

CLAT Sample Paper 2023 with Solution

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

For many, the pandemic has revealed the porous nature of our bodies and lives: the invisible ties between one and another, the need to do well by others. For others, it has affirmed the value of keeping apart, entrenching the deep histories of property, segregation and isolation that secure white wellbeing in the US. I tell Frank that we need to learn how to live together, that the country and planet need this. "I'm over this," he retorts. "I'm going to build my little hamlet." Two weeks after the Capitol invasion, Frank sent me a video message from a small town in northern Indiana: dozens of men and women packed indoors at the sports bar, not a mask in sight. "People die. I've never been afraid of it. I know it's coming.", said Frank. I was feeling hurt and a little combative myself, and I started throwing facts and statistics back at him. "People are playing Russian roulette with the lives of their own neighbors, in the name of freedom, and the numbers show the price," I shot back. Frank remained defiant. "Freedom is more important to me." In the face of this difficult lesson, walls of retreat are a timeworn choice. Like many Americans on the right, Frank has lately given up trusting anything but conservative media. At his request, I've given him a pseudonym here. But he's mostly given up on people like me. He faults me for failing to defend our liberties, and for being unwilling to leave my own "cocoon", to see first-hand his unmasked pandemic life. I wish I could have done this. But I have my own family to care for and worry about. Frank remains steadfast in his refusal to wear a mask or take the vaccine. He says he's probably had Covid and overcome it already, tough like the former president he reveres. I hope Frank stays well. For masks and vaccines acknowledge something he won't: the truth of our vulnerability, our capacity to wound and be wounded by others. I don't know when Frank and I will talk again. But we remain exposed to each other's whims and disdains. One way or another, we'll have to figure out what to do with each other's company.

[Extracted, with edits and revisions, from "What I learnt From an Unlikely Friendship with an Anti-masker", by Anand Pandian, The Guardian]

1.1 How best would the reader describe Frank?

- (a) He is against the sciences
- (b) He is against immigrants
- (c) He is a baseball fan
- (d) He is against vaccine use and poses a threat to public health by his refusal to take COVID19 vaccines

A: The correct answer is (d) – (a is close but we don't have enough information to come to that conclusion. B and c are obviously wrong, d is the most comprehensive description of Frank's conduct and personality based on the information in the passage.)

1.2 What does the author mean by "we'll have to figure out what to do with each other's company"?

- (a) The author wants to end his friendship with Frank
- (b) The author wants to extend a hand of friendship to Frank despite their difficult relationship
- (c) The author is not trying to understand Frank's perspective
- (d) The author is sure that Frank's perspective is wrong and yet wants to extend a human empathy to him

A: The correct answer is (d) – (a cannot be concluded from the passage clearly enough. B could come close but we don't know enough about their continuing relationship from the passage, C is true but not a good paraphrase of the statement in the question, d is the most comprehensive explanation of the statement given the information in the passage.)

1.3 What do you think Frank meant by the comment "Freedom is more important to me"?

- (a) He was going to war to free the world of COVID19.
- (b) He was planning to engage in public health-related community organising.
- (c) His personal freedom to do and act according to his own will was the least important thing in his life.
- (d) He was willing to put his health at risk to protect his personal freedom.

Answer: The correct answer is (d) – (a and b are obviously wrong. C is contradictory to the information in the passage. D is the most comprehensive explanation of the statement in the question.)

1.4 Pick the word that best describes Frank's behavior:

- (a) Reckless
- (b) Lackadaisical
- (c) Arrogant
- (d) Delusional Rationale

A: The correct answer is (a) – (b is baseless, c cannot be clearly concluded from the information in the passage. Not d because Frank knows the risks of not wearing masks or taking vaccines, he is aware of the risks he is taking. Option a is the best description of his behaviour).

