

Sec 1

Directions for questions 1 to 4: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 1

In the past two decades, the time between deadly international disease outbreaks has shortened, and the human and economic cost of these outbreaks has grown. . . . The next infectious-disease threat could be even more deadly and costly. Political leaders can choose to prevent it. . . . To stop the next health threat, heads of state and government must lead – nationally, and in solidarity. With some exceptions, the COVID-19 pandemic has been characterized by too many words and not enough action, despite its clear threat to global health, economies and security. The global COVID-19 summits have brought welcome funding announcements and leaders have spoken at WHO gatherings, but action has not been sustained. . . .

Global pandemic prevention is estimated to cost \$10.5 billion each year – a sizeable sum, but a fraction of the cost of not being prepared. A new fund for pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, approved by the board of the World Bank in June, is too new to evaluate properly. However, early signs indicate that it is based on an outdated ‘donor–beneficiary’ model, with high-income countries having too much influence and insufficient money being pledged. Instead, we recommend an inclusive, global public investment funding model that gives lower-income countries a seat at the table and disburses funds based on a country’s needs and finances.

The role of the WHO must also be considered. If it is to remain the coordinating authority for global health, member states must give it the authority, independence and funding to perform that role well. The WHO was too slow to declare a public-health emergency of international concern (PHEIC) when the SARS-CoV-2 virus emerged. Work is now underway to amend the international health regulations, which govern global responses to international public-health threats, to give the WHO clear authority to communicate freely on disease outbreaks, declare a PHEIC based on evidence and investigate without hindrance. However, these amendments are not scheduled to be accepted until May 2024, and changes won’t come into force until even later. This creates a dangerous interim period, during which the WHO must be bold and sound the alarm should new threats arise. The relative speed with which it called a PHEIC for the current monkeypox outbreak was encouraging, although some think it should have come sooner.

The area of reform that faces the most resistance, from industry and some countries, is the guarantee that appropriate medical countermeasures be available where they are most needed. Vaccines and therapeutics are a global common good – they are meant to slow the spread of disease and protect lives during a health emergency, not be a profit-making opportunity. Countermeasures should be equitably distributed on the basis of public-health need, and research and development must be tailored to the settings in which these products will need to operate – ‘ultra-cold chain’ vaccines, for example, cannot be easily delivered in warm, lower-income countries. . . .

These recommendations are not exhaustive. . . . Political leaders now have a clear choice: to watch while a new disease with pandemic potential emerges and spreads, or to lay the foundations required to thwart it. Given the damage done by COVID-19, it’s hard to fathom why this is a choice at all.

Q.1 [11831809]

Following from the passage, which one of the following may be seen as a true statement regarding the WHO?

-
- 1 ☐ The WHO's response to the monkey pox has been unanimously appreciated.
-
- 2 ☐ World leaders have done nothing to amend the rules that govern the WHO.
-
- 3 ☐ The WHO had complete authority to communicate during the Covid pandemic.
-
- 4 ☐ The WHO was tardy in responding to the Covid pandemic.
-

Solution:

Correct Answer : 4

 Answer key/Solution

1. 4 Refer to the sentence, "The WHO was too slow to declare a public-health emergency of international concern (PHEIC) when the SARS-CoV-2 virus emerged." Therefore, option (4) is correct.

Incorrect answers

Option (1) cannot be the answer because "The relative speed with which it called a PHEIC for the current monkey pox outbreak was encouraging, although some think it should have come sooner." Therefore, a unanimous appreciation is incorrect.

Option (2) cannot be the answer because "Work is now underway to amend the international health regulations, which govern global responses to international public-health threats, to give the WHO clear authority" Regulations have been changed in the post-pandemic age.

Option (3) cannot be the answer because "Work is now underway to amend the international health regulations, which govern global responses to international public-health threats, to give the WHO clear authority to communicate freely on disease outbreaks ..." It means that during the pandemic, the WHO did not have a clear authority.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Directions for questions 1 to 4: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 1

In the past two decades, the time between deadly international disease outbreaks has shortened, and the human and economic cost of these outbreaks has grown. . . . The next infectious-disease threat could be even more deadly and costly. Political leaders can choose to prevent it. . . . To stop the next health threat, heads of state and government must lead — nationally, and in solidarity. With some exceptions, the COVID-19 pandemic has been characterized by too many words and not enough action, despite its clear threat to global health, economies and security. The global COVID-19 summits have brought welcome funding announcements and leaders have spoken at WHO gatherings, but action has not been sustained. . . .

Global pandemic prevention is estimated to cost \$10.5 billion each year — a sizeable sum, but a fraction of the cost of not being prepared. A new fund for pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, approved by the board of the World Bank in June, is too new to evaluate properly. However, early signs indicate that it is based on an outdated ‘donor–beneficiary’ model, with high-income countries having too much influence and insufficient money being pledged. Instead, we recommend an inclusive, global public investment funding model that gives lower-income countries a seat at the table and disburses funds based on a country’s needs and finances.

The role of the WHO must also be considered. If it is to remain the coordinating authority for global health, member states must give it the authority, independence and funding to perform that role well. The WHO was too slow to declare a public-health emergency of international concern (PHEIC) when the SARS-CoV-2 virus emerged. Work is now underway to amend the international health regulations, which govern global responses to international public-health threats, to give the WHO clear authority to communicate freely on disease outbreaks, declare a PHEIC based on evidence and investigate without hindrance. However, these amendments are not scheduled to be accepted until May 2024, and changes won’t come into force until even later. This creates a dangerous interim period, during which the WHO must be bold and sound the alarm should new threats arise. The relative speed with which it called a PHEIC for the current monkeypox outbreak was encouraging, although some think it should have come sooner.

The area of reform that faces the most resistance, from industry and some countries, is the guarantee that appropriate medical countermeasures be available where they are most needed. Vaccines and therapeutics are a global common good — they are meant to slow the spread of disease and protect lives during a health emergency, not be a profit-making opportunity. Countermeasures should be equitably distributed on the basis of public-health need, and research and development must be tailored to the settings in which these products will need to operate — ‘ultra-cold chain’ vaccines, for example, cannot be easily delivered in warm, lower-income countries. . . .

These recommendations are not exhaustive. . . . Political leaders now have a clear choice: to watch while a new disease with pandemic potential emerges and spreads, or to lay the foundations required to thwart it. Given the damage done by COVID-19, it’s hard to fathom why this is a choice at all.

Q.2 [11831809]

Which one of the following, if true, would best complement the passage's findings?

-
- 1 ☐ The present fund policy for pandemic prevention of the World Bank is updated and caters to the needs of the world.
-

2 ☐ Poor countries should be provided an equitable share of the resources and an opportunity to present their requirements.

3 ☐ The WHO's authority vis-à-vis public health has been unquestioned over the time.

4 ☐ Owing to the policy changes, in the year 2023, the WHO will function in a desired manner.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 2

 Answer key/Solution

2. 2 Refer to the sentence, "Instead, we recommend an inclusive, global public investment funding model that gives lower-income countries a seat at the table and disburses funds based on a country's needs and finances." Therefore, option (2) is correct.

Incorrect answers

Option (1) is incorrect because "A new fund for pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, approved by the board of the World Bank in June, is too new to evaluate properly. However, early signs indicate that it is based on an outdated 'donor-beneficiary' model"

Option (3) is incorrect because "The role of the WHO must also be considered. If it is to remain the coordinating authority for global health, member states must give it the authority ..." That means the WHO does not have complete authority.

Option (4) is incorrect because "However, these amendments are not scheduled to be accepted until May 2024, and changes won't come into force until even later. This creates a dangerous interim period, during which the WHO must be bold and sound the alarm should new threats arise." Therefore, 2023 is the interim period that may turn out to be dangerous.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Directions for questions 1 to 4: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 1

In the past two decades, the time between deadly international disease outbreaks has shortened, and the human and economic cost of these outbreaks has grown. . . . The next infectious-disease threat could be even more deadly and costly. Political leaders can choose to prevent it. . . . To stop the next health threat, heads of state and government must lead — nationally, and in solidarity. With some exceptions, the COVID-19 pandemic has been characterized by too many words and not enough action, despite its clear threat to global health, economies and security. The global COVID-19 summits have brought welcome funding announcements and leaders have spoken at WHO gatherings, but action has not been sustained. . . .

