: tax returns appear later, in the final paragraph, as a source of income data, but the second-paragraph reference concerns principle, not collection. The objection option is wrong because the objection is the defence of fixed fines; the tax example is part of the author's reply.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The collection option is attractive because tax returns do reappear in the final paragraph, but there they serve feasibility, whereas here the tax reference serves the argument about equality.

Q15 **B** ***Strengthen*** HARD

The argument rests on a claim about behaviour: fixed fines leave 'the person most able to bear the penalty' the 'least deterred', and income-scaled fines would restore a 'comparable bite'. The best support is evidence that scaling actually changes the behaviour of those whom fixed fines fail to deter. If a country that moved to income-scaled fines saw repeat offences by its highest earners fall sharply, the predicted effect of the reform is observed directly. That is the keyed option. The survey option concerns raising fines 'for everyone', a flat increase, which supports a different reform and could even suggest that scaling is unnecessary. The daily-wage option, if anything, implies the burden of fixed fines falls mostly on salaried people, which is irrelevant to the comparison of means and does not show scaling works.

The option about countries restricting day-fines to serious offences tends to weaken the proposal, since it suggests experience has narrowed their use rather than extending it to everyday offences like traffic.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The survey option is attractive because it shows wealthy drivers responding to bigger fines, but a flat increase is not the reform the author proposes.

Q16 **D** *Main conclusion* MED

The first paragraph says counting bags not handed out is 'the wrong measure'. The second sets out the life-cycle reply, which would be 'close to fatal' if the case for the ban were climate. The third denies that premise: 'the case was never climate', and the bags are banned 'because of where they end up'. The fourth draws the conclusion: 'A ban justified by litter should be judged by litter', counting drain litter rather than bags not issued, and designing the rule around escape. The keyed option states that conclusion. The carbon-footprint option is a finding the author accepts as a premise of the opposing reply; it is not what the argument establishes. The unreliability option overstates: the author never says life-cycle studies are unreliable, only that their tallies of manufacturing emissions miss harm that comes later. The suspension option reverses the author's view; the author defends the ban and says carbon is the wrong test for it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The carbon-footprint option is attractive because the author does accept it, but it is a concession inside the argument, not the point the argument is making.

Q17 **B** *Assumption behind a recommendation* HARD

The author proposes 'counting what is pulled out of drains before and after the ban' as the right measure of success. A before-and-after count can only measure the ban if the change it records is due, at least broadly, to the ban. If drain litter rose or fell mainly because of something else, such as a new collection service, a change in rainfall or a road project, the count would not tell the city whether its rule worked. Negate the keyed option and the proposed measure becomes uninformative, so the recommendation depends on it. The cleaning option is not required; indeed, more frequent cleaning would distort the comparison, which is a reason to control for it, not something the author must assume. The paper-bag option is too strong: the author says nothing about paper bags in drains, and the recommendation works whether or not some paper reaches them. The under-reporting option is a possible reason to distrust bag counts, but the author rejects bag counts on grounds of relevance, not of honesty.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The under-reporting option is attractive because it seems to explain why bag counts are a poor measure, but the author's objection to counts is that they measure the wrong thing.

Q18 **C** *Weaken a sub-argument (Stretch)* ELITE

The claim in the final paragraph has a stated basis: what matters is 'how likely a bag is to be dropped, blown away or left in a drain', and 'a thick bag that people keep and reuse escapes far less often than a thin one they discard within the hour'. The comparison therefore rests on an empirical premise about behaviour: that people really do keep and reuse thick bags. If thick bags meant for reuse are in fact discarded almost as quickly as thin ones, the difference in escape largely vanishes, and with it the reason to call them less of a menace. That is the keyed option. The carbon option is the most attractive trap, but the author has already argued that 'the case was never climate'; a larger carbon footprint is irrelevant to a test defined by litter. The cost option concerns whether shops stock thick bags, not how menacing they are once used. The cattle option reduces one harm of all bags alike and does not distinguish thick from thin.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The carbon option is attractive because it makes thick bags look worse, but the author has deliberately set carbon aside as the wrong test for a litter rule.

Q19 **A** *Method of argument* HARD

In the second paragraph the author reports the life-cycle findings without disputing them: a thin plastic bag is 'a remarkably frugal object', and a cotton tote must be reused 'by some estimates more than a hundred' times. The author even grants that 'If the case for the ban were climate, this reply would be close to fatal.' The third paragraph then changes the ground: 'But the case was never climate', and the harm of thin bags 'happens after the bag has been used', so 'None of this harm appears' in a tally of manufacturing emissions. The findings are accepted on their own terms and declared irrelevant to the ban's purpose, as the keyed option says. The exaggeration option is wrong because the author never challenges the estimates. The cotton option reverses the findings, which show totes to be worse on carbon unless heavily reused. The fatal option misreads a conditional: the findings would be fatal only if the case were climate, and the author denies that condition, while defending the ban rather than replacing it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The fatal option is attractive because the passage uses the words 'close to fatal', but they sit inside a conditional whose condition the author rejects.

