

PASSAGE I

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.

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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 II

The current debate on intellectual property rights (IPRs) raises a number of important issues concerning the strategy and policies for building a more dynamic national agricultural research system, the relative roles of public and private sectors, and the role of agribusiness multinational corporations (MNCs). This debate has been stimulated by the international agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), negotiated as part of the Uruguay Round. TRIPs, for the first time, seeks to bring innovations in agricultural technology under a new worldwide IPR regime. The agribusiness MNCs (along with pharmaceutical companies) played a leading part in lobbying for such a regime during the Uruguay Round negotiations. The argument was that incentives are necessary to stimulate innovations, and that this calls for a system of patents which gives innovators the sole right to use (or sell/lease the right to use) their innovations for a specified period and protects them against unauthorized copying or use. With strong support of their national governments, they were influential in shaping the agreement on TRIPs, which eventually emerged from the Uruguay Round.

The current debate on TRIPs in India—as indeed elsewhere—echoes wider concerns about ‘privatization’ of research and allowing a free field for MNCs in the sphere of biotechnology and agriculture. The agribusiness corporations, and those with unbounded faith in the power of science to overcome all likely problems, point to the vast potential that new technology holds for solving the problems of hunger, malnutrition and poverty in the world. The exploitation of this potential should be encouraged and this is best done by the private sector for which patents are essential. Some, who do not necessarily accept this optimism, argue that fears of MNC domination are exaggerated and that farmers will accept their products only if they decisively outperform the available alternatives. Those who argue against agreeing to introduce an IPR regime in agriculture and encouraging private sector research are apprehensive that this will work to the disadvantage of farmers by making them more and more dependent on monopolistic MNCs. A different, though related apprehension is that extensive use of hybrids and genetically engineered new varieties might increase the vulnerability of agriculture to outbreaks of pests and diseases. The larger, longer-term consequences of reduced biodiversity that may follow from the use of specially bred varieties are also another cause for concern. Moreover, corporations, driven by the profit motive, will necessarily tend to underplay, if not ignore, potential adverse consequences, especially those which are unknown and which may manifest themselves only over a relatively long period. On the other hand, high-pressure advertising and aggressive sales campaigns by private companies can seduce farmers into accepting varieties without being aware of potential adverse effects and the possibility of disastrous consequences for their livelihood if these varieties happen to fail. There is no provision under the laws, as they now exist, for compensating users against such eventualities.

Excessive preoccupation with seeds and seed material has obscured other important issues involved in reviewing the research policy. We need to remind ourselves that improved varieties by themselves are not sufficient for sustained growth of yields. In our own experience, some of the early high yielding varieties (HYVs) of rice and wheat were found susceptible to widespread pest attacks; and some had problems of grain quality. Further research was necessary to solve these problems. This largely successful

research was almost entirely done in public research institutions. Of course, it could in principle have been done by private companies, but whether they choose to do so depends crucially on the extent of the loss in market for their original introductions on account of the above factors and whether the companies are financially strong enough to absorb the 'losses', invest in research to correct the deficiencies and recover the lost market. Public research, which is not driven by profit, is better placed to take corrective action. Research for improving common pool resource management, maintaining ecological health and ensuring sustainability is both critical and also demanding in terms of technological challenge and resource requirements. As such research is crucial to the impact of new varieties, chemicals and equipment in the farmer's field, private companies should be interested in such research. But their primary interest is in the sale of seed material, chemicals, equipment and other inputs produced by them. Knowledge and techniques for resource management are not 'marketable' in the same way as those inputs. Their application to land, water and forests has a long gestation and their efficacy depends on resolving difficult problems such as designing institutions informed by broader, long-term concerns can only do such work.

The public sector must therefore continue to play a major role in the national research system. It is both wrong and misleading to pose the problem in terms of public sector versus private sector or of privatization of research. We need to address problems likely to arise on account of the public-private sector complementarity, and ensure that the public research system performs efficiently. Complementarity between various elements of research raises several issues in implementing an IPR regime. Private companies do not produce new varieties and inputs entirely as a result of their own research. Almost all technological improvement is based on knowledge and experience accumulated from the past, and the results of basic and applied research in public and quasi-public institutions (universities, research organisations). Moreover, as is increasingly recognized, accumulated stock of knowledge does not reside only in the scientific community and its academic publications, but is also widely diffused in traditions and folk knowledge of local communities all over.

