

Comment on the following in about 150 words each :

Que.1 (a)

Post Behaviouralism is not the negation of behaviouralism rather its corrective. (10 Marks)

Behaviouralism emerged from Positivist Movement post World War II.

Chicago School Political Scientists like Charles Merriam and David Easton rejected Traditional Approach as 'armchair theorizing', 'ethno-centric' and suffering from guilt of historicism as restricted to study of 'Plato to Marx'.

Easton inspired by inculcation of Quantitative and Scientific methods in other Social Sciences (eg: Talcott Parson) aimed at making Political Science 'value-neutral', scientific 'pure science'.

But Behaviouralism overemphasized methods over relevance; restricting the scope to electoral behaviour.

With Rawls Theory of Justice and Easton's lectures on 'Credo of Relevance' Post-Behaviouralism emerged as a synthesis of Traditional value-laden Political Theory and Behaviouralists Quantitative Science.

Thus Post-Behaviouralism is not a negation of Behaviouralism rather its corrective in restoring scope and Relevance and as Easton said made Political Science an 'applied science' capable of solving Modern Social Problems (eg: Justice, Rights, Equality)



Que.1(b)

Neo-liberal perspective of state. (10 Marks)

As Garner said Political Science 'begins and ends with the state?'

Neoliberalism emerged as a reaction to failure of Keynesianism in 1970s (Inflation and Unemployment simultaneously; Stagflation).

Theoretically it was based in Market Fundamentalism of Milton Friedman, FA Hayek, George Stigler and others.

Politically it gained success in form of Thatcherism (UK) and Reaganism (USA) asserting that present Economic problems arise due to 'overextended welfare State'.

Friedman called for 'roll

back of State, liberalization of trade and privatization of economy reducing State to mere regulatory role.

Hayek decried State-led Planning as 'Road to Serfdom' and Social Justice as a mirage.

Neoliberalism accepted as 'Washington Consensus' led to LPG (Liberalization-Privatization-globalization) diluting State's role and Sovereignty leading to de-territorialization (Kenichi Ohama: Borderless world) with rise of Non-state Actors (MNCs) and global governance Bodies (WTO).

However post global Financial crisis (2008-09) and recent COVID shock State has 'rolled back in' with vengeance and ~~so~~ Thomas Piketty ^{dismisses} Neoliberalism as 'Zombie idea'.

Que.1(c)

Concept of original position. (10 Marks)

John Rawls in his 'Theory of Justice' (1971). attempted to propose a Universal, Procedural and Rational principles of Justice.

To arrive at his notion of Justice; he designed a 'Thought Experiment'.

He argues that to decide 'principles of Justice' abstract souls unaware about particular details but only general features of human nature meet behind a 'veil of Ignorance'.

This as per Rawls is the 'Original Position' where abstract souls free of biases or prejudices design a 'Social Contract' that



is fair and just?

He further says that in 'Original Position' based on 'Minimax Principle' that is acceptable to both poor and rich; Theory of Justice will be in lexical order:

- A) Equal Maximum Liberty
- B) Equality of Opportunity
- C) Difference Principle in favour of vulnerable

However Communitarians like Michael Sandel rejects atomistic abstract conception of Justice.

While Amartya Sen prefers a consequentialist outcomes focused approach.

Despite flaws 'Original Position' remains most unique and innovative thought experiment in Modern Political Theory.

Que.1(d)

End of ideology thesis. (10 Marks)

Frenchman Destutt De Tracy defined Ideology as a 'holistic system of thought or a paradigm to view the world'.

Post-enlightenment world was dominated by multiple Ideologies, masquerading as science.

Post-World War II the ideological antagonism between Capitalism (USA) and Communism (USSR) led to Cold War.

However 'End of Cold War' and victory of Liberal Capitalistic Democratic world led to 'End of Ideology' thesis.

Daniel Bell argued post cold war Political Development has led to creation of technocracies and welfare state that resolve the



conflict between labour and capital.

While WW Rostow said there will be no ideological differences and every nation would transition to 'Capitalistic Consumerism'

However Alasdair MacIntyre criticized 'End of Ideology' thesis as Ideology itself.

And CW Mills argued even in Western countries Inequality is rampant and domination of 'Power-elites' (Corporate-Military nexus) continues.

With emergence of Chinese Socialism and Critical theories like Intersectionality; Thomas Piketty known as 'Modern Marx' says Ideology is well and alive and serves the ruling plutocratic elite?