Q20 **C** *Strengthen* MED

The argument holds that the real case for banning thin bags is the harm they do after use, chiefly that 'They gather in drains and culverts, and in a monsoon city a blocked drain turns a heavy shower into a flooded street.' Evidence that discarded thin bags are among the commonest causes of blocked drains in urban flooding confirms the very harm on which the author rests the ban, and so supports both the claim that the case is litter and the proposal to judge the ban by drain litter. That is the keyed option. The cotton-tote option strengthens the life-cycle reply, since unused totes make the carbon comparison worse; it cuts against the ban on the author's opponents' terms. The shop-count option offers exactly the measure the author calls 'the wrong measure'. The recycled-paper option concerns the carbon comparison between alternatives, a question the author sets aside as irrelevant to a litter rule, so it neither helps nor harms the argument.

Examiner's note — the trap: The shop-count option is attractive because it reports a ban succeeding, but it uses the bags-avoided measure that the author's argument rejects.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. What answer do most people give when asked why the night sky is dark? — **The sun has set**

2. For roughly how long did the dark-sky question trouble astronomers? — **Three centuries**

3. What does the darkness between the stars show about the universe? — **It has not existed, in its present form, for ever**

4. What analogy does the author use to explain the dark-sky puzzle? — **A forest of endless trees**

5. In an endless forest, what does every line of sight eventually meet? — **A tree trunk**

6. In an infinite, unchanging, star-filled universe, how bright would the sky be? — **As bright as the face of the sun**

7. Why does distance not rescue the infinite-universe argument? — **Fainter far stars are offset by more of them**

8. Which astronomer argued the stars could not go on for ever? — **Johannes Kepler**

9. Whose name did the dark-sky puzzle later take? — **Heinrich Olbers**

10. In which decade did Olbers discuss the puzzle? — **The 1820s**

11. Who first glimpsed the resolution of the dark-sky puzzle? — **The poet Edgar Allan Poe**

12. What two facts resolve the puzzle of the dark night sky? — **Light's finite speed and the stars' finite age**

13. How far out can we see, according to the passage? — **As far as light has travelled since the first stars formed**

14. What lies beyond the horizon set by light's travel time? — **No star at all, only the dark**

15. What does cosmic expansion do to ancient light? — **Stretches and dims it**

16. What does the author say deserves attention more than the cosmology? — **The method**

17. Who had access to the decisive dark-sky observation? — **Every shepherd who lay on a hillside at night**

18. What instrument did the dark-sky observation NOT need? — **A telescope**

19. Complete: 'a refusal to treat the obvious as ...' — **Self-explaining**

20. How is science 'often presented', per the author? — **As the discovery of hidden things**

21. Why did things in plain view go unexamined? — **Precisely because everyone could see them**

22. The dark sky was not a gap in the evidence; it was what? — **The evidence**

23. 'Interrogation' of things in plain view means what here? — **Close, persistent questioning**

24. What is the primary purpose of 'The Information in the Dark'? — **To show obvious observations can be decisive evidence**

25. Which paragraph of the dark-sky essay states its lesson? — **The final (fourth) paragraph**

26. What do psychologists call overrating others' attention to us? — **The spotlight effect**

27. What did students wear in the spotlight-effect experiments? — **An embarrassing T-shirt**

28. Did more or fewer peers remember the shirt than the wearers guessed? — **Far fewer**

29. How is the spotlight finding usually passed on? — **As comfort**

30. What does the author say the error does NOT come from? — **Vanity**

31. What mental process causes the spotlight effect, per the author? — **Anchoring**

32. Where do we begin when judging what others notice? — **From our own vivid experience**

33. What goes wrong with our adjustment towards others' views? — **It is almost always too small**

34. What part of the mind can we not switch off? — **The part that is living in our own world**

35. What do nervous speakers wrongly believe? — **That their anxiety is plain to the audience**

36. What do negotiators who think their bluff is transparent do? — **Give up concessions they did not need to make**

37. What did the manager believe he had 'obviously' signalled? — **That a deadline was serious**

38. What did the friend believe she had 'clearly' hinted? — **That she was hurt**

39. What was loud inside their heads but not audible outside? — **Their feelings and intentions**

40. Why is reassurance alone a poor remedy? — **It leaves the underlying habit untouched**

41. What may reassurance quiet, according to the author? — **The blush**

42. What will the same habit later persuade a person about an email? — **That a vague email said everything needed**

43. Others are not indifferent but what, says the author? — **Occupied**

44. Each person stands in what, according to the passage? — **A spotlight of their own**

45. The finding counsels ease about what? — **Our stains**

46. The finding counsels effort in what? — **Our sentences**

47. Complete: 'less visible than we fear, and less ... than we assume' — **Legible**

48. 'Legible' in the passage figuratively means what? — **Clearly understood by others**