The deciphering of the structure and functioning of DNA forms the basis of much modern biotechnology. But this fundamental breakthrough is a 'public good' freely accessible in the public domain and usable free of any charge. Varieties/techniques developed using that knowledge can however be, and are, patented for private profit. Similarly, private corporations draw extensively, and without any charge, on germ plasm available in varieties of plants species (neem and turmeric are by now famous examples). Publicly funded gene banks as well as new varieties bred by public sector research stations can also be used freely by private enterprises for developing their own varieties and seek patent protection for them. Should private breeders be allowed free use of basic scientific discoveries? Should the repositories of traditional knowledge and germ plasm be collected which are maintained and improved by publicly funded institutions? Or should users be made to pay for such use? If they are to pay, what should be the basis of compensation? Should the compensation be for individuals or for communities/institutions to which they belong? Should individuals/institutions be given the right of patenting their innovations? These are some of the important issues that deserve more attention than they now get and need serious detailed study to evolve reasonably satisfactory, fair and workable solutions. Finally, the tendency to equate the public sector with the government is wrong. The public space is much wider than government departments and includes co-operatives, universities, public trusts and a variety of non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Giving greater autonomy to research organisations from government control and giving non-government public institutions the space and resources to play a larger, more effective role in research, is therefore an issue of direct relevance in restructuring the public research system.

1. Which one of the following statements describes an important issue, or important issues, not being raised in the context of the current debate on IPRs?
 - a) The role of MNCs in the sphere of biotechnology and agriculture.
 - b) The strategy and policies for establishing an IPR regime for Indian agriculture.
 - c) The relative roles of public and private sectors.
 - d) Wider concerns about 'privatisation' of research.

2. The fundamental breakthrough in deciphering the structure and functioning of DNA has become a public good. This means that:
 - a) breakthroughs in fundamental research on DNA are accessible by all without any monetary considerations.
 - b) the fundamental research on DNA has the characteristic of having beneficial effects for the public at large.
 - c) due to the large scale of fundamental research on DNA, it falls in the domain of public sector research institutions.
 - d) the public and other companies must have free access to such fundamental breakthroughs in research.

3. In debating the respective roles of the public and private sectors in the national research system, it is important to recognise:
 - a) that private companies do not produce new varieties and inputs entirely on their own research.
 - b) that almost all technological improvements are based on knowledge and experience accumulated from the past.
 - c) the complementary role of public- and private-sector research.
 - d) that knowledge repositories are primarily the scientific community and its academic publications.

4. Which one of the following may provide incentives to address the problem of potential adverse consequences of biotechnology?
 - a) Include IPR issues in the TRIPs agreement.
 - b) Nationalise MNCs engaged in private research in biotechnology.
 - c) Encourage domestic firms to patent their innovations.
 - d) Make provisions in the law for user compensation against failure of newly developed varieties.

5. Which of the following statements is not a likely consequence of emerging technologies in agriculture?
 - a) Development of newer and newer varieties will lead to increase in biodiversity.
 - b) MNCs may underplay the negative consequences of the newer technology on environment.
 - c) Newer varieties of seeds may increase vulnerability of crops to pests and diseases.
 - d) Reforms in patent laws and user compensation against crop failures would be needed to address new technology problems.

6. The TRIPs agreement emerged from the Uruguay Round to:
 - a) address the problem of adverse consequences of genetically engineered new varieties of grain.
 - b) fulfil the WTO requirement to have an agreement on trade related property rights.
 - c) provide incentives to innovators by way of protecting their intellectual property.

- d) give credibility to the innovations made by MNCs in the field of pharmaceuticals and agriculture.
7. Public or quasi-public research institutions are most likely than private companies to address the negative consequences of new technologies, because of which of the following reasons?
- a) Public research is not driven by profit motive.
 - b) Private companies may not be able to absorb losses out of the negative effects of the new technologies.
 - c) Unlike new technology products, knowledge and techniques for resource management are not amenable to simple market transactions.
 - d) All of the above.
8. While developing a strategy and policies for building a more dynamic national agricultural research system, which one of the following statements needs to be considered?
- a) Public and quasi-public institutions are not interested in making profits.
 - b) Public and quasi-public institutions have a broader and long-term outlook than private companies.
 - c) Private companies are incapable of building products based on traditional and folk knowledge.
 - d) Traditional and folk knowledge cannot be protected by patents.

