ANSWER KEY — 26 NOVEMBER 2026

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

READING COMPREHENSION

Q1 **A** *Main idea* MED

The second paragraph gives the author's positive account: forgiveness 'does not alter the verdict on the act'; the forgiver 'continues to hold that what was done was wrong', and 'What she gives up is resentment'. Giving up resentment while keeping the judgment of wrong is therefore the account the passage defends. Accepting an apology and restoring trust describes reconciliation, which the third paragraph separates from forgiveness and says requires trust 'which the wrongdoer must earn'; the author also says forgiveness 'need not wait for an apology'. Discovering that the agent was pushed, misinformed or ill is the author's definition of excusing, and the passage says a successful excuse shows resentment was 'misplaced from the start', not overcome. Letting the memory fade is forgetting, which the opening paragraph rejects outright: forgiveness 'is something done with the memory intact'. Only the account that keeps the verdict and drops the grievance matches the text.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The reconciliation option tempts because apology and trust feel like part of forgiving, but the author deliberately treats reconciliation as a separate act that may never follow forgiveness.

Q2 **D** *Function of an analogy* HARD

One does not decide to lose an umbrella on a train; it simply happens, without intention and without any thought of another person. The author uses the image to show why forgetting cannot be forgiveness: a person who has forgotten 'has simply lost the memory', whereas forgiveness 'is something done with the memory intact'. The contrast is between something that happens to us and something we do, which is exactly the idea of an involuntary loss rather than a response to a wrong. Calling forgetting a generous act reverses the point, since generosity requires a choice the analogy denies. The passage never says the forgotten injury was trivial; serious injuries can be forgotten too, and triviality is not the contrast drawn. Nor does the author recommend forgetting as a surer route to peace; the opening calls the 'forgive and forget' advice 'a confusion', not a better path.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The option about a trivial injury tempts because umbrellas are small things, but the analogy compares the manner of losing, not the size of what is lost.

Q3 **D** *Inference (structure of argument)* HARD

The puzzle runs: if the wrong was excusable there is nothing to forgive; if inexcusable, 'forgiving it looks like condoning it, as though the victim had decided that it did not matter after all'. The second horn works only if forgiving means changing one's view of the act, deciding it did not matter. The author then says the puzzle 'dissolves once we see what forgiveness actually changes. It does not alter the verdict on the act.' So the mistaken assumption that generates the puzzle is that forgiveness revises the judgment that the act was wrong. The apology condition belongs to the third paragraph's separate discussion, and the author rejects it, but it plays no part in the puzzle. Restoration of the relationship is reconciliation, again a later topic. The idea that only the injured may forgive is never raised in the puzzle; the final paragraph discusses outsiders demanding forgiveness, not outsiders granting it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The apology option tempts because the author does reject that requirement, but it is rejected in a different paragraph and is not what makes the puzzle look unsolvable.

Q4 **B** *Application of principle (Stretch)* ELITE

Two of the author's distinctions must be applied together. Forgiveness means giving up resentment while still judging the act wrong; reconciliation means restoring the relationship, which 'requires trust, which the wrongdoer must earn and the victim is entitled to withhold'. The woman who drops her grievance against the cousin still treats the cheating as a wrong, yet withholds the trust needed to lend to him again: forgiveness without reconciliation. The tenant's case is a trap: she stops resenting only because she learns the landlord was misled, and the passage says a successful excuse shows resentment was 'misplaced from the start', so this is excusing, not forgiving. The clerk who forgets an insult over the years has merely lost the memory, which the author says leaves nothing to forgive. The shopkeeper who accepts an apology and resumes business as before has restored the relationship, so his case includes reconciliation rather than lacking it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The tenant option tempts because resentment is laid down, but it is laid down on learning of an excuse, which the passage expressly distinguishes from forgiveness.

Q5 **D** *Tone / attitude* MED

The final paragraph states that the public demand that victims forgive 'is not a counsel of virtue but a second injury', and explains why: 'It asks the wronged to perform the moral work that properly belongs to the one who did the wrong.' Calling the demand an injury is plainly

disapproving, and the stated reason is that it places a moral burden on the wrong person, the victim. Firm disapproval on that ground matches both the tone and the reason. Cautious approval is contradicted directly; the author never mentions communal healing and denies that the demand is a counsel of virtue. Studied neutrality fails because the author takes a sharp position and gives no case for the other side. Mild amusement misreads the register: the author treats the demand as harmful, not comic, and the remark that it is often made by people who suffered nothing is an indictment rather than a joke.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** Neutrality tempts students who notice the measured, essay-like prose, but measured prose can still carry a firm verdict, and 'a second injury' is one.

