

PSIR Model Question Answer_

Q 1. Comment on following in about 150 words each:

10×5=50

- (a) What were the factors that led to the development of the Post-Behavioural Movement in Political Science?
- (b) “Politics as authoritative allocation of value”
- (c) What is ‘Equality of Opportunity’ and how is it different from ‘Equality of Outcome’?
- (d) Define Gandhis’ idea of ‘Swaraj’
- (e) Discuss ‘Harm Principle’

Q1.

a. What were the factors that led to the development of the Post-Behavioural Movement in Political Science?

ANS: The Behavioural movements in social science pioneered by **the Chicago schools and scholars like Charles Merriam, David Truman and David Easton** attracted severe criticism. In addition the contemporary global crisis, namely, **nuclear weapons, inner- conflict, civil war, various movements, and environmental degradation, human rights issues, Vietnam war, and so on along with critique of scientific and value-free social science had initiated post-behavioural movement.**

The critics like Leo Strauss in this paper “What is political philosophy?” argued that the rise of behaviouralism led to the decline of political theory due to its failure to accommodate normative theory. **Thomas Kuhn in his work “The Structure of Scientific Revolution ”** has argued that the significance of scientific method lies in its capacity of problem solving and crisis management, not in methodological sophistication. Even the exponent of behaviouralism agreed that the adherence to “pure science” was responsible for studying the social and political movement of the 1960s and 1970s. In 1969, **David Easton announced for post-behaviouralism or post- behaviour revolution in social science.** This reflects a major shift from strict methodology to a greater concern and responsibilities of social science.

David Easton categorically mentioned the duty of social scientists is to study all political phenomena in order to solve the problems and manage the crisis. He argued that the social scientist must be concerned with value, relevance and action while producing knowledge.

Q1. B. Politics as authoritative allocation of value.

Ans: David Easton defined politics as “authoritative allocation of value” which constitutes the political system in any country. He meant that the government is a **legitimate authority which allocates values (like education, health and welfare)** in the society in response to the demand made from the society or environment.

In Easton's view, there is a political system which has input (demand and support) and output (decision and policies). He classified demands in four kinds, namely, demand for:

1. allocation of goods and services (like jobs, PDS, vaccine, education etc.)
2. regulation of behaviour: protection of the women from the sexual harassment, domestic violence, traffic rules, law and order etc.
3. political participation: like right to vote, 33% reservation for women, etc.
4. communication and information. Like IT Rules, Data protection Bill, etc.

In response to these demands, society gives support to the political system. David Easton also divided support into four parts, namely, material Supports (like tax, charity fund, PM care fund, etc), obey law (like wearing a mask in the wake of covid), participatory (like election's participation, contest in election) and paying attention to government communication (like announcement made by the govt).

There is input in the form of demand and support as well as output in the form of policies and decisions in all political systems. In addition, the output flows back into the environment through the process of feedback that gives rise to new demand in the political system. Feedback is a communication process which flows in the system through the media, civil society, NGO, pressure group, etc. Therefore, David Easton viewed politics as authoritative allocation of value but unable to explain human political behavior like why and how to vote in elections. However, this method was used by Gabriel Almond's in structural functional theory and Karl Deutch in his communication theory.

Q.1. c. What is Equality of Opportunity and how is it different from Equality of Outcome?

ANS: In political philosophy equality is a value loaded, normative and highly contested political concept. In the midst of multi-layered inequality, why do we need to talk about equality because, as Bernard Williams put it, that being humans, all are equal and entitled for equal dignity and equal worth.

Equality of opportunity is a pure liberal concept advocated by John Locke, Jermey Bentham, J S mill, and neo-liberals like Milton Friedmen, Hayek and Robert Nozick. It denotes, all citizens should be given equal chance and there should be no discrimination of any kind. Giving exception to any person on whatever grounds leads to injustice to others. In brief, for liberals, there are two types of equality:

- a. Equality Before Law: it means rule of law i.e., each individual is equal in the eyes of law.
- b. Equality of Opportunity: It means absence of privileges i.e.; all should be given equal opportunities without any kind of discrimination.