Que.1(e)

Saptanga Theory. (10 Marks)

Kautilya in his masterpiece ARTHSASTRA gave Saptanga or Sapta Prakriti Theory to describe 'Elements of State'.

He believes seven elements make up a state and when used in combination determine Comprehensive National Power (CNP).

King or Vijigishu forms the centre (Nabhi) as he is the most important element. As Kautilya says 'a strong king can make good of weaker elements but if king is weak the state is doomed'. King should make skillful use of other 6 elements and avoid hubris. Amatayas or ministers are advisors, eyes and ears to King.

They must be kept loyal and their integrity tested through spies.
Ambassador is the most important Amataya and must be handsome and knowledgeable.

Hard Power is represented through Bala (force) and Forts; thus both Offense and defense are necessary.

Kosh (Treasury) determines economic strength and buffer must be maintained for contingencies.

while Tanpath or Public opinion is necessary for King's legitimacy.

Finally Mitras or Allies are symbol of Soft Power and number of King is proportional to number of Mitras.

Thus Kautilya offers a comprehensive theory of State Elements in form of Saptanga.

Que.2(a)

Define the concept of Rights. Elaborate on the liberal individualistic perspective of Rights with reference to Entitlement Theory of Nozick. (20 Marks)

'Individuals possess rights and no-one: State or Society can take them' - Nozick

Rights are anti-statist idea denoting claims of citizens against State.

John Locke first proposed Natural Right to Life, Liberty and Property to be ensured by State.

while Locke based his conception on 'reason' and 'enlightened self-interest', Bentham and Hobbes gave a Legalistic Positive Theory of Rights.

Within the liberal tradition
Thomas Paine and JH Green
ascribed a Teleological Human
Consciousness as basis for
Liberty and hence notion of Rights.

Modern or Social liberals
like Laski balance rights
with duties.

However Classical liberal
or often termed 'libertarian'
scholar Robert Nozick gave
the 'Entitlement Theory' to
justice a 'liberal individualistic'
conception of Rights.

He argued Social liberals
are diluting Individual Rights
by balancing them with duties
or welfare or Social Justice
(John Rawls)



He asserted Rights are non-negotiable Entitlements and therefore inviolable.

For him use of state violence for taxation or Distributive Justice was akin to Slavery or Bonded Labour.

Nozick believed only individual through 'free-consent' can give-up his entitlements.

State violence or coercion is only justified when Rights of other individuals are in jeopardy. [HARM Principle].

Thus in reaction to Rawlsian Social Liberalism; Nozick revived Classical Liberalism of Locke and JS Mill.



However Nozick's libertarianism is criticized by liberal egalitarians like Macpherson as 'possessive individualism' that justifies injustices and inegalitarian social order.

While Amartya Sen argues pure liberty is procedural and substantial freedom lies in development of capabilities through State.

While Marxist criticize it as preservation of Bourgeois interests and exploitation of workers.

Thus concept of Rights has allowed development of global Human Rights (HR) that are inspired by Liberal Individualism but subsequent generations of HR include socio-economic rights too.



Que.2(b)

Compare Buddhist political thought with Ancient Hindu political thought. Do you think that there is a greater element of continuity than change between the two? (15 Marks)

Bhikhu Parekh calls Buddhism as 'rebel child of Hinduism'. Thus there is both continuity and change between the two.

Jail Omvedt points out significant difference in Buddhist Political Thought vis-a-vis Hinduism, such as:

① Origin of State: In Hinduism's Dharma Shashtra (Manusmriti) 'Arajak' (anarchy) while in Buddhism corruption of man by materialism is the cause of origin.

② Nature of King: Hindu King has Divine Rights (Manu = Son of God) while Buddhist 'Mahasamatta'

is Republican i.e. elected by SANGHA.

③ Foreign Policy : In Dandshastras (Kautilya) follows Realism while Buddhist follow Idealism i.e. spreading Dhamma. Thus Hindu Political Thought creates Chandragupta Maurya then Buddhism creates Ashoka.

④ Goal of life : In Hinduism it's attaining Four Purusharthas (Artha, Dharma, Kama, Moksha) while Buddhist goal is Nirvana (enlightenment) through Middle Path and Eight fold way.

⑤ Social Order : In Hinduism, hierarchical varna system based



on Functional Specialisation and Division of Labour while in Buddhism an egalitarian social order is envisaged.

However despite change VR Mehta says Indian Political Thought unlike West is not dichotomous but continuous.