Q6 **A** *Main idea* MED

The second paragraph explains the mechanism: before rewards attach, number and goal 'travel together'; once pay, promotion or funding depends on the number, people seek 'the cheapest way to move it', which 'is rarely the one that moves the thing behind it'. The third paragraph calls Goodhart's law 'a law about incentives', and the fourth discusses how to make gaming costlier. The claim that rewards on an indicator invite cheap ways of separating it from its goal ties all of this together. The view that targets should be replaced by judgment is the conclusion the author calls 'tempting' and then rejects, since impressions 'are gamed too'. The money-supply option inverts the passage, which says the observation 'has since escaped economics entirely'. The claim that the underlying quantities cannot be measured misplaces the problem: the author says indicators are useful precisely because they move with things we cannot easily observe; they fail when incentives pull them apart.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The judgment option tempts because the passage is critical of targets, but the author explicitly rejects abandoning numbers in the third paragraph.

Q7 **C** *Inference (example)* HARD

The hospital is 'judged on how quickly patients are seen after arrival', and the 'quickest improvement lies in delaying the moment of arrival, keeping patients in ambulances outside until a bed is free'. The measured interval begins at arrival, so delaying arrival shortens the recorded wait while the patient waits just as long, outside. The author's summary, 'The figure improves; the wait does not', confirms that the clock's starting point moved and the real wait did not shrink. Faster treatment inside the wards would be a genuine improvement, which is exactly what the example denies. Nothing suggests fewer patients came by ambulance; the patients are still there, simply held in ambulances. The managers do not stop recording any cases; every patient is still timed, only from a later moment. The example is chosen to show gaming that leaves the record complete but misleading.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The option about unrecorded worst cases tempts because it also describes manipulation of a figure, but the passage describes delaying the start of timing, not omitting records.

Q8 **C** *Strengthen (evaluation of a remedy)* ELITE

The remedies are to use several indicators, to check some measures 'without announcing them in advance', and to pair figures 'with an inspector who actually visits', all intended to make honest improvement relatively cheaper than gaming, so that the number 'stays honest' and keeps moving with the underlying goal. A finding that schools subject to unannounced visits had scores that tracked real learning more closely is direct evidence that such devices keep indicator and goal together. A rapid rise in a single published score shows only that one number moved, which on the author's own account may reflect gaming rather than learning, so it does not support the remedies. Higher data-collection costs for multi-indicator hospitals, if anything, count against the remedy. Managers' satisfaction under impressions is about the alternative the author rejects and says nothing about whether the proposed devices work; satisfaction is itself an impression open to flattery.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The single-score option tempts because it shows a target responding strongly, but a fast-rising target is exactly what Goodhart's law warns may no longer measure the goal.

Q9 **B** *Meaning in context* HARD

The phrase follows directly from the passage's account of why indicators are useful: an indicator 'moves with something we care about but cannot easily observe', and under incentives 'the two' can be separated. A number 'stays honest only so long as moving it falsely costs more than moving it truly'; moving it 'falsely' means moving it without moving the thing behind it. An honest number, then, is one that continues to track the underlying quality it was chosen to indicate. Freedom from arithmetical error is a literal sense of accuracy that the passage never discusses; the hospital's figure in the example is correctly computed and still misleading. Open publication is not mentioned, and the author in fact recommends some unannounced checks. Reporting by an independent inspector is one of the devices for keeping a number honest, not the meaning of honesty itself; the author says inspectors should be paired with figures, not substituted for them.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The inspector option tempts because inspectors appear in the same paragraph, but they are a means of keeping a number honest, not what an honest number is.

