



UPSC & STATE PCS CURRENT AFFAIRS · UJIYARI.COM

DAILY QUIZ — SOLVED

Daily Quiz, August 11, 2026

11 August 2026



CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

[linkedin.com/in/epicbharat](https://www.linkedin.com/in/epicbharat)

ALSO FROM THE CREATOR

BharatNotesFree UPSC notes, MCQs, PYQ analysis. **100% Free.**bharatnotes.com →

📢 ADVERTISE

Advertise with Ujiyari

Reach thousands of UPSC aspirants daily.

[✉ epicbharat@gmail.com](mailto:epicbharat@gmail.com)

DAILY QUIZ — SOLVED ANSWER KEY

Daily Quiz, August 11, 2026

11 August 2026 · 10 Questions · Answers & Explanations Included

Question 1

of 10

[Source →](#)

Lebanon's Parliament voted on August 11, 2026 to abolish the death penalty. In India, capital punishment is restricted by the "rarest of rare" doctrine established by the Supreme Court in which case?

- ☐ A Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab (1983)
- ☐ B Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978)
- ☒ C Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab (1980) ✓
- ☐ D Mithu v. State of Punjab (1983)

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab (1980) established the "rarest of rare" doctrine, requiring courts to weigh aggravating and mitigating circumstances before imposing a death sentence rather than treating it as default punishment. **ANALYSIS:** Machhi Singh (1983) later elaborated the doctrine into concrete categories of aggravating circumstances but did not originate it, while Mithu (1983) separately struck down the mandatory death sentence under IPC Section 303; students often merge these three cases into one.

📖 CONCEPT NOTE

India retains capital punishment but confines it through Bachan Singh's "rarest of rare" test, requiring a reasoned balance of aggravating and mitigating factors before a death sentence can be imposed. Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab (1983) built on Bachan Singh by listing categories, manner of commission, motive, magnitude, and victim's status, that could qualify a case as "rarest of rare." Separately, Mithu v. State of Punjab (1983) struck down Section 303 IPC's mandatory death sentence for murder by a life convict, holding a mandatory sentence unconstitutional regardless of circumstances. The Law Commission of India's Report No. 262 (2015), chaired by Justice A.P. Shah, went further and recommended abolishing the death penalty for all offences except terrorism-related crimes and offences against the state, citing weak deterrence evidence and risks of arbitrary sentencing. Lebanon's August 2026 abolition, the first by an Arab League state, offers a live comparative peg for this debate.

Q1 **CONCEPT KIT**
 CROSS-PAPER

GS2 (judiciary, constitutional law, criminal justice reform).

 MAINS KEYWORDS

rarest of rare, aggravating and mitigating circumstances, Law Commission Report 262, comparative abolitionism.

 COMMON MISTAKE

treating Bachan Singh and Machhi Singh as the same ruling; Bachan Singh originated the doctrine, Machhi Singh elaborated it three years later.

 EXAM TIP

anchor the case chain, Bachan Singh (1980, doctrine), Mithu (1983, mandatory sentence struck down), Machhi Singh (1983, categories elaborated).

 INTERVIEW

should India follow Lebanon and move toward full abolition, or does the "rarest of rare" safeguard already strike the right balance?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 2

of 10

[Source](#) →

A Damascus court's August 2026 verdict sentenced Bashar al-Assad and eight others to death for offences under which category of international law, which requires a widespread or systematic attack against a civilian population, distinct from isolated battlefield conduct?

- ☐ A Genocide, requiring proof of intent to destroy a national, ethnic, racial or religious group
- ☐ B Aggression, referring exclusively to the unlawful use of force between states
- ☐ C Piracy jure gentium, a universal-jurisdiction offence under customary international law
- ☒ D **Crimes against humanity, encompassing a widespread or systematic attack on a civilian population ✓**

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: The Damascus court convicted Assad and eight co-defendants of crimes against humanity and war crimes; crimes against humanity specifically require a widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population, a broader threshold than an isolated war crime tied to specific battlefield conduct. **ANALYSIS:** Genocide additionally requires proof of intent to destroy a protected group, aggression concerns unlawful interstate force, and piracy is an unrelated classical universal-jurisdiction offence, each a distinct international-law category from what this verdict addressed.