Unlike classical or neo-liberals, socialists and welfarists or social liberals believe in equality of outcome or social equality. Why do we need social equality? Socialists have offered three reasons, namely, social equality upholds justice/ fairness (like giving reservation for SCs/STs and Transgender in India, for black in America etc), true equality can only be established through co-operation and social equality increases social solidarity (ex. Fraternity can be realized in absence of equality of outcome), and social equality is needed to fulfill satisfaction of the need to masses and self-realization. **John Rawls, Ronal Dworkins, and Amartya Sen argue along these lines.**

Equality of opportunity directs the state to follow the principle of non-discrimination whereas equality of outcome gives scope to the state to follow preferential policies or positive discrimination like reservation, constitutional protection, law, social welfare schemes so that disadvantaged groups can be empowered.

Q1.(d). Explain Gandhi's Hind Swaraj

The concept of “Swaraj” refers to ‘ruling oneself’. In his classic ‘Hind Swaraj’, Gandhi’s Swaraj’ means more than mere political independence. It meant **freedom from political domination, economic domination, social domination and freedom from the lower-self** or purification of soul. But more importantly, for Gandhi, is the freedom of soul from any outside domination i.e. self-realization.

Gandhi said that **the village swaraj is a complete republic**. It has its own food crops and cotton for its cloth. It should have a reserve **for its cattle, recreation and playground for adults and children**. The village will maintain a theater, school, and public hall. Education will be compulsory up to final basic courses. The farms activity will be based on co-operative society. The Panchayat will be elected on the basis of universal adult franchise, who will govern the **village and act as legislature, executive and judiciary. Panchayat will act as a legislature, executive and judiciary.**

Gandhi proposed four dimension of Swaraj:

1. **The Political dimension:** For Gandhi, every village should be such a republic. It shall be based on an oceanic circle rather than vertical where the top enjoys at the cost of bottom.
1. **The economic dimension of Swaraj:** Gandhi was very critical to western machine and industrialization. He was in favour of a self-sufficient village economy, local production and consumption. He said that nature has sufficient resources to fulfill everybody’s needs but not a single person’s greed.
2. **Social Dimension of Swaraj:** Gandhi was a severe critic of untouchability. He said that freedom means freedom from social evil. He regarded untouchability as a most cruel form of social evil. He launched Satyagraha against it.

3. **Moral dimension of Swaraj:** Gandhi was impressed by Bhagwat Geeta. He said moral freedom means self-realization. He said listen to your inner voice and self-realize whether you are good or not. Whenever you have confusion, see the last person of the society and think whether your action would benefit that person.

Q1. (e). Discuss the Harm Principle

ANS: J. S. Mill's essay "On Liberty" is one of the classical texts in defence of personal liberty. It details the idea of liberty extensively within the entire western liberal tradition. While Bentham popularized the idea of utility as the central theme, Mill brought liberty as the central theme to liberalism. According to Mill, liberty is the first and foremost value necessary for every individual.

For Mill, liberty is a good in itself, good for individuals, good for society and good for the state. It means it is a public good and everyone should avail it. Only under the condition of freedom (liberty), an individual can pursue his excellence and individuality. It enriches society as well as the state. In the absence of liberty, the society that emerges is a dwarf society or a senile society. Liberty benefits everyone. It benefits the society as well as the state. If states give liberty to its people, it does progress because people have their potentiality/ personality when they are completely free. According to Mill, the state which allows freedom to its people is bound to be more progressive than those who deny. For example, the USA, UK and European liberal states have progressed due to the availability of liberty and the USSR, North Korea have declined due to absence of liberty. Without liberty, human life becomes a stagnant pool. Genius can only breathe in an atmosphere of freedom.