Q10 **B** *Purpose of a detail* HARD

The detail appears where the author rejects the 'tempting' conclusion that numbers should be abandoned: 'Without indicators, managers fall back on impressions, and impressions are gamed too: by confidence, by flattery, by whoever speaks loudest in the meeting.' The three examples show that the alternative to measurement, judgment based on impressions, has its own ways of being manipulated, which supports the claim that Goodhart's law 'is a law about incentives' applying 'to any signal on which rewards come to depend'. The passage says nothing about managers designing indicators badly. It does not compare meetings with written reports; the meeting is merely a

setting in which impressions are formed. The concession option reverses the target of the examples: confidence and flattery manipulate impressions, the substitute for indicators, not the indicators themselves, and the author is extending the argument rather than conceding a point against it.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The concession option tempts because the examples do describe manipulation, but what is manipulated is managers' impressions, the alternative to numbers, not the numbers.

CRITICAL REASONING

Q11 **D** ***Main conclusion*** MED

The argument grants that the demand is 'understandable', argues that a legal guarantee 'would not deliver what its supporters expect' because private buyers would stop buying and the state could not absorb the surplus, proposes a price-deficiency scheme that pays 'the difference up to the support price', and ends: 'The guarantee farmers deserve is a guarantee of income, delivered as a payment, not a price written into law.' Paying the gap rather than legislating a price is therefore the main conclusion. Extending procurement to pulses and oilseeds is the opposite of the author's view, since the passage says the state lacks 'the warehouses nor the outlets' for many more commodities. The author never says the unions exaggerate; the first paragraph accepts that the announced price is often 'a promise only on paper'. Abolishing the support price goes too far: the author keeps the support price as the benchmark for the payment.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The abolition option tempts because the author opposes the legal guarantee, but the proposed scheme still pays farmers up to the support price, so the price survives as a benchmark.

Q12 **B** ***Assumption*** HARD

The author reasons that when the market price is below the support price, a buyer forbidden to pay less than the support price 'will simply stop buying'. That follows only if paying the support price would mean a loss, that is, if the trader could not sell the crop on at a price above the market rate. If traders could pass the higher price on to processors, exporters or consumers, they would keep buying at the legal price and the predicted exit would not occur. So the inability to recover more than the market rate is a necessary assumption. Weak enforcement would actually cut against the author's prediction, since traders could then keep buying below the price. The argument does not need support prices to rise; the problem arises at existing levels. Restricting the guarantee to rice and wheat contradicts the demand described, which covers 'more than twenty crops'.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The weak-enforcement option tempts because it seems to explain trader behaviour, but if enforcement were weak, traders would keep buying below the price rather than stop buying.

Q13 **A** ***Weaken*** HARD

The second paragraph predicts that a legal floor would make private buyers 'simply stop buying', leaving the state as 'the only lawful purchaser' and pushing produce into informal channels. Evidence that, where traders were actually barred from buying below a floor, private purchases barely fell contradicts the central prediction on which the paragraph's conclusion depends. If buyers do not exit, the state need not absorb the whole surplus and farmers can still sell lawfully. The location of warehouses in high-procurement states, if anything, supports the author's claim that storage elsewhere is inadequate. Farmers receiving less than the support price for pulses is the very problem the first paragraph describes; it explains the demand but does not touch the prediction. Informal markets operating even when prices are high shows such markets exist, but says nothing about whether a legal floor would drive more trade into them.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The pulses option tempts because it concerns low prices, but it restates the problem the author already accepts rather than challenging the predicted effect of a legal floor.

Q14 **D** ***Strengthen*** HARD

The case against a legal price rests on the prediction that private buyers, unable to pay less than the floor, will withdraw rather than buy at a loss, leaving farmers without lawful buyers. A real instance in which a district enforced a cotton floor price and traders moved their buying to neighbouring districts is direct evidence that buyers respond to a binding floor by exiting, which confirms the key premise. Higher earnings in strong-procurement states, if anything, suggest that guaranteed purchase at the support price helps farmers, which is the unions' case rather than the author's. Quick bank transfers make the author's alternative easier to run, but the question asks about the case against a legal price, and the ease of payments does nothing to show that the legal floor fails. The timing of announcements before sowing is neutral background that bears on neither the legal floor nor the payment.

> **Examiner's note — the trap:** The bank-transfer option tempts because it helps the author's proposal, but it supports the alternative rather than the argument that a legal price would empty the market.