Global pandemic prevention is estimated to cost \$10.5 billion each year — a sizeable sum, but a fraction of the cost of not being prepared. A new fund for pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, approved by the board of the World Bank in June, is too new to evaluate properly. However, early signs indicate that it is based on an outdated ‘donor–beneficiary’ model, with high-income countries having too much influence and insufficient money being pledged. Instead, we recommend an inclusive, global public investment funding model that gives lower-income countries a seat at the table and disburses funds based on a country’s needs and finances.

The role of the WHO must also be considered. If it is to remain the coordinating authority for global health, member states must give it the authority, independence and funding to perform that role well. The WHO was too slow to declare a public-health emergency of international concern (PHEIC) when the SARS-CoV-2 virus emerged. Work is now underway to amend the international health regulations, which govern global responses to international public-health threats, to give the WHO clear authority to communicate freely on disease outbreaks, declare a PHEIC based on evidence and investigate without hindrance. However, these amendments are not scheduled to be accepted until May 2024, and changes won’t come into force until even later. This creates a dangerous interim period, during which the WHO must be bold and sound the alarm should new threats arise. The relative speed with which it called a PHEIC for the current monkeypox outbreak was encouraging, although some think it should have come sooner.

The area of reform that faces the most resistance, from industry and some countries, is the guarantee that appropriate medical countermeasures be available where they are most needed. Vaccines and therapeutics are a global common good — they are meant to slow the spread of disease and protect lives during a health emergency, not be a profit-making opportunity. Countermeasures should be equitably distributed on the basis of public-health need, and research and development must be tailored to the settings in which these products will need to operate — ‘ultra-cold chain’ vaccines, for example, cannot be easily delivered in warm, lower-income countries. . . .

These recommendations are not exhaustive. . . . Political leaders now have a clear choice: to watch while a new disease with pandemic potential emerges and spreads, or to lay the foundations required to thwart it. Given the damage done by COVID-19, it’s hard to fathom why this is a choice at all.

Q.3 [11831809]

Which one of the following best explains the author’s perception regarding the international response to any future global medical crisis?

-
- 1 ☐ An international camaraderie can prove to be the key in tackling a global medical catastrophe.
-

2 ☐ Future pandemics may not affect international economy thanks to the response of global leaders.

3 ☐ WHO congregations have proved to be more action oriented and not rhetoric centric.

4 ☐ Heads of states should take recourse to individual responses when it comes to tackling a global health problem in the future.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 1

 **Answer key/Solution**

3. 1 Refer to the sentence, “To stop the next health threat, heads of state and government must lead – nationally, and in solidarity.” Therefore, the author prefers solidarity or camaraderie.

Incorrect answers

Option (2) is incorrect because the author has mentioned that the Covid pandemic affected the economy. It has not been stated in the passage that future pandemics may not affect the economy. So, it is not the answer.

Option (3) is incorrect because it is the other way round. Refer to the sentence, “The global COVID-19 summits have brought welcome funding announcements and leaders have spoken at WHO gatherings, but action has not been sustained. . . .”

Option (4) is incorrect because as per the author, individual response cannot be the ideal course of action. Refer to the first paragraph.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Directions for questions 1 to 4: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 1

In the past two decades, the time between deadly international disease outbreaks has shortened, and the human and economic cost of these outbreaks has grown. . . . The next infectious-disease threat could be even more deadly and costly. Political leaders can choose to prevent it. . . . To stop the next health threat, heads of state and government must lead — nationally, and in solidarity. With some exceptions, the COVID-19 pandemic has been characterized by too many words and not enough action, despite its clear threat to global health, economies and security. The global COVID-19 summits have brought welcome funding announcements and leaders have spoken at WHO gatherings, but action has not been sustained. . . .

Global pandemic prevention is estimated to cost \$10.5 billion each year — a sizeable sum, but a fraction of the cost of not being prepared. A new fund for pandemic prevention, preparedness and response, approved by the board of the World Bank in June, is too new to evaluate properly. However, early signs indicate that it is based on an outdated ‘donor–beneficiary’ model, with high-income countries having too much influence and insufficient money being pledged. Instead, we recommend an inclusive, global public investment funding model that gives lower-income countries a seat at the table and disburses funds based on a country’s needs and finances.

The role of the WHO must also be considered. If it is to remain the coordinating authority for global health, member states must give it the authority, independence and funding to perform that role well. The WHO was too slow to declare a public-health emergency of international concern (PHEIC) when the SARS-CoV-2 virus emerged. Work is now underway to amend the international health regulations, which govern global responses to international public-health threats, to give the WHO clear authority to communicate freely on disease outbreaks, declare a PHEIC based on evidence and investigate without hindrance. However, these amendments are not scheduled to be accepted until May 2024, and changes won’t come into force until even later. This creates a dangerous interim period, during which the WHO must be bold and sound the alarm should new threats arise. The relative speed with which it called a PHEIC for the current monkeypox outbreak was encouraging, although some think it should have come sooner.

The area of reform that faces the most resistance, from industry and some countries, is the guarantee that appropriate medical countermeasures be available where they are most needed. Vaccines and therapeutics are a global common good — they are meant to slow the spread of disease and protect lives during a health emergency, not be a profit-making opportunity. Countermeasures should be equitably distributed on the basis of public-health need, and research and development must be tailored to the settings in which these products will need to operate — ‘ultra-cold chain’ vaccines, for example, cannot be easily delivered in warm, lower-income countries. . . .

These recommendations are not exhaustive. . . . Political leaders now have a clear choice: to watch while a new disease with pandemic potential emerges and spreads, or to lay the foundations required to thwart it. Given the damage done by COVID-19, it’s hard to fathom why this is a choice at all.

Q.4 [11831809]

All of the following arguments are made in the passage EXCEPT that:

-
- 1 ☐ Inoculation can check the spread of communicable diseases.
-

2 ☐ Some countries have proved themselves to be hindrances in ensuring suitable medical efforts when required.

3 ☐ Political leaders should take a backseat and let doctors spearhead the campaign against a future possible medical emergency.

4 ☐ Vaccines should not be sold for financial gain.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 3

 Answer key/Solution

4. 3 Option (3) is the answer. Refer to: "Political leaders now have a clear choice: to watch while a new disease with pandemic potential emerges and spreads, or to lay the foundations required to thwart it." Therefore, it can be clearly understood that the author is in favour of a positive and proactive political will. Option (3) is factually incorrect and therefore, it is the answer.

Incorrect answers

Option (1) is true as per the passage and therefore, it is not the answer. Refer to: "... Vaccines and therapeutics are a global common good – they are meant to slow the spread of disease"

Option (2) is true as per the passage and therefore, it is not the answer. Refer to: "The area of reform that faces the most resistance, from industry and some countries, is the guarantee that appropriate medical countermeasures be available where they are most needed."

Option (4) is true as per the passage and therefore, it is not the answer. Refer to: "... they are meant to slow the spread of disease and protect lives during a health emergency, not be a profit-making opportunity."

Bookmark

FeedBack

Directions for questions 5 to 8: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 2

In moral philosophy, nihilism is seen as the denial that morality exists. . . . Moral nihilism can be seen as a consequence of epistemological nihilism (Epistemological nihilism is a form of philosophical scepticism according to which knowledge does not exist, or, if it does exist, it is unattainable for human beings.) If there exist no grounds for making objective claims about knowledge and truth, then there exist no grounds for making objective claims about right and wrong. In other words, what we take to be morality is a matter of what is *believed* to be right – whether that belief is relative to each historical period, to each culture or to each individual – rather than a matter of what is right.

To claim that something is right has been done historically by basing these claims on a foundation such as God, or happiness, or reason. Because these foundations are seen as applying universally – as applying to all people, in all places, in all times – they are seen as necessary to make morality apply universally.

The 18th-century moral philosopher Immanuel Kant recognised the danger of grounding morality on God or on happiness as leading to moral scepticism. The belief in God can motivate people to act morally, but only as a means to the end of ending up in heaven rather than hell. The pursuit of happiness can motivate people to act morally, but we can't be certain in advance what action will result in making people happy. So, in response, Kant argued for a reason-based morality instead. According to him, if a universal foundation is what morality needs, then we should simply make decisions in accordance with the logic of universalisability. . . . Logic – rather than God or desire – can. . . tell us if any intended action is right (universalisable) or wrong (not universalisable).

There are, however, several problems with trying to base morality on reason. One such problem, as pointed out by Jacques Lacan in 'Kant with Sade' (1989), is that using universalisability as the criterion of right and wrong can let clever people justify some seemingly horrific actions if they can manage to show that those actions can actually pass Kant's logic test. Another problem, as pointed out by John Stuart Mill in *Utilitarianism* (1861), is that humans are rational, but rationality is not all that we have, and so following Kantian morality forces us to live like uncaring robots rather than like people.