As both Hinduism and Buddhism share emphasis on Dharma, normative thought, Ideal and selfless King and Yogakshema i.e. welfare of citizenry

Thus Hinduism and Buddhism imbue values of Tolerance and Pluralism in domestic sphere while as Pt. Nehru said inspire a foreign policy of Realism & Idealism in international sphere.

Que.2(c)

Critically examine the relevance of Hannah Arendt's views on Totalitarianism. (15 Marks)

Hannah Arendt using Phenomenological approach gave a unique perspective on Totalitarianism.

She combined her experience as a Jew living under Nazi Germany and her quasi-philosophical experiential to write 'On Totalitarianism'.

She argued "Totalitarianism is Totalitarianism" there is no other way to understand it but to experience it.

For other ideologies 'Violence' is a means but in totalitarian ideologies of 20th century viz. Fascism and Communism; violence becomes both means

and end.

The regimes of Hitler or Stalin was sustained by 'gruesome spectacle' of 'violence and terror'.

She believed 'Politically apathetic' citizenry in modern times governed by techno-bureaucracy creates fertile ground for rise of totalitarian leaders.

In modernity the 'Zoon Politikon' (Political Action) is undermined by 'Homo Faber' (economic human action).

While the mindless bureaucracy devoid of critical thought as visible in Eichmann who followed orders for promotion leads to

'banality of evil'

As a remedy Arendt recommends
'civic republicanism' and
'Political Action' as expression
of Freedom and Pluralism against
dogma of ideology?

with rise of both far-
right populist (Trump, Orban) and
far-left (Chinese Socialism) and
global back-sliding of democracy,
Arendt's political ideas have
gained renewed relevance.

Though criticized for lack
of coherence by mainstream
theorists; Arendt's work
forms the bedrock of Modern
Social Movements from pro-Democracy
protests in Hongkong to BLM in USA.

Qu. 4(a)

Make a comparative assessment of Ambedkar's Theory of Social Justice with that of John Rawls. (20 Marks)

'Justice is central to any Social System just like Truth to any system of Thought'
- John Rawls.

Justice is an archetonic concept in Political Theory.

As it forms the central virtue or defining feature of any system of Thought.

For Plato it was 'Functional specialisation' and 'Non-intellectual' in hierarchy based on 'myth of Metals'

while for Aristotle it was meritocracy and for Gandhi it is Sarvodaya and Swaraj.

But Modern conception of Social Justice as equitable

distribution of material goods or opportunities emerges with Marx.

However it was modified and adapted for Indian content by Ambedkar and for liberal progressive American content by John Rawls.

Ambedkar argued that caste based Indian society economic structure is not the basic structure but caste forms the basic social structure.

Hence achieving social Justice would require 'annihilation of caste'?

Similarly Rawls in his Theory of Justice was concerned



with Inequality in Western Societies hence he argued based on 'Difference Principle' to achieve Social Justice through State-led Welfare by helping the vulnerable groups.

Both Ambedkar and Rawls assign different sources of Social Injustices but suggest similar solutions. Ambedkar demands Reservations for Dalits while Rawls calls for 'Affirmative Action' for American Blacks.

Both recognise that Political Democracy based on socially unjust order is



unsustainable.

Hence state-led Welfare are needed to create a 'Social Democracy' and achieve 'Democratic Equality'.

However libertarians like Nozick dismiss it as justification for State Coercion akin to Bonded labour. While Hayek calls 'Social Justice' a mirage.

In contrast Marxists decry both Ambedkar and Rawls as giving an 'ugly justification for inequalities' under Capitalism.

Despite criticisms Indian Constitution's idea of Welfare State (Directive Principles, DPSP) is based on Ambedkar & Rawls.



Que.4(b)

Explain Gandhian views on State and their relationship with Modern democracy and Principles of anarchism. (15 Marks)

Prof. Mumayyaz Kabir argues though Gandhi was not a conventional philosopher but Gandhian Thought has significant Political content.

As Bhikhu Parekh says Gandhi was a Moral Anarchist in tradition of Tolstoy and Thoreau.

For him State with 'monopoly over violence' was against Gandhian 'creed' of 'Ahimsa' and represented 'weakness of men?'

He like Aurobindo Ghosh preferred Spiritual notion of

Swaraj.

His alternative for State Power was 'Oceanic Circles of Power' with Individual at centre and Democratic Decentralization through Self-sufficient Village Republics governed by Panchayati Raj.

He was also against Modern Representative Democracies with competing parties.