PASSAGE III

Crinoline and croquet are out. As yet, no political activists have thrown themselves in front of the royal derby on Derby Day. Even so, some historians can spot the parallels. It is a time of rapid technological change. It is a period when the dominance of the world's superpower is coming under threat. It is an epoch when prosperity masks underlying economic strain. And, crucially, it is a time when policy-makers are confident that all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Welcome to the Edwardian Summer of the second age of globalisation.

Spare a moment to take stock of what's been happening in the past few months. Let's start with the oil price, which has rocketed to more than \$65 a barrel, more than double its level 18 months ago. The accepted wisdom is that we shouldn't worry our little heads about that, because the incentives are there for business to build new production and refining capacity, which will effortlessly bring demand and supply back into balance and bring crude prices back to \$25 a barrel. As Tommy Cooper used to say, 'just like that'.

Then there is the result of the French referendum on the European Constitution, seen as thick-headed luddites railing vainly against the modern world. What the French needed to realise, the argument went, was that there was no alternative to the reforms that would make the country more flexible, more competitive, more dynamic. Just the sort of reforms that allowed Gate Gourmet to sack hundreds of its staff at Heathrow after the sort of ultimatum that used to be handed out by Victorian mill owners. An alternative way of looking at the French "non" is that our neighbours translate "flexibility" as "you're fired".

Finally, take a squint at the United States. Just like Britain a century ago, a period of unquestioned superiority is drawing to a close. China is still a long way from matching America's wealth, but it is growing at a stupendous rate and economic strength brings geo-political clout. Already, there is evidence of a new scramble for Africa as Washington and Beijing compete for oil stocks. Moreover, beneath the surface of the US economy, all is not well. Growth looks healthy enough, but the competition from

China and elsewhere has meant the world's biggest economy now imports far more than it exports. The US is living beyond its means, but in this time of studied complacency a current account deficit worth 6 percent of gross domestic product is seen as a sign of strength, not weakness.

In this new Edwardian summer, comfort is taken from the fact that dearer oil has not had the savage inflationary consequences of 1973-74, when a fourfold increase in the cost of crude brought an abrupt end to a postwar boom that had gone on uninterrupted for a quarter of a century. True, the cost of living has been affected by higher transport costs, but we are talking of inflation at 2.3 per cent and not 27 per cent. Yet the idea that higher oil prices are of little consequence is fanciful. If people are paying more to fill up their cars it leaves them with less to spend on everything else, but there is a reluctance to consume less. In the 1970s unions were strong and able to negotiate large, compensatory pay deals that served to intensify inflationary pressure. In 2005, that avenue is pretty much closed off, but the abolition of all the controls on credit that existed in the 1970s means that households are invited to borrow more rather than consume less. The knock-on effects of higher oil prices are thus felt in different ways—through high levels of indebtedness, in inflated asset prices, and in balance of payments deficits.

There are those who point out, rightly, that modern industrial capitalism has proved mightily resilient these past 250 years, and that a sign of the enduring strength of the system has been the way it apparently shrugged off everything—a stock market crash, 9/11, rising oil prices—that have been thrown at it in the half decade since the millennium. Even so, there are at least three reasons for concern. First, we have been here before. In terms of political economy, the first era of globalisation mirrored our own. There was a belief in unfettered capital flows, in free trade, and in the power of the market. It was a time of massive income inequality and unprecedented migration. Eventually, though, there was a backlash, manifested in a struggle between free traders and protectionists, and in rising labour militancy.

Second, the world is traditionally at its most fragile at times when the global balance of power is in flux. By the end of the nineteenth century, Britain's role as the hegemonic power was being challenged by the rise of the United States, Germany, and Japan while the Ottoman and Hapsburg empires were clearly in rapid decline. Looking ahead from 2005, it is clear that over the next two or three decades, both China and India—which together account for half the world's population—will flex their muscles.

Finally, there is the question of what rising oil prices tell us. The emergence of China and India means global demand for crude is likely to remain high at a time when experts say production is about to top out. If supply constraints start to bite, any declines in the price are likely to be short-term cyclical affairs punctuating a long upward trend.