Yet another problem, as pointed out by [Friedrich] Nietzsche, is that reason might not be what Kant claimed it to be, as it is quite possible that reason is no firmer a foundation than is God or happiness. In *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), Nietzsche argued that reason is not something absolute and universal but rather something that has evolved over time into part of human life. In much the same way that mice in a lab experiment can be taught to be rational, so too have we learned to become rational thanks to centuries of moral, religious and political 'experiments' in training people to be rational. Reason should not be seen therefore as a firm foundation for morality since its own foundations can be called into question.

Q.5 [11831809]

The central theme of the passage is about

-
- 1 ☐ morality basing itself off Rationality.
-
- 2 ☐ providing a perspective of the development of morality across time.
-
- 3 ☐ arrival of nihilism through negation of the certainty of Morality.
-

4 ☐ dissecting the Kantian tradition of substituting logic in place of theology.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 3

Correct Answer: 3

The passage begins with nihilism as the denial that morality exists. Then on the passage looks at the various attempts of grounding morality and their subsequent negations. Thus 3 is the correct answer.

Incorrect Answers:

(1) is incorrect since it is something which Kant bases and not the passage. It is used as an example in the passage.

(2) is incorrect since the passage is concerned with the arrival of nihilism and not Morality. The passage discusses morality so as to negate the developments.

(4) is incorrect since it goes beyond the scope of the passage.

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Directions for questions 5 to 8: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 2

In moral philosophy, nihilism is seen as the denial that morality exists. . . . Moral nihilism can be seen as a consequence of epistemological nihilism (Epistemological nihilism is a form of philosophical scepticism according to which knowledge does not exist, or, if it does exist, it is unattainable for human beings.) If there exist no grounds for making objective claims about knowledge and truth, then there exist no grounds for making objective claims about right and wrong. In other words, what we take to be morality is a matter of what is *believed* to be right – whether that belief is relative to each historical period, to each culture or to each individual – rather than a matter of what is right.

To claim that something is right has been done historically by basing these claims on a foundation such as God, or happiness, or reason. Because these foundations are seen as applying universally – as applying to all people, in all places, in all times – they are seen as necessary to make morality apply universally.

The 18th-century moral philosopher Immanuel Kant recognised the danger of grounding morality on God or on happiness as leading to moral scepticism. The belief in God can motivate people to act morally, but only as a means to the end of ending up in heaven rather than hell. The pursuit of happiness can motivate people to act morally, but we can't be certain in advance what action will result in making people happy. So, in response, Kant argued for a reason-based morality instead. According to him, if a universal foundation is what morality needs, then we should simply make decisions in accordance with the logic of universalisability. . . . Logic – rather than God or desire – can. . . tell us if any intended action is right (universalisable) or wrong (not universalisable).

There are, however, several problems with trying to base morality on reason. One such problem, as pointed out by Jacques Lacan in 'Kant with Sade' (1989), is that using universalisability as the criterion of right and wrong can let clever people justify some seemingly horrific actions if they can manage to show that those actions can actually pass Kant's logic test. Another problem, as pointed out by John Stuart Mill in *Utilitarianism* (1861), is that humans are rational, but rationality is not all that we have, and so following Kantian morality forces us to live like uncaring robots rather than like people.

Yet another problem, as pointed out by [Friedrich] Nietzsche, is that reason might not be what Kant claimed it to be, as it is quite possible that reason is no firmer a foundation than is God or happiness. In *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), Nietzsche argued that reason is not something absolute and universal but rather something that has evolved over time into part of human life. In much the same way that mice in a lab experiment can be taught to be rational, so too have we learned to become rational thanks to centuries of moral, religious and political 'experiments' in training people to be rational. Reason should not be seen therefore as a firm foundation for morality since its own foundations can be called into question.

Q.6 [11831809]

Kant would support none of the following statements about morality except:

1 ☐ The general positive applicability of an action across space-time is a desired moral action.

2 ☐ The happiness provided in Heaven is a cardinal motivator in our society towards driving individuals in correct moral direction.

3 ☐ People generally tend to be correct in their actions as the importance of being correct has been trained into them.

4 ☐ The question of approaching morality through reason is complicated by the human's entrapment through desire.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 1

 Answer key/Solution

Correct Answer: 1

In the passage it is stated that, 'According to him, if a universal foundation is what morality needs, then we should simply make decisions in accordance with the logic of universalisability. . . . Logic – rather than God or desire – can. . . tell us if any intended action is right (universalisable) or wrong (not universalisable).' Generalising across time and space is what being universal is.

Incorrect Answers:

(2) Kant actually argues opposite. He states that, 'The belief in God can motivate people to act morally, but only as a means to the end of ending up in heaven rather than hell.'

(3) This is not stated anywhere in the passage. It confuses Nietzsche's assertions as presented in the passage.

(4) This option is something that Mill may accept since he states that, 'humans are rational, but rationality is not all that we have'.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Directions for questions 5 to 8: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 2

In moral philosophy, nihilism is seen as the denial that morality exists. . . . Moral nihilism can be seen as a consequence of epistemological nihilism (Epistemological nihilism is a form of philosophical scepticism according to which knowledge does not exist, or, if it does exist, it is unattainable for human beings.) If there exist no grounds for making objective claims about knowledge and truth, then there exist no grounds for making objective claims about right and wrong. In other words, what we take to be morality is a matter of what is *believed* to be right – whether that belief is relative to each historical period, to each culture or to each individual – rather than a matter of what is right.

To claim that something is right has been done historically by basing these claims on a foundation such as God, or happiness, or reason. Because these foundations are seen as applying universally – as applying to all people, in all places, in all times – they are seen as necessary to make morality apply universally.

The 18th-century moral philosopher Immanuel Kant recognised the danger of grounding morality on God or on happiness as leading to moral scepticism. The belief in God can motivate people to act morally, but only as a means to the end of ending up in heaven rather than hell. The pursuit of happiness can motivate people to act morally, but we can't be certain in advance what action will result in making people happy. So, in response, Kant argued for a reason-based morality instead. According to him, if a universal foundation is what morality needs, then we should simply make decisions in accordance with the logic of universalisability. . . . Logic – rather than God or desire – can. . . tell us if any intended action is right (universalisable) or wrong (not universalisable).

There are, however, several problems with trying to base morality on reason. One such problem, as pointed out by Jacques Lacan in 'Kant with Sade' (1989), is that using universalisability as the criterion of right and wrong can let clever people justify some seemingly horrific actions if they can manage to show that those actions can actually pass Kant's logic test. Another problem, as pointed out by John Stuart Mill in *Utilitarianism* (1861), is that humans are rational, but rationality is not all that we have, and so following Kantian morality forces us to live like uncaring robots rather than like people.

Yet another problem, as pointed out by [Friedrich] Nietzsche, is that reason might not be what Kant claimed it to be, as it is quite possible that reason is no firmer a foundation than is God or happiness. In *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), Nietzsche argued that reason is not something absolute and universal but rather something that has evolved over time into part of human life. In much the same way that mice in a lab experiment can be taught to be rational, so too have we learned to become rational thanks to centuries of moral, religious and political 'experiments' in training people to be rational. Reason should not be seen therefore as a firm foundation for morality since its own foundations can be called into question.

Q.7 [11831809]

Nietzsche implies that:

-
- 1 ☐ Divinity is a social contract entered between mankind and rationality.
-
- 2 ☐ Rationalism has been created rather than evolved universally.
-
- 3 ☐ Reason as a foundation is akin to the arrival of Divinity.
-

4 ☐ Animals can become rational overtime.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 2

Correct Answer: 2

In the passage it is stated that according to Nietzsche, 'In much the same way that mice in a lab experiment can be taught to be rational, so too have we learned to become rational thanks to centuries of moral, religious and political 'experiments' in training people to be rational.' Thus, 2 is the correct answer.

Incorrect Answers:

The other options go beyond the scope of the passage.

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Directions for questions 5 to 8: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 2

In moral philosophy, nihilism is seen as the denial that morality exists. . . . Moral nihilism can be seen as a consequence of epistemological nihilism (Epistemological nihilism is a form of philosophical scepticism according to which knowledge does not exist, or, if it does exist, it is unattainable for human beings.) If there exist no grounds for making objective claims about knowledge and truth, then there exist no grounds for making objective claims about right and wrong. In other words, what we take to be morality is a matter of what is *believed* to be right – whether that belief is relative to each historical period, to each culture or to each individual – rather than a matter of what is right.