As Max Weber called them 'Powerhouses' and Electioneering Machines'.

Gandhi like Rousseau believed Direct Partyless Decentralized Democracy.



He compared 'Political Parties' with 'prostitutes' (Hind Swaraj) that ^{promote} 'Machiavellianism' i.e. Ends justify means.

For Gandhi the ultimate political goal is utopian 'Ram Rajya' and it cannot be achieved through means of Raavan like state-coercion or politics devoid of ethics. It could only be achieved through adherence to Ahimsa (non-violence) and Truth.

However MN Roy criticize Gandhi as 'Bourgeois' leader while Ambedkar warned Dalits that following Gandhi is a death trap.

Yet as Ramchandra Guha says Gandhian Principles imbue politics with ethics and inspire utopian non-violent movements even today.



Que 4(-)

Plato as an enemy of Open Society. Comment (15 Marks)

'Plato is an enemy of Open Society as Philosophers under charm of Platonic, ^{Idealism} are ignoring their real-world grave consequences.'

- Karl Popper.

Plato as Emerson said is Philosophy and Philosophy is Plato.

His Platonic Idealism, primacy to Reason, Theory of Justice for an Ideal State ruled by Philosopher King and functional use of Philosophy make him the 'Father of Political Philosophy'.

Yet Karl Popper his greatest critic in 20th century describes him as an enemy of open



society.

Pluralism and ability to course-correct ('error correction mechanism') is fundamental feature of Open Societies as seen in Modern Liberal Democratic countries and missing in Authoritarian regimes.

He blames Perato of guilt

of :

① Historicism i.e. Ideological use of history to justify dictatorial rule similar to what Marx (Dictatorship of Proletariat) or Mussolini / Hitler (Fascism) did.

② Holism i.e. sacrificing the individual at the altar of State or Society



③ Essentialism i.e. placing Ideas over real-world Reality.

④ Anti-democracy i.e. creating a rigid stratified social order based on myth of Metals

Thus for Popper Plato is the first Fascist. and enemy of open society

However Levinson defends Plato and claims that Popper's critique is itself politically motivated as Plato modified and moderated his Thought in 'the LAWS'.

Yet in real-world Platonic ideals turns into totalitarian dictatorship (Xi Jinping ^{China}, Ayatollah Khomeini ^{Iran}) and Democracies based on Individual Rights & Rule of Law survive longer (India, West).



Answer the following in about 150 words each:

Que.5(a)

Radical humanist perspective of National Movement. Comment (10 Marks)

As Sunil Khilnani in 'Idea of India' says multiple ideological perspectives from Gandhianism to Communism to Radical Humanism interpret Indian National Movement (INM) differently.

The perspective of Radical Humanism is the endpoint of ideological evolution of MN Roy.

He was frustrated and disappointed with mainstream perspectives.

As Liberals (SN Banerjee) justified British Rule and Bourgeois Interests in name of Constitutional Means.



While Marxists in name of class-struggle justified violence and Dictatorship of Proletariat.

And Gandhianism for Roy promoted 'Reactionary Conservatism'.

Thus Radical Humanism believes in Rationality, Scientific Humanism and Cosmopolitan association of free-men.

It rejects dogma' from all sides.

However Sudipto Kaviraj calls him a 'remarkable failure' as despite failure in real world his ideas inspire and provide an alternative to different ideologies stressing common humanity.



Que.5(b)

Compare the strategies of Extremists with that of Moderates. (10 Marks)

Bipin Chandra argues Indian National Movement (INM) became increasingly radical both in its demands and methods with time.

During the Moderate Phase (1887-1905) the strategies were limited to Constitutional means of Prayers, Petitions and Protests, assembly resolutions or demands for increasing civil service jobs.

As Moderates like Dadabhai Naoroji considered British Rule a 'blessing in disguise', Ranade thanked them for Rule of Law while SN Banerjee praised British 'sense of justice'.

However Bipin Chandra says early moderates were both 'leaders'

& learners' who gave the Idiological and economic (Drain of Wealth Theory) critique of British Raj.

On the other hand, Extremists like Aurobindo Ghosh dismissed Constitutional means as 'Political Mendicancy'.

while BG Tilak supported Ghosh's Passive Resistance, used Hindu festivals for mass mobilization and declared Swaraj as 'birthright' justifying 'Rajdroha' (Treason).

With Swadeshi Movement Extremists supported National Education, picketing, burning of foreign clothes and setting up local industries.