For Mill, individuals should be free from interference, either by the state or by the society or by any other groups. The state can exercise its legitimate force over its citizens only if an individual's action is going to harm others. State can't impose physical or moral coercion for an individual's own good. It can't act like a parent.

On the other hand, Mill believes that individual liberty is not absolute. There should be reasonable restrictions on individual liberty otherwise it would become a license.

How much restriction should the state impose on individual liberty?

To explain the above question, **J. S. Mill offered "Harm Principle" or "Liberty Principle"**. Mill divided human actions into two parts:

- a. Self-regarding actions, and
- b. Other regarding actions.

In the sphere of self-regarding actions, an individual has supreme control. Over himself, over his own body and mind, an individual is sovereign. The state and society cannot intervene in the

self- regarding actions. But the state and society can intervene in other-regarding actions because it adversely affects/ hurts the interest of other people.

Mill identified three areas of self- regarding actions in which exercise of liberty does no harm:

1. **Freedom of thought, discussion and expression in its various forms.**
2. **Liberty of tests and pursuit i.e., liberty to pursue the kind of lifestyle we choose.**
3. **Liberty of association.**

Therefore, Mill rules out paternalistic intervention of the state. According to Mill, the state cannot intervene if the action of man is not harming others. Even if someone is harming himself, the state should not intervene. State can intervene only when a man's actions are likely to harm others. J. S. Mill is more tilted towards negative liberty i.e., *absence of external interference* but he recognised to limit the scope of liberty in *other regarding action*. Therefore, Mill initiated debate over state intervention for individual development and self-realisation. In this way, Mill started talking about positive liberty.

Exception to the Harm Principles

- a. Harm principles cannot be applied to the human beings whose mind is not matured. For example: children, mentally unsound people.
- b. People who need to be taken care of by others like a certified insane.
- c. Backward state of the society cannot exercise harm principle. Mill said that despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the government should use despotic authority for people's improvement.

2(a). Evaluate Feminist understanding of Rawlsian theory of justice.

ANS: John Rawls was the greatest political philosopher of the 20th century who revived political theory. In the 1950s and 1960s, the behaviouralist and positivist intervention in social science led to the decline of political theory. In such circumstances, John Rawls's book "A Theory of Justice" provoked many political philosophers to talk about justice. But feminist raised several questions to Rawls and analyzed it.

Feminists ask a simple question to Rawls: where do you place women in your theory of justice. In addition, they analyzed the grand theory of justice celebrated throughout the world among philosophers. Susan Mollar Okin analyzed in following ways:

First, Political philosophers from Aristotle to John Rawls divided society into the public sphere and private sphere. Justice is operational in the public sphere while the private sphere like family is empty from such an idea, therefore, women face injustice within the family.

Second, Rawls' social contract is a contract among males. He explicitly mentioned that heads of the family participate in the social contract and agree to principles of justice. Who is this head of

the family? It is obviously male. Therefore, his theory of justice is male biased. Susan Mollar Okin argues that Rawls ignored women in his conception of justice.

Third, Rawls does not consider women as a party of social contract and he followed the path of his precursor like Aristotle or Hobbes who subordinated women under the authority and power of men. Hence, feminist understanding of Rawls' theory of justice is critical to his few basic ideas as discussed above.

**2(b). Comment: "The Sovereign power is absolute, undivided, inalienable and perpetual"
Hobbes**

Thomas Hobbes was a great political philosopher that the English speaking British had produced. His work 'Leviathan' is one of the classical texts in political philosophy. In this text, Hobbes analyzes human nature, social contract and power of the sovereign. The covenant or the sovereign power emerged through a social contract and it has all power including imposing taxes, and law.

During social contract each individual said to others that "I authorize and give-up my right of governing myself to this man or this assembly of men on the condition that you give up your right to him, and authorized all of his action". The contract is perpetual and irrevocable. Every man limited their rights and liberty voluntarily and transferred it to the Leviathan (sovereign). Therefore, the social contract has created an artificial body politic called or sovereign power.