To claim that something is right has been done historically by basing these claims on a foundation such as God, or happiness, or reason. Because these foundations are seen as applying universally – as applying to all people, in all places, in all times – they are seen as necessary to make morality apply universally.

The 18th-century moral philosopher Immanuel Kant recognised the danger of grounding morality on God or on happiness as leading to moral scepticism. The belief in God can motivate people to act morally, but only as a means to the end of ending up in heaven rather than hell. The pursuit of happiness can motivate people to act morally, but we can't be certain in advance what action will result in making people happy. So, in response, Kant argued for a reason-based morality instead. According to him, if a universal foundation is what morality needs, then we should simply make decisions in accordance with the logic of universalisability. . . . Logic – rather than God or desire – can. . . tell us if any intended action is right (universalisable) or wrong (not universalisable).

There are, however, several problems with trying to base morality on reason. One such problem, as pointed out by Jacques Lacan in 'Kant with Sade' (1989), is that using universalisability as the criterion of right and wrong can let clever people justify some seemingly horrific actions if they can manage to show that those actions can actually pass Kant's logic test. Another problem, as pointed out by John Stuart Mill in *Utilitarianism* (1861), is that humans are rational, but rationality is not all that we have, and so following Kantian morality forces us to live like uncaring robots rather than like people.

Yet another problem, as pointed out by [Friedrich] Nietzsche, is that reason might not be what Kant claimed it to be, as it is quite possible that reason is no firmer a foundation than is God or happiness. In *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), Nietzsche argued that reason is not something absolute and universal but rather something that has evolved over time into part of human life. In much the same way that mice in a lab experiment can be taught to be rational, so too have we learned to become rational thanks to centuries of moral, religious and political 'experiments' in training people to be rational. Reason should not be seen therefore as a firm foundation for morality since its own foundations can be called into question.

Q.8 [11831809]

From the passage, we can infer that Lacan is not in favour of:

-
- 1 ☐ Distancing the significance of morality from rationalism.
-
- 2 ☐ Using logic as a base for understanding criminal psychology.
-
- 3 ☐ Using Kant's views on morality in interpreting the importance of Sade.
-

4 ☐ Moral justifications through logic since logic can be subverted.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 4

Correct Answer: 4

In the passage it is mentioned that, 'that using universalisability as the criterion of right and wrong can let clever people justify some seemingly horrific actions if they can manage to show that those actions can actually pass Kant's logic test.' Thus logic can be twisted accordingly. This makes 4 the correct choice.

Incorrect Answers:

(1) he is very much in favour of distancing the two. Thus this is an incorrect option.

(2) and (3) go beyond the scope of the given passage.

 Answer key/Solution

Bookmark

FeedBack

Directions for questions 9 to 12: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 3

When future generations of Indian school-children read history, they will be made to memorize two important dates from the 20th century — 1947 and 1991. The importance of the first is obvious. It was the year when India gained independence from Britain, a colonial power that had dominated the country since the 18th century. . . . What of 1991? It was the year that India decided to liberalize its economy, but can it be said to be a turning point comparable to 1947? For almost half a century, the country had been held down by self-imposed constraints that had hampered economic development and stunted its international stature. Liberalization has clearly unleashed the country's economic potential. However, the shift in 1991 was not just about changing economic policies but about gaining freedom from a cultural attitude embodied in the old inward-looking economic regime. . . .

India has a long and proud history. However, during its "golden age" prior to the 11th century, it was a country that encouraged innovation and change. Indian society celebrated its risk-takers. It was open to foreign trade, ideas and immigrants. Foreign students flocked to its universities even as foreign merchants flocked to its ports. Yet a change in cultural attitudes by the 11th century created a fossilized society obsessed with regulating all aspects of life according to fixed rules. Not surprisingly, this discouraged the spirit of innovation and led to a long and painful decline. India fell behind not just as an economy but as a civilization.

The year 1991 marks the turning point when India was forced to open itself out to the world. The "opening" was not limited to the economy but to all aspects of life, and the process was sped up by the fact that it coincided with the communications revolution — cable television, mobile telephones, and the internet. . . . Of course, the process of change did not begin suddenly in 1991. It has its roots in early 19th-century Bengal. Thanks to Raja Ram Mohan Roy and his fellow reformers, the country witnessed important social reforms as well as the introduction of the English language. The process gradually spread through the country till the middle of the 20th century. Independence from colonization should have accelerated the process, but unfortunately, it led to a reversion to isolationism. Instead of catching up with the world, the country fell even further behind.

It was only with the opening of India in the 1990s that it has seen a renaissance both as an economy and as a civilization. The efforts of the 19th-century reformers had prepared India for the flood of ideas. Moreover, the country also now had a large and successful global diaspora that provided the country with international linkages that it had not enjoyed since the days of the ancient spice trade. Within a few years, there was a major shift in India's cultural attitude to change. In this sense, the year 1991 has the same importance in Indian history as the Meiji Restoration in Japanese history. This year witnessed that instead of whining about the rest of the world, Indians began to believe in themselves again.

Q.9 [11831809]

With which of the following would the author agree the most?

-
- 1 ☐ The 11th century brought an end to India's cultural ties with the rest of the world.
-
- 2 ☐ Colonization led to the fossilization of India's economic and cultural interactions with foreigners.
-
- 3 ☐ It was only in the 1990s since the ancient times that India had opened up to the world.
-

4 ☐ None of the ones listed here

Solution:

Correct Answer : 4

Correct answer: 4

Solution:

Option 1: It is factually incorrect as India sharing 'cultural' ties with foreigners prior to the 11th century has not been mentioned in the passage.

Option 2: It is factually incorrect. Refer to these lines of the passage: 'Yet a change in cultural attitudes by the 11th century created a fossilized society obsessed with regulating all aspects of life according to fixed rules.'

Option 3: It is factually incorrect as India shared economic ties with the rest of world during the 'golden era'.

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Directions for questions 9 to 12: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 3

When future generations of Indian school-children read history, they will be made to memorize two important dates from the 20th century – 1947 and 1991. The importance of the first is obvious. It was the year when India gained independence from Britain, a colonial power that had dominated the country since the 18th century. . . . What of 1991? It was the year that India decided to liberalize its economy, but can it be said to be a turning point comparable to 1947? For almost half a century, the country had been held down by self-imposed constraints that had hampered economic development and stunted its international stature. Liberalization has clearly unleashed the country's economic potential. However, the shift in 1991 was not just about changing economic policies but about gaining freedom from a cultural attitude embodied in the old inward-looking economic regime. . . .

India has a long and proud history. However, during its "golden age" prior to the 11th century, it was a country that encouraged innovation and change. Indian society celebrated its risk-takers. It was open to foreign trade, ideas and immigrants. Foreign students flocked to its universities even as foreign merchants flocked to its ports. Yet a change in cultural attitudes by the 11th century created a fossilized society obsessed with regulating all aspects of life according to fixed rules. Not surprisingly, this discouraged the spirit of innovation and led to a long and painful decline. India fell behind not just as an economy but as a civilization.

The year 1991 marks the turning point when India was forced to open itself out to the world. The "opening" was not limited to the economy but to all aspects of life, and the process was sped up by the fact that it coincided with the communications revolution – cable television, mobile telephones, and the internet. . . . Of course, the process of change did not begin suddenly in 1991. It has its roots in early 19th-century Bengal. Thanks to Raja Ram Mohan Roy and his fellow reformers, the country witnessed important social reforms as well as the introduction of the English language. The process gradually spread through the country till the middle of the 20th century. Independence from colonization should have accelerated the process, but unfortunately, it led to a reversion to isolationism. Instead of catching up with the world, the country fell even further behind.

It was only with the opening of India in the 1990s that it has seen a renaissance both as an economy and as a civilization. The efforts of the 19th-century reformers had prepared India for the flood of ideas. Moreover, the country also now had a large and successful global diaspora that provided the country with international linkages that it had not enjoyed since the days of the ancient spice trade. Within a few years, there was a major shift in India's cultural attitude to change. In this sense, the year 1991 has the same importance in Indian history as the Meiji Restoration in Japanese history. This year witnessed that instead of whining about the rest of the world, Indians began to believe in themselves again.

Q.10 [11831809]

Which of the following was true about the 'golden age' of India?

-
- 1 ☐ It witnessed assimilation of foreign culture into Indian consciousness through immigrants, foreign students and spice trade.
-
- 2 ☐ It saw the introduction of innovation and risk-taking attitude in the economic and cultural spheres of Indian states.
-

3 ☐ It ushered India to economic and intellectual supremacy over the rest of the world through its trade and educational institutions.