Thus both Moderates and Extremists differed in means were united in their ultimate goal i.e. freedom from British yoke.



Que.5(c)

Write short note on the Relevance of Rajya Sabha. (10 Marks)

India as per British Model is a Bicameral Parliamentary Democracy.

With Rajya Sabha (RS) or Council of States as the Upper House representing States interest

It acts as 'chamber of elders' to aid and advise on legislative functioning similar to British House of Lords.

In past many significant bills have been improved with RS counsel (eg: FRBM, GST Acts)

While it also prevents 'hastily formed' legislations (eg: Prevention of Torture Bill)



It also houses 'non-politicians'
domain-experts and 'eminent
personalities' that can unique
shape the legislative process.

While in recent years it
has supplied 'top members' including
Prime Minister (PM) and current
EAM (Foreign Minister) in the executive.

But it is often criticized
as 'useless stepney tyre' due to
its weak role vis-a-vis Lok
Sabha especially with regards
to Money Bills.

Structurally it is weaker
relative to US Senate due to
centralizing Quasi-federal nature
of Indian Polity.

Despite criticisms, RS has acted
as 'Revising chamber' and is ever-relevant
given complexity
of legislation.

Que.5(d)

Write about the relationship between Judicial review and the Doctrine of Basic Structure. (10 Marks)

Pt. Nehru said inspired by American Constitution the provision of Judicial Review (A-13) makes Indian Judiciary an active member in India's Social Transformation.

In Shankari Prasad (1951) case Supreme Court (SC) accepted Parliamentary Supremacy allowing amendments to Constitution.

However Golaknath case (1967) was first instance of Judicial Activism (JA) as SC used powers of Judicial Review (JR) to declare Fundamental Rights (FRs) as 'sacrosanct' and unamendable under A-368.

But the 24th amendment (CAA) gave ^{unlimited} amending powers to Parliament

beyond scope of JR.

In response SC in Kesavanand Bharti case (1973) gave the Basic Structure Doctrine making certain core features (eg: Democracy, Republicanism etc). unamendable.

Further in Minerva Mills case (1980) Judicial Review itself was made part of Basic Structure.

Thus JR allowed Judicial Innovation (Justice Baxi) of Basic Structure possible and has now become integral part of it.

While it has been criticized for Judicial Overreach and violation of 'Separation of Powers' but as Zoya Hasan argues Basic Structure is 'safety valve' preventing certain tyranny for uncertain Democracy'



Que.5(e)

Comment on Fundamental Duties under Article 51A of the Indian Constitution. (10 Marks)

'Rights and Duties go together'
- Grandhiji

The Constituent Assembly after much debate decided against inclusion of Fundamental Duties (FDs).

But with 42nd Constitutional Amendment FDs inspired by Society Socialism were included in Constitution Part IV A under A-51A.

While Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles (DPSP) are claims by citizens on State; Duties are claims of State on citizens.

They are not necessarily justicible but can be enforced by Parliamentary legislation (eg: National Honour Act).

They inspire Nationalism, Fraternity, Common Brotherhood, Scientific Temper, Environmentalism and many similar virtues that make functioning and achieving ideals of our founding fathers possible.

Though they are criticized for their Soviet-heritage but they remain legitimate.

As even NCRWC recommended addition of more duties like voting, paying taxes etc. to the list.



Que.6(a)

What do you understand by the phenomenon of the Decline of Parliament? What are the reasons behind? Suggest a way forward. (20 Marks)

India as per British Model is a Parliamentary Democracy, where the Parliament is responsible for legislation.

But in recent years there has been the phenomenon of 'Decline of Parliament'. The causes of this decline are complex and manifold.

Electoral Researchers Devesh Kapoor and Milan Vaishnav argue Criminalization of Politics i.e. dominance of Money and Muscle Power with 427 MPs with criminal antecedents in 17th Lok Sabha (ADR) is the root cause.

Further due to live broadcasting there has been 'theatrisation' of proceedings with increase in frequency of Disruptions and halving of working hours.
(PRS : 65 days).

While the flaws in Anti-defection law (10th Schedule) has restricted Freedom of Speech as Shashi Tharoor says restricting parliamentarians to party-line meanwhile Politicizing the post of Speaker.

Similarly as Zoya Hasan documents decline in 'Intra-Party Democracy' and Party 'high-command culture' has reduced Deliberative aspects of Democracy creating



an 'Electoral Autocracy' (V-DEM).

