

VA - 6 : Reading Comprehension - 2



Workshop

Number of Questions : 22

WSP-0013/18

The aim of the session is to revise the different types of questions in RC. We also need to develop a strategy to deal with the RC section in CAT.

Directions for questions (1-22): Read the following passages and answer the questions that follow.

Passage – 1

(CAT 2017, Slot 2)

Creativity is at once our most precious resource and our most inexhaustible one. As anyone who has ever spent any time with children knows, every single human being is born creative; every human being is innately endowed with the ability to combine and recombine data, perceptions, materials and ideas, and devise new ways of thinking and doing. What fosters creativity? More than anything else: the presence of other creative people. The big myth is that creativity is the province of great individual geniuses. In fact creativity is a social process. Our biggest creative breakthroughs come when people learn from, compete with, and collaborate with other people.

Cities are the true fonts of creativity... With their diverse populations, dense social networks, and public spaces where people can meet spontaneously and serendipitously, they spark and catalyze new ideas. With their infrastructure for finance, organization and trade, they allow those ideas to be swiftly actualized.

As for what stanches creativity, that's easy, if ironic. It's the very institutions that we build to manage, exploit and perpetuate the fruits of creativity — our

big bureaucracies, and sad to say, too many of our schools. Creativity is disruptive; schools and organizations are regimented, standardized and stultifying.

The education expert Sir Ken Robinson points to a 1968 study reporting on a group of 1,600 children who were tested over time for their ability to think in out-of-the-box ways. When the children were between 3 and 5 years old, 98 percent achieved positive scores. When they were 8 to 10, only 32 percent passed the same test, and only 10 percent at 13 to 15. When 280,000 25-year-olds took the test, just 2 percent passed. By the time we are adults, our creativity has been wrung out of us.

I once asked the great urbanist Jane Jacobs what makes some places more creative than others. She said, essentially, that the question was an easy one. All cities, she said, were filled with creative people; that's our default state as people. But some cities had more than their shares of leaders, people and institutions that blocked out that creativity. She called them "squelchers."

Creativity (or the lack of it) follows the same general contours of the great socio-economic divide — our rising inequality — that plagues us. According to my own estimates, roughly a third of us across the United States, and perhaps as much as half of us in our most creative cities — are able to do work which engages our creative faculties to some extent, whether as artists, musicians, writers, techies, innovators, entrepreneurs, doctors, lawyers, journalists or educators — those of us who work with our minds. That leaves a group that I term "the other

66 percent,” who toil in low-wage rote and rotten jobs — if they have jobs at all — in which their creativity is subjugated, ignored or wasted.

Creativity itself is not in danger. It’s flourishing is all around us – in science and technology, arts and culture, in our rapidly revitalizing cities. But we still have a long way to go if we want to build a truly creative society that supports and rewards the creativity of each and every one of us.

1. In the author’s view, cities promote human creativity for all the following reasons EXCEPT that they:
 - (1) contain spaces that enable people to meet and share new ideas.
 - (2) expose people to different and novel ideas, because they are home to varied groups of people.
 - (3) provide the financial and institutional networks that enable ideas to become reality.
 - (4) provide access to cultural activities that promote new and creative ways of thinking.
2. The author uses ‘ironic’ in the third paragraph to point out that:
 - (1) people need social contact rather than isolation to nurture their creativity.
 - (2) institutions created to promote creativity eventually stifle it.
 - (3) the larger the creative population in a city, the more likely it is to be stifled.
 - (4) large bureaucracies and institutions are the inevitable outcome of successful cities.
3. The central idea of this passage is that:
 - (1) social interaction is necessary to nurture creativity.
 - (2) creativity and ideas are gradually declining in all societies.
 - (3) the creativity divide is widening in societies in line with socio-economic trends.
 - (4) more people should work in jobs that engage their creative faculties.