1.5 Why do you think the author stopped engaging with Frank's arguments?

- (a) The author was angry
- (b) The author was disappointed

- (c) The author felt defeated
- (d) None of the above Rationale The author shows no signs of being angry or defeated, and from the last paragraph of the passage, it can be inferred that the author is disappointed

GENERAL KNOWLEDGE

Sri Lanka has suffered through one of the world's worst economic crises for most of the year, marked by soaring inflation, food and fuel shortages, and low supplies of foreign reserves. In April, Sri Lanka defaulted on its foreign debt. This economic stress prompted mass protests and a political crisis that came to a head in July, with then-President Gotabaya Rajapaksa briefly fleeing the country. Many Sri Lankans blame the Rajapaksa family for the economic mismanagement that produced the current crisis. Since Sri Lanka's economic crisis began, it has received emergency assistance from Japan, a currency swap offer from Bangladesh, and humanitarian aid from the European Union. The United States announced last month that its total assistance to Sri Lanka during its crisis had exceeded \$90 million. The World Bank has repurposed funds from current financing projects to provide essential goods. And in September, Colombo reached a preliminary agreement with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) on a \$2.9 billion assistance package. India has provided nearly \$4 billion in assistance and is negotiating a future debt restructuring plan and a credit line of \$55 million for badly needed imports of fertilizer. Meanwhile, China and Sri Lanka have begun debt-restructuring talks, an important step toward finalizing the IMF deal. Even with the increased support, Sri Lanka's immediate economic outlook looks grim. Financial analysts estimate that inflation will remain high until mid-2023, predicting economic contraction

2.1 Who assumed the office of the President in Sri Lanka after Gotabaya Rajapaksa?

- (a) Ranil Wickremesinghe**
- (b) Maithiripala Sirisena
- (c) Milinda Moragoda
- (d) Dinesh Gunawardena

2.2 In 2021, Sri Lanka passed the controversial Colombo Port City Economic Commission Bill. Which among the following was a key feature of this bill?

- (a) It banned Bangladeshi ships from entering its port
- (b) It introduced draconian taxation policies to finance the Colombo Port City Project
- (c) It promoted the Colombo Port City to be a Special Economic Zone to attract foreign investment**
- (d) By virtue of making direct investments towards building the city, Japan was given primary control over the city management

2.3 Which of these is the most exported item from Sri Lanka?

- (a) Coconut oil
- (b) Tea
- (c) Textile**
- (d) Rubber

2.4 Which Sri Lankan author was awarded the Booker Prize in 2022?

- (a) Michael Ondaatje**
- (b) Shehan Karunatilaka
- (c) Nihal De Silva
- (d) Tissa Abeysekera

2.5 How many times has the Sri Lankan cricket team reached the World Cup finals?

- (a) 1
- (b) 3**
- (c) 5
- (d) None

LEGAL REASONING

The Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act 1971 (the “MTPA”) allows termination of pregnancy by a medical practitioner in two stages. After a crucial amendment in 2021, for pregnancies up to 20 weeks, termination is allowed with the consent of one registered medical practitioner. For pregnancies between 20- 24 weeks, the Rules attached to the law prescribe certain criteria in terms of who can avail termination. It also requires the consent of two registered medical practitioners in this case.

Termination can be allowed if: a) the continuance of the pregnancy would involve a risk to the life of the pregnant woman or of grave injury to her physical or mental health; or b) there is a substantial risk that if the child was born, it would suffer from any serious physical or mental abnormality. Only if these conditions are present are abortions allowed under the MTPA. In other cases, doctors are allowed to reject requests by women to terminate their pregnancies. However, if these conditions are present, doctors have to provide consent to terminate under the MTPA. If the pregnancy occurs as a result of failure of any method used by any woman or her partner for the purpose of limiting the number of children or preventing pregnancy, the anguish caused by such pregnancy is presumed to constitute a grave injury to the mental health of the pregnant woman. The phrase “any woman or her partner” was introduced in 2021 in place of the earlier phrase “married woman or her husband”. Similarly, where any pregnancy is alleged by the pregnant woman to have been caused by rape, the anguish caused by the pregnancy is presumed to constitute a grave injury to the mental health of the pregnant woman. For pregnancies between 20-24 weeks, Section 3B of the Rules under the MTPA lists

seven categories of women. Women have to fall within one of these categories, and meet the conditions listed above, to be granted an abortion: (a) survivors of sexual assault or rape or incest; (b) minors; (c) change of marital status during the ongoing pregnancy (widowhood and divorce); (d) women with physical disabilities (major disability as per criteria laid down under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016); (e) mentally ill women including mental retardation; (f) the foetal malformation that has substantial risk of being incompatible with life or if the child is born it may suffer from such physical or mental abnormalities to be seriously handicapped; and (g) women with pregnancy in humanitarian settings or disaster or emergency situations as may be declared by the Government.