The sovereign power is political authority which is permanent, and possess unlimited and undivided command. The power of the sovereign is unlimited, undivided, inalienable, perpetual and absolute. The command or sovereign power will treat all individuals equally in matters of justice and levying taxes. Individuals have no rights except the right to life. They are supreme and have absolute authority over law, rules, regulation and life in the society. The command or will of political authority is law. He is the source and final interpreter of law. Hobbes places the law beyond challenges and conceptualised an absolute sovereign power and this absolute sovereign power is the outcome of social contract.

2(c). Discuss Kautilya's Mandala theory? How does it contribute to making foreign policy?

Kautilya's mandala theory is a strategic policy which guides the ruler in order to interact with neighbours and other states. In ancient India, the state was divided into small territories. The king used to face challenges related to defence, security and survival. Only powerful kings and states survived. The basic rule of Mandala theory is today's theory of balance of power in international relations.

Kautilya said that the king must be expansionist in order to gain more power, territory and fame. In the western philosophy, Machiavelli followed his ideas and advised the king the same. For Kautilya, the king who is willing to expand the territory of the state is called *Vijigishu*. Both Kautilya and Manu in order to explain foreign policy made circles of states that are called Mandal.

In today's foreign policy it is very important. For example, Kautilya divided the states into four kinds: 1) *Adi Rajya* (enemy states); 2) *Mitra Rajya* (friendly state); 3) *Madhyam Rajya* (non-aligned state) and 4) *Udasin Rajya* (neutral state). We can find such categories of state even today.

In robust foreign policy, Kautilya has suggested four *upayaya*: 1) *Sam* (treaty); 2) *Dam* (economic benefit); 3) *Danda* (force or punishment) and 4) *Bhed* (spies, division). He said that the victorious king should apply all these *upayaya* in his foreign policy. He suggested 6 courses of action in foreign policy:

1. *Sandhi*- if your enemy is powerful, go for an agreement.
2. *Vigrah*- when the *Vijigishu* is powerful, he should go for *Vigrah*
3. *Asana*- the *Vijigishu* put their forces at border areas.
4. *Yana*- it means the king should mobilize forces.
5. *Samashrya*- it means join hands with friends
6. *Dwaid-bhav*- it means dual policy.

Kautilya argued that the king should opt for all these courses of action for a strong state. If we look at today's international politics, Kautilya Mandala theory has lots of significance.

3(a). Compare and contrast between liberal feminism and radical feminism.

Like liberalism, feminism is also a meta-ideology. Feminism, as an ideology, defined by two basic beliefs, namely, women are disadvantaged because of their sex and this disadvantage should be overthrown. Mary Wollstonecraft is considered a pioneer of feminism. In the due course of time there are many versions of feminism like liberal, socialist, radical, black, eco-feminism and the list goes on.

The liberal feminism is known as the first wave of feminism. In the mid 19th century women activists were influenced by anti-slavery movement and the worker's movement. They started talking about equal civil and political rights for women as well. They sought to establish fundamental equality between men and women. Harriet Taylor Mill and J.S. Mill was an

exponent of women's equality, right to vote, equal property rights and right to participation for women in the public sphere. Once feminists achieved these rights, they felt women were still subordinated to men, why? They interrogated the primary structure like family and power structure within the family and theorized gender and patriarchy called radical feminism.

Like Liberal feminism, radical feminist tried to liberate women so that women can exercise freedom and not face injustice. In the mid 20th century, feminists like Betty Friedan, Simon de Beauvoir, and Kate Millet raised inequality and power structure within the family. They aimed to dismantle patriarchy. Radical feminist is credited with the use of consciousness-raising groups to make people aware about women's oppression. Unlike Liberal, Radical focused on two core areas, namely, power relationship within the family and sexual relationship between men and women. Liberals demand equality in the public sphere whereas radical feminist demand is to reduce power inequality within the family.

