

CRITICAL REASONING

In 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev launched an ill-fated anti-alcohol campaign in the then Soviet Union. According to Gorbachev's biographer, William Taubman, the campaign followed on a high-powered Politburo report that worried about the deleterious consequences of excessive drinking in the Soviet Union: Annually, 12 million drunks arrested, 13,000 rapes attributed to alcohol, along with 29,000 robberies. The anti-alcohol campaign had some beneficial public health consequences: Crime fell and life expectancy rose. But the campaign was a political and economic disaster. The people of the Soviet Union hated it, and preferred to have their access to alcohol restored.

Gorbachev forgot that the addiction of the state to alcohol revenue was even more incurable than the addiction of some citizens to alcohol itself. The budgetary losses created an economic crisis. Historians suspect that more than the loss of the Soviet Empire, it was this campaign that delegitimised Gorbachev.

As the lockdown eased in India, and social distancing went for a toss at alcohol outlets, we were reminded of how difficult an issue alcohol is to rationally discuss in India. Like in Russia, it is difficult to wean many states away from the political economy of alcohol. It lubricates not just the state coffers but whole political machines. There is also the fear that simply discussing this topic puts you on the slippery slope to prohibition; acknowledging the problem will legitimise state repression.

Liberals should, rightly, be suspicious of prohibition on moral and practical grounds. Government grossly exceeds its legitimate power when it interferes with the rights of individuals to lead their lives as they please, and fashion their selves after their own ideals, interests and preferences. And certainly, moralism or puritanism on alcohol cannot be the basis of state policy. That moralism has no basis, and it violates the dignity and freedom of individuals.

But one of the paradoxes of liberalism is this. In order for liberal freedoms to flourish, society requires more self-restraint and judgement, not less. The state should not interfere with any freedom of expression. But freedom of expression will not survive, or be rendered relatively meaningless, if social norms that flourish under this freedom simply use freedom as a cover for hate or subordinating others. The state should not interfere in matters of sexuality or intimacy. But norms of freedom will impose serious costs and will not survive if the expressions of sexuality are consistently degrading or violent, as we have seen in the locker room scandals. The state should not interfere with people's right to drink; but there will be a backlash if drinking takes forms that inflict great social harms.

[Extracted, with edits and revisions, from "We need to question our addiction to cultural and political economy of alcohol", by Pratap Bhanu Mehta, *The Indian Express*, <https://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/drink-for-thought-india-lockdown-alcohol-addiction-6397378/>]

19.1 Which of the following about the people of the Soviet Union, if true, would have resulted in the anti-alcohol campaign launched by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985 not failing in the manner described in the passage above?

- (a) They wished for the Soviet Union to be dissolved.
- (b) They liked Mikhail Gorbachev's manner of delivering speeches.
- (c) They wanted a reduction in the prices of food, which were escalating.

- (d) They were prepared to lose their access to alcohol in exchange for reduced crime rates.

19.2 Which among the following would have resulted in the anti-alcohol campaign launched by Mikhail Gorbachev not being an ‘economic disaster’ for the Soviet Union?

- (a) The Soviet Union moving to a capitalist economic system from a communist system.
- (b) The Soviet Union reducing its reliance on alcohol for revenue.
- (c) The Soviet Union setting up nationalized distilleries to produce more alcohol.
- (d) The Soviet Union signing international disarmament treaties.

19.3 Based on the information in the passage above, which of the following is least likely to be true about the people of the Soviet Union in 1985?

- (a) They preferred an increase in overall life expectancy over access to alcohol.
- (b) They preferred access to alcohol over an increase in overall life expectancy.
- (c) They preferred to have vodka over any other form of alcohol.
- (d) They preferred vodka least among all forms of alcohol.

19.4 The author says that as the lockdown eased in India, “we were reminded of how difficult an issue alcohol is to rationally discuss in India”. Based on the author’s statements in the passage above, which of the following, if true, would have resulted in alcohol not being a difficult issue to rationally discuss in India?

- (a) States not being dependent on the political economy of alcohol.
- (b) No apprehensions of prohibition being aroused by simply discussing the topic of alcohol.
- (c) Both, (a) and (b).
- (d) Neither (a) nor (b).

19.5 Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the author’s arguments about what he describes as ‘one of the paradoxes of liberalism’?