[Extracted with edits and revisions from “Supreme Court’s Abortion Ruling”, by Apurva Vishwanath, The Indian Express]

3.1 At 8 weeks of pregnancy, a woman seeks to terminate her pregnancy because continuing the pregnancy would cause severe anxiety, agony and mental distress to her. She approaches a doctor at KRTS Medical College. The doctor, however, refused termination. After medical examination, the doctor found that continuing the pregnancy would not pose a threat to the woman’s life and survival. In other words, the pregnant woman was not at risk of death from the pregnancy continuing to term. This, the doctor stated, meant that abortion could not be allowed. As per the MTPA, is the doctor justified in his decision?

- (a) Yes, because the MTPA requires the doctor’s consent to terminate pregnancy.
- (b) No, because pregnancy can be terminated at 8 weeks even if there is no threat to life of the pregnant woman.
- (c) No, because the doctor needed the consent of a second doctor to confirm his finding.
- (d) No, because the doctor cannot reject the decision of the pregnant woman to terminate her pregnancy

Rationale The correct answer is (b) – no, because pregnancy can be terminated at 8 weeks even if there is no threat to life of the pregnant woman. This is evident from the MTPA which states: ‘the continuance of the pregnancy would involve a risk to the life of the pregnant woman or of grave injury to her physical or mental health’. This provision clearly allows abortions even where there is no threat to life, as long as there is grave injury to mental health, which exists in the present case. Though the MTPA requires the consent of doctors, doctors are required to grant abortions under the conditions mentioned in the MTPA, so (a) is not the answer. As the pregnancy was less than 20 weeks, the consent of only one doctor is required, so (c) is not the answer. The doctor can reject the decision of the pregnant woman if her request does not fall within the conditions, so (d) is not the answer.

3.2 At 23 weeks of pregnancy, a pregnant woman approaches hospital. Her husband died three weeks ago. She was severely distressed by his death, and by the prospect of raising the child alone. She did not have any support for bringing up the child. She also worked only part-time, and would find it difficult to bear the economic costs of pregnancy and raising the child. Dr. Gopal assents to her abortion. However, Dr. Shankar refuses. Can she access abortion? (a) Yes, because Dr. Gopal has consented. (b) Yes, because she does not need the consent of doctors. It is her decision. (c) No, because only Dr. Gopal's consent is not sufficient. (d) No, because abortions are not allowed under the MTPA at 23 weeks.

Rationale

The correct answer is (c) – no, because only Dr. Gopal's consent is not sufficient. The woman is 23 weeks pregnant. As per the MTPA, between 20 and 24 weeks of pregnancy, the consent of two doctors is required. The consent of just one doctor is not sufficient, so (a) is not the answer. The MTPA requires doctors to consent to the woman's decision, so (b) is not the answer. The MTPA allows abortion between 20 and 24 weeks when specific conditions are satisfied, so (d) is not the answer.

3.3 Damini and Nisha are two women aged 29. Damini was 18 weeks pregnant in May 2016. Nisha was 15 weeks and 3 days pregnant in February 2022. Both their pregnancies occurred because the emergency contraceptive pill did not prevent pregnancy. Damini got married in 2019. Nisha is still unmarried. Damini and Nisha approached medical providers seeking termination of pregnancy on May 24, 2016 and March 1, 2022 respectively. In light of the above consider the following statements:

- i. Damini and Nisha will be denied abortions.
- ii. Nisha will obtain an abortion; Damini will not.
- iii. Damini and Nisha will obtain abortions.
- iv. Damini will obtain an abortion; Nisha will not.

Which of the following statements is true?

- (a) ii and iii are true
- (b) ii is false
- (c) i, iii, and iv are false
- (d) ii, iii and iv are true

Rationale The correct answer is (c) – i, iii, and iv are false. Damini will not be granted an abortion because at the time she sought it, she was unmarried, and the MTPA allowed abortions only to married women and their husbands before 2021. Nisha will obtain an abortion. Even though she is unmarried, the MTPA was amended in 2021 to allow abortions to any woman and her partner; and Nisha is seeking an abortion in 2022. (a) is not the answer, because 2 and 3 are not true (only 2 is true, not 3). (b) is not the answer because 2 is true, not false. (d) is not the answer because 2, 3 and 4 are not true (only 2 is true, not 3 and 4).