4. Jane Jacobs believed that cities that are more creative:
 - (1) have to struggle to retain their creativity.
 - (2) have to ‘squench’ unproductive people and promote creative ones.
 - (3) have leaders and institutions that do not block creativity.
 - (4) typically do not start off as creative hubs.
5. The 1968 study is used here to show that:
 - (1) as they get older, children usually learn to be more creative
 - (2) schooling today does not encourage creative thinking in children.
 - (3) the more children learn, the less creative they become.
 - (4) technology today prevents children from being creative.
6. The author’s conclusions about the most ‘creative cities’ in the US (paragraph 6) are based on his assumption that:
 - (1) people who work with their hands are not doing creative work.
 - (2) more than half the population works in non-creative jobs.
 - (3) only artists, musicians., writers., and so on should be valued in a society.
 - (4) most cities ignore or waste the creativity of low-wage workers

Passage – 2

CAT 2003 (R)

While I was in class at Columbia, struggling with the *esoterica du jour*, my father was on a bricklayer’s scaffold not far up the street, working on a campus building. Once we met up on the subway going home—he was with his tools, I with my books. My father wasn’t interested in Thucydides, and I wasn’t up on arches. My dad has built lots of places; in New York City he can’t get into: colleges, condos, office towers. He made his living on the outside. Once the walls were up, a place took on a different feel for him, as though he wasn’t welcome anymore. Related by blood, we’re separated by class, my father and I. being the white-collar child of a blue-collar parent means being the hinge on the door

between two ways of life. With one foot in the working-class, the other in the middle class, people like me are Straddlers, at home in neither world, living a limbo life.

What drove me to leave what I knew? Born blue-collar, I still never felt completely at home among the tough guys and anti-intellectual crowd of my neighbourhood in deepest Brooklyn. I never did completely, either. It's like that for Straddlers. It was not so smooth jumping from Italian old-world style to US professional in a single generation. Others who were the first in their families to go to college, will tell you the same thing; the academy can render you unrecognisable to the very absorbed in college challenge the mom-and-pop orthodoxy that passed for truth for 18 years. Limbo folk may eschew polyester blends for sea-isle cotton, prefer Brie to Kraft slices. They marry outside the neighbourhood and raise their kids differently. They might not be in church on Sunday.

When they pick careers (not *jobs*), it's often a kind of work their parents never heard of or can't understand. But for the white-collar kids of blue-collar parents, the office is not necessarily a sanctuary. In Corporate America, where the rules are based on notions foreign to working-class people, a Straddler can get lost. Social class counts at the office, even though nobody likes to admit it. Ultimately, corporate norms are based on middle-class values, business types say. From an early age, middle-class people learn how to get along, using diplomacy, nuance, and politics to grab what they need. It is as though they are following a set of rules laid out in a manual that blue-collar families never have the chance to read.

People born into the middle class to parents with college degrees have lived filled with what French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu calls "cultural capital". Growing up in an educated environment, they learn about Picasso and Mozart, stock portfolios and *creme brulee*. In a home with cultural capital, there are networks: someone always has an aunt or golfing buddy with the inside track for an internship or some entry-level job. Dinner-table talk could involve what happened that day to mom and dad at the law firm,

the doctor's office, or the executive suite. Middle-class kids can grow up with a sense of entitlement that will carry them through their lives. This 'belongingness' is not just learning and possessing confidence in your place in the world. Such early access and direct exposure of culture in the home is the more organic, 'legitimate' means of appropriating cultural capital, Bourdieu tells us. Those of us possessing 'ill-gotten Culture' can learn it, but never as well. Something is always a little off about us, like an engine with imprecise timing. There's a greater match between middle-class lives and the institutions in which the middle class works and operates—universities or corporations. Children of the middle and upper classes have been speaking the language of the bosses and supervisors forever.

Blue-collar kids are taught by their parents and communities to work hard to achieve, and that merit is rewarded. But no blue-collar parent knows whether such things are true in the middle-collar world. Many professionals born to the working-class report feeling out of place and outmanoeuvred in the office. Soon enough, Straddlers learn that straight talk won't always cut. Resolving conflicts head-on and speaking your mind doesn't always work, no matter how educated the Straddler is.

In the working-class, people perform jobs in which they are closely supervised and are required to follow orders and instructions. That, in turn, affects how they socialise their children. Children of the working-class are brought up in a home in which conformity, obedience and intolerance for back talk are the norm—the same characteristics that make a good factory worker.

7. According to the passage, which of the following statements about 'cultural capital' is NOT true?
- (1) It socializes children early into the norms of middle class institutions.
 - (2) It helps them learn the language of universities and corporations.
 - (3) It creates a sense of enlightenment in middle-class children.
 - (4) It develops bright kids into Straddlers.

