

WRAP Exams • wrapexams.com

Prelims PYQ, Mains model answers, and copy evaluation. Write to the desk for this paper, a doubt, or the AI waitlist.

ask@wrapexams.com • +91 85951 84903 • wrapexams.com

UPSC Mains 2022 PSIR Paper 1

Year-wise PYQ pack • WRAP model answers with canonical links

Official UPSC stems in exam order. Each live answer sits on one WRAP URL; this PDF is the year pack, not a second copy of the article. Open the link under a question for the full page.

<https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains/psir/gs-1/2022/>

Q1(a) • 10 marks

Systems Approach.

PSIR GS 1 • 2022 • Political Theory

Revision summary

Easton treated politics as authoritative allocation inside a system of inputs, conversion, outputs, and feedback.

Almond restated conversion as interest and rule functions plus political culture.

The method compared new states by function, not by legal text alone.

Critics charge equilibrium bias and neglect of class, ideology, and silent power.

It remains a map of process, not a theory of justice.

Introduction

The systems approach treats politics as a set of interrelated parts that convert demands into binding decisions. It was the behavioural answer to legal-institutional description of offices alone.

Body

The model

- **David Easton** defined politics as the authoritative allocation of values for a society.
- Inputs are demands and support. The political system converts them. Outputs are decisions and policies. Feedback returns as new inputs.
- **The environment is extra-political:** economy, culture, and international pressure.
- **Gabriel Almond** added conversion functions: interest articulation, aggregation, rule-making, rule application, and rule adjudication, with political culture as the subjective weather of the system.
- **Karl Deutsch** stressed communication and steering. **David Apter** used systems language for modernisation.

Use and limit

- The approach compared regimes by function, not only by written constitutions, which helped the study of new states after decolonisation.

- **Critics said it was conservative:** equilibrium and persistence look like the good, and conflict and class look like noise.
- **Marxist** writers and later **Foucault** said allocation hides who is silenced before a demand is even voiced, which **Steven Lukes** called the third face of power.
- Easton's later post-behavioural turn admitted relevance and values, which the first systems sketch had postponed.

Flow diagram

Environment -> Demands and support
Demands and support -> Political system Easton
Political system Easton -> Authoritative outputs
Authoritative outputs -> Feedback
Feedback -> Demands and support

Conclusion

The systems approach maps politics as input, conversion, output, and feedback. Easton and Almond made it the teaching kit of comparative politics. It describes persistence better than it explains domination.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/systems-approach/>

Q1(b) · 10 marks

Cultural Relativism.

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Political Theory

Revision summary

Cultural relativism asks that meaning be read inside a culture, against racial ranking.

Boas and Herskovits are the canonical names.

As method it blocks ethnocentrism; as absolute ethics it can protect domination.

Parekh and Kymlicka keep culture with exit and equality.

Indian minority rights sit beside **Article 17**, which relativism cannot erase.

Introduction

Cultural relativism holds that practices and values must be understood inside the culture that gives them meaning. It was a reply to ranking peoples on a single civilisational ladder.

Body

The claim

- **Franz Boas** rejected racial hierarchy and insisted that each culture is a historical whole, not a delayed copy of Europe.
- **Melville Herskovits** stated cultural relativism as a method and, more strongly, as a moral warning against ethnocentric reform.
- The American Anthropological Association's 1947 statement on human rights used this warning against a premature universal code.
- In political theory the idea challenges a single list of rights taken from **Locke** or **Mill** as if it were nature.

Politics and limit

- **Relativism is a research discipline:** do not judge before you can describe.
- As a political doctrine it can shield caste, gender violence, or authoritarian custom from **Ambedkar**'s civil equality and from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- **Bhikhu Parekh** and **Will Kymlicka** keep cultural context without surrendering exit, sex equality, and a public law of the state.
- Indian **Articles 25** to 30 protect culture; **Article 17** and Part III still bind custom. Relativism cannot cancel that hierarchy of norms.

Flow diagram

Cultural relativism -> Boas historical cultures
Cultural relativism -> Herskovits anti-ethnocentrism
Cultural relativism -> Limit: rights and Article 17
Universal rights -> Public argument

Conclusion

Cultural relativism, after Boas and Herskovits, is a method against ethnocentrism. It is not a veto on human rights or on Ambedkar's attack on caste. Description first, then a public argument about which harms a state may forbid.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/cultural-relativism/>

WRAP Exams

Q1(c) · 10 marks

"Revolution in Permanence".

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Political Theory

Revision summary

Trotsky's revolution in permanence refuses a long bourgeois stage in late societies.

Democratic and socialist tasks are chained; the process is international.

The formula opposes Stalin's socialism in one country.

Marx's 1850 phrase is the ancestor; 1905 and 1917 are the cases.

The limit is neglect of peasantry, nation, and post-revolutionary law.

Introduction

"Revolution in permanence" is **Leon Trotsky's** formula that a bourgeois-democratic opening in a late, uneven society must pass without pause into socialist transformation, and that socialism cannot rest as a finished national regime.

Body**Trotsky's meaning**

- In a country of combined and uneven development, the weak bourgeoisie cannot complete land reform and democracy. The working class must lead those tasks and then keep going.
- National revolution is therefore not a long separate stage. It is chained to international revolution, because a single workers' state is encircled by capital.
- The phrase answers **Stalin's** socialism in one country. For Trotsky, Thermidor and bureaucracy begin when the process is declared finished inside one border.
- **Marx** had used "revolution in permanence" in 1850 for continuous class struggle after 1848. Trotsky made it a strategy for 1905 and 1917.

Contrast and limit

- **Lenin's** April Theses also skipped a long bourgeois pause; the later dispute was internationalism versus socialism in one country.
- **Mao's** continuous revolution and the Cultural Revolution used a different enemy: restoration inside the party, not Trotsky's world market.
- Critics say the formula underestimates peasantry, national question, and the need for legal institutions after seizure of power.
- In political theory it remains a claim about unfinished transformation, against both reformist pause and nationalist closure.

Flow diagram

Trotsky -> Uneven development
 Uneven development -> Revolution in permanence
 Revolution in permanence -> International socialism
 Stalin -> Socialism in one country

Conclusion

Revolution in permanence, in Trotsky, joins democratic tasks to socialist ones and national victory to world process. It is a strategy against stageism and against socialism as a completed one-country order.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/revolution-in-permanence/>

WRAP Exams

Q1(d) · 10 marks

Bases of Power.

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Political Theory

Revision summary

A base of power is whatever enables A to affect B.

Dahl locates it in observable decisions; Bachrach and Baratz in agenda; Lukes in shaped wants.

Weber lists tradition, charisma, and legal-rational legitimacy.

Foucault adds productive discipline and knowledge.

Gramsci's hegemony and Indian basic-structure review are further institutional bases.

Introduction

Bases of power are the resources and relations that make A able to affect B. Political theory names several maps: decision, agenda, ideology, and the productive routines that form subjects.

Body

Maps of the base

- **Robert Dahl** treated power as A getting B to do what B would not otherwise do, visible in decisions, as in Who Governs?
- **Peter Bachrach** and **Morton Baratz** added non-decision: keeping issues off the agenda is itself a base.
- **Steven Lukes** added a third face: shaping wants so that conflict never appears.
- **Max Weber** based legitimate domination on tradition, charisma, and legal-rational office.
- **John French** and **Bertram Raven** listed reward, coercion, legitimacy, expertise, and referent identification as social-psychological bases.
- **Michel Foucault** shifted the base from a stock owned by a sovereign to capillary discipline and bio-power joined to knowledge.

Political use

- A constitution lists offices. Bases of power ask who actually prevails in the municipality, the party, and the clinic.
- **Antonio Gramsci's** hegemony is consent in civil society, another base besides the state's coercion.
- Indian judicial review after **Kesavananda Bharati** (1973) is a legal-rational base that can check the amending legislature.
- No single list is complete. Dahl's decisions, Lukes's silence, and **Foucault's** routines must be read together.

Flow diagram

Bases of power -> Dahl decisions
Bases of power -> Bachrach non-decision
Bases of power -> Lukes third face
Bases of power -> Foucault discipline
Bases of power -> Weber legitimacy

Conclusion

Bases of power are decision, agenda, preference-shaping, legitimacy types, and disciplinary knowledge. Dahl, Lukes, Weber, and Foucault name the main files. Office is only one base.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/bases-of-power/>

Q1(e) · 10 marks

Locke's Social Contract.

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Political Theory

Revision summary

Locke's contract starts from natural rights and inconvenience, not from a war of all against all.

Consent creates a community and a trustee legislature.

The end is preservation of life, liberty, and estate.

Betrayal of trust justifies revolution.

Hobbes yields an absolute sword; **Locke** yields limited government.

Introduction

John Locke in the Two Treatises of Government treats political society as a contract among persons who already have natural rights. The contract creates a trustee government, not an unlimited sovereign.

Body

The argument

- In the state of nature, persons are free and equal under natural law. Reason teaches that none may harm another in life, health, liberty, or possessions.
- **Inconvenience, not Hobbesian war, is the problem:** there is no known standing law, no impartial judge, and no executive power to enforce.
- People consent, expressly or tacitly, to form a community and then to set a legislature as the supreme fiduciary power.
- **Government is a trust for the preservation of property in Locke's wide sense:** life, liberty, and estate.
- When the trust is betrayed, the people have a right of revolution. **James II** is the historical target.

Contrast

- **Hobbes's** covenant yields an undivided sword; subjects retain only the right of self-preservation against immediate death.
- **Rousseau's** contract creates the general will; **Locke** keeps majority rule inside natural-law limits and private property.
- **Rawls** later rebuilt contract as a hypothetical original position. **Locke's** contract is more historical and proprietary.
- Indian "**We, the People**" and the right to constitutional remedies echo trust and limited government more than Leviathan.

Flow diagram

State of nature -> Natural rights
Natural rights -> Consent and trust
Consent and trust -> Limited government
Limited government -> Right of revolution

Conclusion

Locke's social contract is consent to a limited, fiduciary state that protects natural rights. It is the classic liberal alternative to Hobbesian absolutism and the ancestor of constitutional trust.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/lockes-social-contract/>

WRAP Exams

Q2(a) · 20 marks

Factors like community, culture and nation weaken the hegemony of neo-liberalism today. Discuss

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Political Theory

Revision summary

Neo-liberalism was a Gramscian common sense of markets after 1991, named in Hayek and the Washington Consensus.

Community, in communitarian theory and in household welfare, refuses the unencumbered market self.

Culture, from Boas to religious and linguistic politics, refuses culture as a private leftover.

Nation, in Brexit, tariffs, and self-reliance talk, restores borders against hyper-globalisation.

The hegemony of the slogan is weaker; capitalist and disciplinary practices still operate.