3.4 A woman is 21 weeks pregnant. Medical examination by a five-member Medical Board found the following: “The woman is perfectly healthy. Continuing of pregnancy does not pose any threat to her health or life. The foetus presents a minimal chance of Strophe’s disease. Foetuses with Strophe’s disease have high chances of survival. With appropriate support, such children can live like other children, without quality of life being severely impaired”. Will the MTPA allow the pregnant woman to terminate her pregnancy?

- (a) Yes, because the foetus has a disability, and the MTPA allows the termination of pregnancies where the foetus is disabled.
- (b) No, because the woman is perfectly healthy, and continuing of pregnancy does not pose a threat to her life.
- (c) Yes, because it is the pregnant woman’s decision whether to terminate her pregnancy or not.
- (d) No, because conditions for abortion under the MTPA have not been met.

Rationale

The correct answer is (d) – no, because conditions under the MTPA have not been met. The MTPA allows abortions for foetal ‘abnormality’ when there is a ‘substantial risk’ that if the child was born, it would suffer from any ‘serious physical or mental abnormality’. The report of the Medical Board shows that the risk is ‘minimal’. It also shows that the ‘abnormality’ is not ‘serious’, because ‘[f]oetuses with Strophe’s disease have high chances of survival. With appropriate support, such children can live like other children, without quality of life being severely impaired’. Simply being pregnant with a disabled foetus is not reason enough under the MTPA for termination, thus (a) is not the answer. Even if the woman is perfectly healthy, if the foetus shows a substantial risk of serious abnormality, the MTPA allows termination. The health condition and the foetal abnormality condition are alternatives. So, (b) is not the answer. The MTPA does not unconditionally allow pregnant women to terminate their pregnancies. Termination is allowed only if certain conditions are satisfied. Here, since no condition is satisfied, termination cannot be allowed. Thus, (c) is not the answer.

3.5 Consider the following: Section 4(a) of the MTPA: No pregnancy of a woman, who has not attained the age of eighteen years, or, who, having attained the age of eighteen years, is a mentally ill person, shall be terminated except with the consent in writing of her guardian. Section 2(a) of the MTPA: “guardian” means a person having the care of the person of a minor or a mentally ill person. A 12 yearold girl became pregnant as a result of rape. She was an orphan, who was being brought up by her aunt and uncle. She, along with her aunt, approached the doctor to terminate pregnancy. The girl is 12 weeks pregnant. When the doctor asked the aunt if she consented to the

termination, the aunt said that she did. Can the doctor proceed to medically terminate pregnancy?

- (a) No, because the MTPA requires the consent of the girl's parents
- (b) Yes, because the aunt consented to termination
- (c) Yes, because the girl wanted to terminate her pregnancy, which is a result of rape
- (d) No, because the aunt's verbal consent is not sufficient for termination under the MTPA

Rationale

The correct answer is (d) – no, because the aunt's verbal consent is not sufficient for termination under the MTPA. Section 4(a) states that the guardian has to provide consent in writing. This means that verbal consent is not sufficient as per the MTPA. (a) is not the answer because the MTPA only requires guardians to give consent, not parents. Here, since the girl is being brought up by her aunt and uncle, who have the care of the girl because she is an orphan, the aunt and uncle are her guardians. (b) is not the answer because while the aunt consented verbally, she did not consent in writing. (c) is not the answer because consent of a minor alone is insufficient under the MTPA, which also requires the consent of the minor's guardian.

CRITICAL REASONING

External affairs minister S Jaishankar rejected suggestions from the West that India's purchases of Russian oil is helping fund the war in Ukraine, saying New Delhi is only working to get the best deal for its citizens amid intense volatility in global energy markets. He noted that European countries have included carve-outs in sanctions imposed on Russia that allow them to access Russian gas. "I don't want to sound argumentative but then tell me if buying Russian gas is not funding the war [in Ukraine]. It's only Indian money and oil coming to India which funds [the war] but it's not gas coming to Europe which funds [it]?" he said. Russian crude flows to India were set to touch 3.36 million tonnes in May, nearly nine times higher than the 2021 monthly average of 382,500 tonnes. India has procured 4.8 million tonnes of discounted Russian oil since the Ukraine war began in February. Jaishankar said the narrative about the volume of purchases increasing nine times should factor in the fact that was "from a very low base at a time when markets were more open". "If countries in Europe and the West and the US are so concerned, why don't they allow Iranian [and] Venezuelan oil to come into the market? They've squeezed every other source of oil we have, and then say, okay guys you must not go into the market and