📖 CONCEPT NOTE

International criminal law distinguishes several categories of atrocity crime: war crimes (violations of the laws of armed conflict tied to specific incidents), crimes against humanity (a widespread or systematic attack on civilians, which can occur even outside formal armed conflict), genocide (requiring specific intent to destroy a protected group, the hardest to prove), and aggression (the unlawful use of force by one state against another, a crime of state leadership). The Assad verdict, delivered in absentia against Bashar and Maher al-Assad (both granted asylum in Russia) and in person against co-defendants including former Daraa political security chief Atef Najib, is Syria's first conviction since the regime fell on December 8, 2024, testing the new government's transitional-justice capacity, and the practical enforceability of in-absentia sentences against defendants a host state will not extradite.

Q2
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS2 (international law, transitional justice, extradition and asylum).


MAINS KEYWORDS

crimes against humanity, war crimes, trial in absentia, transitional justice.


COMMON MISTAKE

treating "war crimes" and "crimes against humanity" as interchangeable; the latter has a distinct widespread-or-systematic-attack threshold and can apply even without a formal armed conflict.


EXAM TIP

remember the four-category international-crime ladder, war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, aggression, in ascending order of the intent/scale threshold required.


INTERVIEW

can retributive justice against fled leaders coexist with a genuine national reconciliation process, or does it risk entrenching division?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 3

of 10

[Source →](#)

Skyroot Aerospace's Vikram-1, which completed India's first privately-developed orbital-class launch in July 2026, operates within a private space sector regulatory architecture built around which single-window authorising body?

- ☐ A NewSpace India Limited (NSIL), ISRO's commercial arm
- ☒ B Indian National Space Promotion and Authorisation Centre (IN-SPACe) ✓
- ☐ C Department of Space, functioning directly as the licensing authority
- ☐ D Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI), for satellite spectrum allocation

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: IN-SPACe, established under India's 2020 space-sector reforms, is the single-window regulator that authorises and promotes private space activity, including licensed launch-vehicle operations like Skyroot's.

ANALYSIS: NSIL is a plausible but distinct trap, ISRO's commercial arm markets ISRO-developed technology and manages certain commercial launches, but it is not the private-sector authorising regulator; the Department of Space is the parent ministry, not the single-window licensing body itself.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

India's 2020 space-sector liberalisation opened launch-vehicle development, satellite manufacturing and space services to private industry for the first time, and created IN-SPACe as the single-window body authorising and promoting private space activities, distinct from NSIL (ISRO's commercial and marketing arm) and the Department of Space (the parent government ministry). Skyroot's Vikram-1 reached orbit on July 18, 2026 from Sriharikota, deploying the SCOPE and Grahaa satellites, becoming India's first privately-developed orbital-class launch vehicle to fly successfully.

The subsequent Multi-Launch Agreement with HEX20 (signed August 6, 2026, for three launches from Q4 2027) signals the sector moving from single demonstration flights toward repeat commercial business, a maturation Skyroot hopes will support its stated goal of 12 launches a year, contingent on sustained IN-SPACe regulatory support.

Q3
 **CONCEPT KIT**
 CROSS-PAPER

GS3 (space-sector liberalisation, private participation in strategic technology, Atmanirbhar Bharat).

 MAINS KEYWORDS

IN-SPACE, single-window regulator, private launch vehicle, commercial space ecosystem.

 COMMON MISTAKE

confusing IN-SPACE (the regulator) with NSIL (the commercial/marketing arm); both were created around the same reform period but perform different functions.

 EXAM TIP

IN-SPACE = authorisation and promotion; NSIL = commercialisation of ISRO technology and launches; Department of Space = the parent ministry.

 INTERVIEW

does India's regulatory architecture for private space companies need further streamlining to hit ambitious launch-cadence targets like Skyroot's?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 4

of 10

[Source](#) →

Which of the following is **NOT** one of the core principles of the Artemis Accords, which India signed on June 21, 2023 and under which NASA has now invited ISRO to join its Moon Base programme?

- ☐ A Registration of space objects consistent with the COPUOS framework
- ☐ B Transparency in space activities among signatory nations
- ☐ C Interoperability of systems between partner nations
- ☒ D Binding arbitration of inter-signatory disputes before the International Court of Justice ✓

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: The Artemis Accords are a set of non-binding political principles, transparency, interoperability, emergency assistance to astronauts, public release of scientific data, and COPUOS-consistent registration of space objects, and do not establish any binding ICJ arbitration mechanism for disputes among signatories. **ANALYSIS:** India signed on June 21, 2023, becoming the 27th signatory nation; the August 5-6, 2026 India-U.S. Civil Space Joint Working Group's Moon Base invitation builds a more substantive lunar-cooperation ask on top of this still-non-binding baseline.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

Launched by the United States in 2020 and grounded in the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, the Artemis Accords are explicitly non-binding, deliberately avoiding a treaty-style dispute-resolution mechanism like ICJ arbitration. Their core commitments cover transparency in space activities, interoperability of systems, provision of emergency assistance to astronauts in distress, public release of scientific data, registration of space objects consistent with the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) framework, and principles for the extraction and use of space resources.