Introduction

Neo-liberalism claimed that free markets, open capital, and a small welfare state were the only rational order after the Cold War. Community, culture, and nation have since returned as rival sources of consent, so that **Hayek's** market order is no longer an unchallenged common sense.

Body

What neo-liberal hegemony was

- **Friedrich Hayek** and **Milton Friedman** treated prices as the only large coordinator and treated politics as a threat of planning.
- The Washington Consensus of the 1990s, structural adjustment, and India's 1991 liberalisation spread privatisation, fiscal squeeze, and global value chains.
- **Antonio Gramsci's** hegemony means leadership by consent in civil society, not only coercion. For two decades, market reform spoke as necessity, not as one ideology among others.
- **Karl Polanyi** had already warned that a disembedded market would provoke a countermovement to protect society.

Community as a limit

- Communitarian writers such as **Michael Sandel**, **Michael Walzer**, and **Charles Taylor** denied that persons are only market choosers.
- Family, caste association, church, mosque, and neighbourhood still allocate care, honour, and votes. They are **Easton's** extra-political environment that the market cannot fully convert.
- Self-help groups, cooperatives, and **Gandhi's** constructive village programme treat livelihood as membership, not as a labour contract alone.
- COVID-19 welfare, food rations, and migrant return showed that households and local community, not only markets, absorbed shock.

Culture as a limit

- **Boas** and **Herskovits** had argued that culture is not a lagging extra. Cultural nationalism now uses that insight against a cosmopolitan consumer identity.
- Hindutva, Christian right, Islamic politics, and indigenous movements all refuse the claim that culture is a private taste after the market has done its work.

- Multicultural rights, in **Will Kymlicka** and in Indian **Articles 25** to 30, protect language and religion as public facts.
- The limit is that culture can become majoritarian coercion. Weakening neo-liberalism is not the same as enlarging liberty.

Nation as a limit

- Brexit, tariff wars, industrial policy, and "Atmanirbhar" language restored the nation as an economic unit after hyper-globalisation.
- **List's** infant industry and later developmental-state practice contradict Hayek's world market as the only law.
- Border, citizenship amendment, and security politics put membership before mobility of capital and labour.
- Regional parties and federal bargains, as in GST Council politics, show that the nation is internally contested, yet still a veto on borderless neo-liberalism.

How far the hegemony is weakened

- **The claim is strongest as ideology:** few parties now win only on privatisation slogans. Welfare transfers, reservation politics, and cultural identity organise consent.
- Capital still structures production, platform work, and fiscal rules. **Foucault's** governmentality can survive as audit and targeting even when the slogan is social.
- **Rawls's** difference principle and rights-based laws (MGNREGA, NFSA, RTE) are liberal, not neo-liberal, replies inside the state.
- So community, culture, and nation have punctured market common sense. They have not abolished capitalist power; they have pluralised the bases of hegemony.

Flow diagram

Neo-liberal hegemony -> Hayek market order
 Community -> Walzer Sandel Gandhi
 Culture -> Kymlicka Arts 25-30
 Nation -> Brexit industrial policy
 Community -> Weakens Neo-liberal hegemony
 Culture -> Weakens NL
 Nation -> Weakens NL

Conclusion

Neo-liberal hegemony weakened when community, culture, and nation again supplied consent that the price system cannot buy. Gramsci and Polanyi explain the shift. Hayek's order remains as practice more than as uncontested faith. The political task is to see that the countermovement may be welfare and rights, or it may be majoritarian closure.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/factors-like-community-culture-and-nation-weaken-the-hegemony-of-neo-liberalism-today-discuss/>

Q2(b) · 15 marks

"Equality of estates caused equality of power, and equality of power is liberty." Comment

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Political Theory

Revision summary

Harrington held that the balance of land is the balance of power, and that civic liberty needs an agrarian check on estates.

The claim is republican non-domination, not a night-watchman market.

Locke and Nozick defend property against patterned equality; **Rousseau** and **Marx** deepen the inequality-power link.

Indian land reform and the 44th Amendment moved in Harrington's direction.

- **Land is no longer the only estate of power:** capital, caste, and office also dominate.

Introduction

The line is **James Harrington's** in *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656). It states a civic-republican law: the balance of property sets the balance of power, and only a relatively equal agrarian order can be a free commonwealth.

Body

Harrington's claim

- In *Oceana*, empire follows the balance of land. If one man or a few hold the soil, monarchy or aristocracy follows. If the people hold it, a commonwealth follows.
- An agrarian law must keep estates from reconcentrating. Equality of estates is not identical incomes. It is a floor against oligarchy of land.
- Equality of power then means that no private fortune can buy the sword or the senate.
- Liberty is non-domination in a free state, closer to **Machiavelli's** republican liberty than to a market right to accumulate without limit.

Conversation with other theorists

- **Locke** protected property as a natural right of labour mixed with things. Harrington treats property as a political constitution that must be legally capped.
- **Rousseau** feared inequality of fortune as the death of the general will. The maxim agrees with that fear.
- **Marx** radicalised the point: class power sits in ownership of means of production, not only in landed estates.
- **Hayek** and **Robert Nozick** reverse the maxim. They treat patterned equality of holdings as itself a threat to liberty.
- **John Rawls** permits inequality only if it helps the least advantaged, which is a justice constraint on estates, not Harrington's agrarian cap.

Indian bearing

- Zamindari abolition, land-reform ceilings, and the 44th Amendment's removal of property from fundamental rights were Harringtonian in spirit: estates as power.
- The limit is that contemporary power also sits in capital, media, caste, and office, which **Dahl** and **Lukes** map beyond land.

- **Ambedkar** added that equality of land without annihilation of caste still leaves social domination.
- So the maxim is true as a warning against oligarchy. It is incomplete as a full theory of liberty in a capitalist and caste society.

Flow diagram

Equality of estates -> Equality of power
Equality of power -> Liberty as non-domination
Harrington Oceana -> Equality of estates
Oligarchy of land -> Unfreedom

Conclusion

Harrington's sentence binds liberty to a non-oligarchic property map. **Locke** and Nozick refuse the cap; **Rousseau**, **Marx**, and Indian land reform partly accept it. Equality of estates is a republican condition of liberty, not the whole of it.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/equality-of-estates-caused-equality-of-power-and-equality-of-power-is-liberty-comment/>

Q2(c) · 15 marks

Elitist theory of democracy denies the possibility of democracy as 'rule of the people'. Elucidate

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Democracy: Classical and contemporary theories; different models of democracy

Revision summary

Elitist theory holds that a minority always rules, so democracy cannot mean the people governing themselves.

Mosca, Pareto, and Michels state minority organisation and the iron law of oligarchy.

Schumpeter keeps democracy only as a method of elite competition.

Dahl's polyarchy and the 73rd Amendment's gram sabha try to disperse, not abolish, elite rule.

The denial is of **Rousseau**'s identity of people and sovereign, not always of elections.

Introduction

Classical elitists argued that every political society is ruled by a minority. If that is so, democracy cannot be the people ruling. It can only be a method for circulating elites or for getting the people's consent to those who actually rule.

Body

The elitist core

- **Gaetano Mosca** wrote of a ruling class that organises and a majority that is organised. Formulae of legitimacy change; minority rule does not.
- **Vilfredo Pareto** described circulation of elites: lions and foxes replace each other. Residues and derivations explain why the many obey.
- **Robert Michels** stated the iron law of oligarchy: organisation, even in socialist parties, produces a leadership distinct from the rank and file.
- **Joseph Schumpeter** redefined democracy as competition of elites for the people's vote. The voter does not rule. The voter chooses who will.

Why 'rule of the people' is denied

- **Rousseau**'s general will and the textbook of popular sovereignty assume a people that can be the author of law. Elitists say scale, organisation, and expertise make that a myth.
- **C. Wright Mills** later named a power elite of military, corporate, and political chiefs in the United States.
- **Dahl** answered with polyarchy: multiple minorities, open contestation, and inclusive participation, which is still not identity of ruler and ruled.
- **Lukes** and **Foucault** deepen the denial: agenda-setting and discipline mean that even electoral majorities may not know what is done in their name.

What remains of democracy

- Elitism does not always preach dictatorship. Schumpeter keeps civil liberties as conditions of elite competition.
- **Ambedkar** feared that without social democracy, political democracy would be a hollow form, which is a different denial: the people are split by caste, not only by organisation.
- Participatory and deliberative replies, from **Carole Pateman** to gram sabhas after the **73rd Amendment**, try to thicken rule of the people at the local scale.

- **The accurate elucidation is:** elitist theory denies identity of the people and the government. It need not deny elections. It denies Rousseau's meaning of democracy.

Flow diagram

Elitist theory -> Mosca ruling class

Elitist theory -> Pareto circulation

Elitist theory -> Michels oligarchy

Elitist theory -> Schumpeter elite competition

Rule of the people -> Denied as identity

Conclusion

Mosca, Pareto, Michels, and Schumpeter replace rule of the people with rule of organised minorities, at best chosen by the people. Polyarchy and local participation qualify the iron law. They do not restore the classical identity of ruler and ruled.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/elitist-theory-of-democracy-denies-the-possibility-of-democracy-as-rule-of-the-people-elucidate/>

Q3(a) · 20 marks

Examine the liberal theory of State in contemporary politics

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Theories of the State

Revision summary

The liberal state is limited public power justified by consent and rights.

Locke and Mill set trust and liberty of thought; **Rawls** added fair opportunity and the difference principle.

Hayek's neo-liberal state is a market framework, not **Rawls**'s well-ordered society.

India joins liberal limitation (Part III, Kesavananda) to social-revolution tasks (Part IV, **Ambedkar**).

Contemporary politics tests liberalism with populist culture, Emergency memory, and market governmentality.

Introduction

Liberal theory treats the state as a limited public power justified by consent, rights, and law. In contemporary politics that theory is split between a night-watchman reading, a rights-and-welfare reading, and a neo-liberal reading that tries to run the state like a market.

Body

Classical liberal state

- **Locke** made the state a trust for life, liberty, and estate, with a right of revolution against tyranny.
- **J. S. Mill** added representative government and liberty of thought, so that the state may not close discussion even for a majority.
- **Immanuel Kant** supplied a republican legality of equal subjects under public law.
- The state is necessary because inconvenience and conflict exist. It is dangerous because it holds the sword. Limitation is the liberal art.

Twentieth-century restatement

- **John Rawls** rebuilt the liberal state as a well-ordered society: equal basic liberties, fair opportunity, and the difference principle.
- That state is not minimal. It must keep the fair value of liberties, which needs education, a social minimum, and regulation of political money.
- **Isaiah Berlin**'s negative liberty warned against a state that imposes a single positive ideal.
- **Robert Dahl**'s polyarchy translated liberalism into inclusive contestation: opposition, association, and elections.