3(b). Comment. Man is zoon-politikon. Aristotle

Aristotle argued that a man & woman come together due to their natural instinct of self-preservation and reproduction. They formed a family to fulfill the needs and requirements of each other. It is an institution of friendship between man and woman, and solidarity and justice among all. It fosters love, emotions and bonding within the family. Since man is not self-sufficient, they formed a family. It is a private sphere based on natural hierarchy among husband, wife, child and slave. It is a foundation of polis (state).

In due course of time, man observes that even family does not fulfill all needs they require. So, many families came together and formed the village in order to fulfill each other's needs. In social evolution, a village was a good institution but a further evolution like polis (state) is the highest form of association.

Polis is a natural institution and it is prior to man. It is a great institution which provides preservation, education, administration, justice, civic virtue and good life. Human beings can achieve happiness and the fullest sense of life only in polis. Individuals cultivate reason, power of deliberation and they develop their full potential in polis.

For Aristotle, that the polis is an association for the sake of securing the best moral life. The nature of a polis depends on good citizens, participation of citizens in collective affairs of the state, deliberation, civic virtue and idea of justice. The Aristotle state is a combination of civic virtue, moral behaviour of citizens, good life, constitution, form of government and law. When all qualities coalesce for the purpose of good life then it is called Polis which is necessary for satisfaction of the basic wants. Everyone needs it and those who don't feel the need of society are either angels or beasts.

Q3(c). Explain Aurobindo Ghose' idea of 'cultural nationalism'? How does Aurobindo's idea influence the national freedom movement?

Aurobindo Ghosh was a great political leader in the Indian freedom struggle. He was educated in England and when he returned to India, he engaged himself for national freedom.

He emphasized on "free nation" and "cultural nationalism". He said that like two individuals who have distinct identities despite many physical similarities, each nation is having distinct character due to their free will. Like individual liberty, which is essential for individual development, national freedom is required for development of a nation. Thus, liberation of India from British rule is not less than serving God itself. Nationalists must have faith in God and they should remember that they are discharging God given duty to free Maa Shakti i.e. *Mother India*. Swaraj cannot be achieved without political freedom.

Like Vivekanand and Gandhi, Ghosh criticised the western civilization. He influenced a generation of freedom fighters in the early three decades of the 20th century. Aurobindo was influenced by Vivekananda's neo-vedantism and Bankim Chandra Chatterjee's idea of 'Bharat Mata' (Vande Mataram). Like Aurobindo many freedom fighters depicted nation as a divine entity, spiritual entity and he said that nation is not a mere geographical territory, nor merely a piece of land, but a divine entity, i.e., 'sanatan' which is imperishable. For instance, Abanindranath Tegore's portrayal of 'Bharat Mata', a hindu goddesses wearing saffron coloured cloths and having four hands holding a manuscript, a mala, sheaves of rice, and a white clothes created nationalist feelings. For later cultural nationalist, nationalism was a spiritual sadhana, which is a moral endeavour. Like Aurobindo, freedom fighters depicted India as an *avatar* (incarnation), an eternal force and a divinely appointed Shakti who had to perform God given work.

Thus, Aurobindo's idea of nationalism is more metaphysical than political and it influenced a generation of cultural nationalist. However, it had its own impact on India's constitutional parliamentary democracy.

4(a) What are essential elements of Liberalism and how is it different from neoliberalism?

Liberalism is a product of renaissance, reformation, enlightenment, industrial revolution, rise of capitalism and evolution of modernity. John Locke (father of liberalism) and was redefined and broadened by Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, J.S. Mill, and Herbert Spencer.

Essential elements of liberalism:

1. Human Nature: For liberals, man is rational being capable of understanding what is right and wrong. Man does not require external authority like church, state or society to determine his conduct.
2. Individualism: Liberalism gives supreme importance to individuals over social groups or collective body or states.