get the best deal for your people. I don't think that's a very fair approach," he said. Jaishankar noted that European countries were continuing to buy Russian oil and gas, and the latest package of sanctions included a carve-out for pipelines and timelines reducing energy imports. If European states manage energy deals in a way that the impact on their economy is "not traumatic, that freedom or choice should exist for other people as well", he said. India is only buying the "best oil in the market" and "no political messaging should be attached to this", he added. Asked about India's ban on wheat exports, he said this was done to prevent speculation by international traders in centres such as Singapore and Dubai. India remains committed to providing wheat to developing countries that have a genuine need for food grains, he said. India has usually exported two to three million tonnes of wheat a year, and the figure touched seven million tonnes last year before this year's heat wave affected crops "very badly", and New Delhi acted to prevent the diversion of wheat to high income countries, as had happened in the case of Covid-19 vaccines, he said.

[Extracted, with edits and revisions, from "'Only Indian money funds war?' Jaishankar counters West on Russian oil", by Rezaul H. Laskar, Hindustan Times]

4.1 Which of the following arguments is most like the argument put forward by S. Jaishankar in the passage above as regards India's purchase of oil from Russia?

- (a) It is acceptable for India to trade with a country only if it does not engage in wars.
- (b) India should not trade with any country but should instead aim to be completely self-reliant.
- (c) It is acceptable for India to trade with a country that engages in wars if other nations also trade with that country.
- (d) India should not trade with a country that engages in wars even if other nations continue to trade with that country.

Rationale

The correct answer is (c) – It is acceptable for India to trade with a country that engages in wars if other nations also trade with that country. Jaishankar argues that India's purchases from Russian oil are no different from Western countries' purchase of Russian oil and gas, and asks if only India's oil purchases fund Russia's war against Ukraine, but not Western countries' purchases of Russian oil and gas. He does this while refuting the statement that India's purchase of Russian oil is funding Russia's war against Ukraine, and to justify such purchases by India. Option (c) states a similar argument, and claims that India can trade with a country that engage in wars if other nations also do so. Option (a) cannot be the correct answer since it would undermine Jaishankar's justification of India's purchases of Russian oil. Similarly, option (b) cannot be the correct answer since it would imply that India should not trade with any country, while Jaishankar seeks to justify India's trade with Russia (through its purchase of Russian oil). Option (d) is directly contradictory to

Jaishankar's arguments in the passage above, and so, it cannot be the correct answer.

4.2 Which of the following is Jaishankar most likely to agree with?

- (a) Regardless of how much oil India imported from Russia in the past, the fact that its imports have increased nine times is shocking and unacceptable.
- (b) One should not place too much emphasis on the fact that India's import of Russian crude has multiplied nine times, since India imported a very small volume of oil from Russia in the past.
- (c) The fact that India's import of Russian crude has multiplied nine times is particularly shocking since India has always imported large volumes of crude oil from Russia.
- (d) The manifold increase in India's imports of Russian crude are justified since other countries have also increased their imports of Russian oil and gas.

Rationale The correct answer is (b) – One should not place too much emphasis on the fact that India's import of Russian crude has multiplied nine times, since India imported a very small volume of oil from Russia in the past. Jaishankar says that the discussion about India's import of Russian crude increasing nine times should also account for the fact that that was "from a very low base at a time when markets were more open". Option (b) most closely reflects this statement, and so, it is the correct answer. Option (a) argues that one should disregard the low base from which India's import of Russian crude have multiplied, which is contrary to Jaishankar's argument that the past low base should be taken into consideration, and so, it cannot be the correct answer. Option (c) contradicts Jaishankar's claim of the multiple being over "a very low base", and so, it cannot be the correct answer. There is nothing in the passage to support the claim in option (d), and so, it cannot be the correct answer.