Neo-liberal and contemporary strain

- **Hayek** and **Friedman** recast the liberal state as a framework for prices, with suspicion of planning and of trade unions.
- After 1991, many states, including India, cut industrial licensing and opened trade, which looked like Hayek, while they also expanded rights laws, which looked like **Rawls**.
- **Foucault** described neo-liberalism as a governmentality that produces competitive subjects, not only as a shrinking of the state.

- Populist majorities now use the liberal ballot to press a cultural state, which tests Mill's harm principle and minority rights.

Indian contemporary form

- Part III, **Articles 32 and 226**, and **Kesavananda Bharati** (1973) are liberal limitation of the amending state.
- Part IV, reservations, and **Ambedkar**'s social democracy pull the state beyond a night watchman toward egalitarian intervention.
- The Emergency of 1975-77 showed how a formally liberal constitution can suspend the conditions of liberalism.
- Judicial review, an independent election commission, and federal splits remain the working liberal theory of the Indian state.

Examination, not celebration

- Liberal theory still best explains why contemporary constitutional states claim rights, regular elections, and legal responsibility of officials.
- It is weaker on caste, capital, and colonial afterlives unless joined to **Ambedkar**, **Gramsci**, and political economy.
- Communitarians say the liberal state abstracts too much from membership. Elitists say it overstates popular rule.
- The contemporary liberal state is therefore a rights-bound, election-bound power that is asked to do more welfare than **Locke** wrote, and less cultural imposition than majorities sometimes want.

Flow diagram

Liberal state -> Locke trust
Liberal state -> Rawls rights and difference
Liberal state -> Hayek market framework
Liberal state -> India Parts III-IV Kesavananda

Conclusion

Liberal theory of the state remains consent, rights, and legal limits. **Rawls** and Dahl update it for welfare and polyarchy. Hayek narrows it to the market framework. In India, Parts III and IV and Kesavananda show a liberal state that is also a social-revolution state. Examination today is of that tension, not of a vanished night watchman.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/examine-the-liberal-theory-of-state-in-contemporary-politics/>

Q3(b) · 15 marks

Human Rights are complex and contested social practice that organises relations between individuals, society and the State. Comment

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Rights

Revision summary

Human rights are a practice of claims and institutions, not only a declaration.

They organise what persons may demand of the state and of social custom.

Donnelly and Shue state the equal-claim structure; Shue's basic rights are the floor.

Relativism, class critique, and security exceptions make the practice contested.

Indian **Articles 17 and 21**, **Maneka**, and group-rights clauses show the three-cornered relation.

Introduction

Human rights are not only a list in a treaty. They are a social practice: claims, institutions, and struggles that sort what a person may demand of others, of society, and of the state. The practice is complex because the list is many-layered, and contested because cultures, classes, and states disagree on who is a subject and what is due.

Body

Practice, not a tablet

- **Jack Donnelly** treated human rights as a regime of equal and inalienable claims against standard threats, especially from the state.
- **Henry Shue** named basic rights to security, subsistence, and liberty as the floor without which other rights are empty.
- Practice includes petition, litigation, reporting, and movement politics, not only the 1948 Universal Declaration.
- **Easton's** allocation language fits: rights are values made authoritative when courts and administrations bind themselves.

Individuals, society, and the state

- Against the state, rights limit police, prison, and censorship. **Article 21** jurisprudence and **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India** (1978) show that path in India.
- **Against society, rights reach custom:** **Article 17**, **Vishaka** guidelines, and the reading down of **Section 377** in **Navtej Singh Johar** (2018).
- Society also supplies the associations, press, and professions that make rights usable, which **Gramsci** would call civil society.
- The individual is the formal subject. Group rights in **Articles 29 and 30**, and **Kymlicka's** multicultural argument, complicate that form.

Why contested

- **Herskovits** and cultural relativism asked whether a Western list travels. The 1993 Vienna Conference answered that rights are universal in claim and diverse in implementation.
- **Marx** called some rights the rights of the egoistic man of civil society. **Ambedkar** insisted that civil rights without social democracy are incomplete.

- Security states invoke public order. Developmental states invoke eminent domain. Both contest the scope of rights.
- **Foucault** notes that rights can coexist with disciplinary institutions. A habeas corpus win does not end the prison as a power.

Complexity

- **Generations of rights:** civil-political, economic-social, and collective-developmental, sit in one practice and often trade off in budgets.
- **National Human Rights Commission**, NHRC, and state commissions are statutory practice, not the Constitution's only door.
- International covenants bind unevenly. Domestic politics decides which clause is live.
- **So the statement is accurate:** human rights organise a three-cornered relation, and they do so as argument and institution, not as a finished morality.

Flow diagram

Human rights practice -> Individual claims
Human rights practice -> Society custom civil society
Human rights practice -> State limit and duty
Human rights practice -> Contestation

Conclusion

Human rights are a contested social practice that binds individuals, society, and the state through claims, courts, and movements. Donnelly and Shue name the structure. Relativism, Marxism, and security politics name the contests. Indian Part III is the local working file.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/human-rights-are-complex-and-contested-social-practice-that-organises-relations-between-individuals-society-and-the-state-comment/>

Q3(c) · 15 marks

Individualism is inherent in Hobbes' absolutist ideology.

Comment

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Political Theory

Revision summary

Hobbes starts from separate, equal, self-preserving individuals, not from a natural polis.

Their war of fear makes an undivided sovereign seem necessary.

Macpherson named this possessive individualism.

Locke keeps individuals and drops absolutism; **Hobbes** joins the two.

The residual individual right is only against immediate self-destruction, not against the civil law as such.

Introduction

Thomas Hobbes builds an absolute sovereign out of individuals who fear death. The absolutism is not a medieval corporate chain. It is a machine assembled from equal, separate persons. Individualism is therefore not an accident of Leviathan. It is the starting point of the ideology.

Body

Individuals before the city

- **Natural equality is equality of vulnerability:** anyone may kill anyone. That is an individualist anthropology, not an Aristotelian *zoon politikon*.
- Each has a natural right to everything that seems to preserve himself. There is no shared *summum bonum*.
- Competition, diffidence, and glory are passions of separate agents. The state of war is a relation among individuals without a common judge.
- **C. B. Macpherson** called this possessive individualism: the person as owner of his own capacities, entering the market of security.

How individualism yields the absolute sword

- Covenants are acts of individuals who authorise one will. The sovereign is a representative person made by those acts.
- Because individuals will otherwise defect, the sword must be undivided. Absolutism is the security technology of atomised fear.
- The subject retains the inalienable individual right not to kill himself or to walk quietly to death, which is a residual individualism inside obedience.
- Religion, guild, and family are not allowed to become rival common powers. That flattening is individualist in method even when the result is a giant state.

Comment: inherent, not identical with liberalism

- **Locke** keeps individualism and refuses absolutism by adding natural law, property, and trust.
- **Hobbes** shows that individualism plus extreme insecurity can justify concentration, not only limitation.
- **Rousseau** attacked this path: the Hobbesian individual is already a product of a fallen comparison, not a natural given.

- **Sandel's** later critique of the unencumbered self has a Hobbesian ancestor: persons without constitutive community need an artificial common power.
- **Contemporary security states still use Hobbesian individualism:** the isolated frightened subject who trades liberty for order.

Limit of the comment

- **Hobbes** also needs unity, honour of the sovereign, and civil religion. Those are not market individualism.
- Absolutist ideology here means undivided sovereignty, not a cult of the private consumer.
- **The accurate comment is:** methodological individualism is the premise; political absolutism is the inferred remedy.

Flow diagram

Equal individuals -> State of war
State of war -> Covenant
Covenant -> Absolute sovereign
Absolute sovereign -> Residual right of life

Conclusion

Hobbes's absolutism is built from equal, fearful individuals who authorise one sword. Individualism is inherent as method and as residual right of self-preservation. It is not Lockean limited government. It is the paradox of modern sovereignty: atoms produce Leviathan.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/individualism-is-inherent-in-hobbes-absolutist-ideology-comment/>

Q4(a) · 20 marks

Ambedkar's idea of social justice leads to 'egalitarian justice' as compared to Rawls' 'justice as fairness' which aims at the notion of 'pure procedural justice'. Comment

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Justice

Revision summary

- **Rawls's justice as fairness models pure procedural justice:** a fair original position defines just shares.

Ambedkar's social justice starts from graded inequality and aims at equal status, not only a fair bet among equals.

Article 17, reservations, and annihilation of caste are substantive egalitarian tools.

The original position assumes moral equality that caste society denies.

Indian basic structure and reservation law sit closer to **Ambedkar's** end-state than to a caste-blind procedure.

Introduction

B. R. Ambedkar and **John Rawls** both reject a caste or class lottery as destiny. They still aim at different objects. **Ambedkar's** social justice is a substantive egalitarian reconstruction of a graded society. **Rawls's** justice as fairness is a hypothetical procedure whose outcome is to be accepted as just if the procedure is fair.

Body

Rawls: justice as fairness and procedure

- In *A Theory of Justice* (1971), parties behind a veil of ignorance choose equal basic liberties, fair equality of opportunity, and the difference principle.
- **Rawls** distinguishes perfect, imperfect, and pure procedural justice. Gambling is his school example of pure procedure: whatever results from a fair bet is fair.
- Justice as fairness is presented as the closest political analogue of pure procedural justice: a fair original position defines the just distribution, without a prior independent pattern of desert.
- The self is prior to its social titles. Caste, race, and class are morally arbitrary and must not dictate life chances.
- The theory is ideal theory for a well-ordered society of free and equal citizens, not a handbook for annihilating untouchability.

Ambedkar: social justice as egalitarian substance

- **Ambedkar** treated caste as a system of graded inequality, not as one more social primary good to be redistributed after a veil.
- Annihilation of Caste, the Poona Pact struggle, **Article 17**, and constitutional reservations aim at a real equality of status, not only a fair procedure among already equal persons.
- Representation, education, and entry into office are instruments of egalitarian justice because the Hindu social order denied personality itself to the Depressed Classes.
- **Granville Austin** placed this in the Constitution's social-revolution strand, beside political democracy.
- For **Ambedkar**, a procedure among caste Hindus would reproduce hierarchy. The end-state of equal dignity is known in advance and must be forced by law.

The comparison the question asks

- **Rawls**'s persons in the original position are already moral equals. **Ambedkar**'s society does not contain that fact; it must be made.
- Pure procedural justice suspends a prior criterion of just shares. **Ambedkar** has a prior criterion: end of untouchability, end of graded inequality, effective equal citizenship.
- Reservations look 'patterned' in **Nozick**'s hostile sense. For **Ambedkar** they are corrective of a structural wrong, closer to rectification than to a lottery.
- **Rawls** can support fair equality of opportunity and even some affirmative action in non-ideal theory. He does not start from caste as the central injustice.
- Egalitarian justice in **Ambedkar** is status equality plus material access. Justice as fairness is lexical liberties first, then distribution regulated by the difference principle.