Q15 **A** ***Function of a statement*** ELITE

The final paragraph opens with a concession, 'Such schemes are not free of difficulty', and gives the Madhya Pradesh example: traders were accused of depressing prices because the state would make up the gap. The author immediately responds that this 'is an argument for calculating the payment from an average of market prices rather than from the price each farmer actually receives'; a payment fixed by the average cannot be enlarged by depressing one farmer's price. The reference therefore admits a weakness in the author's own proposal and shows how design can meet it. It does not prove that such schemes always fail; one state's difficulty is answered, not generalised. It is not offered as evidence that traders would evade a legal price; the point concerns the deficiency scheme, and the author's objection to the legal price rests on exit, not evasion. Nothing compares state and Union capacity.

Examiner's note — the trap: The evasion option tempts because the example shows traders behaving opportunistically, but the author uses it to refine the payment scheme, not to attack the legal guarantee.

Q16 **C** *Main conclusion* MED

The author rejects the critics' demand that edited plants face transgenic-style trials 'whatever tool was used', argues that risk 'lies in what a plant is and does', and concludes: 'The sensible rule is therefore to let the trait, not the technique, decide how much review a new variety must undergo.' The final sentence restates this, warning against regulators who ask how a plant was made 'rather than what it will do'. Trait-based review is therefore the conclusion. The claim that edited crops need no further review is expressly denied: 'None of this means that edited crops should escape scrutiny', and a herbicide-tolerant crop 'deserves a hard look'. Bringing mutation-bred varieties under transgenic rules is not proposed; the comparison with them is used to show the incoherence of process-based rules, not to extend those rules. The 'back door' charge is the critics' view, which the author is arguing against.

Examiner's note — the trap: The no-review option tempts because the author defends the 2022 exemption, but the final paragraph insists on scrutiny wherever a trait raises real risk.

Q17 **C** *Assumption* HARD

The author argues that demanding trials for an edited rice but not for a radiation-bred rice with 'the identical change' regulates 'the laboratory's method rather than the plant'. This works only if the two plants really are alike in everything that matters for risk, that is, if the act of editing does not itself introduce some further hazard that the radiation-bred plant lacks. If editing carried a risk of its own, there would be a reason to treat the two differently, and the charge of incoherence would fail. That is the necessary assumption. Which method has produced more useful varieties is irrelevant to whether they pose equal risk. Regulators' ability to distinguish the plants is not needed; the author's point is that they should not need to. The relative danger of transgenic crops is never asserted; the author treats a transgenic herbicide trait the same as an edited or mutation-bred one.

Examiner's note — the trap: The transgenic option tempts because the article contrasts edited and transgenic crops, but the author never claims transgenic crops are riskier and treats all three methods alike for herbicide traits.

Q18 **B** *Weaken* HARD

The author's case turns on parity: an edited plant and a mutation-bred plant with 'the identical change' are alike in all respects relevant to risk, so 'pose the same risk, however differently they were made'. If editing tools leave hidden changes elsewhere in the genome of a kind mutation breeding does not produce, the two plants are not in fact alike beyond the intended edit, and the technique becomes relevant to what the plant is. That undercuts the claim that only the trait matters. Consumer reluctance to buy edited rice concerns market acceptance, not biological or ecological risk, which is the ground of the argument. The long use of mutation breeding for several crops is consistent with, and mildly supports, the author's point that such varieties are familiar. Resistant weeds from herbicide-tolerant crops confirm the author's own example of a trait that deserves a hard look, so it strengthens rather than weakens.

Examiner's note — the trap: The consumer option tempts because it looks like an objection to edited crops, but the argument is about how much risk review is warranted, not about whether buyers will accept the product.

Q19 **A** *Strengthen* MED

The argument holds that risk 'lies in what a plant is and does: what it contains, how it behaves', and that two plants alike in these respects 'pose the same risk, however differently they were made'. Evidence that edited and radiation-bred rice carrying the same change proved identical in composition and in field behaviour confirms that the method leaves no trace in the respects the author says matter, which supports treating them alike and regulating by trait. The slow approval of transgenic crops describes how long the regime takes but does not show that edited crops are as safe as mutation-bred ones. Farmers' preference for older drought-tolerant varieties is irrelevant to how new varieties should be reviewed. The critics' opposition to transgenic mustard says something about the critics' consistency, not about the risks of edited crops, and attacking the opponents is not evidence for the author's claim.