India signed on June 21, 2023, at a ceremony in Washington, D.C., becoming the 27th signatory. NASA's August 2026 invitation to ISRO to join its Moon Base programme, discussed at the 9th India-U.S. Civil Space Joint Working Group in Bengaluru, builds on this non-binding framework and on existing cooperation such as the NISAR satellite (launched July 2025), testing how far India will deepen a US-anchored lunar partnership while preserving strategic autonomy.

Q4
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS2 (international space governance, India-US strategic partnership); GS3 (India's space capabilities as diplomatic leverage).


MAINS KEYWORDS

Artemis Accords, non-binding principles, COPUOS, strategic autonomy.


COMMON MISTAKE

assuming the Artemis Accords function like a binding treaty with formal dispute resolution; they are explicitly non-binding political commitments.


EXAM TIP

fix "India signed June 21, 2023, as the 27th signatory" as a standalone Prelims fact.


INTERVIEW

should India accept a substantive Moon Base role under a US-led framework, or hold out for a more co-equal governance stake?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 5

of 10

[Source](#)

The August 2026 MSME-DPIIT MoU to widen market access for GI-tagged products operates under the legal framework of which statute, whose nodal department is DPIIT?

- ☐ A The Designs Act, 2000
- ☐ B The Patents Act, 1970
- ☒ C **The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999 ✓**
- ☐ D The Trade Marks Act, 1999

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: The Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999 governs GI registration and protection in India, with DPIIT as the nodal department overseeing the regime alongside the GI Registry in Chennai.

ANALYSIS: The Designs Act 2000, Patents Act 1970 and Trade Marks Act 1999 are all separate intellectual-property statutes also under DPIIT's broader IP portfolio, making them plausible but incorrect matches, students must know which specific statute governs GI protection.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

DPIIT administers India's full intellectual-property statutory framework, but each IP category has its own dedicated law: patents (Patents Act, 1970), trademarks (Trade Marks Act, 1999), industrial designs (Designs Act, 2000), and geographical indications (Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999). The August 5, 2026 MSME-DPIIT MoU links MSME enterprise-support systems with this GI legal framework, aiming to onboard GI collectives onto ONDC and the Government e-Marketplace (GeM) under a "Bharat GI" banner, and integrating the existing One District One Product (ODOP) ecosystem.

Well-known GI-tagged products include Darjeeling Tea and the Kanchipuram Silk Saree. The MoU addresses a recognised gap: GI registration protects a name from misuse but does not by itself deliver market access to often small, dispersed producer collectives.

Q5
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS2 (government policy, IP administration); GS3 (MSME sector, rural livelihoods, export diversification).


MAINS KEYWORDS

GI Act 1999, DPIIT, ODOP, ONDC/GeM market access.


COMMON MISTAKE

conflating GI protection with trademark or patent protection; each IP category has a distinct governing statute despite a shared nodal department.


EXAM TIP

memorise the four DPIIT-administered IP statutes and their exact years, Patents (1970), Trade Marks (1999), GI (1999), Designs (2000).


INTERVIEW

does legal registration alone meaningfully protect small GI producers, or does market-access infrastructure like ONDC matter more in practice?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 6

of 10

[Source](#) →

Nalsarovar Bird Sanctuary, the site of Gujarat's new plastic waste management project launched August 11, 2026, is a wetland of international importance under which convention, adopted in which year?

- A Ramsar Convention, 1971 ✓**
- B Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992
- C Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), 1973
- D UNESCO World Heritage Convention, 1972

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: Nalsarovar is designated a Ramsar site under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, adopted in 1971, an international treaty obliging signatory states to maintain the ecological character of listed wetlands and promote their wise use. **ANALYSIS:** CBD (1992), CITES (1973) and the World Heritage Convention (1972) are separate international environmental treaties addressing biodiversity, species trade, and cultural/natural heritage sites respectively, each a plausible but distinct instrument from the one governing wetland designation.