4 ☐ It predated a period of cultural and intellectual lethargy in the minds of Indians, possibly including the then existing Indian Diaspora.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 4

Correct answer: 4

Solution:

 Answer key/Solution

Option 4: It can be inferred from these lines of the passage: 'India has a long and proud history. However, during its "golden age" prior to the 11th century, it was a country that encouraged innovation and change. Indian society celebrated its risk-takers. It was open to foreign trade, ideas and immigrants. Foreign students flocked to its universities even as foreign merchants flocked to its ports. Yet a change in cultural attitudes by the 11th century created a fossilized society obsessed with regulating all aspects of life according to fixed rules. Not surprisingly, this discouraged the spirit of innovation and led to a long and painful decline. India fell behind not just as an economy but as a civilization.'

Incorrect options:

Option 1: 'Assimilation of foreign culture into Indian society' has not been mentioned at any point in the passage.

Option 2: 'Introduction' of innovation and risk-taking attitude has not been mentioned in the passage.

Option 3: 'India's supremacy over the rest of the world' has not been mentioned in the passage.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Directions for questions 9 to 12: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 3

When future generations of Indian school-children read history, they will be made to memorize two important dates from the 20th century – 1947 and 1991. The importance of the first is obvious. It was the year when India gained independence from Britain, a colonial power that had dominated the country since the 18th century. . . . What of 1991? It was the year that India decided to liberalize its economy, but can it be said to be a turning point comparable to 1947? For almost half a century, the country had been held down by self-imposed constraints that had hampered economic development and stunted its international stature. Liberalization has clearly unleashed the country's economic potential. However, the shift in 1991 was not just about changing economic policies but about gaining freedom from a cultural attitude embodied in the old inward-looking economic regime. . . .

India has a long and proud history. However, during its "golden age" prior to the 11th century, it was a country that encouraged innovation and change. Indian society celebrated its risk-takers. It was open to foreign trade, ideas and immigrants. Foreign students flocked to its universities even as foreign merchants flocked to its ports. Yet a change in cultural attitudes by the 11th century created a fossilized society obsessed with regulating all aspects of life according to fixed rules. Not surprisingly, this discouraged the spirit of innovation and led to a long and painful decline. India fell behind not just as an economy but as a civilization.

The year 1991 marks the turning point when India was forced to open itself out to the world. The "opening" was not limited to the economy but to all aspects of life, and the process was sped up by the fact that it coincided with the communications revolution – cable television, mobile telephones, and the internet. . . . Of course, the process of change did not begin suddenly in 1991. It has its roots in early 19th-century Bengal. Thanks to Raja Ram Mohan Roy and his fellow reformers, the country witnessed important social reforms as well as the introduction of the English language. The process gradually spread through the country till the middle of the 20th century. Independence from colonization should have accelerated the process, but unfortunately, it led to a reversion to isolationism. Instead of catching up with the world, the country fell even further behind.

It was only with the opening of India in the 1990s that it has seen a renaissance both as an economy and as a civilization. The efforts of the 19th-century reformers had prepared India for the flood of ideas. Moreover, the country also now had a large and successful global diaspora that provided the country with international linkages that it had not enjoyed since the days of the ancient spice trade. Within a few years, there was a major shift in India's cultural attitude to change. In this sense, the year 1991 has the same importance in Indian history as the Meiji Restoration in Japanese history. This year witnessed that instead of whining about the rest of the world, Indians began to believe in themselves again.

Q.11 [11831809]

In light of the passage, which one of the following interpretations of 'the old inward-looking economic regime' is the most accurate?

1 ☐ The range of economic policies that existed in the independent India and curtailed foreign participation in the Indian economy.

2 ☐ The range of economic policies that existed in the independent India and endorsed harmonious international trade.

3 ☐ The range of economic policies that existed in the colonized India and curtailed foreign participation.

4 ☐ The range of economic policies that existed in the independent India and incentivized domestic production of commodities.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 1

Correct answer: 1

Solution:

The correct implication of 'the inward-looking economic regime' can be deduced from the key point of these lines of the passage: 'What of 1991? It was the year that India decided to liberalize its economy, but can it be said to be a turning point comparable to 1947? For almost half a century, the country had been held down by self-imposed constraints that had hampered economic development and stunted its international stature. Liberalization has clearly unleashed the country's economic potential. However, the shift in 1991 was not just about changing economic policies but about gaining freedom from a cultural attitude embodied in the old inward-looking economic regime'

The inward-looking economic regime hampered trade with foreign entities. Thus, option A is the correct answer. It also implies that option 2 is incorrect.

Incorrect answers:

As per the concerning lines, the inward-looking economic regime came into existence after the independence of India. Therefore, option 3 is incorrect.

Nowhere in the passage have the 'incentives for domestic industries' been mentioned. Thus, option 4 is incorrect.

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Directions for questions 9 to 12: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 3

When future generations of Indian school-children read history, they will be made to memorize two important dates from the 20th century — 1947 and 1991. The importance of the first is obvious. It was the year when India gained independence from Britain, a colonial power that had dominated the country since the 18th century. . . . What of 1991? It was the year that India decided to liberalize its economy, but can it be said to be a turning point comparable to 1947? For almost half a century, the country had been held down by self-imposed constraints that had hampered economic development and stunted its international stature. Liberalization has clearly unleashed the country's economic potential. However, the shift in 1991 was not just about changing economic policies but about gaining freedom from a cultural attitude embodied in the old inward-looking economic regime. . . .

India has a long and proud history. However, during its "golden age" prior to the 11th century, it was a country that encouraged innovation and change. Indian society celebrated its risk-takers. It was open to foreign trade, ideas and immigrants. Foreign students flocked to its universities even as foreign merchants flocked to its ports. Yet a change in cultural attitudes by the 11th century created a fossilized society obsessed with regulating all aspects of life according to fixed rules. Not surprisingly, this discouraged the spirit of innovation and led to a long and painful decline. India fell behind not just as an economy but as a civilization.

The year 1991 marks the turning point when India was forced to open itself out to the world. The "opening" was not limited to the economy but to all aspects of life, and the process was sped up by the fact that it coincided with the communications revolution — cable television, mobile telephones, and the internet. . . . Of course, the process of change did not begin suddenly in 1991. It has its roots in early 19th-century Bengal. Thanks to Raja Ram Mohan Roy and his fellow reformers, the country witnessed important social reforms as well as the introduction of the English language. The process gradually spread through the country till the middle of the 20th century. Independence from colonization should have accelerated the process, but unfortunately, it led to a reversion to isolationism. Instead of catching up with the world, the country fell even further behind.

It was only with the opening of India in the 1990s that it has seen a renaissance both as an economy and as a civilization. The efforts of the 19th-century reformers had prepared India for the flood of ideas. Moreover, the country also now had a large and successful global diaspora that provided the country with international linkages that it had not enjoyed since the days of the ancient spice trade. Within a few years, there was a major shift in India's cultural attitude to change. In this sense, the year 1991 has the same importance in Indian history as the Meiji Restoration in Japanese history. This year witnessed that instead of whining about the rest of the world, Indians began to believe in themselves again.

Q.12 [11831809]

Which of the following can be inferred about the Meiji Restoration?

-
- 1 ☐ The Meiji Restoration must have put back the long lost glory of Japanese conquerors.
-
- 2 ☐ The Meiji Restoration must have reinstated the lost Japanese imperial wealth.
-
- 3 ☐ The Meiji Restoration must have reinstated the lost Japanese cultural intellect and heritage.
-

4 ○ The Meiji Restoration must have revived the lost Japanese outlook towards foreign world.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 4

Correct answer: 4

Solution:

The answer to this question can be found in the last three statements of the passage: 'Moreover, the country also now had a large and successful global diaspora that provided the country with international linkages that it had not enjoyed since the days of the ancient spice trade. Within a few years, there was a major shift in India's cultural attitude to change. In this sense, the year 1991 has the same importance in Indian history as the Meiji Restoration in Japanese history. This year witnessed that instead of whining about the rest of the world, Indians began to believe in themselves again'.

Only option 4 reflects the intended implication of the author.

Incorrect options:

Option 1: 'Conquerors' lie outside the scope of the passage.

Option 2: 'Imperial wealth' lies outside the scope of the passage

Option 3: 'Cultural intellect and heritage' lie outside the context of the passage.