Examiner's note — the trap: The approval-delay option tempts because it hints that transgenic rules are burdensome, but burden alone does not show that edited crops deserve lighter review.

Q20 **C** *Application (Stretch)* ELITE

The author's rule is 'to let the trait, not the technique, decide how much review a new variety must undergo', and herbicide tolerance is the example of a trait that 'raises real ecological questions' which 'arise equally whether the tolerance was introduced by editing, by mutation breeding or by a transgene'. Close review of every herbicide-tolerant variety, however produced, applies that rule exactly. Exempting all edited crops ignores the author's warning that 'None of this means that edited crops should escape scrutiny'. Trials for every laboratory-developed variety make the technique the trigger, the very approach the author rejects. The final policy is the subtle trap: it is triggered by a trait, but it applies the extra rules only to edited crops, leaving a mutation-bred or otherwise produced herbicide-tolerant variety outside them. That again lets the technique decide, which contradicts the closing warning against asking how a plant was made rather than what it will do.

Examiner's note — the trap: The last option tempts because it is triggered by the herbicide trait, but it still singles out edited crops, so the method rather than the trait decides who is reviewed.

RAPID FIRE — ANSWERS

1. What, per the author, is the advice 'to forgive is to forget' in fact? — **A confusion**

2. What does a person who has forgotten an injury have left to forgive? — **Nothing**

3. To what does the author compare forgetting an injury? — **Losing an umbrella on a crowded train**

4. Where, in the analogy, is the umbrella lost? — **On a crowded train**

5. With what intact, per the author, is forgiveness done? — **The memory**

6. What is it to 'excuse', according to the passage? — **To find the act was not really a wrong or not the agent's fault**