Comment, not a false choice

- Both oppose natural hierarchy and both use the state. The comment is about starting point and metric.
- Indian courts after **Indra Sawhney** (1992) and the 103rd Amendment's EWS debate show the tension: group remedy versus a Rawlsian-looking income criterion.
- **Kesavananda** keeps both dignity and equality inside basic structure, which is more **Ambedkar**'s substance than a pure gamble.
- A fair procedure is not enough where the players are not recognised as players. That is **Ambedkar**'s decisive addition.

Flow diagram

Rawls -> Pure procedural justice
 Rawls -> Veil and two principles
 Ambedkar -> Egalitarian social justice
 Ambedkar -> Annihilation of caste
 Egalitarian social justice -> Status equality in law

Conclusion

Rawls aims at fair terms of social cooperation through a procedure that defines justice. **Ambedkar** aims at an egalitarian social order that must be known and built because caste already defines persons as unequal. Social justice here is substantive equality of status. Justice as fairness is hypothetical pure procedure among equals. India needs both, but it cannot treat the veil as a substitute for annihilation of caste.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/ambedkars-idea-of-social-justice-leads-to-egalitarian-justice-as-compared-to-rawls-justice-as-fairness-which-aims-at-the-notion-of-pure-procedural-justice-comment/>

Q4(b) · 15 marks

"The Panchayats with Gram Sabhas should be so organised as to identify the resources locally available for the development in agricultural and industrial sectors." Examine the statement in the context of Gram Swaraj

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Indian Nationalism

Revision summary

Gram Swaraj is **Gandhi's** village self-rule in production and decision, stated in Hind Swaraj and village writings.

The quoted task is local resource identification for farm and small industry.

The 73rd Amendment and **Eleventh Schedule** constitutionalise that task through panchayat and gram sabha.

Mehta committees had asked for planning from below long before 1992.

Without real devolution and a power to refuse extraction, mapping is not swaraj.

Introduction

The statement asks panchayats and gram sabhas to map local resources for farm and small-industry development. **M. K. Gandhi's** Gram Swaraj is the right context: the village republic as a producing and deciding community, not a mere agency of a distant plan.

Body

Gram Swaraj

- In Hind Swaraj and later village writings, **Gandhi** wanted swaraj as self-rule in the village: bread labour, khadi, and a limit on industrial centralisation.
- Gram Swaraj is moral and economic. The gram sabha is the people in assembly, not only a statutory quorum.
- **Jayaprakash Narayan** and the after-**Gandhi** sarvodaya stream kept the village as the unit of planning.
- **The statement's stress on identifying local resources is Gandhian:** development starts from what the place already has, not from a ministry template alone.

Constitutional organisation

- The **73rd Constitutional Amendment** gives the gram sabha constitutional status and lists agriculture, irrigation, khadi, small-scale industry, and poverty alleviation in the **Eleventh Schedule**.
- **Article 243A** leaves the powers of the gram sabha to state law, which is why organisation is uneven.
- **Balwantrai Mehta** (1957) and **Ashok Mehta** (1978) had already asked for planning from below. The 73rd Amendment is their delayed legal form.
- **State Finance Commissions** and the **Fourteenth Finance Commission's** local grants are meant to match functions with resources, without which resource-mapping is theatre.

Agricultural and industrial sectors

- Local identification fits watershed works, seeds, storage, and MGNREGA assets, and also rural crafts and micro-enterprise.

- **Gandhi** was wary of industrialism as a civilisational choice. Contemporary panchayats must still deal with agro-processing, power looms, and mineral leases that Hind Swaraj did not design.
- **Gram sabha** consent under the **Forest Rights Act, 2006**, and mining consultation, show resource identification as a veto and a plan, not as a survey for extraction only.
- Elite capture, sarpanch-pati, and un-devolved functionaries remain the gap between the sentence and Gram Swaraj.

Examination

- **The quote is sound as a directive of method:** organise sabhas to know and to decide on local productive resources.
- It is Gram Swaraj only if the sabha can refuse a project, not only inventory it for a department.
- Without funds, functionaries, and freedom, the 73rd Amendment's list does not become **Gandhi's** village republic.

Flow diagram

Gram Swaraj -> Gram Sabha
Gram Sabha -> Identify local resources
Identify local resources -> Agriculture
Identify local resources -> Local industry khadi
73rd Amendment -> Gram Sabha

Conclusion

Panchayats with gram sabhas as local resource planners is the developmental face of Gram Swaraj. The 73rd Amendment and the **Eleventh Schedule** supply the legal frame. **Gandhi's** swaraj is met only when the sabha is a deciding producer-community, not a mapping unit for someone else's industry.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/the-panchayats-with-gram-sabha-should-be-so-organised-as-to-identify-the-resources-locally-available-for-the-development-in-agricultural-and-industrial-sectors-examine-the-statement-in-the-context-of-gram-swaraj/>

Q4(c) · 15 marks

Examine the entitlement theory of justice

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Justice

Revision summary

Nozick's entitlement theory judges holdings by a just historical chain, not by an end-state pattern.

Acquisition, voluntary transfer, and rectification are the three principles.

The Chamberlain example defends inequality that arises from consent.

Rectification, if honest about conquest and caste, could undo much of the theory's conservative use.

Rawls and Indian social-revolution clauses reject the minimal state that the theory prefers.

Introduction

Robert Nozick in *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974) stated the entitlement theory of justice. A distribution is just if it arises from just acquisition, just transfer, and rectification of past injustice. There is no further patterned end-state that the state may impose.

Body

The three principles

- **Justice in acquisition:** how unowned things may be appropriated, drawing on **Locke's** labour mixed with nature, plus a proviso that others not be worsened in a severe sense.
- **Justice in transfer:** voluntary exchange, gift, and bequest. The Wilt Chamberlain example says that fans who pay to see him make him rich, and that this inequality is not unjust.
- **Justice in rectification:** past theft and enslavement require repair, which Nozick admits is historically hard.
- Whatever comes from a just history is just, even if it is highly unequal. Patterned principles such as 'to each according to need' or **Rawls's** difference principle would constantly interfere with voluntary moves.

Against **Rawls** and Harrington

- **Rawls** uses a hypothetical procedure to pick a pattern that then regulates institutions. Nozick calls that a patterned or end-result principle that treats goods as if they fell from heaven.
- Harrington's equality of estates would, for Nozick, violate liberty of transfer.
- The minimal state is limited to protection against force, theft, and fraud, and to enforcement of contract. A redistributive welfare state is on this view on a par with forced labour.

Examination

- The theory states clearly why liberty of holding matters and why a snapshot of equality is not by itself justice.
- It understates how acquisition in history is conquest, enclosure, and caste monopoly, so rectification could be enormous if taken seriously, as **Ambedkar's** structural wrong suggests.
- **Locke's** proviso is thin in Nozick's reading. Ecological limits and landless labour sit uneasily with first occupancy.
- **Hayek** is a cousin on markets as discovery, but Hayek still allowed a minimum income that Nozick's strict view resists.

- Indian **Articles 38 and 39**, land reform, and reservations are patterned on purpose. Entitlement theory explains the libertarian objection; it does not settle the constitutional aim of social revolution.

Flow diagram

Nozick entitlement -> Just acquisition
Nozick entitlement -> Just transfer
Nozick entitlement -> Rectification
Nozick entitlement -> Minimal state
Rawls pattern -> Difference principle

Conclusion

Entitlement theory defines justice as a just history of holdings, not as a fair pattern of shares. Acquisition, transfer, and rectification are the three tests. It is a powerful critique of constant redistribution and a weak sociology of how property actually arose. **Rawls**, **Ambedkar**, and the Directive Principles refuse to stop at Nozick's minimal state.

Open WRAP page —

<https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/examine-the-entitlement-theory-of-justice/>

Q5(a) · 10 marks

Analyse the workers' movement in India in the pre-Independence period.

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Indian Nationalism

Revision summary

Indian workers organised first in textiles, railways, and jute.

AITUC (1920) nationalised the union map; communists and Girni Kamgar radicalised Bombay.

The 1926 Act recognised unions; Meerut and dispute laws showed colonial fear.

Gandhi's Ahmedabad TLA offered arbitration against class war.

Caste, migration, and the national movement limited a single class politics before Independence.

Introduction

The pre-Independence workers' movement grew with mills, railways, and plantations. It was at once a fight over wages and hours and a stream inside the national movement, with early unions, communist organisation, and colonial labour law.

Body

Beginnings and organisation

- Bombay and Ahmedabad textile strikes, railway unions, and jute labour in Bengal were the first mass sites, from the late nineteenth century into the 1920s.
- The All India Trade Union Congress was founded in 1920, with **Lala Lajpat Rai** as the first president, linking labour to the Congress political calendar.
- **M. N. Roy**, the Communist Party, and the Girni Kamgar Union under **S. A. Dange** and **A. A. Alwe** radicalised Bombay mill politics.
- The **Trade Unions Act, 1926**, gave legal recognition. The **Trade Disputes Act, 1929**, and later wartime rules tried to contain strikes.

Politics and split

- The Meerut Conspiracy Case (1929-33) prosecuted labour leaders and advertised communist influence to the colonial state.
- AITUC split in the 1930s between moderate nationalists and the left; the National Trade Union Federation and later the Indian Federation of Labour showed the fracture.
- **Gandhi's** Ahmedabad Textile Labour Association practised trusteeship and arbitration with **Ambalal Sarabhai** and **Anasuya Sarabhai**, a non-class-war path.
- ILO membership (1919) and **Royal Commission** on Labour (Whitley, 1931) put Indian labour on an international and inquiry map.

Analysis

- The movement won limited legal personality and public visibility. It did not become a nationwide class party before 1947.
- Caste, migrant labour, and communal riots repeatedly split the mill-gate.
- **Nationalism often set the horizon:** swaraj first, socialism later, which **Ambedkar** and communists both criticised from different sides.

Flow diagram

Pre-1947 workers -> AITUC 1920
Pre-1947 workers -> Communists Meerut Girni Kamgar
Pre-1947 workers -> Gandhi TLA Ahmedabad
Pre-1947 workers -> 1926 Act colonial limits

Conclusion

Pre-Independence labour was mill and rail unionism, AITUC politics, communist organising, and Gandhian arbitration, under colonial restriction. It was a real movement with a fragmented class and a national question it could not postpone.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/analyse-the-workers-movement-in-india-in-the-pre-independence-period/>

Q5(b) · 10 marks

The Preamble of the Indian Constitution reflects itself as a 'social contract'. Elucidate.

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Making of the Indian Constitution

Revision summary

The Preamble's "**We, the People**" is popular contract language of self-authorisation.

Justice, liberty, equality, and fraternity are the terms of the trust, closer to **Locke** and **Rousseau** than to **Hobbes**.