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Directions for questions 13 to 16: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 4

Capital punishment has long engendered considerable debate about both its morality and its effect on criminal behaviour. Contemporary arguments for and against capital punishment fall under three general headings: moral, utilitarian, and practical.

Supporters of the death penalty believe that those who commit murder because they have taken the life of another, have forfeited their own right to life. Furthermore, they believe, capital punishment is a just form of retribution, expressing and reinforcing the moral indignation not only of the victim's relatives but of law-abiding citizens in general. By contrast, opponents of capital punishment, following the writings of Cesare Beccaria (in particular *On Crimes and Punishments* [1764]), argue that, by legitimizing the very behaviour that the law seeks to repress—killing—capital punishment is counterproductive in the moral message it conveys. Moreover, they urge, when it is used for lesser crimes, capital punishment is immoral because it is wholly disproportionate to the harm done. Abolitionists also claim that capital punishment violates the condemned person's right to life and is fundamentally inhuman and degrading.

Although death was prescribed for crimes in many sacred religious documents and historically was practiced widely with the support of religious hierarchies, today there is no agreement among religious faiths, or among denominations or sects within them, on the morality of capital punishment. Beginning in the last half of the 20th century, increasing numbers of religious leaders—particularly within Judaism and Roman Catholicism—campaign against it. Capital punishment was abolished by the state of Israel for all offenses except treason and crimes against humanity, and Pope John Paul II condemned it as “cruel and unnecessary.”

Supporters of capital punishment also claim that it has a uniquely potent deterrent effect on potentially violent offenders for whom the threat of imprisonment is not a sufficient restraint. Opponents, however, point to research that generally has demonstrated that the death penalty is not a more effective deterrent than the alternative sanction of life or long-term imprisonment.

There also are disputes about whether capital punishment can be administered in a manner consistent with justice. Those who support capital punishment believe that it is possible to fashion laws and procedures that ensure that only those who are really deserving of death are executed. By contrast, opponents maintain that the historical application of capital punishment shows that any attempt to single out certain kinds of crime as deserving of death will inevitably be arbitrary and discriminatory. They also point to other factors that they think preclude the possibility that capital punishment can be fairly applied, arguing that the poor and ethnic and religious minorities often do not have access to good legal assistance, that racial prejudice motivates predominantly white juries in capital cases to convict black and other nonwhite defendants in disproportionate numbers, and that, because errors are inevitable even in a well-run criminal justice system, some people will be executed for crimes they did not commit. Finally, they argue that, because the appeals process for death sentences is protracted, those condemned to death are often cruelly forced to endure long periods of uncertainty about their fate.

Q.13 [11831809]

All of the following statements may be considered valid inferences from the passage EXCEPT:

-
- 1 ☐ The abolitionists are likely to argue that when we deliberately and decide the purposeful extinguishing of human life under law, we essentially degrade it.
-

2 ☐ The human race has a history of condemning people to death and these condemnations have, at times, been enforced with the aid of religious hierarchies.

3 ☐ Even though the various religions and the denominations within them vary on the reasoning, they are all consistent in their denouncement of capital punishment.

4 ☐ None of the above

Solution:

Correct Answer : 3

Correct Answer: 3

The passage simply states that “.....today there is no agreement among religious faiths, or among denominations or sects within them, on the morality of capital punishment.” Thus, we cannot draw any inferences about whether they support or denounce capital punishment.

Incorrect Answers:

1 – Can be inferred from: “by legitimizing the very behaviour that the law seeks to repress—killing—capital punishment is counterproductive in the moral message it conveys.” Also, “Abolitionists also claim that capital punishment violates the condemned person’s right to life and is fundamentally inhuman and degrading.”

2 –Can be inferred from: “Although death was prescribed for crimes in many sacred religious documents and historically was practiced widely with the support of religious hierarchies...”

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Directions for questions 13 to 16: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 4

Capital punishment has long engendered considerable debate about both its morality and its effect on criminal behaviour. Contemporary arguments for and against capital punishment fall under three general headings: moral, utilitarian, and practical.

Supporters of the death penalty believe that those who commit murder because they have taken the life of another, have forfeited their own right to life. Furthermore, they believe, capital punishment is a just form of retribution, expressing and reinforcing the moral indignation not only of the victim's relatives but of law-abiding citizens in general. By contrast, opponents of capital punishment, following the writings of Cesare Beccaria (in particular *On Crimes and Punishments* [1764]), argue that, by legitimizing the very behaviour that the law seeks to repress—killing—capital punishment is counterproductive in the moral message it conveys. Moreover, they urge, when it is used for lesser crimes, capital punishment is immoral because it is wholly disproportionate to the harm done. Abolitionists also claim that capital punishment violates the condemned person's right to life and is fundamentally inhuman and degrading.

Although death was prescribed for crimes in many sacred religious documents and historically was practiced widely with the support of religious hierarchies, today there is no agreement among religious faiths, or among denominations or sects within them, on the morality of capital punishment. Beginning in the last half of the 20th century, increasing numbers of religious leaders—particularly within Judaism and Roman Catholicism—campaign against it. Capital punishment was abolished by the state of Israel for all offenses except treason and crimes against humanity, and Pope John Paul II condemned it as “cruel and unnecessary.”

Supporters of capital punishment also claim that it has a uniquely potent deterrent effect on potentially violent offenders for whom the threat of imprisonment is not a sufficient restraint. Opponents, however, point to research that generally has demonstrated that the death penalty is not a more effective deterrent than the alternative sanction of life or long-term imprisonment.

There also are disputes about whether capital punishment can be administered in a manner consistent with justice. Those who support capital punishment believe that it is possible to fashion laws and procedures that ensure that only those who are really deserving of death are executed. By contrast, opponents maintain that the historical application of capital punishment shows that any attempt to single out certain kinds of crime as deserving of death will inevitably be arbitrary and discriminatory. They also point to other factors that they think preclude the possibility that capital punishment can be fairly applied, arguing that the poor and ethnic and religious minorities often do not have access to good legal assistance, that racial prejudice motivates predominantly white juries in capital cases to convict black and other nonwhite defendants in disproportionate numbers, and that, because errors are inevitable even in a well-run criminal justice system, some people will be executed for crimes they did not commit. Finally, they argue that, because the appeals process for death sentences is protracted, those condemned to death are often cruelly forced to endure long periods of uncertainty about their fate.

Q.14 [11831809]

The debate on capital punishment is structured around all the following aspects EXCEPT:

-
- 1 ☐ The humaneness of the various manners in which capital punishment is administered.
-

2 ☐ Can the practical aspects of justice be upheld in the implementation of capital punishment?

3 ☐ Whether capital punishment acts as an effective deterrent to violent crimes.

4 ☐ The morality of taking away someone's right to life by condemning them to death.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 1

 Answer key/Solution

Correct Answer: 1

Nowhere does the passage mention the humaneness of the manners in which capital punishment is administered as a point of discord between those who support the death penalty versus those who are opposed to it. This makes (1) the correct answer.

Incorrect Answers:

2 – This is the aspect of practicality that the arguments are centered around.

3 – This is the utilitarian aspect that the arguments are centered around.

4 – This is the moral aspect of the debate.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Directions for questions 13 to 16: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 4

Capital punishment has long engendered considerable debate about both its morality and its effect on criminal behaviour. Contemporary arguments for and against capital punishment fall under three general headings: moral, utilitarian, and practical.

Supporters of the death penalty believe that those who commit murder because they have taken the life of another, have forfeited their own right to life. Furthermore, they believe, capital punishment is a just form of retribution, expressing and reinforcing the moral indignation not only of the victim's relatives but of law-abiding citizens in general. By contrast, opponents of capital punishment, following the writings of Cesare Beccaria (in particular *On Crimes and Punishments* [1764]), argue that, by legitimizing the very behaviour that the law seeks to repress—killing—capital punishment is counterproductive in the moral message it conveys. Moreover, they urge, when it is used for lesser crimes, capital punishment is immoral because it is wholly disproportionate to the harm done. Abolitionists also claim that capital punishment violates the condemned person's right to life and is fundamentally inhuman and degrading.

Although death was prescribed for crimes in many sacred religious documents and historically was practiced widely with the support of religious hierarchies, today there is no agreement among religious faiths, or among denominations or sects within them, on the morality of capital punishment. Beginning in the last half of the 20th century, increasing numbers of religious leaders—particularly within Judaism and Roman Catholicism—campaign against it. Capital punishment was abolished by the state of Israel for all offenses except treason and crimes against humanity, and Pope John Paul II condemned it as “cruel and unnecessary.”