- (a) Self-restraint and judgment do not come automatically to everyone.
- (b) All people do not have the same capacity to exercise self-restraint and judgment.
- (c) If people have to exercise increasing amounts of self-restraint and judgement, it is impossible for society to flourish.
- (d) If people have to exercise increasing amounts of self-restraint and judgement, it is very likely that society would flourish.

Until recently, most policymakers and investors remained complacent about the potential economic impact of the coronavirus crisis. As late as the end of February, most wrongly assumed that it would have only a brief, limited, China-specific impact. Now they realise that it is generating a global shock, which will be sharp—but which most still expect to be short.

The coronavirus crisis has highlighted the downsides of extensive international integration while fanning fears of foreigners and providing legitimacy for national restrictions on global trade and flows of people: all sorts of businesses have suddenly realised the risks of relying on complex global supply chains that are specific not just to China—but to particular places such as Wuhan, the epicentre of the pandemic.

Meanwhile, governments of all stripes have rushed to impose travel bans and export restrictions. The travel ban on arrivals from Europe that the U.S. announced is particularly broad, but far from unique. All of this is making economies more national and politics more nationalistic.

Much of this disruption may be temporary. But the coronavirus crisis is likely to have a lasting impact, especially when it reinforces other trends that are already undermining globalisation. It may deal a blow to fragmented international supply chains, reduce the hypermobility of global business travellers, and provide political fodder for nationalists who favour greater protectionism and immigration controls.

The complex China-centred global supply chains on which so many Western companies have come to rely are particularly at risk. The cost advantage of producing in China has eroded in recent years as the country has become richer and wages have soared. Inertia is a powerful thing. And there are still many advantages to producing in China, such as scale and efficient logistics. But the coronavirus crisis could mark a tipping point that prompts many businesses to remodel their supply chains and invest in more resilient and often more local patterns of production.

A second enduring consequence of the coronavirus crisis may be reduced business travel. Technology gurus have long argued that videoconferencing and chat apps would eliminate the need for most business travel and allow many people to work from home more. Yet until the coronavirus crisis, business travel had continued growing, seemingly inexorably. Now, whether because of government bans, business decisions, or individual caution, all but the most essential international travel has been cancelled, and those who can work from home are increasingly staying put.

Perhaps most significantly, the coronavirus crisis plays into the hands of nationalists who favour greater immigration controls and protectionism. The crisis will strengthen those who believe in strong government, prioritising societal needs over individual freedom, and national action over international cooperation.

[Extracted, with edits and revisions, from "The Coronavirus Is Killing Globalization as We Know It", by Philippe Legrain, *Foreign Policy*, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/03/12/coronavirus-killing-globalization-nationalism-protectionism-trump/?utm_source=PostUp&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=21910&utm_term=Master%20Marketing%20List&tpcc=21910]

20.1 Which of the following best describes the change in how, according to the author, most policymakers and investors think about the potential economic impact of the coronavirus crisis?

- (a) While they thought the impact of the crisis would be relatively small and limited to China earlier, they now think the impact will be greater, and permanent.
- (b) While they felt the crisis would have had no impact at all earlier, they now feel its effects will last permanently.
- (c) While they thought the impact of the crisis would be relatively small and limited to China earlier, they now think the impact will be greater, although for a limited time.
- (d) While they thought the impact of the crisis would last a long time and affect the entire world earlier, they now think it will be short-lived and limited to China.

20.2 What role does the author's statement about businesses realizing the risks of relying on complex global supply chains play in relation to his statement that the crisis has highlighted the downsides of extensive international integration?

- (a) The two statements are not related to each other at all.
- (b) It offers evidence in support of his conclusion.
- (c) It offers contradictory evidence to challenge his conclusion.
- (d) It presents a contrasting point of view to his conclusion.

20.3 Which of the following, if true, would most strongly support what businesses now think of complex global supply chains?

- (a) Since countries care more about profit than the health of populations, the future stability of global supply chains is guaranteed.
- (b) Global supply chains are very deeply embedded in the international trade system, and countries will ensure they are not affected again in the future.
- (c) The crisis will result in frequent lockdowns and the shutting down of the international movement of goods and people at unpredictable intervals.
- (d) Global supply chains will evolve to deal with the impact of the crisis, such that they will no longer be affected by events such as the Covid-19 pandemic.

20.4 Which of the following is the most likely outcome of the author's statement that economies are becoming "more national" is true?