Austin treated this as the Assembly's nation-making bargain.

Kesavananda tied the Preamble to basic structure.

Ambedkar's social democracy is the test of whether the contract is lived.

Introduction

The Preamble begins with "**We, the People of India**" and states the ends of the Union. That is contract language in a Lockean and Rousseauist register: a people authorises a constitutional order and names what the trust is for.

Body

Contract form

- **Locke**'s contract is consent to a trustee government for liberty and estate. The Preamble's justice, liberty, equality, and fraternity are the public terms of that trust.
- **Rousseau**'s people as sovereign appears in the enacting formula: the people give the Constitution to themselves, not a crown.
- **Granville Austin** read the Assembly as a seamless web of national unity, democracy, and social revolution. The Preamble is the short text of that bargain.
- **Kesavananda Bharati** (1973) treated the Preamble as a key to basic structure, so the contract is not a preface that Parliament may empty.

What kind of contract

- It is hypothetical and founding, not a signed parchment of every citizen. **Rawls** would call it public terms of social cooperation.
- The 42nd Amendment added socialist, secular, and integrity, which amended the stated terms of the bargain after Emergency politics.
- **Ambedkar** warned that political democracy without social democracy would fail the contract's equality and fraternity.
- Unlike **Hobbes**, the Preamble does not authorise an undivided extra-constitutional sword. Limitation is written into the same people-made text.

Elucidation

- Calling the Preamble a social contract is right as popular authorship plus named ends.
- It is incomplete if it hides that the Assembly was not a veil of ignorance: caste, property, and princely India shaped who could speak.

Flow diagram

Preamble -> We the People

Preamble -> Justice liberty equality fraternity

We the People -> Social contract form

Kesavananda -> Preamble

Conclusion

- **The Preamble is a social-contract text:** a people constitutes a limited Union for justice, liberty, equality, and fraternity. Austin and Kesavananda make those words operative. Ambedkar still asks whether society honours the bargain.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/the-preamble-of-the-indian-constitution-reflects-itself-as-a-social-contract-elucidate/>

Q5(c) · 10 marks

Legislative Council is a house without any effective powers. Comment.

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Indian Nationalism

Revision summary

State Legislative Councils exist under **Article 169** and are weaker than Assemblies.

They cannot reject money bills or defeat a government.

Ordinary bills can only be delayed, then deemed passed by the Assembly.

Rajya Sabha is a stronger second chamber than a Vidhan Parishad.

The house has revising use, not effective ruling power.

Introduction

A State Legislative Council is a second chamber created under **Article 169**. Compared with the Legislative Assembly it is weak. Calling it a house without any effective powers is a half-truth: it can delay and revise, it cannot rule.

Body

What it cannot do

- Money bills originate only in the Assembly. The Council may recommend within fourteen days; the Assembly may ignore the recommendations (**Article 198**).
- On other bills it may delay, not veto. After the Assembly's second passage, the bill is deemed passed (**Article 197**).
- The Council of Ministers is responsible to the Assembly, not to the Council. No government falls in the upper house.
- Creation and abolition themselves lie with Parliament after a state resolution, so the Council's existence is politically contingent.

What remains

- A revising chamber can catch drafting errors and give a voice to teachers, graduates, and local-body members where those constituencies exist.
- Delay can matter in a thin Assembly majority or near the end of a session.
- Compared with the Rajya Sabha, which has federal and some exclusive functions (**Articles 249, 312**), a Vidhan Parishad is far weaker.
- States have abolished councils (West Bengal, Tamil Nadu at times, Punjab, Andhra debates) precisely because parties judged them costly and ineffective.

Comment

- Effective power in a parliamentary system means confidence, money, and final legislative will. The Council lacks those.
- It is not a cipher in every bill, but it is not a coequal house. The statement is substantially right if "effective" means decisive.

Flow diagram

Legislative Council -> Delay and revise
Legislative Council -> No confidence power
Legislative Council -> No money veto
Legislative Assembly -> Government and final will

Conclusion

The Legislative Council is a delaying and revising house without confidence power or a money veto. That is not zero function. It is not effective government. The comment holds for decisive powers.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/legislative-council-is-a-house-without-any-effective-powers-comment/>

Q5(d) · 10 marks

How far is the National Commission for Backward Classes an empowered body? Assess its role in the context of rising demand for backwardness among dominant communities.

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Statutory Institutions/Commissions

Revision summary

The 102nd Amendment made NCBC a constitutional commission under **Article 338B**.

It inquires and must be consulted; it does not replace legislatures as the final list-maker.

The 105th Amendment restored state power over state OBC lists after the Maratha case.

Jat, Patidar, Maratha, and Kapu agitations show dominant groups claiming backwardness.

Mandal criteria and street power now compete; NCBC is not the winner by default.

Introduction

The **National Commission** for Backward Classes became a constitutional body through the **102nd Amendment** (2018), as **Article 338B**. Empowerment is real on paper and limited in the politics of dominant-caste reservation demands.

Body

Empowerment after 102nd Amendment

- **Article 338B** copies much of the SC and ST commission design: inquiry, reporting, and a duty of governments to consult on major policy affecting socially and educationally backward classes.
- The Commission is not a court. It cannot by itself add a community to a list in the way a legislature or, earlier, the executive did after **Indra Sawhney** (1992).
- The **105th Amendment** (2021) restored the power of states to identify OBCs for their lists after the Supreme Court's Maratha judgment read 102nd as stripping states.
- So NCBC is empowered as a watchdog and adviser, not as the sole gatekeeper of every backward-class list.

Dominant-community demands

- Jats, Patidars, Marathas, Kapus, and similar agrarian-dominant groups have sought OBC or special reservation after agrarian crisis and public-job scarcity.
- **Mandal** was about social and educational backwardness plus inadequate representation, not about every politically strong community's unemployment.
- NCBC's role is to apply criteria, not to ratify street strength. In practice, cabinets and state laws often move first; the Commission follows or is bypassed.
- Rising demand therefore tests the Commission's independence more than it proves its supremacy.

Assessment

- Compared with the pre-2018 statutory NCBC, the constitutional status is an upgrade.
- Compared with the political weight of dominant groups, the body is not decisive. Empowerment is legal, not hegemonic.

Flow diagram

NCBC Art 338B Art 338B -> Inquire and advise
Mandal Indra Sawhney -> Backwardness criteria
Dominant caste demands -> Political lists
Political lists -> NCBC Art 338B

Conclusion

NCBC under **Article 338B** is a constitutional adviser and investigator, not a sovereign classifier. Dominant-caste movements for backwardness have often outrun it. The 105th Amendment returned list-making to states, which further relativises the Commission's gate.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/how-far-is-the-national-commission-for-backward-classes-an-empowered-body-assess-its-role-in-the-context-of-rising-demand-for-backwardness-among-dominant-communities/>

Q5(e) · 10 marks

High concentration of economic activities and consumption patterns in post-liberalisation period has led to the failure of environmental movements in India. Elucidate.

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Party System

Revision summary

Liberalisation clustered economic activity and high consumption in corridors, mines, and cities.

That geography raised the cost of environmental vetoes compared with Chipko's forest economy.

Narmada, SEZ, and mining conflicts show frequent defeat and occasional gram sabha or court checks.

Urban consumption politics is not the same as environmentalism of the poor.

The statement explains many failures; it overstates a total end of movements.

Introduction

After 1991, growth clustered in metros, corridors, mines, and branded consumption. That concentration raised the cost of saying no to projects. It did not simply kill environmental movements. It changed their battlefield and often their outcomes.

Body

Concentration after liberalisation

- Liberalisation pulled investment to coastal SEZs, mineral belts, expressways, and mega-cities. Ecological load followed capital, not the old licence-permit map.
- New middle-class consumption-cars, power, packaged water, real estate-created a constituency for growth that **Hayek's** market order treats as preference, not as a political defeat of Chipko.
- **Ramachandra Guha's** environmentalism of the poor still existed, but it now faced global capital, not only a forest contractor.

What happened to movements

- Chipko had slowed commercial felling in a pre-1991 Himalayan economy. Narmada Bachao Andolan faced a developmental state plus later private power and a Supreme Court that allowed dam height to rise.
- POSCO, Vedanta-Niyamgiri, Sterlite, and various SEZ fights show both losses and a few vetoes, including gram sabha votes after Court directions at Niyamgiri.
- The National Green Tribunal and **Article 21** environment cases are institutional traces, not proof of movement victory.
- Failure is real where displacement outran organisation. It is overstated as a total end of environmental politics.

Elucidation of the claim

- Concentration and consumption weakened livelihood movements by raising the opportunity cost of protest and by splitting urban consumers from forest users.

- They also produced new middle-class clean-air and waste movements that do not speak Guha's poor.
- So post-liberalisation geography explains many defeats. It does not license the word failure for the whole field.

Flow diagram

Post-1991 concentration -> Corridors mines metros

Post-1991 concentration -> Consumer class

Movements -> Narmada Chipko Niyamgiri

Post-1991 concentration -> Weaker livelihood veto

Conclusion

Post-1991 concentration of production and consumption stacked power against place-based ecology. Chipko-to-Narmada history shows harder defeats, not a completed burial of environmental movements.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/high-concentration-of-economic-activities-and-consumption-patterns-in-post-liberalisation-period-has-led-to-the-failure-of-environmental-movements-in-india-elucidate/>

Q6(a) · 20 marks

Electoral behaviour of voters is governed more by the social and economic factors than the political factors. Explain

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Party System

Revision summary

Indian voters use caste, religion, region, and household economy as the default map.

Lipset-Rokkan cleavages and Mandal identity politics explain the social pull.

Prices, jobs, and transfers explain the economic pull.

Leadership, FPTP coalitions, and events remain political governors of the margin.

The ranking social-economic over purely ideological politics is sound; organisation still converts those factors into seats.

Introduction

Indian voting is never only a choice among manifestos. Caste, religion, region, class, and household economy structure who is trusted. Political factors-leadership, organisation, welfare delivery, and events-still swing margins. The statement is a strong tendency, not a law that politics is epiphenomenal.

Body

Social factors

- **Lipset** and **Rokkan** treated cleavages of religion, class, and centre-periphery as the frozen bases of European parties. India analogously votes through caste blocs, language, and minority security.
- The **Rudolphs** described caste associations as modern political actors. Mandal politics after **Indra Sawhney** (1992) made OBC identity a durable electoral grammar.
- Communal polarisation and riot memory can realign whole states, which is social fear organised as a vote.
- Kin, village faction, and gender of the household head still cue many ballots, especially where information is costly.

Economic factors

- Class in the Marxist sense is weaker as a nationwide party cleavage than caste, but farm prices, inflation, jobs, and migrant remittances are felt in the household.
- **Pranab Bardhan** and later political economists linked anti-incumbency to economic disappointment.
- Targeted transfers, farm loan waivers, and MGNREGA are economic facts that become political credit when they arrive before polling.
- Urban informal labour and agrarian distress explain why dominant-caste reservation movements also become vote banks.