On the Institutional side the number of Bills referred to Parliamentary Committees has declined, the capacity and research support in parliamentary secretariat is lacking and individual parliamentarian is not in a position to understand complexity of modern legislative process.

To halt the decline of Parliament, from NCRWC to 2nd ARC to Law Commissions and several others have recommended a slew of reforms.

First and foremost 'cleaning of politics' through simplifying ROPA (ITBI) and strengthening Election

Commission and implementation of Electoral Reforms is must.

Second minimum working hours, mandatory Question Hour and compulsory referring of major bills to Committees.

Third reforming ADL to provide 'breathing space' to parliamentarians and enable debate & deliberation across party-lines.

Fourth like UK a permanent apolitical Speaker.

Fifth, making intra-party elections mandatory and bringing Political Parties under RTI ambit.

Sixth, investing in Capacity Building of Parliamentary Secretariat.

Thus above reforms could restore the sanctity of 'temple of our democracy'



Que.6(b)

The frequent interventions by judiciary sometimes borders on judicial adventurism, tend to weaken the functioning of the other two branches of government. Comment. (15 Marks)

As Pt. Nehru said Indian Judiciary is active participant of India's Social Transformation.

It enjoys Independence at Constitutional-level, possesses Judicial Review (JR: A-13). and has ability to deliver 'Complete Justice' (A-142).

Since independence it has protected Constitutionalism (Basic Structure Doctrine: Kesavananda Bharti case, 1973), individual rights (Maneka case, 1978) and with PIL Revolution (Justice Bhagwati & Iyer) led to progressive realization of Rights. (eg: Right to Clean Environment or Prisoners Rights).



But as Justice Bani argues
Judicial Activism devolves
into Judicial Overreach (eg:
Liquor ban on highways) and even
Judicial Adventurism (eg: declaring
99th amendment as unconstitutional)

This violates Montesquieu's
Principle of 'Separation of Powers'

Pratap Bhanu Mehta calls
Indian Judiciary a 'paradoxical,
self-perpetuating and highly
politicized' institution. That acts as
'Imperium in Imperio' (Empire in Empire)
undermining Deliberative Democracy
and major cause of 'Parliamentary Decline'
(eg. stay on Farm Bills)

While Originalists like Justice
Banerjee allege Judiciary without



resources or expertise engages in 'micromanaging' the administrative Leviathan by dictating 'Public Policy' undermining the executive (eg: ODD-Even in Delhi)

Further Justice Katju says Judicial Adventurism has increased Judicial Pendency (> 4.5cr) and reduced Public trust and credibility.

Thus as Upendra Baxi Judicial Activism is necessary to fill legislative/executive vacuum and act as guardian protector of Constitution in Prismatic society (FW Riggs) like India but Judicial Activism should be used as medicine and not become 'daily bread'.

Que. 6(c)

Explain the linkages between caste system and OBC politics in India. What is the current trend of the role of caste in Indian elections? (15 Marks)

'Mandal and Kamandal are two idioms of Indian Politics'

- C Jaffrelot.

C Jaffrelot argues that caste forms the mosaic of 'Indian Politics'.

With OBC (Other Backward Classes) are the largest caste-block (42%) and were the historical 'shudras' who are socially and educationally disadvantaged (A-15, 16).

As Yogendra Yadav describes they are the 'Dominant Landed class' that benefitted the most from Green Revolution ('Bullock Capitalists').



which precipitated their Political rise in first 'Democratic Upsurge' (SP: Yadavs, in Uttar Pradesh) that broke the Hegemony of 'Congress System' (R. Kothari).

Due to their large population, resource-base and political organisation OBC politics is a dominating force in caste calculations.

As seen in recent demands of caste-census that reveal the Internal makeup and could lead to Re-Mandalization of Indian Politics (Subhas Palshikar)

In recent times as Psychologist Prashant Kishor argues and lokniti data confirms there has been consolidation of OBC, adivasi and



'anxious middle class' and even at-places Dalit vote (eg: Jalon-Jalans in VP) under 'Saffron wave' (TH Blom) of Hindutva. (BJP).

While Suhas Palshikar describes the New Welfarism (PM-KISAN, ^{Ujjwala} LPG) combined with Religious Polarization (Hindu-Muslim) has reduced the role of caste in recent elections.

Though as Rajni Kothari believed that in a traditional society like India the institution of caste is mutating. As visible in Political Mobilization by Neo-Ambedkarites (Bhum Army of Chandrashekhar Azad).

Despite dormancy in recent elections; caste remains a long-term trend in Identity Politics of India.