- (a) Travel bans and export restrictions are likely to continue, and possibly even increase.
- (b) Travel bans and export restrictions are likely to ease off over time.
- (c) Travel bans and export restrictions will cease as soon as the crisis is over.
- (d) None of the above.

20.5 The author says that the cost advantage of producing in China has eroded in recent years as certain other things have occurred. Based on the author's reasoning and statements, which of the following would result if these other things were reversed?

- (a) China will impose stricter laws regarding labour and factories.
- (b) China will see increasing incidents of bad weather.
- (c) China will become even richer, and wages will increase even more.
- (d) China will become a poorer country, and wages will reduce.

In June, the death of a female pregnant elephant in Kerala's Mannarkkad forest range in Palakkad evoked a public furore. Initial reports suggested a deliberate ploy to kill the elephant, but investigations revealed that local farmers had planted an explosive-laden trap as bait for menacing wild boars. The hungry elephant accidentally ate the pineapple, sustained wounds in its mouth when the explosive stuffed in it exploded, and died in pain, videos of which went viral.

Miles away in Vidarbha, Maharashtra's eastern region, five people have died in two months on account of tiger attacks. The number has been rising ever since the man-tiger conflict first broke out in the late 1990s. A fortnight on, the elephant story is dead and will soon be forgotten, like that of Avni.

Avni, who? The robust tigress had killed 14 people in Maharashtra's cotton-growing Yavatmal district in 2017-18 before being put down after one of the longest track-and-search operations to neutralise a beast. One of her cubs was captured; the other could never be found.

Alas, the Palakkad incident is the tip of an iceberg. Man-animal conflict is a complex phenomenon that needs immediate attention from policy. It is a manifestation of the conflict among diverse worldviews with regard to forest and ecosystem conservation. Hard line wildlife activists do not want humans in jungles. Rights activists, on the other end, do not want wildlife to be captured and evacuated. And governments want big-ticket projects to be cleared for development. The problem is that both wildlife and humans share forest landscapes and so must learn to co-exist, but very rarely do officials, wildlife activists or conservationists see local populations as partners in conservation.

The approach to see locals as beneficiaries of weird government doles, such as the distribution of petty cash or barbed wire fences or gas stoves to reduce the use of firewood, is obsolete. The alternative model is that of human-wildlife co-existence with regulations and incentives, and stakes for locals in conservation.

The overarching context, though, is this: India's protected forests are fragmenting; they are being turned into large zoos as we fell them to expand our infrastructure for mindless, destructive development. So when the minister for environment, forest and climate change, Prakash Javadekar, condemned Left-ruled Kerala for the elephant death and said that the incident was against our national ethos, his double-speak was quite glaring. During the lockdown, his ministry quietly cleared the way for over 30 projects that conservationists say would affect 15 tiger reserves, wildlife corridors, eco-sensitive zones and sanctuaries, including the Dehing Patkai Elephant Reserve in Assam.

[Extracted, with edits and revisions, from "The Elephant in the Room", by Jaideep Hardikar, *The Telegraph*, https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/man-animal-conflict-is-a-complex-phenomenon-that-needs-immediate-attention-from-policy/cid/1781171?ref=opinion_opinion-page]

21.1 Which of the following is the author most likely to agree with?

- (a) Local populations must be involved in conservation efforts, and made stakeholders in the process.
- (b) Local populations should be evacuated from places near forests.
- (c) Local populations should have no role to play in conservation efforts.
- (d) Local populations do not suffer any hardship caused by wild animals.

21.2 Which among the following, if true, would most weaken the author's arguments in the passage above?

- (a) Some government policies seek to provide handouts to local populations.
- (b) Local populations sometimes receive petty cash or gas stoves under government policies to reduce their use of firewood.
- (c) Government policies always consider local populations as important actors in conservation efforts.
- (d) Government policies don't always have the best interests of wildlife in mind.

21.3 Based on the author's arguments in the passage above, which of the following is the most likely explanation for why the author begins the passage by talking about the death of the wild elephant in Kerala and the tiger attacks in Maharashtra?

- (a) The author uses these incidents to show that there are no complexities in man-animal conflicts.
- (b) The author uses these incidents to show the challenges faced by both, wildlife and local populations, when sharing forest land.
- (c) Both, (a) and (b).
- (d) Neither (a) nor (b).