Political factors that still govern

- **Duverger's** first-past-the-post rewards coalitions and local brokers, a political-institutional filter on social blocs.
- Leadership image, campaign money, booth organisation, and the **Election Commission's** model code are political, not social, variables.

- 1977 after the Emergency, 1984 after Indira Gandhi's assassination, and several "waves" show event politics overriding routine social arithmetic.
- Welfare branding and media, which Foucault would call government of conduct, are political technologies that use social data.

How to explain the statement

- **Social identity often supplies the default heuristic:** who is "our" party. Economy supplies valence: who can feed and protect.
- Political factors operate on that ground. A party that ignores caste geography usually loses, which is why the statement is largely true at the micro level.
- **Easton's** inputs include demands from the social environment; conversion is still political.
- Regional parties such as **DMK**, **TMC**, and **AAP** win by mixing linguistic or urban social bases with distinctive political offers (Dravidian welfare, Bengal regionalism, Delhi services).

Limit

- **If political factors meant only high ideology, the statement is clearly right:** few Indian voters are programmatic liberals or socialists first.
- If political factors include organisation and leadership, they are co-governors, not a residual.
- **Ambedkar's** warning remains: political democracy sits on social inequality, so the social will keep structuring the vote until that inequality thins.

Flow diagram

Vote -> Caste religion region
 Vote -> Household economy
 Vote -> Leadership organisation welfare
 Caste religion region -> Default heuristic
 Leadership organisation welfare -> Swing and wave

Conclusion

Electoral behaviour in India is governed first by social identity and household economy, which elitist and cleavage theories both predict. Political organisation, leadership, and welfare delivery work upon that base and sometimes override it. The statement is a correct ranking of routine causes, not a claim that campaigns do not matter.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/electoral-behaviour-of-voters-i-s-governed-more-by-the-social-and-economic-factors-than-the-political-factors-explain/>

Q6(b) · 15 marks

The Doctrine of Basic Structure of the Constitution has enhanced the power of judicial review of the Supreme Court. Examine

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Salient Features of the Indian Constitution

Revision summary

Kesavananda held that amendments cannot destroy basic structure, extending review to **Article 368**.

Indira **Gandhi**'s election case and *Minerva Mills* protected review against ouster clauses.

Coelho opened post-1973 **Ninth Schedule** laws to structure review.

NJAC (2015) struck an appointments amendment in the name of judicial independence.

Bommai used structure values against arbitrary President's Rule.

The Court's power grew as a shield and as a political prize.

Introduction

Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973) held that Parliament's amending power cannot destroy the Constitution's basic structure. That doctrine enlarged judicial review from ordinary law to the constitutional amendment itself.

Body

What review was before

- **A. K. Gopalan** treated fundamental rights in separate silos. **Golaknath** (1967) barred amendments to fundamental rights, a first expansion, then found unworkable.
- **Dicey's** parliamentary sovereignty had no Indian home once a written constitution with **Article 13** existed, but amendments under **Article 368** still looked like a sovereign key.
- Judicial review of ordinary legislation was already in **Articles 13, 32**, and 226. The new claim was review of the constituent power.

How basic structure enhanced review

- The Court named essentials-supremacy of the Constitution, democracy, secularism, federalism, judicial review, and later additions in case law-and measured amendments against them.
- **Indira Nehru Gandhi v. Raj Narain** (1975) struck an amendment that sought to place an election dispute beyond review, which showed the doctrine protecting the Court's own jurisdiction.
- **Minerva Mills** (1980) invalidated clauses that tried to make amendments immune from review and to subordinate fundamental rights to Directive Principles without limit.
- **I. R. Coelho** (2007) brought **Ninth Schedule** laws after 24 April 1973 under basic-structure review if they damage rights that are essentials.
- **NJAC / Fourth Judges Case** (2015) used independence of the judiciary as basic structure to strike a constitutional amendment on appointments.

Examination of "enhanced"

- **Enhancement is real:** the Supreme Court became the umpire of what Parliament may not do even with a special majority.

- **Granville Austin**'s social revolution still needs amendment; the doctrine can freeze a judicial reading of essentials.
- Compared with **Hobbes**'s undivided sovereign, this is Lockean trust enforced by judges.
- **S. R. Bommai** (1994) used secularism and federalism, basic-structure values, to discipline **Article 356**, another expansion of review into executive federal power.
- The cost is a political Court. Enhancement of review is also a shift of amending power toward a bench.

Balance

- Without the doctrine, Emergency-era amendments showed how a written constitution can be emptied.
- With the doctrine, democracy depends on judicial self-restraint as well as on judicial courage.
- The examination therefore agrees with the statement and adds that enhancement is both a shield of constitutional identity and a concentration of power in the Court.

Flow diagram

Kesavananda 1973 -> Basic structure
Basic structure -> Review of Article 368
Review of Article 368 -> Minerva Mills
Review of Article 368 -> NJAC 2015
Review of Article 368 -> Bommai secularism federalism

Conclusion

Basic structure extended judicial review from statutes to constitutional amendments and to devices that would oust courts. Kesavananda, Minerva Mills, Coelho, NJAC, and Bommai mark the growth. The power of the Supreme Court rose. So did the need for judicial discipline.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/the-doctrine-of-basic-structure-of-the-constitution-has-enhanced-the-power-of-judicial-review-of-the-supreme-court-examine/>

Q6(c) · 15 marks

Discuss the composition and functions of the Inter-State Council. To what extent has this body been successful in achieving its objectives?

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Federalism

Revision summary

Article 263 authorises an Inter-State Council; Sarkaria's push led to its 1990 constitution.

The PM chairs; Chief Ministers and some Union ministers are members.

Functions are dispute advice, common-interest discussion, and policy coordination, all recommendatory.

Meetings have been too few for a standing federal forum.

Bommai, GST Council, and tribunals did more for federal conflict than the Council did.

Introduction

The Inter-State Council is a constitutional body under **Article 263** for coordination between the Union and the States and among States. **Sarkaria** recommended that it be set up as a standing political forum. It was constituted in 1990. Success has been modest beside the problems it was meant to ease.

Body

Composition

- The Prime Minister is the chairman. Chief Ministers of all States and those Union Territories with assemblies are members.
- Six Union Cabinet ministers, nominated by the Prime Minister, sit on the Council.
- A standing committee, usually chaired by the Union Home Minister, does preparatory work.
- The Secretariat, now with the Ministry of Home Affairs after shifts of location, services meetings. This is a political council, not a court.

Functions under **Article 263**

- Inquiring into and advising upon disputes between States.
- Investigating and discussing subjects of common interest to some or all States, or to the Union and one or more States.
- Making recommendations for better coordination of policy and action.
- Sarkaria wanted it to be the principal forum for Union-State consultation, including on concurrent-list bills and fiscal federal stress.
- **Punchhi** later asked for more regular meetings and a stronger follow-up of recommendations.

Extent of success

- The Council created a recognised table after decades of ad hoc National Development Council and zonal councils. That is a partial success of form.
- It discussed Sarkaria's own report, **Article 356**, and some concurrent-list issues. Recommendations are advisory. Cabinets may ignore them.
- Meetings have been infrequent for long stretches, which is the opposite of a standing coordinating device.

- **S. R. Bommai** (1994) disciplined President's Rule through the Court, not through the Council, showing where federal protection actually bit.
- GST Council under **Article 279A** became a more consequential federal bargain on tax. **NITI Aayog** replaced **Planning Commission** as a different talking shop. The Inter-State Council did not become the centre of either money or planning.
- River disputes still go to tribunals and the Supreme Court. The Council has not been the successful dispute-settler **Article 263** imagined.

Assessment

- Objectives of dialogue and a less imperial Centre are only weakly met.
- Coalition eras used extra-constitutional bargaining more than this Council. A dominant national party can starve it of meetings.
- It remains useful when used. It has not achieved Sarkaria's standing political federalism.

Flow diagram

Article 263 -> Inter-State Council
Inter-State Council -> PM plus CMs plus CMs
Inter-State Council -> Advise coordinate disputes
Sarkaria 1990 -> Inter-State Council
GST Council Council -> Stronger fiscal forum

Conclusion

The Inter-State Council's composition is PM, Chief Ministers, and nominated Union ministers. Its functions are inquiry, common-interest discussion, and recommendatory coordination. Success is limited: irregular meetings, advisory teeth, and displacement by GST Council, courts, and informal coalition bargains.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/discuss-the-composition-and-functions-of-the-inter-state-council-to-what-extent-has-this-body-been-successful-in-achieving-its-objectives/>

Q7(a) · 20 marks

Examine the unique features of the 73rd Constitutional Amendment. Do you think this Amendment would contribute in achieving the goal of empowerment of marginalised sections of the society?

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Salient Features of the Indian Constitution

Revision summary

The 73rd Amendment constitutionalised panchayats, gram sabhas, five-year elections, and State Election and **Finance Commissions**.

Reservations for SC, ST, and women are the distinctive social mechanism.

Eleventh Schedule lists developmental subjects including agriculture and poverty work.

Seats have opened; sarpanch-pati, thin devolution, and caste violence still hollow many offices.

The Amendment contributes to empowerment as a necessary institutional floor, not as a completed social revolution.

Introduction

The **73rd Constitutional Amendment** (1992) gave panchayats a constitutional third tier. Its unique features are a uniform basic design, a gram sabha, reserved seats, and State Election and **Finance Commissions**. Empowerment of the marginalised is the intent. Capture, patriarchy, and thin devolution still decide how far the intent travels.

Body

Unique features

- Part IX and the **Eleventh Schedule** constitutionalise village, intermediate, and district panchayats, ending the habit of suspending local bodies by ordinary whim.
- The **gram sabha** is named in **Article 243A** as the assembly of voters, a direct-democratic piece inside representative local government.
- Direct elections, five-year terms, and a **State Election Commission** (**Article 243K**) copy Union and State electoral regularity at the local scale.
- Reservations for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in proportion to population, and not less than one-third of seats (now 50 per cent in many states) for women, including offices of chairpersons, are the sharpest unique social device.
- A **State Finance Commission** (**Article 243I**) is to recommend devolution of taxes and grants, linking **Gandhi's** village claim to a fiscal procedure.
- **Article 243N** saves existing laws only for a time; states must fit the new scheme. **Eleventh Schedule** lists 29 subjects, including agriculture and poverty alleviation, which the question of Gram Swaraj also raises.

Contrast with earlier panchayats

- **Balwantrai Mehta** and **Ashok Mehta** recommended democratic decentralisation. Those remained state statutes, easy to supersede.
- The 73rd Amendment makes non-holding of elections a constitutional default that is harder to justify.