1. Which of the following best represents the key argument made by the author?

- a) The rise in oil prices, the flux in the global balance of power and historical precedents should make us question our belief that the global economic prosperity would continue.
- b) The belief that modern industrial capitalism is highly resilient and capable of overcoming shocks will be belied soon.
- c) Widespread prosperity leads to neglect of early signs of underlying economic weakness, manifested in higher oil prices and a flux in the global balance of power.
- d) A crisis is imminent in the West given the growth of countries like China and India and the increase in oil prices.

2. What can be inferred about the author's view when he states, 'As Tommy Cooper used to say "just like that"'?

- a) Industry has incentive to build new production and refining capacity and therefore oil prices would reduce.
- b) There would be a correction in the price levels of oil once new production capacity is added.
- c) The decline in oil prices is likely to be short-term in nature.
- d) It is not necessary that oil prices would go down to earlier levels.

3. By the expression 'Edwardian Summer', the author refers to a period in which there is

- a) a sense of complacency among people because of all-round prosperity.
- b) a culmination of all-round economic prosperity.
- c) an imminent danger lurking behind economic prosperity.
- d) unparalleled luxury and opulence.

4. What, according to the author, has resulted in a widespread belief in the resilience of modern capitalism?

- a) Growth in the economies of Western countries despite shocks in the form of increase in levels of indebtedness and inflated asset prices.
- b) Increase in the prosperity of Western countries and China despite rising oil prices.
- c) Continued growth of Western economies despite a rise in terrorism, an increase in oil prices and other similar shocks.
- d) The success of continued reforms aimed at making Western economies more dynamic, competitive and efficient.

PASSAGE IV

Have you ever come across a painting, by Picasso, Mondrian, Miro, or any other modern abstract painter of this century, and found yourself engulfed in a brightly coloured canvas which your senses cannot interpret? Many people would tend to denounce abstractionism as senseless trash. These people are disoriented by Miro's bright, fanciful creatures and two-dimensional canvases. They click their tongues and shake their heads at Mondrian's grid works, declaring the poor guy played too many scrabble games. They silently shake their heads in sympathy for Picasso, whose gruesome, distorted figures must be a reflection of his mental health. Then, standing in front of a work by Charlie Russell, the famous Western artist, they'll declare it a work of God. People feel more comfortable with something they can relate to and understand immediately without too much thought. This is the case with the work of Charlie Russell. Being able to recognize the elements in his paintings—trees, horses and cowboys—gives people a safety line to their world of "reality". There are some who would disagree when I say abstract art requires more creativity and artistic talent to produce a good piece than does representational art, but there are many weaknesses in their arguments.

People who look down on abstract art have several major arguments to support their beliefs. They feel that artists turn abstract because they are not capable of the technical drafting skills that appear in a Russell; therefore, such artists create an art form that anyone is capable of and that is less time consuming, and then parade it as artistic progress. Secondly, they feel that the purpose of art is to create something of beauty in an orderly, logical composition. Russell's compositions are balanced and rational; everything sits calmly on the canvas, leaving the viewer satisfied that he has seen all there is to see. The modern abstractionists, on the other hand, seem to compose their pieces irrationally. For example, upon seeing Picasso's *Guernica*, a friend of mine asked me, "What's the point?" Finally, many people feel that art should portray the ideal and real. The exactness of detail in Charlie Russell's work is an example of this. He has been called a great historian because his pieces depict the life style, dress, and events of the times. His subject matter is derived from his own experiences on the trail, and reproduced to the smallest detail.

I agree in part with many of these arguments, and at one time even endorsed them. But now, I believe differently. Firstly I object to the argument that abstract artists are not capable of drafting. Many abstract artists, such as Picasso, are excellent draftsmen. As his work matured, Picasso became more abstract in order to increase the expressive quality of his work. *Guernica* was meant as a protest against the bombing of that city by the Germans. To express the terror and suffering of the victims more vividly, he distorted the figures and presented them in a black and white journalistic manner. If he had used representational images and colour, much of the emotional content would have been lost and the piece would not have caused the demand for justice that it did. Secondly, I do not think that a piece must be logical and aesthetically pleasing to be art. The message it conveys to its viewers is more important. It should reflect the ideals and issues of its time and be true to itself, not just a flowery, glossy surface. For example, through his work, Mondrian was trying to present a system of simplicity, logic, and rational order. As a result, his pieces did end up looking like a scrabble board. Miro created powerful, surrealistic images from his dreams and subconscious. These artists were trying to evoke a response from society through an expressionistic manner. Finally, abstract artists and representational

artists maintain different ideas about 'reality'. To the representational artist, reality is what he sees with his eyes. This is the reality he reproduces on canvas. To the abstract artist, reality is what he feels about what his eyes see. This is the reality he interprets on canvas. This can be illustrated by Mondrian's *Trees* series. You can actually see the progression from the early recognizable, though abstracted, *Trees*, to his final solution, the grid system.