4.3 Which of the following, if true, would most weaken Jaishankar's arguments in the passage above?

- (a) All Western nations, including those in Europe and the US, have banned imports of Russian oil and gas completely.
- (b) All Western nations, including those in Europe and the US, continue to provide funds to Russia by importing Russian oil and gas.
- (c) Western nations continue to import oil and gas from Russia since they do not have any other sources from which they can source oil and gas.
- (d) All Western nations, including those in Europe and the US, are making strong efforts to develop sources of renewable energy production.

Rationale

The correct answer is (a) – All Western nations, including those in Europe and the US, have banned imports of Russian oil and gas completely. Jaishankar argues that it is wrong for the Western nations to suggest that India's purchases of Russian crude oil are funding the war in Ukraine, since they continue to import Russian oil

and gas, and have included carveouts in sanctions imposed on Russia that allow them to access Russian gas. If the statement in option (a) were true, the premise on which Jaishankar's argument is based would be negated, thereby weakening his argument. Therefore, option (a) is the correct answer. Option (b) supports Jaishankar's argument directly, and so, it cannot be the correct answer. Option (c) is similar to Jaishankar's argument about how all other sources for India have been 'squeezed' and so, it cannot be the correct answer. Jaishankar's arguments justifying India's imports of Russian oil are based on the fact that Western nations continue to import Russian oil and gas; further, there is nothing in the passage that would provide any information about whether India's efforts to develop sources of renewable energy sources is comparable to the West, and so, option (d) cannot be the correct answer.

4.4 On which of the following assumptions do Jaishankar's arguments about India's ban on wheat exports depend?

- (a) That high income countries do not need Indian wheat exports
- (b) That international traders in centres such as Singapore and Dubai prevent Indian wheat exports from reaching developing countries that need them.
- (c) That international traders in centres such as Singapore and Dubai divert supplies of Indian wheat to developing countries that most need food grains.
- (d) That India's ban on wheat exports is justified because Western countries continue to import Russian oil and gas.

Rationale

The correct answer is (b) – That international traders in centres such as Singapore and Dubai prevent Indian wheat exports from reaching developing countries that need them. Jaishankar says that speculation by traders in Singapore and Dubai is the reason why India banned wheat exports, while saying that India remains committed to providing wheat to developing countries that have a genuine need for food grains. This implies that the speculation by such traders prevents Indian wheat exports from reaching developing countries that genuinely need food grains, and so, option (b) is the correct answer. He does not suggest that high-income countries do not need Indian wheat exports, merely that India is committed to providing such food grains to developing countries in need; therefore, there is nothing in the passage to support option (a), and so, it cannot be the correct answer. The statement in option (c) would contradict, rather than support Jaishankar's argument in the passage, and so, it cannot be an assumption on which Jaishankar's argument depends. Therefore, option (c) cannot be the correct answer. Jaishankar does not draw any correlation between the import of Russian oil and gas by Western countries and India's ban on wheat exports. Therefore, there is nothing in the passage to support option (d), and so, it cannot be the correct answer.

4.5 Jaishankar's arguments supporting India's ban on wheat exports is most vulnerable to criticism on which of the following grounds?

(a) Preventing speculation by international traders prevents abnormal rises in the price of wheat.

(b) International traders try to maximise wheat prices, which results in Indian wheat exports reaching high income countries rather than developing nations.

(c) International traders provide better business terms to Indian wheat exporters and banning exports to them would harm the interests of Indian wheat exporters.

(d) Banning wheat exports results in Indian wheat not reaching international traders in Singapore and Dubai, as well as developing countries that are most in need of food grains.

Rationale

The correct answer is (d) – Banning wheat exports results in Indian wheat not reaching international traders in Singapore and Dubai, as well as developing countries that are most in need of food grains. Jaishankar argues that the reason behind India's wheat ban policy is to prevent speculation by international traders in centres such as Singapore and Dubai, while stating that India remains committed to providing wheat to developing countries that have a genuine need for food grains. A ban on exports would mean that Indian wheat would be unable to reach such international traders, as well as needy developing countries. Therefore, option (d) is the correct answer. Option (a) would support Jaishankar's argument, since it implies that India's wheat ban policy would prevent wheat prices from rising abnormally, thereby making wheat more accessible for needy developing countries. Therefore, option (a) cannot be the correct answer. Similarly, the argument in option (b) would support Jaishankar's arguments in support of India's wheat ban, and so, it cannot be the correct answer. Jaishankar's arguments in support of India's wheat exports ban rest upon the need to ensure supplies of Indian wheat reach developing countries, rather than protecting the interests of Indian wheat exporters. Therefore, option (c) would not be as strong a criticism of Jaishankar's arguments as option (d), and cannot be the correct answer.