8. According to the passage, the patterns of socialization of working-class children make them most suited for jobs that require:
- (1) diplomacy.
 - (2) compliance with orders.
 - (3) enterprise and initiative.
 - (4) high risk-taking.
9. When Straddlers enter white collar jobs, they get lost because:
- (1) they are thrown into an alien value system.
 - (2) their families have not read the rules in corporate manuals.
 - (3) their families have not read the rules in corporate manuals.
 - (4) they miss the 'mom and pop orthodoxy'.
10. What does the author's statement, "My father wasn't interested in Thucydides, and I wasn't up on arches," illustrate?
- (1) Organic cultural capital
 - (2) Professional arrogance and social distance
 - (3) Evolving social transformation
 - (4) Breakdown of family relationships
11. Which of the following statements about Straddlers does the passage NOT support explicitly?
- (1) Their food preferences may not match those of their parents.
 - (2) They may not keep up some central religious practices of their parents.
 - (3) They are at home neither in the middle class nor in the working-class.
 - (4) Their political ideologies may differ from those of their parents.

Passage – 3

(CAT, 2006)

My aim is to present a conception of justice which generalizes and carries to a higher level of abstraction the familiar theory of the social contract. In order to do this we are not to think of the original contract as one to enter a particular society or to set up a particular form of government. Rather, the idea is that the principles of justice for the basic

structure of society are the object of the original agreement. They are the principles that free and rational persons concerned to further their own interests would accept in an initial position of equality. These principles are to regulate all further agreements; they specify the kinds of social cooperation that can be entered into and the forms of government that can be established. This way of regarding the principles of justice, I shall call justice as fairness. Thus, we are to imagine that those who engage in social cooperation choose together, in one joint act, the principles which are to assign basic rights and duties and to determine the division of social benefits. Just as each person must decide by rational reflection what constitutes his good, that is, the system of ends which it is rational for him to pursue, so a group of persons must decide once and for all what is to count among them as just and unjust. The choice which rational men would make in this hypothetical situation of equal liberty determines the principles of justice.

In 'justice as fairness', the original position is not an actual historical state of affairs. It is understood as a purely hypothetical situation characterized so as to lead to a certain conception of justice. Among the essential features of this situation is that no one knows his place in society, his class position or social status, nor does anyone know his fortune in the distribution of natural assets and abilities, his intelligence, strength, and the like. I shall even assume that the parties do not know their conceptions of the good or their special psychological propensities. The principles of justice are chosen behind a veil of ignorance. This ensures that no one is advantaged or disadvantaged in the choice of principles by the outcome of natural chance or the contingency of social circumstances. Since all are similarly situated and no one is able to design principles to favor his particular condition, the principles of justice are the result of a fair agreement or bargain.

Justice as fairness begins with one of the most general of all choices which persons might make together, namely, with the choice of the first principles of a conception of justice which is to regulate all subsequent criticism and reform of

institutions. Then, having chosen a conception of justice, we can suppose that they are to choose a constitution and a legislature to enact laws, and so on, all in accordance with the principles of justice initially agreed upon. Our social situation is just if it is such that by this sequence of hypothetical agreements we would have contracted into the general system of rules which defines it. Moreover, assuming that the original position does determine a set of principles, it will then be true that whenever social institutions satisfy these principles, those engaged in them can say to one another that they are cooperating on terms to which they would agree if they were free and equal persons whose relations with respect to one another were fair. They could all view their arrangements as meeting the stipulations which they would acknowledge in an initial situation that embodies widely accepted and reasonable constraints on the choice of principles. The general recognition of this fact would provide the basis for a public acceptance of the corresponding principles of justice. No society can, of course, be a scheme of cooperation which men enter voluntarily in a literal sense; each person finds himself placed at birth in some particular position in some particular society, and the nature of this position materially affects his life prospects. Yet a society satisfying the principles of justice as fairness comes as close as a society can to being a voluntary scheme, for it meets the principles which free and equal persons would assent to under circumstances that are fair.

12. A just society, as conceptualized in the passage, can be best described as:
- (1) A Utopia in which everyone is equal and no one enjoys any privilege based on their existing positions and powers.
 - (2) A hypothetical society in which people agree upon principles of justice which are fair.
 - (3) A society in which principles of justice are not based on the existing positions and powers of the individuals.
 - (4) A society in which principles of justice are fair to all.
 - (5) A hypothetical society in which principles of justice are not based on the existing positions and powers of the individuals.