Supporters of capital punishment also claim that it has a uniquely potent deterrent effect on potentially violent offenders for whom the threat of imprisonment is not a sufficient restraint. Opponents, however, point to research that generally has demonstrated that the death penalty is not a more effective deterrent than the alternative sanction of life or long-term imprisonment.

There also are disputes about whether capital punishment can be administered in a manner consistent with justice. Those who support capital punishment believe that it is possible to fashion laws and procedures that ensure that only those who are really deserving of death are executed. By contrast, opponents maintain that the historical application of capital punishment shows that any attempt to single out certain kinds of crime as deserving of death will inevitably be arbitrary and discriminatory. They also point to other factors that they think preclude the possibility that capital punishment can be fairly applied, arguing that the poor and ethnic and religious minorities often do not have access to good legal assistance, that racial prejudice motivates predominantly white juries in capital cases to convict black and other nonwhite defendants in disproportionate numbers, and that, because errors are inevitable even in a well-run criminal justice system, some people will be executed for crimes they did not commit. Finally, they argue that, because the appeals process for death sentences is protracted, those condemned to death are often cruelly forced to endure long periods of uncertainty about their fate.

Q.15 [11831809]

All of the following, if true, can support the views of those opposing capital punishment on the principles of justice EXCEPT:

1 ☐ According to research; in USA, 35% of people sentenced to capital punishment in the last 40 years have been Black, despite the fact that Black Americans only make up 13% of the general population.

2 ☐ In many countries, capital punishment is not administered immediately after it is imposed; there is often a long period of uncertainty for the convicted while the cases are appealed.

3 ☐ Because of the number of botched executions, capital punishment is considerably inhumane because the condemned takes a long time to die which causes severe suffering.

4 ☐ In countries like Iran people can receive capital punishment for crimes like extramarital affairs, spreading corruption on earth, and protesting vehemently against the government.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 3

Correct Answer: 3

Those who argue against capital punishment from the perspective of justice do so on grounds of

it being discriminatory, prejudiced against the poor and cruel as it leaves someone's fate undecided for a long time. The element of botched executions and the suffering caused by them has not been addressed in the passage.

Incorrect Answers:

1 – Refer: “.... that racial prejudice motivates predominantly white juries in capital cases to convict black and other nonwhite defendants in disproportionate numbers...”

2 – Refer: “Finally, they argue that, because the appeals process for death sentences is protracted, those condemned to death are often cruelly forced to endure long periods of uncertainty about their fate.”

4 – Refer: “.... historical application of capital punishment shows that any attempt to single out certain kinds of crime as deserving of death will inevitably be arbitrary and discriminatory.”

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Directions for questions 13 to 16: Study the following information and answer the questions that follow:

Passage 4

Capital punishment has long engendered considerable debate about both its morality and its effect on criminal behaviour. Contemporary arguments for and against capital punishment fall under three general headings: moral, utilitarian, and practical.

Supporters of the death penalty believe that those who commit murder because they have taken the life of another, have forfeited their own right to life. Furthermore, they believe, capital punishment is a just form of retribution, expressing and reinforcing the moral indignation not only of the victim's relatives but of law-abiding citizens in general. By contrast, opponents of capital punishment, following the writings of Cesare Beccaria (in particular *On Crimes and Punishments* [1764]), argue that, by legitimizing the very behaviour that the law seeks to repress—killing—capital punishment is counterproductive in the moral message it conveys. Moreover, they urge, when it is used for lesser crimes, capital punishment is immoral because it is wholly disproportionate to the harm done. Abolitionists also claim that capital punishment violates the condemned person's right to life and is fundamentally inhuman and degrading.

Although death was prescribed for crimes in many sacred religious documents and historically was practiced widely with the support of religious hierarchies, today there is no agreement among religious faiths, or among denominations or sects within them, on the morality of capital punishment. Beginning in the last half of the 20th century, increasing numbers of religious leaders—particularly within Judaism and Roman Catholicism—campaigns against it. Capital punishment was abolished by the state of Israel for all offenses except treason and crimes against humanity, and Pope John Paul II condemned it as “cruel and unnecessary.”

Supporters of capital punishment also claim that it has a uniquely potent deterrent effect on potentially violent offenders for whom the threat of imprisonment is not a sufficient restraint. Opponents, however, point to research that generally has demonstrated that the death penalty is not a more effective deterrent than the alternative sanction of life or long-term imprisonment.

There also are disputes about whether capital punishment can be administered in a manner consistent with justice. Those who support capital punishment believe that it is possible to fashion laws and procedures that ensure that only those who are really deserving of death are executed. By contrast, opponents maintain that the historical application of capital punishment shows that any attempt to single out certain kinds of crime as deserving of death will inevitably be arbitrary and discriminatory. They also point to other factors that they think preclude the possibility that capital punishment can be fairly applied, arguing that the poor and ethnic and religious minorities often do not have access to good legal assistance, that racial prejudice motivates predominantly white juries in capital cases to convict black and other nonwhite defendants in disproportionate numbers, and that, because errors are inevitable even in a well-run criminal justice system, some people will be executed for crimes they did not commit. Finally, they argue that, because the appeals process for death sentences is protracted, those condemned to death are often cruelly forced to endure long periods of uncertainty about their fate.

Q.16 [11831809]

Which of the following scenarios, if false, could be seen as supporting those in favour of capital punishment?

- 1 ☐ Society has a moral obligation to protect its citizens and only by putting murderers to death can society ensure that convicted killers do not kill again.
-

2 ☐ Society should support those practices that will bring about the greatest balance of good over evil, and capital punishment is one such practice.

3 ☐ Capital punishment benefits society because it may deter violent crime; if people know that they will die if they perform a certain act, they will be unwilling to perform it.

4 ☐ Capital punishment has no deterrence value and society should give equal importance to the rights of the guilty even though it might mean risking the lives of innocents.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 4

Correct Answer: 4

 Answer key/Solution

We have to identify the statement, which, if false, will lend support to those who are in favour of capital punishment. Option (4), if false, would lead something like – Capital punishment has a deterrence value and society should not give equal importance to the rights of the guilty if it might mean risking the lives of innocents. This would lend support to those who are in favour of capital punishment.

Incorrect Answers:

All the other options, if false, would lend support to those who oppose capital punishment, either directly or indirectly.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Q.17 [11831809]

Directions for question (17):The four sentences (labelled 1, 2, 3, and 4) given in this question, when properly sequenced, form a coherent paragraph. Decide on the proper order for the sentences and key in this sequence of four numbers as your answer.

1. It's curious how friends get let out of novels.
2. But the non-presence of friends is almost a convention – there seems no room for friends in a narrative already cluttered with event and the tortuous vibrations of the inner person.
3. Parents (loving or negligent) are admitted to fiction, and siblings (weak, envious, self-destructive) have a role.
4. Nevertheless, I like to sketch in a few friends in the hope they will provide a release from a profound novelistic isolation that might otherwise ring hollow and smell suspicious.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 1324

Correct Answer – 1324

 Answer key/Solution

Solution:

Since 2 and 4 start with a transition word, they are least likely to be the opening statement of the paragraph. Statement 1 is a general statement which paves way for statement 3. Statement 2 presents an idea opposing statement 3. Statement 4 gives a concluding remark based on statement 2.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Q.18 [11831809]

Directions for question (18): The four sentences (labelled 1, 2, 3, and 4) given in this question, when properly sequenced, form a coherent paragraph. Decide on the proper order for the sentences and key in this sequence of four numbers as your answer.

1. Santa Muerte is most commonly known for being the saint of healing, wisdom, prosperity, protection, love, sorcery, justice, and even vengeance.
2. The growing popularity of Santa Muerte hints at the many appealing qualities she has.
3. The cult of Santa Muerte, the Mexican folk saint and the female personification of death, is characterized as being one of the fastest-growing religious movements in the Americas, with an estimated 10 to 12 million devotees.
4. Arguably one of her most enticing characteristics is her multidimensionality: even though she is the saint of death, she deals with a variety of issues and concerns that her devotees have.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 3241

Correct Answer – 3241

Statement 3 sets the tone and subject of the paragraph, i.e. Santa Muerte.

Statement 2 narrows down the focus of the paragraph to qualities of Santa Muerte. Statement 4 further describes one of her features. The entities of the list stated in statement 1 are a part of ‘variety of issues and concerns’ of Santa Muerte. Thus, the sequence is 3241

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Q.19 [11831809]

Directions for question (19): The passage given below is followed by four summaries. Choose the option that best captures the author’s position.