4.6 Which of the following most accurately and comprehensively describes Jaishankar's arguments in support of India's imports of Russian oil and his response to the suggestion that India's purchases of Russian oil is helping fund the war in Ukraine?

(a) He justifies India's imports of Russian oil on the grounds that Western nations continue to import Russian oil and gas, and says that India is entitled to make such choices in the interests of protecting its economy, since Western nations are also adopting policies that ensure the impact on their economy is not traumatic; however, he does not deny that the money from Indian imports of Russian oil may be used to fund Russia's war against Ukraine.

(b) He justifies India's imports of Russian oil on the grounds that India remains committed to ensuring that its wheat exports reach developing countries that most need such food grains; he argues that India's wheat export policy justifies any funding of the Ukraine war that may result from India's import of Russian oil.

(c) He justifies India's imports of Russian oil on the grounds that Western nations continue to import Russian oil and gas, and says that India is entitled to continue importing Russian oil to protect its interests since Western nations continue to import Russian oil and gas; further, he says that since India and Western countries continue to make foreign policy decisions as they think fit, Russia should also be able to make such decisions, including the decision to wage a war in Ukraine.

(d) He argues that while Russian crude oil exports to India were set to touch 3.36 million tonnes in May, which is nearly nine times higher than the 2021 monthly average of 382,500 tonnes, this increase is from a very low base, and therefore not as dramatic as it is being made out to be by some people.

Rationale

The correct answer is (a) – He justifies India's imports of Russian oil on the grounds that Western nations continue to import Russian oil and gas, and says that India is entitled to make such choices in the interests of protecting its economy, since Western nations are also adopting policies that ensure the impact on their economy is not traumatic; however, he does not deny that the money from Indian imports of Russian oil may be used to fund Russia's war against Ukraine. Jaishankar compares India's imports from Russia with those of Western nations and says that if European states manage energy deals in a way that minimises traumatic impacts on their economy, then that freedom or choice should exist for other people as well", but does not say that the money from India's imports of Russian oil is not being used to fund the war against Ukraine. Option (a) captures this accurately, and therefore, it is the correct answer. Jaishankar draws no relation between India's wheat export policy and its imports of Russian oil, and so, option (b) cannot be the correct answer. While the first part of the statement in option (c) may be right, Jaishankar makes no statements supporting Russia's decision to wage war in Ukraine, and so, option (c) cannot be the correct answer. While Jaishankar does say that the increase in India's imports of Russian oil is from a very low base, he says this in response to the argument that India's imports of Russian oil have increased, and not in response to the suggestion that India's imports of Russian oil are funding the war in Ukraine, nor as a justification for India's imports of Russian oil. Therefore, option (d) cannot be the correct answer.

QUANTITATIVE TECHNIQUES

Smita purchased some rulers, notebooks and pens for her younger siblings. She had to buy at least 10 pieces of each items in a way that number of notebooks bought be more than the number of pens which is more than the number of rulers. She purchased a total of 38 items.

5.1 What is the maximum number of rulers that Smita could have bought?

- (a) 10
- (b) 11
- (c) 8
- (d) Cannot be determined**

5.2 If the number of pens cannot be divided equally among 4 persons, how many pens did she purchase?

- (a) 14
- (b) 12
- (c) 15
- (d) Cannot be determined**

5.3 If each ruler costs Rs. 5, each pen Rs. 3 and each notebook Rs. 15, what is the maximum amount that Smita could have spent?

- (a) 338**
- (b) 207
- (c) 331
- (d) 304

5.4 What is the maximum number of notebooks she could have purchased?

- (a) 10
- (b) 11
- (c) 17
- (d) 15

5.5 Smita purchased the 3 items in a way that after distributing each of the items equally among 5 siblings she was left with total 3 pieces with no notebook. How many rulers did she buy?

- (a) 10
- (b) 12
- (c) 11**
- (d) Cannot be determined