13. The original agreement or original position in the passage has been used by the author as:
- (1) A hypothetical situation conceived to derive principles of justice which are not influenced by position, status and condition of individuals in the society.
 - (2) A hypothetical situation in which every individual is equal and no individual enjoys any privilege based on the existing positions and powers.
 - (3) A hypothetical situation to ensure fairness of agreements among individuals in society.
 - (4) An imagined situation in which principles of justice would have to be fair.
 - (5) An imagined situation in which fairness is the objective of the principles of justice to ensure that no individual enjoys any privilege based on the existing positions and powers.
14. Which of the following best illustrates the situation that is equivalent to choosing 'the principles of justice' behind 'a veil of ignorance'?
- (1) The principles of justice are chosen by businessmen, who are marooned on an uninhabited island after a shipwreck, but have some possibility of returning.
 - (2) The principles of justice are chosen by a group of school children whose capabilities are yet to develop.
 - (3) The principles of justice are chosen by businessmen, who are marooned on an uninhabited island after a shipwreck and have no possibility of returning.
 - (4) The principles of justice are chosen assuming that such principles will govern the lives of the rule makers only in their next birth if the rule makers agree that they will be born again.
 - (5) The principles of justice are chosen by potential immigrants who are unaware of the resources necessary to succeed in a foreign country.

15. Why, according to the passage, do principles of justice need to be based on an original agreement?
- (1) Social institutions and laws can be considered fair only if they conform to principles of justice.
 - (2) Social institutions and laws can be fair only if they are consistent with the principles of justice as initially agreed upon.
 - (3) Social institutions and laws need to be fair in order to be just.
 - (4) Social institutions and laws evolve fairly only if they are consistent with the principles of justice as initially agreed upon.
 - (5) Social institutions and laws conform to the principles of justice as initially agreed upon.
16. Which of the following situations best represents the idea of justice as fairness, as argued in the passage?
- (1) All individuals are paid equally for the work they do.
 - (2) Everyone is assigned some work for his or her livelihood.
 - (3) All acts of theft are penalized equally.
 - (4) All children are provided free education in similar schools.
 - (5) All individuals are provided a fixed sum of money to take care of their health.

Passage – 4

Neanderthals were capable of sophisticated, collective hunting strategies, according to an analysis of prehistoric animal remains from Germany that contradicts the enduring image of these early humans as knuckle-dragging brutes.

The cut marks — or “hunting lesions” — on the bones of two 1,20,000-year-old deer provide the earliest “smoking gun” evidence such weapons were used to stalk and kill prey, according to a study the journal *Nature Ecology and Evolution*.

Microscopic imaging and ballistics experiments reproducing the impact of the blows confirmed that at least one was delivered with a wooden spear at low velocity. “This suggests that Neanderthals approached animals very closely and thrust, not threw, their spears at the animals, most likely from an underhand angle,” said Sabine Gaudzinski-Windheuser, a researcher at Johannes Gutenberg-University Mainz, Germany.

“Such a confrontational way of hunting required careful planning and concealment, and close cooperation between individual hunters,” she said.

Neanderthals lived in Europe from about 300,000 years ago until they died out 30,000 years ago, overtaken by our species.

It was long thought that these evolutionary cousins — modern Europeans and Asians have about 2% of Neanderthal DNA — were not smart enough to compete, and lacked symbolic culture, a trait supposedly unique to modern humans.

But recent findings have revealed a species with more intelligence and *savoir faire* than suspected.

They buried their dead in ritual fashion, created tools, and painted animal frescos on cave walls at least 64,000 years ago, 20,000 years before *Homo sapiens* arrived in Europe.

17. What kind of confrontational way of hunting Sabine Gaudzinski-Windheuser is talking about?
- (1) The Neanderthals used spears with long handles.
 - (2) The Neanderthals had a strong underarm which played a vital role in hunting.
 - (3) The Neanderthals had a close and careful approach towards their victims.
 - (4) The Neanderthals were clumsy and often threw spear from a great distance

18. As far as the given passage is concerned, all of the following are true, except:
- (1) they were known to lack a symbolic culture.
 - (2) they attacked their prey with sophistication.
 - (3) they paid proper respect to the dead.
 - (4) homo sapiens came into being more than 50,000 years earlier.
19. The primary purpose of the author is to:
- (1) trace the origin of Neanderthals.
 - (2) understand the hunting procedures of Neanderthals.
 - (3) contradict the embedded idea that they were brainless creatures.
 - (4) understand that Neanderthals could compete the homo sapiens in every field.