21.4 Why does the author accuse the minister for environment, forest, and climate change of 'double-speak'?

- (a) Because his ministry hands out 'weird' doles to local populations.
- (b) Because his ministry paid the hunter who tracked down and killed Avni.
- (c) Because his ministry did not take action to prevent the death of the elephant in Kerala.
- (d) Because the actions of his ministry during the lockdown undermine his statements about Left-ruled Kerala.

21.5 Which of the following conservation policies is the author most likely to disagree with?

- (a) A policy that recognises both, wild animals and local populations as stakeholders in forests.

- (b) A policy that prioritises development over the conservation of wild animal populations.
- (c) A policy that seeks to balance development with the conservation of forests, wild animals, and local populations.
- (d) A policy that incentivizes local populations to participate in conservation efforts.

Most big ideas have loud critics. Not disruption. Disruptive innovation as the explanation for how change happens has been subject to little serious criticism, partly because it's headlong, while critical inquiry is unhurried; partly because disrupters ridicule doubters by charging them with intolerance of change, as if to criticize a theory of change were identical to decrying change; and partly because, in its modern usage, innovation is the idea of progress insulated from criticism.

Disruptive innovation is a theory about why businesses fail. It's not more than that. It doesn't explain change. It's not a law of nature. It's an artefact of history, an idea, forged in time; it's the manufacture of a moment of upsetting and edgy uncertainty. Transfixed by change, it's blind to continuity. It makes a very poor prophet.

The upstarts who work at startups don't often stay at any one place for very long. (Three out of four startups fail. More than nine out of ten never earn a return.) They work a year here, a few months there—zany hours everywhere. They wear jeans and sneakers and ride scooters and share offices and sprawl on couches like Great Danes. Their coffee machines look like dollhouse-size factories.

They are told that they should be reckless and ruthless. Their investors, if they're like Josh Linkner, tell them that the world is a terrifying place, moving at a devastating pace. "Today I run a venture capital firm and back the next generation of innovators who are, as I was throughout my earlier career, dead-focused on eating your lunch," Linkner writes. His job appears to be to convince a generation of people who want to do good and do well to learn, instead, remorselessness. Forget rules, obligations, your conscience, loyalty, a sense of the commonweal. If you start a business and it succeeds, Linkner advises, sell it and take the cash. Don't look back. Never pause. Disrupt or be disrupted.

But they do pause and they do look back, and they wonder.

[Extracted, with edits and revisions, from "The Disruption Machine", by Jill Lepore, *The New Yorker*, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/06/23/the-disruption-machine>]

22.1 Which of the following best describes the author's arguments about the disruptive innovation theory?

- (a) The author questions the ability of the theory to explain anything beyond the failure of certain companies.
- (b) The author feels that the theory is more about disruption than innovation.
- (c) The author criticises the critics who have been silent regarding this theory.

(d) The author urges the proponents of the theory to modify it so that it can explain successes of some businesses.

22.2 Which of the following contradicts the author's arguments the most?

(a) The disruptive innovation theory has provided an accurate formula to explain why businesses fail.

(b) The disruptive innovation theory has enormous predictive power about the future performance of businesses.

(c) It is not possible to criticise the disruptive innovation theory.

(d) The disruptive innovation theory has few opponents and is widely accepted by those who matter in business.

22.3 Which of the following is consistent with the author's view regarding the influence that investors like Josh Linkner have on young entrepreneurs?

(a) They motivate young entrepreneurs to create a just society.

(b) They motivate young entrepreneurs to chase success at all costs.

(c) They teach young entrepreneurs to be repentant.

(d) They teach young entrepreneurs to earn enough to be able to buy lunch for themselves.

22.4 Which of the following, if true, most weakens the argument of the author that disruptive innovation is a theory about why businesses fail and not more than that?

(a) The founders of most successful businesses have applied the theory of disruptive innovation.

(b) Several businesses that succeeded have been headed by leaders who have never heard of the theory of disruptive innovation.

(c) Of the businesses that failed despite adhering to the theory of disruptive innovation, all of them misapplied the theory.

(d) The disruptive innovation theory dwells on the nature of change that took place at the time of its publication at length.

22.5 If the author were right, which of the following would ensure that the disruptive innovation theory attracts sufficient criticism?

(a) Those who propound the theory make specific, verifiable predictions about the success and failure of businesses in the future based on the theory.

(b) The proponents of the theory appreciate that critics of the theory may be advocates of change, but may question whether the disruptive innovation theory is accurate in its hypothesis about how change plays a role in the success and failure of a company.