49. What is the 'more interesting half' of the spotlight finding? — **We overrate how clearly our meanings show**

50. Which bias makes people think their inner states show plainly? — **The same anchoring bias (illusion of transparency)**

51. What traffic fine amount opens the day-fines argument? — **Five thousand rupees**

52. For whom may a fixed fine equal a week's earnings? — **A daily-wage worker**

53. For a company director the fine is less than what? — **The cost of a dinner**

54. A fixed fine treats people identically in what, but unequally in what? — **In form; in substance**

55. Under fixed fines, who is least deterred? — **The person most able to bear the penalty**

56. What is the usual defence of fixed fines? — **Equality before the law requires the same rule for all**

57. Has equality before the law ever meant identical treatment? — **No, never regardless of circumstance**

58. How do courts already fix compensation for an injured person? — **By reference to the earnings lost**

59. Which tax is cited as rising with income? — **Income tax**

60. What does equality require of a penalty, per the author? — **That it take a comparable bite from each offender**

61. Which country is the most famous user of day-fines? — **Finland**

62. In a day-fine, how is the seriousness of an offence expressed? — **As a number of days**

63. How is the value of one day-fine set? — **By the offender's daily income**

64. Two drivers at the same speed receive the same what? — **Number of days**

65. Finnish speeding fines are reported running to how much? — **Tens of thousands of euros**

66. How does the Finnish public tend to view large day-fines? — **As fitting, not unjust**

67. Which offences should India begin day-fines with? — **Traffic violations**

68. Why start with traffic violations? — **Widest gap in means and largest volume of cases**

69. Which records does the author say give a workable income base? — **Tax returns, salary records, maintenance declarations**

70. A fine that costs the rich nothing is not a penalty but what? — **A fee**

71. What does a law do if it lets some buy the right to break it? — **Stops treating citizens as equals**

72. What role does the income-tax reference play in the argument? — **A parallel case: graded burden fits equality**

73. Main conclusion of 'The Price of a Fine'? — **India should adopt income-scaled day-fines**

74. Key assumption of the day-fines argument? — **Deterrence depends on a fine's size relative to means**

75. What would most weaken starting day-fines with traffic? — **No hearing at which income could be assessed**

76. How is the success of a bag ban usually reported? — **As a count of bags not handed out**

77. What does the author call the bag-count measure? — **The wrong measure**

78. What do life-cycle studies tally? — **Energy, water and emissions used to make each bag**

79. How do life-cycle tallies describe a thin plastic bag? — **A remarkably frugal object**

80. Which bag needs more energy and several reuses to match plastic? — **A paper bag**

81. Why is a cotton tote costly to make? — **Its fibre is thirsty and fertiliser-hungry**

82. By some estimates, how many reuses does a cotton tote need? — **More than a hundred**

83. If the ban's case were climate, the life-cycle reply would be what? — **Close to fatal**

84. What was the case for the bag ban, if not climate? — **Litter: where the bags end up**

85. Why are thin bags not collected for recycling? — **They are too flimsy to be worth collecting**

86. Name one property that makes thin bags blow out of bins. — **They are light**

87. Do thin plastic bags rot? — **No**

88. Where do thin bags gather in a city? — **In drains and culverts**

89. In a monsoon city, what does a blocked drain cause? — **A flooded street from a heavy shower**

90. Which animals swallow thin bags in rubbish heaps? — **Cattle**

91. Where do thin bags end up after washing down rivers? — **The sea**

92. Why does litter harm not appear in life-cycle tallies? — **It happens after the bag is used**

93. Complete: 'A ban justified by litter should be judged by …' — **Litter**

94. What should cities count before and after a ban? — **What is pulled out of drains**

95. The rule should be designed around escape rather than what? — **Material**

96. Which bag escapes less often, per the author? — **A thick bag people keep and reuse**

97. How soon is a thin bag typically discarded? — **Within the hour**

98. Who does the author expect to 'arrive' with objections? — **The carbon accountants**

99. How does the author treat life-cycle findings? — **Accepts them but denies they bear on the ban**

100. What evidence would most strengthen the drain-litter argument? — **Thin bags among top causes of blocked drains**

101. Which poet first glimpsed the resolution of the dark-sky puzzle? — **Edgar Allan Poe**