7. Name one excusing condition listed in the passage. — **Being pushed, misinformed or ill**

8. When an excuse succeeds, what is shown about resentment? — **It was misplaced from the start**

9. If a wrong was excusable, what is there to forgive? — **Nothing**

10. If a wrong was inexcusable, what does forgiving it look like? — **Condoning it**

11. What does forgiveness NOT alter, per the author? — **The verdict on the act**

12. What does the forgiver continue to hold about the act? — **That it was wrong**

13. What does the forgiver give up? — **Resentment**

14. How does the author describe resentment? — **A standing grievance**

15. Resentment keeps the wrongdoer fixed as what, in the victim's eyes? — **The author of that one act**

16. Must forgiveness wait for an apology, per the author? — **No**

17. What may the absence of an apology make forgiveness? — **Unwise**

18. What may an apology make forgiveness? — **Easier**

19. Name one reason a victim may lay down resentment. — **Not letting the injury occupy her life**

20. As more than what may the victim come to see the offender? — **His worst deed**

21. To forgive is to change what, per the passage? — **One's attitude**

22. To reconcile is to restore what? — **A relationship**

23. What does reconciliation require? — **Trust**

24. Who must earn the trust that reconciliation requires? — **The wrongdoer**

25. Who is entitled to withhold trust? — **The victim**

26. Forgiveness is a gift and not a what? — **A debt**

27. Can anyone be owed forgiveness, per the author? — **No**

28. What does the author call the public demand that victims forgive? — **A second injury**

29. Who, the author says, often makes the public demand to forgive? — **People who suffered nothing**

30. The demand to forgive is not a counsel of what? — **Virtue**

31. Whose moral work does the public demand shift onto the victim? — **The wrongdoer's**

32. What is the title of the passage on forgiveness? — **What the Forgiver Keeps**

33. Forgiveness without reconciliation: what does the victim drop? — **Her grievance (resentment)**

34. Forgiveness without reconciliation: what may the victim still withhold? — **Trust**

35. What is the 'old puzzle' about forgiveness? — **Excusable needs none; inexcusable seems condoned**

36. Does forgiving require deciding the wrong did not matter? — **No**

37. In which decade did Goodhart make his observation? — **The 1970s**

38. Which economist gave his name to the law in the passage? — **Charles Goodhart**

39. At which institution was Goodhart an adviser? — **The Bank of England**

40. Which figures had policy begun to target in Goodhart's case? — **Money-supply figures**

41. Measures of money had once moved closely with what? — **Spending**

42. Who rearranged their affairs once money figures were targeted? — **Banks and borrowers**

43. What tends to collapse once pressure is placed on it for control? — **A statistical regularity**

44. Popular form: when a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be what? — **A good measure**

45. A waiting time is meant to move with what? — **The quality of care**

46. A test score is meant to move with what? — **Learning**

47. A clearance rate is meant to move with what? — **The work of detectives**

48. Before rewards attach, why do number and goal travel together? — **Nobody has a reason to separate them**

49. Name one reward that can depend on a number, per the passage. — **Pay, promotion or funding**

50. Once rewarded, what do people look for, per the author? — **The cheapest way to move the number**

51. Is the cheapest way usually the one that moves the real goal? — **No, rarely**

52. On what is the hospital in the example judged? — **How quickly patients are seen after arrival**

53. Where were patients kept to delay their 'arrival'? — **In ambulances outside**

54. Until when were patients kept outside? — **Until a bed was free**

55. Complete: 'The figure improves; the wait ...' — **Does not**

56. What conclusion does the author call tempting but mistaken? — **That numbers should be abandoned**

57. Without indicators, managers fall back on what? — **Impressions**

58. Name one way impressions are gamed, per the passage. — **Confidence, flattery or the loudest speaker**

59. Goodhart's law is not at bottom a law about what? — **Numbers**

60. Goodhart's law is, per the author, a law about what? — **Incentives**

61. To which signals does the law apply? — **Any signal on which rewards depend**

62. What is the practical question, per the author? — **How costly gaming is versus genuine improvement**

63. A number stays honest only so long as moving it falsely costs what? — **More than moving it truly**

64. Name one remedy proposed in the final paragraph. — **Several indicators, unannounced checks or visiting inspectors**

65. Should some measures be checked with or without notice? — **Without announcing them in advance**

66. With whom should every figure be paired? — **An inspector who actually visits**

67. Do the remedies make a target incorruptible? — **No**

68. What do the remedies make relatively cheaper? — **The honest route to a better number**

69. In the passage, a number that 'stays honest' keeps doing what? — **Moving with the quality it indicates**

70. What is the title of the Economics passage? — **When the Measure Becomes the Target**

71. What do farmers' unions want the minimum support price to become? — **A legal right**

72. Who announces the minimum support price? — **The Union government**

73. For roughly how many crops is the support price announced? — **More than twenty**

74. How often is the support price announced? — **Each season**

75. In most of the country, the announced price is a promise only where? — **On paper**

76. In which two crops is effective procurement concentrated? — **Rice and wheat**

77. Procurement is concentrated in how many states? — **A handful**

78. Name a crop group whose farmers often take whatever traders offer. — **Pulses or oilseeds**

79. Can a law forbid a trader to pay less than a stated price? — **Yes**

80. Can a law, per the author, oblige a trader to buy? — **No**

81. When does the market price fall below the support price? — **In seasons farmers most need protection**

82. What does a private buyer do when faced with the legal floor? — **Simply stops buying**

83. Who would become the only lawful purchaser? — **The state**

84. Of what would the state become the only lawful purchaser? — **The whole marketable surplus**

85. What does the state already struggle to do with procured grain? — **Store and dispose of it**

86. What two things does the state lack for many more commodities? — **Warehouses and outlets**

87. Through what channels would produce move under a legal floor? — **Informal channels**

88. At what price would informal sales occur? — **Below the support price**

89. Against what gap do farmers need protection, per the author? — **Market price vs support price**

90. What is the author's proposed scheme called? — **A price-deficiency scheme**

91. Under the scheme, where does the farmer sell? — **In the open market**

92. Under the scheme, what does the state pay? — **The difference up to the support price**

93. Under the scheme, who still buys the crop? — **Private buyers**

94. How many extra sacks must the state hold under the scheme? — **Not a single one**

95. Which state tried a price-deficiency scheme? — **Madhya Pradesh**

96. In which year did Madhya Pradesh try the scheme? — **2017**

97. Of what were traders accused under that scheme? — **Depressing prices**

98. Why might traders depress prices under such a scheme? — **The state would make up the gap**

99. From what should the payment be calculated, per the author? — **An average of market prices**

100. What does the author say a legal price would do to the market? — **Empty it**