📖 CONCEPT NOTE

International environmental law layers multiple treaty regimes over different conservation objects: the Ramsar Convention (1971) protects wetlands of international importance; CITES (1973) regulates cross-border trade in endangered species; the World Heritage Convention (1972) protects cultural and natural heritage sites; and the CBD (1992) sets broader biodiversity-conservation and benefit-sharing goals. Gujarat's Rs 2.94 crore, JICA-funded plastic waste management project around Nalsarovar covers 5 villages in Ahmedabad district and 2 in Surendranagar district, using community volunteers called "Swachhta Praharis" organised under Eco-Development Committees, a Joint Forest Management-style institutional model giving local communities a formal stake in conservation outcomes. The project operates alongside India's Plastic Waste Management Rules, 2016 (as amended), addressing the last-mile collection gap around an ecologically sensitive, internationally designated site.

Q6
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS3 (wetland conservation, international environmental treaties, community-based conservation).


MAINS KEYWORDS

Ramsar Convention, ecological character, Eco-Development Committees, Plastic Waste Management Rules 2016.


COMMON MISTAKE

confusing the Ramsar Convention (wetlands) with the World Heritage Convention (cultural/natural sites) or CITES (species trade); each treaty targets a different conservation object.


EXAM TIP

fix "Ramsar equals wetlands, 1971" as a standalone recurring Prelims fact.


INTERVIEW

are community-based volunteer models like "Swachhta Praharis" a sustainable long-term substitute for formal municipal waste infrastructure near ecologically sensitive sites?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 7

of 10

[Source →](#)

Khudiram Bose's execution on August 11, 1908, whose martyrdom anniversary falls today, is most closely associated with which broader shift in India's early 20th-century freedom movement?

- ☐ A The transition from the Moderate to the Extremist phase of Congress politics after the 1907 Surat split
- ☒ B The rise of revolutionary "extremist" nationalism in Bengal via secret societies like Jugantar, alongside the Alipore Bomb Case ✓
- ☐ C The formation of the Indian National Army under Subhas Chandra Bose
- ☐ D The launch of the Non-Cooperation Movement following the Rowlatt Act

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: Khudiram Bose, hanged on August 11, 1908 at age 18 for his role in the failed April 1908 attempt on District Judge Douglas Kingsford (a bombing that instead killed two British women), was a member of the Bengal revolutionary group Jugantar; his trial and the related Alipore Bomb Case marked the emergence of armed revolutionary nationalism as a distinct strand of the freedom movement. **ANALYSIS:** The 1907 Surat split (Moderate-Extremist Congress divide), the INA (1940s), and the Non-Cooperation Movement (1920, post-Rowlatt Act) are all real but chronologically and thematically distinct milestones, testing precise placement of Bose's episode.

📌 CONCEPT NOTE

India's freedom movement historiography distinguishes several overlapping but distinct strands: constitutional Moderate politics within the Indian National Congress (pre-1907), the Extremist wing that split from Moderates at the 1907 Surat session over methods, armed revolutionary nationalism centred in Bengal and Punjab through secret societies like Jugantar and Anushilan Samiti (from the mid-1900s), Gandhian mass movements (Non-Cooperation from 1920, Civil Disobedience from 1930), and the later armed INA under Subhas Chandra Bose (1940s). Khudiram Bose and Prafulla Chaki's April 30, 1908 bombing attempt, and Bose's subsequent trial in the Muzaffarpur Conspiracy Case linked to the wider Alipore Bomb Case (implicating figures including Aurobindo Ghosh and Barindra Kumar Ghosh), sit squarely within the revolutionary-nationalism strand, distinct from the Congress's internal Moderate-Extremist debate happening around the same years.

Q7
 **CONCEPT KIT**

CROSS-PAPER

GS1 (modern Indian history, freedom struggle).


MAINS KEYWORDS

revolutionary nationalism, Jugantar, Alipore Bomb Case, Muzaffarpur Conspiracy Case.


COMMON MISTAKE

conflating the Congress's 1907 Moderate-Extremist Surat split with the separate, armed revolutionary-nationalism strand that Bose belonged to; they overlapped in time but were organisationally distinct movements.


EXAM TIP

anchor Khudiram Bose to "youngest martyr, 1908, Jugantar, Alipore Bomb Case" as a fixed fact cluster.


INTERVIEW

how should national commemoration balance revolutionary and constitutional strands of the freedom movement, which sometimes had conflicting strategies?