Passage – 5

(XAT, 2018, 7 January)

If history doesn't follow any stable rules, and if we cannot predict its future course, why study it? It often seems that the chief aim of science is to predict the future – meteorologists are expected to forecast whether tomorrow will bring rain or sunshine; economists should know whether devaluing the currency will avert or precipitate an economic crisis; good doctors foresee whether chemotherapy or radiation therapy will be more successful in curing lung cancer. Similarly, historians are asked to examine the actions of our ancestors so that we can repeat their wise decisions and avoid their mistakes. But it never works like that because the present is just too different from the past. It is a waste of time to study Hannibal's tactics in the Second Punic War so as to copy them in the Third World War. What worked well in cavalry battles will not necessarily be of much benefit in cyber warfare. Science is not just about predicting the future, though. Scholars in all fields often seek to broaden our horizons, thereby opening before us new and unknown futures. This is especially true of history. Though historians occasionally try their hand at

prophecy (without notable success), the study of history aims above all to make us aware of possibilities we don't normally consider. Historians study the past not in order to repeat it, but in order to be liberated from it. Each and every one of us has been born into a given historical reality, ruled by particular norms and values, and managed by a unique economic and political system. We take this reality for granted, thinking it is natural, inevitable and immutable. We forget that our world was created by an accidental chain of events, and that history shaped not only our technology, politics and society, but also our thoughts, fears and dreams. The cold hand of the past emerges from the grave of our ancestors, grips us by the neck and directs our gaze towards a single future. We have felt that grip from the moment we were born, so we assume that it is a natural and inescapable part of who we are. Therefore we seldom try to shake ourselves free, and envision alternative futures. Studying history aims to loosen the grip of the past. It enables us to turn our head this way and that, and begin to notice possibilities that our ancestors could not imagine, or didn't want us to imagine. By observing the accidental chain of events that led us here, we realise how our very thoughts and dreams took shape – and we can begin to think and dream differently. Studying history will not tell us what to choose, but at least it gives us more options.

20. Based on the passage, which of the following options would be the most appropriate for citizens to learn history?
- (1) British names of streets in India should not be changed.
 - (2) Every street in India should display a plaque that lists all its previous names.
 - (3) British names of streets in India should be changed to Indian names along with an explanation of their history.
 - (4) Names of Indian streets should be based on suggestions generated through an opinion poll.
 - (5) Names of Indian streets should be periodically changed.

21. Which of the following options is the closest to the essence of the passage?

- (1) History, unlike Physics, does not help predict future.
- (2) History deals with long time periods.
- (3) History documents the past events related to specific people.
- (4) There is no strict cause and effect relationship in history.
- (5) History has the potential to make us eclectic.

22. Read the following sentences:

- i. A historian successfully predicted a political crisis based on similar events of the last century.
- ii. Using the latest technology, doctors could decipher the microbe causing the disease.
- iii. Students who prepared for an examination by perusing past 10 years' question papers did not do well in the examination.
- iv. A tribe in Andaman learns to predict epidemic outbreaks by listening to the stories of how their ancestors predicted the past outbreaks.

Which of the statement(s) above, if true would contradict the view of the author?

- (1) i and ii only (2) iii and iv only
- (3) ii and iii only (4) i and iv only
- (5) i, ii, and iv only

WSP-0013/18 VA - 6 : Reading Comprehension - 2

Answers and Explanations

Workshop

1	4	2	2	3	1	4	3	5	2	6	1	7	4	8	2	9	1	10	3
11	4	12	3	13	1	14	4	15	2	16	4	17	3	18	4	19	3	20	2
21	5	22	4																