3. Freedom: Individual liberty is the core value of liberalism.
4. Liberal Concept of Society: Liberals give priority to individuals over society.
5. Liberals Understanding of State: For liberals, state is a “necessary evil” because it limits liberty.
6. Liberal Concept of Equality: For liberals, there are two types of equality:
 - a. Equality Before Law: it means rule of law i.e., each individual is equal in the eyes of law.
 - b. Equality of Opportunity: It means absence of privileges i.e.; all should be given equal opportunities w/out any kind of discrimination.

Neoliberalism is an updated version of classical liberalism. This philosophy was developed by Frederic Hayek, Milton Friedman (Both are free market economists) and political philosopher Robert Nozick.

Features of Neoliberalism:

1. Neoliberalism is anti-statis: they believe that the state is a realm of coercion and unfreedom.
2. Private is good and public is bad: Neo liberals believe that collectivism i.e., state restricts individual initiatives and harms self-respect.
3. Self-reliance and rational-choice: Neo-liberals believe that individuals are capable of taking self-care of their interest. They believe in individual self-reliant attitude and in individual rational choice. Man can serve his interest in the market.
4. Market leads to progress and general benefit: for them, the market has a solution to all problems. It benefits all.
5. Economic Policy: As a key neo-liberal policy, they strongly believe in privatization funds cut in social security, tax cut and de-regulation.

4(b) Discuss the theory of Natural Right. What is the difference between Natural Right and Human Rights?

Rights is a modern political concept evolved in 17th century Europe. Today, there are various dimensions of rights viz., natural rights, legal rights, fundamental rights, human rights, especial-cultural and ethnic rights, animal rights and the list goes on.

Natural Rights: Thomas Hobbes and John Locke have argued for natural rights. Hobbes maintained that all men have all rights in the state of nature including to subordinate others. Locke said that ‘all men are born free and equal’ and each individual has equal rights provided by nature itself like right to life, liberty and property. For Hobbes, individuals lose all rights after entering into a social contract because they transferred all their right to sovereign except right to life. In the case of Locke, individuals continued their natural right even after the formation of state except right to legislation, to execute and adjudicate which have been transferred to the state.

Further, Natural rights are called 'civil rights and political rights'. All these 'civil and political rights' are negative in nature and must be protected against state's intervention. All these are called the 'first generation of rights' or 'blue rights'.

Human Rights: The United Nations General Assembly recognized a set of rights passed through a resolution known as the 'Universal Declaration of Rights' (UDHR) on December 10, 1948. The UDHR preamble recognizes : (i) Human dignity and fee inalienable rights available to everyone. (ii) Few basic rights are the foundation of freedom, Justice and peace. (iii) Freedom of speech, expression and belief (iv) Freedom from fear and want. (v) Rights protected under rule of law (vi) Equal rights of men and women and to protect and promote social progress and better standards of life. Both natural rights as well as Human rights are universal in their appeal.

4(c) Explain Dr. B R Ambedkar's idea of democracy.

Ambedkar focused on social democracy. He said that we must make political democracy a social democracy as well. What is social democracy?

Social democracy refers to a way of life which recognises liberty equality and fraternity as the principle of life. He said that on 26th January 1950, we are going to enter into a life of contradictions. In politics we will have equality and in social and economic life we will have inequality. In politics we will be recognizing the principle of one man, one vote and one value. In social life and economic life, we shall, by reason of our social and economic structure, continue to deny the principle of one man, one value. How long shall we continue to live this life of contradiction? How long shall we continue to deny equality in our social and economic life? If we continue to deny it for long, we will do so only by putting our political democracy in peril. We must resolve this contradiction at the earliest possible or else those who suffer from inequality will blow up the structure of political democracy."

Ambedkar argued that Indian society is based on 'graded inequality' and it is co-terminus with Hindu religious text. It cannot coexist with democracy.

If the society is based on graded inequality, how would it accept the idea of democracy? Ambedkar said that social democracy involves two important things:

1. An attitude of mind, an attitude of respect and equality towards their fellows.
2. A social organization which should be free from rigidity.

Ambedkar argued that a government cannot be democratic unless the society for which it functions is democratic.