- It is unique in the world as a large-federation mandate of gender reservation in local office, not only in candidate lists.

Empowerment of the marginalised

- SC, ST, and women members entered offices that caste and gender had closed. That is a real shift in who sits on the dais.
- **Ambedkar** was sceptical of the village as a den of localism. The Amendment tries to use the village while binding it with reservations, which is an Ambedkarite correction inside a Gandhian unit.
- Self-help groups, women's quorums, and some documented rise in local public goods show partial social empowerment.
- Sarpanch-pati, proxy SC sarpanches, violence against Dalit women presidents, and un-transferred funds show the gap between seat and power.
- **Michels's oligarchy travels to the panchayat: dominant castes and parties still organise the Gram Sabha agenda, a Lukes third face of power.**

Would it contribute? A balanced answer

- **Yes, as a necessary condition:** without reserved office and regular elections, marginalised groups remain petitioners of the block office.
- **No, as a sufficient condition:** empowerment needs functions, funds, functionaries, land rights, and protection from violence.
- **Forest Rights Act** gram sabhas and PESA in **Fifth Schedule** areas deepen ST voice where implemented, which the 73rd design enables but does not guarantee.
- **Rawls's** fair value of political liberties is the right test: a reserved seat without campaign resources is not yet equal citizenship.
- So the Amendment contributes. It does not complete the goal.

Flow diagram

73rd Amendment -> Gram Sabha
 73rd Amendment -> SC ST women reservation
 73rd Amendment -> State Election Commission
 SC ST women reservation -> Possible empowerment
 Elite capture -> Limits Possible empowerment

Conclusion

The 73rd Amendment's unique features are constitutional status, gram sabha, independent local elections, fiscal commission, and reservations for SC, ST, and women. Those features contribute to empowerment by opening office. They do not by themselves end local oligarchy. **Gandhi's** unit plus **Ambedkar's** safeguards is the design; practice is still a contest.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/examine-the-unique-features-of-the-73rd-constitutional-amendment-do-you-think-this-amendment-would-contribute-in-achieving-the-goal-of-empowerment-of-marginalised-sections-of-the-society/>

Q7(b) · 15 marks

The Speaker represents the freedom and dignity of the House. Examine

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Indian Nationalism

Revision summary

The Speaker is meant to embody the House's freedom of debate and the dignity of its rules.

Indian Speakers certify money bills, run question hour, and decide defection.

Kihoto Hollohan made defection rulings reviewable.

Delay in disqualification and partisan adjournments contradict the ideal.

The statement is a constitutional ethic that courts now partly enforce against the chair.

Introduction

The Speaker is the House's presiding officer. In Westminster theory the office stands for the House's freedom against the executive and for the dignity of its procedure. In India, **Article 93** and the anti-defection **Tenth Schedule** have strained that theory.

Body

The Westminster claim

- The Speaker represents the House, not the government. Freedom means the right of members to speak, question, and oppose under rules.
- Dignity means orderly debate, protection of minorities in the House, and custody of privileges.
- **Erskine May** and Indian practice expect the Speaker to be impartial after election, even if the person came from a party.

Indian constitutional design

- The Speaker is elected by the Lok Sabha or Vidhan Sabha. The office is not a presidential nominee.
- Casting vote, adjournment, and referral of money bills (**Article 110**) are powers that can decide legislative fate.
- The **Tenth Schedule** made the Speaker the first judge of defection, which mixed the referee with party-break politics.
- **Kihoto Hollohan** (1992) held that the Speaker's defection order is judicially reviewable, a limit that protects freedom of the House from a partisan chair.
- **Nabam Rebia** (2016) and later **Keisham Meghachandra** (2020) pressed time-limits and constitutionality when Speakers sat on disqualification.

Examination

- When the Speaker protects question hour, opposes sudden adjournment to save the government, and recognises the opposition, the office does represent freedom and dignity.
- When the Speaker certifies ordinary bills as money bills to bypass the Rajya Sabha, or delays defection cases until a term ends, the office represents the majority, not the House.
- **A. V. Dicey's** parliamentary dignity assumed a culture of restraint. Anti-defection and tight whips reduced the member's freedom that the Speaker is said to incarnate.
- State Assemblies have seen mass disqualification and floor tests where the Governor and the Court, not the Speaker's neutrality, restored a kind of dignity, as in some **Bommai**-line cases.

Conclusion of the examine

- The sentence is a norm, not a description. The Speaker ought to represent the House's freedom and dignity.
- Law has had to review the Speaker because practice often failed the norm.
- Strengthening impartiality-faster defection decisions, less inventive money-bill certification-would make the sentence true again.

Flow diagram

Speaker -> Freedom of speech in House

Speaker -> Dignity of procedure

Tenth Schedule -> Partisan chair

Kihoto Hollohan -> Judicial review

Conclusion

The Speaker is designed as the symbol of the House's freedom and dignity. Tenth Schedule partisanship and procedural abuse have often made the office the majority's tool. Kihoto and later cases restored review so that dignity is not whatever the chair says.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/the-speaker-represents-the-freedom-and-dignity-of-the-house-examine/>

Q7(c) · 15 marks

Discuss the policy initiatives of the Fourteenth Finance Commission aimed towards promoting and strengthening agricultural development in India

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Statutory Institutions/Commissions

Revision summary

The 14th FC's farm-relevant policy was fiscal, not a crop mission.

Devolution rose to 42 per cent so States could fund irrigation and agriculture with discretion.

Panchayat grants support rural public goods linked to the 73rd Amendment.

Forest-cover weight and disaster funds protect ecological and drought-related farm conditions.

Tied CSS reduction was meant to let agro-climatic diversity shape spending.

Outcomes depend on how States use the space.

Introduction

The **Fourteenth Finance Commission** (2015-20), chaired by **Y. V. Reddy**, did not run farm schemes. It strengthened agriculture mainly by enlarging untied fiscal space for States, funding rural local bodies, and easing the grip of tied Centrally Sponsored Schemes on state farm policy.

Body

The fiscal core

- Tax devolution to States rose from 32 per cent to 42 per cent of the divisible pool. Agriculture, irrigation, and rural roads are largely State and concurrent subjects in practice, so untied money is the Commission's chief farm instrument.
- The Commission argued that States know agro-climatic diversity better than a uniform Union scheme, which is a federal reading of **Sarkaria's** cooperation.
- It recommended a sharp reduction in the number of Centrally Sponsored Schemes and a higher state share of discretion, so that crop, irrigation, and extension mixes could differ by region.

Local bodies and the village farm economy

- Large grants to gram panchayats and municipalities, with a basic grant plus a performance grant, were meant to build rural public goods that agriculture needs: water, sanitation, connectivity, and markets at the panchayat scale.
- **This links to the 73rd Amendment and Gram Swaraj:** local identification of resources, not only a ministry line item.
- **Fourteenth Finance Commission** grants were largely untied at the local level compared with many older scheme funds, which mattered for farm-related local works.

Risk, forest, and the farm environment

- Horizontal devolution gave weight to forest cover, which compensates States that keep ecological services relevant to watersheds and rain-fed farming.
- Disaster-relief arrangements under the Commission's award support drought and flood response, which are agricultural shocks.

- The Commission did not invent MSP or crop insurance. Those remained Union and State scheme choices funded from the larger devolved pool.

How far this is "agricultural policy"

- Critics said 42 per cent devolution without matching farm conditionality could be spent on salaries, not on irrigation.
- **Supporters said conditionality was the old problem:** agriculture failed partly because States could not set priorities.
- GST, designed in the same decade, later squeezed some state commodity taxes; that is adjacent fiscal history, not a 14th FC farm scheme.
- Compared with a Union agriculture ministry mission, the 14th FC's initiative is constitutional fiscal federalism aimed at enabling farm development, not at planting a crop.

Assessment

- The policy initiative is enabling, not directive. It can strengthen agriculture where States and panchayats choose to spend on water, extension, and rural infrastructure.
- It cannot by itself correct market concentration or agrarian inequality that **Harrington** would call estates of power.
- Success is therefore state-variable, which is consistent with the Commission's own theory of subsidiarity.

Flow diagram

14th FC Reddy -> 42 percent devolution
14th FC Reddy -> Panchayat grants
14th FC Reddy -> Fewer tied schemes
42 percent devolution -> State farm irrigation spend

Conclusion

The **Fourteenth Finance Commission** promoted agricultural development by raising untied state devolution to 42 per cent, funding panchayats, rewarding forest cover, and asking for fewer tied schemes. That is a federal enabling policy. It is not a substitute for state farm strategy or for land and market reform.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/discuss-the-policy-initiatives-of-the-fourteenth-finance-commission-aimed-towards-promoting-and-strengthening-agricultural-development-in-india/>

Q8(a) · 20 marks

Ethnicity is the underlying cause which poses a great challenge in the resolution of the problems in the North-East region of India. Comment

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Indian Nationalism

Revision summary

Ethnicity is a central, not a solitary, cause of North-East conflict.

Naga, Mizo, Bodo, and Assam Accord politics show peoplehood claims against existing maps.

Sixth Schedule and Inner Line already treat identity as law.

Colonial borders, hydropower and timber, migration, and AFSPA co-produce the deadlock.

Settlements that only pay development, or that only freeze one ethnic winner, recreate minorities.

Introduction

- **Ethnicity is a central cleavage in the North-East:** tribe, language, hills and plains, and indigeneity versus migrant. Calling it the underlying cause of every unresolved problem is too simple. Colonial borders, development models, and the security state also structure the conflict, even when the names of the parties are ethnic.

Body

Why ethnicity is central

- The region is a corridor of Tibeto-Burman, Tai, Mon-Khmer, and Indo-Aryan groups, with Inner Line and **Sixth Schedule** devices that treat identity as a legal fact.
- Naga nationalism, from the Naga National Council to NSCN factions, frames a people and a territory that do not match state boundaries. Peace talks and the Framework Agreement show ethnicity as both grievance and bargaining identity.
- Mizo, Bodo, Kuki, Khasi, and Garo assertions, and Assam's anti-foreigner movement leading to the **Assam Accord (1985)**, organised politics as ethnic demography.
- **Walker Connor** and later Indian scholars of ethno-nationalism treat such mobilisation as more than "law and order." **Kymlicka's** minority-nation argument fits hill councils and autonomous districts.

Why "underlying" overstates a single cause

- Colonial recruitment, inner lines, and the Radcliffe-post-1947 border made minorities overnight. The cause includes state-making, not only primordial culture.
- **Boas** and **Herskovits** warn against treating ethnicity as a timeless essence. North-East identities have been recast by census, conversion, and reservation lists.
- Resource conflicts-oil, timber, hydropower, poppy, and highway corridors-follow **Easton's** allocation. Ethnicity organises who is seen as entitled to the resource.
- AFSPA and militarisation, as in debates after alleged excesses, add a security cause that can outlive any one ethnic charter.
- Migration from Bangladesh and from other Indian states is economic as well as cultural. The NRC exercise in Assam mixed citizenship law with ethnic anxiety.