What *is* balance? Perhaps surprisingly, those who deal with it have struggled to settle on a single definition. Technically, it’s the complex interaction of several different systems in your body – from muscles, nerves, eyesight and the inner ear to the sensory system that lets you recognise where your body is touching the ground, along with movement receptors within your joints that tell you where your body is in space. It’s not something we’re born with, but also it’s not something we learn in the same way as speech – not quite a sense or a skill, but an ability that we gain early and lose over time.

- 1 ☐ There is no single definition for balance, but technically it is an intricate interaction of different body systems, and it is an innate ability of human beings, although it is not everlasting.
 - 2 ☐ Technically, it is through balance that we work our muscles, nerves, eyesight, inner ear, sensory system, and movement receptors in our joints, but we may not be able to learn it.
 - 3 ☐ Balance is the complex interaction of several body systems that tell you where your body is in space, and it’s not a sense or a skill but an ability we gain early and lose over time.
-

4 ○ Balance is distinguished from the speech in that it is not a sense or a skill that one can learn, but it is a complex interaction of several diverse systems of our body that work together.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 3

Correct Answer – (3)

Option (3) provides the most appropriate summary of the given passage. The passage lists several body systems and the interaction between them. Option (3) also covers the information given in the last sentence of the passage.

Incorrect answers

Option (1) is narrow in scope. It does not mention the interaction of the different body systems.

Option (2) is sketchy and is not a comprehensive option.

Option (4) cannot be the answer because it is again narrow in scope. The option does not mention anything about losing the skill of balance over time. <

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Q.20 [11831809]

Directions for question (20):The four sentences (labelled 1, 2, 3, and 4) given in this question, when properly sequenced, form a coherent paragraph. Decide on the proper order for the sentences and key in this sequence of four numbers as your answer.

1. It is quite challenging when it comes to Indian Languages due to the lack of data; as well as being a multilingual society, people tend to use code-mixed patterns in social media.
2. In Natural Language Processing, emotion recognition and classification is a commonly researched task where a model can detect these emotions.
3. The human brain is quite intelligent to sense the emotion associated with social media texts but for a machine to gain such perception is quite difficult.
4. The lack of annotated corpus in the Hindi-English code-mixed domain and the unavailability of the standard model to classify left this area of research still an exploring region.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 3214

Correct Answer – 3214

Sentences 3 and 2 form a mandatory pair. Both sentences talk about emotion recognition. Sentence 1 provides the possible challenge of the context that has been defined in the previous two sentences. Sentence 4 provides additional information in the context of Indian languages. Therefore, sentences 1 and 4 form a mandatory pair as well.

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Q.21 [11831809]

Directions for question (21): The passage given below is followed by four summaries. Choose the option that best captures the author's position.

In his book, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, Robert Nozick argues for a minimalist state that never infringes on personal liberties. He muses over how an income tax is akin to part-time slavery, as a worker is paid in wages, and a part of them is given to the state without the chance to opt-out. In his later book, *The Examined Life*, Nozick reflects on his earlier book and declares, "The position I once propounded now seems to me seriously inadequate, in part because it did not fully knit the humane considerations and joint cooperative activities it left room for more closely into its fabric." He doesn't fundamentally change his position but rather admits problems with it. He endorses the idea that the state can ban discrimination against various groups, admits that the realisation of personal freedom may require mandated group effort, and yields to the use of taxation as a means to ensure society continues to function.

-
- 1 ☐ Robert Nozick changed his view on taxation and other similar infringement of personal liberties to a more humane view of cooperative activities that the state assures society.
-
- 2 ☐ Robert Nozick acknowledges flaws in his earlier position of having a minimalist state and now believe that the state can make some reasonable infringement on personal liberties.
-
- 3 ☐ Robert Nozick changed his earlier understanding that a minimalist state should not interfere with personal freedom and his current view is that freedom requires mandated group effort.
-
- 4 ☐ Robert Nozick's earlier and later books showcase that he had made minor adjustments to his argument to correct the mistake that he made regarding the state's role in personal liberties.
-

Solution:

Correct Answer : 2

Correct Answer – (2)

Consider this line: He doesn't fundamentally change his position but rather admits problems with it. Thus, Nozick acknowledges certain flaws with an idea propounded by him earlier and makes adjustments to them. This makes option (2) the correct summarization.

Incorrect Answers:

1 and 3 – He doesn't change his view.

4 – Again, the books don't show the flaws or the adjustments, they are admitted by the author himself.

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Q.22 [11831809]

Directions for question (22): The passage given below is followed by four summaries. Choose the option that best captures the author's position.

The growth of digital advertising created two main classes of professionals in the advertising industry—the traditional incumbent advertiser or “creative” and the emergent “digital native”. Historically, such digital natives or professionals inclined toward measurement and direct marketing had long operated in the shadow of traditional creative executives. Before the Internet, specialists with measurement expertise typically worked behind the scenes, without direct client contact and were largely subservient to or in supporting roles for creative advertisers. The Internet, however, created substantial opportunities for career growth and status for digitals.

1 ☐ (1) The Internet is instrumental in creating two main classes of professionals, the creative executives and digital natives, and also pushing the digital natives into the limelight.

2 ☐ (2) Creative advertisers have long overshadowed the digital natives, and the digitals were working behind the scenes in a supporting role with no direct contact with clients.

3 ☐ (3) Digital natives owe the Internet for providing numerous opportunities for career growth and status, which were once available to the ones who were inclined toward measurement.

4 ☐ (4) The Internet gave digitals, who once worked in the background of traditional creative executives, considerable chances to advance in their careers and get more respect.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 4

Correct Answer – (4)

Consider this line: Historically, such digital natives or professionals inclined toward measurement and direct marketing had long operated in the shadow of traditional creative executives. Thus, the internet has not given birth to these two categories; rather, it has allowed the digital natives to take the centre-stage as well. Thus, option (4) becomes the correct summarization.

Incorrect Answers:

1 – As explained above, the internet has not created these two classes.

2 – ‘Overshadowed’ is a bit extreme. Also, this is incomplete as it doesn’t discuss the current scenario.

3 – Again, this is extreme.

Bookmark

FeedBack

 Answer key/Solution

Q.23 [11831809]

Directions for question (23): Five jumbled up sentences related to a topic is given below. Four of them can be put together to form a coherent paragraph. Identify the odd one out and key in the number of the sentence as your answer.

1. The dark side of interdependence draws inspiration from emerging biology, much as its light counterpart did.
2. Usually implicit here is the idea that this connectedness is a good and beautiful thing: being connected makes us stronger, healthier, more engaged, and more thoughtful.
3. Fundamental to the idea of interdependence is the view that, in some way, 'we're all connected' – to each other, to other organisms, and to our environments, both analogue and digital.
4. Being connected in the strong sense of being interdependent with others, threatens what it is to be a self, and what it is to be an individual.
5. Yet lurking under this positive view of our relatedness is a darker view – that being inextricably interconnected is existentially horrifying.

Solution:

Correct Answer : 1

Correct Answer – 1

 **Answer key/Solution**

Order: 3254

The sentences if arranged logically form a paragraph. 3 opens the paragraph stating the idea of interdependence, that is, we are all connected. 2 follows 3, describing the positive impacts of interdependency. 5 and 4 form a pair draws criticism to this idea of interdependency.

1 is the odd one out because it focuses on the dark side of interdependence and from where it draws inspiration from. It deviates from the topic in hand by being more specific.

Bookmark

FeedBack

Q.24 [11831809]

Directions for question (24): Five jumbled up sentences related to a topic is given below. Four of them can be put together to form a coherent paragraph. Identify the odd one out and key in the number of the sentence as your answer.

1. The problems involving the moral status of extra-terrestrial life are particularly fraught.
 2. Contemplating encounters with alien life tremendously expands our ethical horizons.
 3. The case of intelligent aliens encompasses not just the problem of how we might treat them but also how they might act or react.
 4. But a good deal of thought has been given to the subject of the moral status of Earth organisms and the idea of intrinsic value on which it is often based.
 5. This is no easy task, since we are ambiguous about relations with animals on Earth, on the one hand sheltering them as beloved pets, on the other hand, and rather arbitrarily hunting, eating and exterminating them.
-

Solution:

Correct Answer : 3

Order: 1542

 [Answer key/Solution](#)

1 opens the paragraph stating that there are problems that involve moral status of alien life. 5 form a pair with 1 elaborating on the argument. 4 and 2 form a pair by providing counter arguments.

3 is the odd one out because it deviates from the initial argument stating that we should consider how the extra life forms might react.

Bookmark

FeedBack