[Read Full Article →](#)

Question 8

of 10

[Source →](#)

The Ministry of Earth Sciences (MoES), which received a new Secretary on August 10, 2026, has an institutional mandate covering monsoon forecasting, seismology, ocean sciences and polar research. Which of the following functions falls OUTSIDE MoES's mandate, sitting instead with the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change?

- A** Administering India's wildlife protected-area network and forest clearances ✓
- B Issuing cyclone and tsunami early warnings
- C Coordinating India's Antarctic and Arctic polar research programme
- D Operating the India Meteorological Department's weather forecasting network

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: MoES covers atmospheric and ocean sciences, seismology, and polar research, including the India Meteorological Department, cyclone/tsunami early-warning systems, and India's Antarctic/Arctic stations; wildlife protected-area administration and forest clearances fall under the separate Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change. **ANALYSIS:** The distinction matters because both ministries deal with "environment"-adjacent subjects but govern entirely different statutory and institutional domains, a frequent source of confusion in institutional-mapping questions.

📖 CONCEPT NOTE

India's environment-and-earth-sciences governance is split across ministries with distinct mandates: MoES (formed 2006, merging earlier departments of ocean development, meteorology and seismology) covers monsoon forecasting via IMD, ocean sciences, tsunami and cyclone early warning, seismology, and polar research through the National Centre for Polar and Ocean Research; the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change separately administers wildlife protection, forest clearances, pollution control, and climate policy. Dr Srinivasa Kumar Tummala assumed charge as MoES Secretary on August 10, 2026, succeeding Dr N. Kalaiselvi, bringing over 30 years of experience in satellite oceanography and tsunami early-warning systems, including heading the Indian Ocean Tsunami Warning and Mitigation System (IOTWMS) Secretariat under UNESCO-IOC in Perth, directly relevant to MoES's core early-warning mandate.

Q8
 **CONCEPT KIT**
 CROSS-PAPER

GS2 (ministries, statutory bodies, government machinery); GS3 (disaster management, ocean and earth sciences).

 MAINS KEYWORDS

MoES mandate, IMD, tsunami early warning, institutional boundaries.

 COMMON MISTAKE

assuming all environment-related functions sit under the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change; MoES separately covers atmospheric, ocean and earth-science functions.

 EXAM TIP

remember MoES equals "monsoon, ocean, seismology, polar," while MoEFCC equals "forests, wildlife, pollution, climate policy," as a fixed institutional split.

 INTERVIEW

would consolidating India's fragmented earth-science and environment ministries improve disaster-response coordination, or would it dilute specialised expertise?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 9

of 10

[Source →](#)

India's legal framework allows a State Government to notify an area of significant biodiversity value, including sites with rare or endemic species that lie outside the formal Wildlife (Protection) Act protected-area network, as a Biodiversity Heritage Site under which provision?

- ☐ A Listing the species under CITES Appendix I to restrict international trade
- ☐ B Declaring the site a Tiger Reserve under the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972
- ☒ C Notification under Section 37 of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002 ✓
- ☐ D Designating the site a Ramsar wetland under the Ramsar Convention, 1971

ANSWER & ANALYSIS

✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: Section 37 of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002 empowers a State Government, on the recommendation of the State Biodiversity Board after consultation with the local body and Biodiversity Management Committee concerned, to notify in the Official Gazette areas of biodiversity importance, including sites outside the formal Wildlife (Protection) Act protected-area network, as Biodiversity Heritage Sites. **ANALYSIS:** A Tiger Reserve designation under the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 is a heavier, wildlife-habitat-specific tool disproportionate for many ecologically significant but non-charismatic sites; Ramsar applies only to wetlands; and CITES regulates international trade, not habitat protection, making all three plausible but incorrect for this specific gap.

📖 CONCEPT NOTE

India's biodiversity-protection toolkit includes several distinct instruments for different scales and purposes: the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 empowers formally notified sanctuaries, national parks and tiger reserves to protect larger wildlife habitats; the Biological Diversity Act, 2002, under Section 37, additionally allows a lighter-touch Biodiversity Heritage Site notification for ecologically significant areas, including small, unprotected sites with high endemism, sacred groves, wetlands, and coastal stretches, without the heavier administrative and land-use restrictions of a full sanctuary; the Ramsar Convention applies specifically to wetlands; and CITES governs cross-border wildlife trade rather than habitat status. India has notified more than 50 Biodiversity Heritage Sites across states as of 2026, a mechanism the National Biodiversity Authority's guidelines say is meant precisely for sites with high endemism, rare or threatened species, or evolutionary significance that fall outside the existing protected-area network.