Explaining democracy, Ambedkar insists that democracy is more than a political machine. It is even more than a social system. It is an attitude of mind and philosophy of life.

Comment on following in about 150 words each:

5. (a) Preamble constitutes the philosophy of Indian Constitution.

Preamble reflects more than mere the character of modern India. India as a modern nation-state emerged in 1947 whose portrayal reflected in the Preamble. Although it is a prefix, prologue and introduction to the constitution, it consists of the 'essence, ethos and spirit' of 'India as a Republic'.

The Preamble explicitly mentions Justice-social, economic, and political; Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship; Equality of status and of opportunities and to promote among all fraternity and assures dignity to all. It reflects freedom fighters' vision about India to shape life on these guiding principles. *In the Berubari Case*, the Supreme Court held that the Preamble is key to the constitution makers. Few ideas like sovereignty, secular, democratic and republic constitute part of the basic structure of the constitution. In addition, it also tells us the vision, perspective and outlook of the constitution makers. It constitutes the philosophy of the Indian constitution.

5. (b) How is the Dalit perspective on the Indian national movement different from the mainstream Congress?

ANS: Dalit had a different view on Indian nationalism and 'India as a nation' than the congress version. They called themselves oppressed or depressed classes or scheduled castes. Gandhi termed them as Harijan. The community faced complex historical injustice from centuries by the hand of upper castes. They were also termed 'panchamas', 'Ati-shudras' or 'chandalas'.

Influenced by the anti-Brahmanical and self-respect movement of Jyotirao Phule and Savitabai Phule in Maharashtra and E.V. Ramaswami Naicker "periyar" in South India, Depressed classes organized especially under the leadership of Dr. B R Ambedkar during the national-freedom struggle.

Ambedkar followed four strategies against caste-system: a) He organized conferences (Mahar conference); b) He published newspaper like Mooknayak, Janata, Bahiskrit Bharat; c) He launched Satyagraha like Mahad Satyagraha and d) he established an organization like All India Scheduled Caste Federation, Indian labour Party, and Indian Republican Party.

He took a very clear stand against Congress and demanded a separate electorate during the second Round Table Conference for depressed classes. When the communal award was recognized by the separate electorate, Gandhi went on 'Fast-unto-Death' to get it revoked. Gandhi requested Ambedkar to leave the demand of the separate electorate for the sake of the nation's unity. Ambedkar replied to Gandhi: "Bapu, where is my country?" Ambedkar meant Dalit has not nation. Finally, an agreement between Gandhi and Ambedkar, known as Poona Pact, provided reservation to scheduled castes. **G. Aloysius** in his book "*Nation and Nationalism*" has argued that nationalism as an ideology and consciousness, as claimed by the

Nationalist, were absent among Dalits. Their prime concern was social freedom and India as a nation evolved without consciousness of nationalism for Dalits.

5. (c) Explain the contribution of moderate leaders in promoting nationalism in India? How were they different from the cultural revivalist?

The first two decades of Indian National Congress (1885-1905) is referred to as moderate politics. Leaders like W.C. Bonnerjee, Pherozeshah Mehta, R.C. Dutta, M.R. Ranadey, Surendranath Banerjee and others were influenced by western liberal ideals like citizenship, rule of law, liberty, equality and fraternity, justice and democracy. They were not against British rule per se but against the “un-British rule” in India perpetrated by the viceroy, his executive council and bureaucracy.

Moderate politicians of the INC had opted for a method of “complaining, petitioning and praying” to the British government. Their method was constitutional and peaceful. The major contributions of the moderate leaders were two, first the economic critique of colonialism and secondly creation of nationalist ideology and national consciousness.

The failure of moderate politics provoked a reaction within the Congress circle referred to as the “Extremist”. The leadership was provided by Bipan Chandra Pal in Bengal, Bal Gangadhar Tilak in Maharashtra and Lala Lajpat Rai in Punjab.