1. 4 Option 4 is the correct answer as in paragraph 2 of the given passage, where the author talks about the promotion of creativity in cities, he does not mention that cities provide access to cultural activities. This is nowhere stated in the passage.
2. 2 Option 2 is the correct answer as in paragraphs 3 and 4 of passage it is presented that organizations that were supposed to foster creativity, actually stifle it.
3. 1 Option 1 is the correct answer as the entire passage revolves around the idea how cities help in flourishing of creativity. The author describes the importance of social interaction and how the lack of it, spoils creativity. Option 2 is ruled out because the author explicitly states that "creativity itself is not in danger". Option 3 is incorrect since it is discussed only in the last 2 paragraphs. Option 4 is too generic. It can't be the main idea.
4. 3 Option 3 is the correct answer as from paragraph 5 it can be easily inferred that Jane Jacobs holds leaders responsible for promoting creativity in people and cities.
5. 2 Option 2 is the correct answer as after talking about what stifles creativity (in paragraph 3), the author presents the 1968 report(in order to validate the previous point). Option 1 states exactly the opposite of what is stated in the passage. Option 3 is incorrect because the reduction of creativity cannot be attributed to learning more. Option 4 is unrelated. The passage does not talk about technology.
6. 1 In the 2nd last paragraph of the passage, it is stated that the creativity of only those people can be utilized who use their minds to work. This implies that people who work with their hands are not creative. Here, if we use the concept of assumption in CR, the answer becomes obvious. Negate option 1 and the argument falls apart. Hence, option 1 is the answer.
7. 4 Refer to the part "exposed the intra-State level of our federal system to a dilemma of which the inter-State and Union-State layers are free".
8. 2 Refer to the part "jobs in which they are closely supervised and are required to follow orders."
9. 1 Refer to the part "Ultimately, corporate norms are based on middle-class values".
10. 3 Refer to the part "We're separated by class."
11. 4 1, 2, and 3 are specifically stated in the passage at the end of the first paragraph and the second paragraph.
12. 3 A careful scrutiny of the second paragraph reveals that the concept of "justice as fairness" is a hypothetical situation in a real society. Thus options (1), (2) and (5) can be eliminated. The possible answers are (3) or (4). (3) is more specific in comparison to option (4). Thus (3) is the correct answer.
13. 1 Refer to para 1. "Rather, the idea is that the principles...initial position of equality." Associate these lines with paragraph 2. So, option (1) can be inferred from the passage.
14. 4 Refer to the latter half in the second paragraph. In essence it states that the principles of justice should be so chosen that they neither favour or disfavour a particular class of society. A law maker who chooses the principle of justice without being aware of his status in society in the next birth exemplifies the situation that has been described as choosing the principles of justice behind a veil of ignorance. Thus option (4) is the most appropriate choice. Option (1) is incorrect because if there is a possibility of return then the businessmen would obviously choose those principles which will favour their situation. Option (2) is incorrect because the reference to school children

<p>is quite vague. Option (3) is incorrect because if businessmen were to choose these principles then they might choose those which favour their family. Also, these businessmen are aware that there is no possibility of their return. Option (5) is incorrect because they may or may not migrate ('potential immigrants'). It also suggests that the current principles of justice in their society do not contribute to their success. If they are unsuccessful in their own society then why would they choose certain principles which do not favour their situation.</p>	<p>19. 3 Refer to the 1st paragraph- "... according to an analysis of prehistoric animal remains from Germany that contradicts the enduring image of these early humans as knuckle-dragging brutes." This makes option 3, the correct answer.</p>
<p>15. 2 Option (2) is correct because 'fair' in this option means 'just'. We cannot choose option (4) though it's a close choice because 'fairly' means 'gradually'. Here, the choice clearly depends upon the usage and the context of this word.</p>	<p>20. 2 Refer to this line-"Each and every one of us has been born into a given historical reality, ruled by particular norms and values, and managed by a unique economic and political system." This clearly states that if one has to learn about the past one should trace it from its origin. Therefore we can say that if we change the British names of streets in India and change to Indian names along with an explanation of their history we will be able to learn more about our ancestors.</p>
<p>16. 4 When all children are provided free education, it indicates that the decision to do so has not been taken with any other consideration in mind, save the children's benefit. Thus, the children's family background and social status do not matter, in accordance with the passage's theme.</p>	<p>21. 5 Option 5 is correct since the passage states that history makes us aware of many things and provides us different options. It shapes "not only our technology, politics and society, but also our thoughts, fears and dreams.</p>
<p>17. 3 "This suggests that Neanderthals approached animals very closely and thrust, not threw, their spears at the animals, most likely from an underhand angle." This clearly indicates that they always properly planned before going for hunting and was careful while doing that. Hence 3 is the correct answer.</p>	<p>22. 4 Read the following statement- "Similarly, historians are asked to examine the actions of our ancestors so that we can repeat their wise decisions and avoid their mistakes. But it never works like that because the present is just too different from the past." So the argument will be weakened if we challenge the application of the predictability. Statements 1 and 4, state the opposite of this and will weaken the argument. Hence 4 is the correct answer.</p>
<p>18. 4 Except option 4, all other options have been mentioned in the given passage. Refer to- "They buried their dead in ritual fashion, created tools, and painted animal frescos on cave walls at least 64,000 years ago, 20,000 years before <i>Homo sapiens</i> arrived in Europe." This makes option 4 logically incorrect.</p>	