A cycle of abstract and representational art began with the first scratchings of prehistoric man. From the abstractions of ancient Egypt to representational, classical Rome, returning to abstractionism in early Christian art and so on up to the present day, the cycle has been going on. But this day and age may witness its death through the camera. With film, there is no need to produce finely detailed, historical records manually; the camera does this for us more efficiently. Maybe, representational art would cease to exist. With abstractionism as the victor of the first battle, maybe a different kind of cycle will be touched off. Possibly, some time in the distant future, thousands of years from now, art itself will be physically non-existent. Some artists today believe that once they have planned and constructed a piece in their mind, there is no sense in finishing it with their hands; it has already been done and can never be duplicated.

1. The author argues that many people look down upon abstract art because they feel that:
 - a. Modern abstract art does not portray what is ideal and real.
 - b. Abstract artists are unskilled in matters of technical drafting.
 - c. Abstractionists compose irrationally.
 - d. All of the above.
2. The author believes that people feel comfortable with representational art because:
 - a. they are not engulfed in brightly coloured canvases.
 - b. they do not have to click their tongues and shake their heads in sympathy.
 - c. they understand the art without putting too much strain on their minds.
 - d. paintings like *Guernica* do not have a point.
3. In the author's opinion, Picasso's *Guernica* created a strong demand for justice since
 - a. it was a protest against the German bombing of Guernica.
 - b. Picasso managed to express the emotional content well with his abstract depiction.
 - c. it depicts the terror and suffering of the victims in a distorted manner.
 - d. it was a mature work of Picasso's, painted when the artist's drafting skills were excellent.
4. The author acknowledges that Mondrian's pieces may have ended up looking like a scrabble board because
 - a. many people declared the poor guy played too many scrabble games.
 - b. Mondrian believed in the 'grid-works' approach to abstractionist painting.
 - c. Mondrian was trying to convey the message of simplicity and rational order.
 - d. Mondrian learned from his *Trees* series to evolve a grid system.
5. The main difference between the abstract artist and the representational artist in matters of the 'ideal' and the 'real', according to the author, is:
 - a. How each chooses to deal with 'reality' on his or her canvas.
 - b. The superiority of interpretation of reality over reproduction of reality.

- c. The different values attached by each to being a historian.
 - d. The varying levels of drafting skills and logical thinking abilities.
 - e. the ability of an illiterate person to narrate grand and intricate musical compositions.
6. According to the passage, in the North Indian classical tradition, the *raga* remains greater than the artist who invokes it. This implies an aesthetic which:
- f. emphasises performance and invocation over the authority of genius and permanent record.
 - g. makes the music no one's property.
 - h. values the composer more highly than the performer.
 - i. supports oral transmission of traditional music.
7. From the author's explanation of the notion that in the Western tradition, music originates in its composer, which one of the following cannot be inferred?
- j. It is easy to transfer a piece of Western classical music to a distant place.
 - k. The conductor in the Western tradition, as a custodian, can modify the music, since it 'lies mute' in his baton.
 - l. The authority of the Western classical music composer over his music product is unambiguous.
 - m. The power of the Western classical music composer extends to the expression of his music.
8. According to the author, the inadequacy of teaching North Indian classical music through a codified, notation based system is best illustrated by:
- n. a loss of the structural beauty of the *ragas*.
 - o. a fusion of two opposing approaches creating mundane music.
 - p. the conversion of free-flowing *ragas* into stilted set pieces.
 - q. its failure to produce any noteworthy student or performer.
9. Which of the following statements best conveys the overall idea of the passage?
- r. North Indian and Western classical music are structurally different.
 - s. Western music is the intellectual property of the genius while the North Indian *raga* is the inheritance of a culture.
 - t. Creation as well as performance are important in the North Indian classical tradition.
 - u. North Indian classical music is orally transmitted while Western classical music depends on written down notations.