- (c) The proponents of the theory underscore that only sustained critique of a theory over a significant period can be the true test of its veracity.
- (d) All of the above.

This leads me to the other mystery in our daily lives related to the monetary: the curiously perennial lack of change. You might wonder where all the change goes; what causes this constant paucity; why we all hoard coins and notes of smaller denominations and lie about not possessing change even when we have it in our wallets.

The poet C.P. Surendran once gave me an insight, in Delhi, into why the situation as we know it exists. We'd arrived in Khan Market late in the morning; we had to pay the fare; not a single auto driver, though, among the line of autos parked in the front, could give us change for a hundred rupees. My old puzzlement came back: "How can not one of them have the money?" C.P. said, "These people don't bring the last day's earnings when they return to work. They begin each day afresh." And this was the first time someone had said something illuminating to me on the subject and opened my eyes to the most common sort of employee around us: the daily-wage earner. This person goes back home at night, possibly having spent part of his money on beedis, gutka, or drink, possibly giving some of it to the family, or part to an employer to whom he owes a species of mortgage. The next day he's back, like a migrant, to whom the business of livelihood is old and inevitable, but to whom money is always new. He could be anywhere. Having money doesn't mean owning it; it means to relentlessly make or break the makeshift rules of exchange. Change isn't hoarded for the purposes of saving or spending, but because it constantly needs to be earned. Others, in the salaried middle classes, or in trade or business, have to deal with this person in their own manner: by outwitting or outwaiting him, or – what's more common – by mimicking him.

[Extracted, with edits and revisions, from "Money Matters", by Amit Chaudhuri, in *The Book of Indian Essays*, edited by Arvind Krishna Mehrotra, Black Kite/Permanent Black, Delhi, 2020]

23.1 Which of the following is most accurate as regards C.P. Surendran's explanation for why the auto drivers did not have change for a hundred rupees?

- (a) It extends not only to daily-wage earners but also explains why non-daily-wage earners do not carry change.
- (b) It explains why people who ride in autos as passengers do not carry change.
- (c) It extends only to daily-wage earners but does not explain why non-daily-wage earners do not carry change.
- (d) It explains why the author does not have change for a hundred rupees.

23.2 Which of the following, if true, would most weaken C.P. Surendran's argument for why auto drivers do not have change?

- (a) Auto drivers do not have access to safe places where they can store their earnings; therefore, they always carry their earnings on their person.
- (b) Auto drivers deposit their daily earnings in bank accounts at the end of each day.

- (c) Auto drivers earn some money every day.
- (d) Auto drivers do not have any money left over after their expenses, payments, and other costs at the end of each day.

23.3 Which of the following would provide an effective solution to problems that may be caused by the “curiously perennial lack of change” that the author mentions?

- (a) Capping auto fares at a reasonable rate per kilometer.
- (b) Removing all restrictions on auto fares.
- (c) Prohibiting payment transactions using digital systems and permitting only cash transactions.
- (d) A complete shift to digital payments systems, and the banning of all cash transactions.

23.4 Which of the following inferences about the salaried middle classes can be drawn based on the author’s comments in the passage?

- (a) They prefer to travel in taxis rather than autos.
- (b) They sometimes try to fool auto drivers into giving them change by pretending not to have any.
- (c) They prefer to use digital payment systems over cash.
- (d) They are always willing to give auto drivers change and go out of their way to do so.

23.5 Which of the following is an assumption that the author has made?

- (a) That we all dislike keeping small change and are only too willing to part with it.
- (b) That all of us hoard small change and are untruthful in order not to part with
- (c) That all of us dislike riding in autos.
- (d) That all of us would gladly exchange small denominations of currency for higher-value notes.

Strict adherence to a set of laws is always critical to the smooth running of any system. It’s essential for these laws to be codified in the clearest possible wording, covering every possible scenario and thus leaving practically nothing to an individual’s discretion and good sense of morals. A game of cricket, however, despite an elaborate set of laws that serve as the guiding principle for most situations, leaves some wriggle room for subjective interpretation of some laws. And players, in these instances, are expected to uphold the most deceptively coined phrase – spirit of cricket.

Running out a non-striker backing up too far while the bowler is still in the process of releasing the ball is one of those situations. Despite the fielding side being afforded every right to affect this mode of dismissal at will and the laws of the game deeming it entirely legitimate, the cricket community somehow has never forged a consensus over this act.