Resolution problems

- Ethnic settlements often create new minorities inside the winner's map, as Bodo territorial politics and Bru/Reang displacement showed.
- A Naga "unique history" claim collides with Manipur's territorial integrity, an inter-ethnic deadlock the Centre cannot split by development grants alone.
- **Sixth Schedule** and **Article 371** variants are liberal-multicultural tools. They can freeze elite ethnic brokers, a **Michels** oligarchy in a tribal key.
- **Gandhi's** swaraj does not by itself settle overlapping homelands. **Ambedkar's** equal citizenship sits in tension with indigenous priority.

Comment

- Ethnicity is the idiom and a real cause of North-East conflict. It is not a geological base under all other causes.
- Resolution needs political recognition (talks, autonomy, Inner Line), economic justice, and demilitarisation sequenced with trust.
- Treating only ethnicity produces either partition logic or forced assimilation. Treating only development produces the charge of internal colonialism.
- **The accurate comment is:** ethnicity is the principal identity through which North-East problems are posed, and therefore a necessary object of any settlement, not a sufficient explanation of why settlements fail.

Flow diagram

North-East problems -> Ethnic homelands
 North-East problems -> Borders migration
 North-East problems -> Resources hydropower
 North-East problems -> AFSPA security
 Ethnic homelands -> Naga talks Sixth Schedule

Conclusion

Ethnicity organises North-East conflict and makes resolution hard because homelands overlap. Borders, resources, migration, and AFSPA are co-causes. A settlement that names ethnicity without sharing power and security will fail, and so will a settlement that pretends ethnicity is only a mask.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/ethnicity-is-the-underlying-cause-which-poses-a-great-challenge-in-the-resolution-of-the-problems-in-the-north-east-region-of-india-comment/>

Q8(b) · 15 marks

The making of the Indian Constitution is described as an attempt towards a 'social revolution'. Comment

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Making of the Indian Constitution

Revision summary

Austin named social revolution as a strand of the constitutional web beside democracy and unity.

Ambedkar drafted justiciable equality, including abolition of untouchability, as the legal engine.

Directive Principles state economic democracy as a continuing duty.

Land reform and reservations extend the attempt against estates and caste monopoly.

The making is an attempt; social facts still lag the text.

Introduction

Granville Austin described the Indian Constitution as a seamless web whose one strand is social revolution. The making of the text was an attempt to use higher law to undo caste, landlordism, and unfreedom, not only to transfer the colonial state to Indian ministers.

Body

Austin's meaning

- Political revolution was Independence and adult franchise. Social revolution was equality of status and opportunity against a hierarchical society.
- **Ambedkar**'s chairmanship of the **Drafting Committee** put that aim into **Articles 15, 16, 17, 23, 24**, and the Directive Principles.
- Abolition of untouchability, common citizenship, and the promise of economic democracy in **Articles 38 and 39** are the revolutionary core.
- The Assembly rejected **Gandhi**'s village constitution as the primary text, but it kept village panchayats in **Article 40** as a directive, a compromise of methods.

How the making attempted it

- Fundamental rights against the state and against some private custom (**Article 17**) were to be justiciable engines of social change.
- Reservations, later expanded after **Mandal**, were built as exceptions that serve equality, not as a denial of **Rawlsian** fair opportunity in **Ambedkar**'s own view of substance.
- Land-reform permission, the First Amendment, and later property's exit from Part III show the Assembly and early Parliament treating estates of power, in **Harrington**'s sense, as a constitutional problem.
- Uniform civil code as a directive, not an immediate right, shows the revolution as sequenced, under **Nehru**'s political caution and against **Ambedkar**'s faster civil-law hope.

Comment on "attempt"

- Attempt is the right word. **Kesavananda** later saved both democracy and the social-revolution reading from a purely procedural Parliament.
- **Implementation lagged**: land reform was captured, caste violence continued, and women's rights inside the family remain uneven.

- **Foucault** would note that a rights text can coexist with disciplinary institutions. The revolution is legal-political, not automatic.
- **Compared with a Trotskyist permanent revolution, this was a constitutional path:** law as the revolution's form, courts and legislatures as its organs.

Balance

- Calling the making a social revolution is fair as intention and design.
- Calling it a completed social revolution is false. Austin himself treated the web as a task for later generations.

Flow diagram

Austin social revolution -> Ambedkar Parts III-IV

Austin social revolution -> Article 17 equality

Austin social revolution -> Directive Principles

Political revolution -> Franchise republic

Conclusion

The Constitution's making was an attempted social revolution in Austin's and **Ambedkar's** sense: higher law against graded inequality and economic domination. The attempt is in Parts III and IV. The completion remains political, which is why the phrase is an aim, not a trophy.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/the-making-of-the-indian-constitution-is-described-as-an-attempt-towards-a-social-revolution-comment/>

Q8(c) · 15 marks

How far is it correct that the regional parties have strengthened the Indian democracy and federal system? Substantiate your answer with suitable examples

PSIR GS 1 · 2022 · Party System

Revision summary

Regional parties widened democratic choice after 1967 and 1989.

DMK, TMC, and AAP show linguistic, state-alternation, and new-urban routes into power.

Coalition politics and Bommai-era federalism made states harder to dismiss or ignore.

GST Council and linguistic statehood claims are federal gains with regional vehicles.

Internal oligarchy and spoils are the democratic costs.

The strengthening claim holds as a net historical judgment.

Introduction

Regional parties have strengthened Indian democracy and federalism by giving linguistic and state majorities a national voice and by forcing coalition bargains. They have also produced opportunism, dynastic machines, and centre-state blackmail. The statement is largely correct for the coalition decades, with those costs named.

Body

Democracy strengthened

- After 1967 and especially after 1989, voters could punish a national party without abandoning parliamentary politics. That is **Dahl's** contestation at the state scale.
- **DMK** and later AIADMK made Dravidian social justice and Tamil linguistic dignity electoral, which widened who counts in the demos.
- **TMC** in West Bengal displaced a long Left Front without extra-constitutional rupture, a democratic alternation.
- **AAP** used city services and anti-corruption talk to enter Delhi and then Punjab, adding a new organisational type to the party system.
- Regional media and state-level leadership reduced the informational monopoly of a single Delhi party, which **Gramsci** would call a more plural civil society.

Federalism strengthened

- Coalition governments at the Centre (1989-2014, and in later mixes) made Chief Ministers veto players on cabinets, which **Sarkaria** wanted as political federalism, not only legal lists.
- **S. R. Bommai** (1994) is often used when regional parties resist **Article 356**; the judgment's federal reading grew in a multi-party climate.
- GST Council voting gives states, often ruled by regional parties, a formal fiscal voice.
- Telangana's creation after a regional movement, and earlier linguistic states, show regional parties as vehicles of boundary federalism.
- The Inter-State Council was still weak; regional parties used extra-constitutional alliances more than **Article 263**, which is messy federalism, but still federal bargaining.

Limits and counter-examples

- Some regional parties have been personalist and intolerant of local opposition, which is **Michels** at the state capital.
- Support-for-stability bargains extracted Union ministries as spoils, which can weaken programmatic democracy.
- Ethnic regionalism in the North-East can harden exclusion even while it checks a distant Centre.
- A dominant national party can recentralise; regional strength is conjunctural, not a locked federal guarantee.

How far correct

- It is correct that regional parties made India a competitive federal democracy rather than a one-party Congress system.
- It is incorrect if "strengthened" means they always deepen rights or always respect opposition.
- Examples that substantiate the positive claim are DMK in Union coalitions, TMC's state alternation, AAP's new entry, and Bommai-era resistance to dismissal.
- **The balanced score is:** more voices, more state bargaining power, uneven internal democracy.

Flow diagram

Regional parties -> Wider contestation
Regional parties -> Coalition federal bargains
DMK -> Regional parties
TMC -> Regional parties
AAP -> Regional parties
Bommai -> Coalition federal bargains

Conclusion

Regional parties have, on balance, strengthened democracy by widening contestation and strengthened federalism by making states political principals. DMK, TMC, and AAP illustrate the gain. Spoils, dynasty, and exclusion illustrate the bill. The claim is largely true, not absolutely true.

Open WRAP page — <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/psir-gs-1/2022/how-far-is-it-correct-that-the-regional-parties-have-strengthened-the-indian-democracy-and-federal-system-substantiate-your-answer-with-suitable-examples/>

Compiled answer key

Last pages of this pack. Each question links to the WRAP model answer on wrapexams.com.

ask@wrapexams.com · wrapexams.com

Q1(a) 10 marks	Q1(b) 10 marks	Q1(c) 10 marks	Q1(d) 10 marks
Q1(e) 10 marks	Q2(a) 20 marks	Q2(b) 15 marks	Q2(c) 15 marks
Q3(a) 20 marks	Q3(b) 15 marks	Q3(c) 15 marks	Q4(a) 20 marks
Q4(b) 15 marks	Q4(c) 15 marks	Q5(a) 10 marks	Q5(b) 10 marks
Q5(c) 10 marks	Q5(d) 10 marks	Q5(e) 10 marks	Q6(a) 20 marks
Q6(b) 15 marks	Q6(c) 15 marks	Q7(a) 20 marks	Q7(b) 15 marks
Q7(c) 15 marks	Q8(a) 20 marks	Q8(b) 15 marks	Q8(c) 15 marks

Question-wise key

Q1(a) · 10 marks Solution

Q1(b) · 10 marks Solution

Q1(c) · 10 marks Solution

Q1(d) · 10 marks Solution

Q1(e) · 10 marks Solution

Q2(a) · 20 marks Solution

Q2(b) · 15 marks Solution

Q2(c) · 15 marks Solution

Q3(a) · 20 marks Solution

Q3(b) · 15 marks Solution

Q3(c) · 15 marks Solution

Q4(a) · 20 marks Solution

Q4(b) · 15 marks Solution

Q4(c) · 15 marks Solution

Q5(a) · 10 marks Solution

Q5(b) · 10 marks Solution

Q5(c) · 10 marks Solution

Q5(d) · 10 marks Solution

Q5(e) · 10 marks Solution

Q6(a) · 20 marks Solution

Q6(b) · 15 marks Solution

Q6(c) · 15 marks Solution

Q7(a) · 20 marks Solution

Q7(b) · 15 marks Solution

Q7(c) · 15 marks Solution

Q8(a) · 20 marks Solution

Q8(b) · 15 marks Solution

Q8(c) · 15 marks Solution

WRAP Exams · Write. Read. Analyse. Practice. · <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains/psir/gs-1/2022/> ·
ask@wrapexams.com · wrapexams.com

WRAP Exams