Q9
 **CONCEPT KIT**
 CROSS-PAPER

GS3 (biodiversity legislation, conservation instruments); GS1 (biogeography, endemism in the Eastern and Western Ghats).

 MAINS KEYWORDS

Biological Diversity Act 2002, Section 37, Biodiversity Heritage Site, protected-area gap.

 COMMON MISTAKE

assuming any ecologically significant or endangered-species site automatically needs a full Wildlife Protection Act sanctuary; the Biodiversity Heritage Site route under Section 37 of the 2002 Act is a lighter, more targeted instrument for smaller unprotected sites.

 EXAM TIP

pair "Biological Diversity Act, 2002, Section 37 equals Biodiversity Heritage Sites" as the go-to answer for unprotected-endemic-species questions.

 INTERVIEW

should India expand Biodiversity Heritage Site notification proactively in under-surveyed hill forests, rather than waiting for new-species discoveries to trigger it?

 [Read Full Article →](#)

Question 10

of 10

[Source →](#)

Jammu and Kashmir's Rs 10 crore restoration of Rattan Garh Fort in Bhaderwah, approved and funded directly by the J&K government rather than the Archaeological Survey of India, illustrates which distinction in India's heritage-protection framework?

- ☐ A All heritage structures in Union Territories are automatically centrally protected, regardless of national-importance status
- ☒ B Monuments declared of "national importance" under the AMASR Act, 1958 are centrally protected by ASI, while other heritage sites fall under state archaeology departments ✓
- ☐ C Fort structures are categorically excluded from protection under the AMASR Act, 1958
- ☐ D Only monuments listed as UNESCO World Heritage Sites are eligible for any government restoration funding

ANSWER & ANALYSIS
✓ EXPLANATION

FACT: The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 empowers the Archaeological Survey of India to protect monuments specifically declared of "national importance"; heritage structures not so declared, like Rattan Garh Fort, remain under state government or state archaeology department jurisdiction, explaining why J&K directly approved and funded this restoration rather than ASI. **ANALYSIS:** There is no automatic UT-wide central protection, no categorical exclusion of forts, and no UNESCO-only funding restriction, each a plausible-sounding but incorrect claim about the framework.

📖 CONCEPT NOTE

India's built-heritage protection operates on a two-tier system: the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 lets the Central Government, through ASI, declare specific monuments and sites of "national importance" for central protection (India has roughly 3,691 such Centrally Protected Monuments), while all other heritage structures, regardless of age or significance, remain under state government jurisdiction, typically administered by state archaeology and museums departments using their own state-level heritage legislation or executive orders. Rattan Garh Fort, built in 1733 in Bhaderwah, Doda district, and later used as a prison, falls into this second category, explaining why its Rs 10 crore restoration was approved directly by the Omar Abdullah-led J&K government as a heritage-tourism initiative for the Chenab Valley, rather than routed through ASI.

Q10 **CONCEPT KIT**
 CROSS-PAPER

GS1 (Art and Culture, heritage conservation); GS2 (Centre-state/UT division of administrative responsibility).

 MAINS KEYWORDS

AMASR Act 1958, national importance, centrally protected monuments, state archaeology departments.

 COMMON MISTAKE

assuming ASI protects all old or historically significant Indian monuments; only those specifically declared of "national importance" fall under central protection.

 EXAM TIP

remember the AMASR Act's "national importance" declaration as the dividing line between ASI-protected and state-protected monuments.

 INTERVIEW

should India establish uniform minimum heritage-conservation standards for state-protected monuments, which often receive far less funding and expertise than ASI sites?

 [Read Full Article →](#)



CURATED & WRITTEN BY

Bharat Choudhary

UPSC Educator & Content Creator

[LinkedIn](#)[Read Full Edition](#)

ALSO FROM THE CREATOR

BharatNotes

Free UPSC study platform — notes across all 4 GS papers, MCQs, PYQ analysis & progress tracking. **100% Free.**

bharatnotes.com →

📢 ADVERTISE WITH UJIYARI

Reach **thousands of UPSC & State PCS aspirants** daily through our PDFs, website & social channels.

Coaching • EdTech • Publishers • Exam apps

[✉ epicbharat@gmail.com](mailto:epicbharat@gmail.com)

“Success is not final, failure is not fatal: it is the courage to continue that counts.”

— Winston Churchill

Free UPSC & State PCS Current Affairs · ujiyari.com · bharatnotes.com