Infamously named after former India all-rounder Vinoo Mankad, 'Mankading' has forever remained a grey area that inevitably raises a conscientious debate. And thus entirely unsurprisingly, it once again made headlines when another India all-rounder Deepti Sharma ran out England's Charlie Dean in this fashion at a decisive moment in a recent ODI match between the two teams.

The English commentariat exercised little restraint, questioning the Indian team's moral character and labelling the incident farcical. Their counterparts in the Indian media defended Sharma vehemently and called the criticism petty, bitter, and hypocritical. The noise around this conversation always follows a familiar theme and the political undertones that accompany the debate every time it spurs up are impossible to ignore.

Cricket's spread in the Indian subcontinent is a legacy of the region's colonial past and despite little history of on-field animosity between the two countries, there's strong baggage of perceptions that the average Indian fan continues to associate with the English. And these perceptions aren't the kindest for obvious reasons. Elitist sanctimony from the English, therefore, is going to have fewer and fewer takers moving forward.

But despite the obvious temptation to dunk on that empty phrase 'spirit of cricket' at every opportunity, those with the platform and reach to influence public opinion might want to just change course a bit. Perhaps when the debate is sparked the next time they might want to steer clear of the tired anti-colonial rhetoric and push for a more meaningful conversation that explores some realistic and achievable alternatives to 'Mankading'.

[Extracted, with edits and revisions, from "The English Obsession With 'Spirit of Cricket' Perverts the Discourse on 'Mankading'", by Parth Pandya, *The Wire*, available at: <https://thewire.in/sport/spirit-of-cricket-mankading-discourse>]

24.1 Which of the following is the author most likely to agree with?

- (a) While Indian and English players have not exhibited animosity towards each other, Indian cricket fans have shown a positive attitude towards English cricketers.
- (b) While Indian and English players have exhibited animosity towards each other, Indian cricket fans have also shown a negative attitude towards English cricketers.
- (c) While Indian and English players have exhibited animosity towards each other, the typical Indian cricket fan has a positive view of English.
- (d) While Indian and English players have not exhibited animosity towards each other, the typical Indian cricket fan has a negative view of the English.

24.2 Which of the following can be validly implied from the authors' arguments?

- (a) The English are very poor cricketers who do not understand the spirit of the sport.
- (b) Indians are very poor cricketers, and do not understand the spirit of the sport.
- (c) It would be more productive to discuss viable alternatives to 'Mankading' when a debate around the practice arises again, instead of adhering to the often-repeated arguments about colonial practices.
- (d) It would be more productive to discuss viable alternatives to cricket when a debate around 'Mankading' arises again, instead of adhering to the often-repeated arguments about colonial practices.

24.3 The author's description of how cricket spread in the Indian subcontinent is premised on:

- (a) The idea that the sport is indigenous to the region and was adopted by colonizers.
- (b) The idea that the sport was introduced in the region by colonizers and has remained in the region even after the colonizers left.
- (c) The idea that the English would not have been able to colonize the region unless they had introduced the sport of Cricket to the people of the region.
- (d) The idea that Indians are now trying to use Cricket as a means of creating economic colonies in other nations.

24.4 Which of the following, if true, would most weaken the author's arguments?

- (a) People in the cricketing world have dramatically different views about whether 'Mankading' should be allowed to continue, particularly since there is nothing in the laws of the sport regarding this act.
- (b) The cricketing world has unanimously rejected 'Mankading' as a valid action in the sport, and there is considerable doubt regarding its legitimacy.
- (c) Players should not have to interpret the meaning of terms like the 'spirit of cricket', but instead, should be able to rely on clearly worded laws that spell out the rules of the game.
- (d) It is worth noting that the controversy around 'Mankading' has arisen due to the actions of another India all-rounder, Deepti Sharma.

24.5 Which of the following best describes the similarities between the reactions of the English commentariat and the Indian media to the 'Mankading' incident involving Deepti Sharma and Charlie Dean?

- (a) Both sides lauded the actions of Deepti Sharma and called her a true champion of the modern game of Cricket.
- (b) Both called for the removal of 'Mankading' as a legitimate action under the laws of Cricket.
- (c) Both made remarks of a personal nature, rather than analysing the players' actions according to the rules of the game.
- (d) Both questioned the colonial legacy of the English in India and called for all future sporting competitions to involve sports that did not have anything to do with the region's colonial past.