There are various reasons which explain the rise of extremism. Leaders like Tilak started criticizing moderate politics and its achievement. Tilak was frustrated with the moderate's method.

The ideological inspiration of extremists was the emergence of new nationalist literature like Bankim Chandra Chatterjee's Anand Math, Bipan's 'Bande Bharat' and Tilak's 'Kesari'. The goal of extremists was swaraj. Bipan Chandra Pal believed that no self-government was possible under British paramountcy. For him, swaraj means complete autonomy and absolutely free from British control.

5(d) Analyse the changing nature of India's fiscal federalism.

No federation can work without proper distribution of Finance between the Union and State. The SC in the *Coffee Board VS CTO* case argued that the sources of revenue collected by the Union are not meant entirely for the purpose of the Union. It must be divided as per constitutional provisions.

However, the Commission on Centre-State relations like Sarkaria Commission and Punchhi Commission remain silent on fiscal federalism. The Sarkaria Commission has recommended to appoint a separate committee to study fiscal federalism in India. But this is yet to be done.

However, tax share has been rationalized through Value Added Tax (VAT) in 2005 and Good and Services Tax (GST) in 2017.

A paradigm shift in economic policies and Union-State relationship grew on the account of liberalization/ privatization/ Globalization. Many States attracted investment while other States failed to do so. Consequently, there are parallel developments of two models of growth, namely; Blue Corridor spanning Delhi-Gurgaon-Mumbai-Pune-Bengaluru-Chennai on the western side of India whereas Red Corridor spanning in Moist affect Eastern India. Since 1991 to 2000, States like Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Punjab and Tamil Nadu attracted 66.7% private capital investment and on the other hand, states like Assam, Bihar, MP, Odisha, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh have attracted only 27.4% private capital investment. The differences regarding Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) are also uneven. This resulted in developmental disparities among the State in India. States like Bihar are demanding special status due to backwardness and need for more financial support from the Union.

The Finance Commission and recently created Goods and Services Tax Council have also changed the fiscal relationship between the Union and State. The 10th Finance Commission has recommended a 29% tax share to the states. The 12th Finance Commission recommended to increase the tax share of States to 30.5% whereas 13th FC recommended to increase it to 32% which further increased to 42% by the 14th FC. The 14th FC also recommended certain criteria like population (1971 census), forest area, territory and income distance that should be considered in tax share between the Union and State. The 15th FC (2021-2025) has recommended to reduce tax share from 42% to 41% and 1% tax should be given to Jammu and Kashmir for its development. **M. Govinda Rao** has argued that the fiscal federalism is not symmetrical in India because the Union government has discretion to give grants to states. Few States like Tamil Nadu are able to negotiate more and get more grants than other states.

5 (e) Discuss the recent trends of electoral behaviours in Indian democracy.

There are various factors that affect the voting behaviour during the election:

1. **Social factors:** There are social factors like patron- client relationship and ascriptive identities like caste and tribe affect the voting behaviour of individuals at local level. But factors like language and religion affect voting behaviour at a larger level. People vote individually as well as collectively. Due to patron-client relationship and religion, people vote en-bloc (mass level voting). For example: BSP and BJP get votes in the en-bloc. It is also true for caste-based parties like SP and RJD.
2. **Economic factors:** Parties economic programme and policies also influence voters to vote. For example: RTI and MGNREGA were the major policies for which the UPA government came in power in 2009. In 2014, NDA campaigning was based on “Development and Good Governance” and they called for “Achhe Din” against the UPA-II corrupt government.

3. Political Factors: Party identification, election manifesto, leadership image, and government performance are the political factors which influence voters to cast their vote.
4. 3 Ms (Money, Muscle and Media): The 3 Ms influence people to vote in elections. As per Association of Democratic Reform (ADR) report, 19% candidates filed by various political parties who had criminal backgrounds in the 2019 general election. It was 17% in 2014 and 15% in 2009. In 2019, the BJP filed 40% of candidates from criminal background whereas the Congress filed 39% of such candidates.

PLUTUS IAS