SHUBHRA RANJAN
Always Ahead
25, Pusa Road, Karol Bagh, Delhi 110005. ☎ 011 45612719

Political Science & International Relations

Crash Course & Test Series - 2023

Test 1

Time Allowed: 3 Hours **Max Marks: 250**

Name PRIYANKA CHOUDHARY
Test Date 2nd July 2023
Email Address
UPSC Roll No 1702507

Instructions:

1. There are EIGHT questions divided in TWO SECTIONS and candidate has to attempt five questions in all.
2. Question Nos. 1 and 5 are compulsory and out of the remaining, any three are to be attempted choosing at least ONE question from each section.
3. Content of the answer is more important than its length.
4. Answers must be written in the medium authorized in the admission Certificate, which must be stated clearly on the cover of the booklet in the space provided.
5. Content of the answer is more important than its length.
6. Any page or portion of the page left blank in the Question-Cum-Answer Booklet must be clearly struck off.
7. All parts of the question should be written at one place itself.
8. Write the test in exam atmosphere.
9. **Filling all the details in BLOCK LETTERS is mandatory.**

S. No.	a	b	c	d	e	Total
1						
2				X	X	
3				X	X	
4				X	X	
5						
6				X	X	
7				X	X	
8				X	X	
Grand Total						

For any issue related to PSIR Test Series, write only at psirtestseries@shubhraranjan.com

Scanned with CamScanner

SHUBHRA RANJAN
Always Ahead
25, Pusa Road, Karol Bagh, Delhi 110005. ☎ 011 45612719

	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Understanding of Questions					
Structure & Flow					
(a) Introduction					
(b) Conclusion					
(c) Overall					
Subject Knowledge					
Presentation					
(a) Underline					
(b) Paragraph					
(c) Overall					

Overall Remarks:

Dear Student,

All the best for next test...!!!

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.1 (a) **"There is no science of politics any more than there is a science of aesthetics-for the line of politics are not the lines of mathematics".(Burke) Comment. (10 Marks)**

The nature of politics has been a 'contested' area. While political phenomena were studied with "philosophical" methods starting with Plato, after World War 2, 'scientific' methods are used.

Politics & ethics were categorised together under 'science' by father of Political Science, Aristotle. He argued that Politics may not be "exact science" like natural sciences, however it can be systematically studied & hence be termed "science". Infact, due to its 'architectonic' nature, Aristotle called Political science - "master science".

Burke argues on same lines that since the line of study of politics & mathematics are different, uncomparable & expecting

Scanned with CamScanner

study of both ~~some~~ to be is wrong. If there is science of aesthetics, there is science of politics & no one can be called more "scientific" than the other.

The scientific nature was highlighted by behaviouralists like Easton by using systems' approach to political system study. However, "post behaviouralism" highlighted that philosophy along with science is needed for politics, seen in 'credo of relevance' by Easton.

We can say that all knowledge and sciences are "discourses" (Foucault). But, it is the beauty of political science which is a "democratic discipline" that take various views, counter views with ultimate aim of solving problems of humanity.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.1(b) **Critically Evaluate the significance of Rawls concept of veil of ignorance. (10 Marks)**

Rawls transformed the liberal theory of justice which was dominated by Utilitarian principle of 'greatest happiness with greated number' with his "Egalitarian" view of justice.

Rawls gives a procedural theory of 'distributive justice' rather than end state theory. He presupposes Kantian men who will come together to decide distribution of primary goods and these men are under veil of ignorance & in their original position.

Veil of ignorance is significant as this helps Rawls create a 'rational but ignorant man' who knows general facts but no particular facts about oneself.

This ignorance helps man go for 'maximin'

Scanned with CamScanner

approach and think from different perspectives of different classes. This way they come up with social contract that values both liberty, equality & difference principle to help least advantaged.

While veil of ignorance helps Rawls integrate liberty & equality, it is criticised for being impractical. Communitarians argue that man can never be in original position under veil of ignorance.

Nozick (neo-liberal) has given entitlement theory of justice criticising Rawls' view & veil of ignorance as theory that favours one class over another, as end state theory.

Rawls, however, has received liberalism & it the greatest philosopher of 20th century! (Bill Clinton)

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.1(c) **Analyse Kymlicka's theory of multicultural citizenship. (10 Marks)**

Will Kymlicka in his book 'multicultural citizenship' has given his criticism for universal citizenship model of rights followed by liberal western societies.

He argues for 'multicultural citizenship' instead of 'one-size-fit-all' approach of universal rights. Multicultural citizenship would give rights to people according to their culture specifications.

For Kymlicka, a particular minority group with a specific culture must be given -

a) Self-determination rights, self-governance rights, such as V, VI schedule in India for tribal communities

b) Special representative rights, for their representation at central bodies (legislature), such as India's reservation

Scanned with CamScanner

9) Special ethnic & cultural rights for preservation of culture, such as Article 29,30 in Indian constitution.

Kymlicka's concept is criticised by Bhikhu Parekh in 'Rethinking Multiculturalism' as Kymlicka while giving multicultural rights to national, ignores refugees and immigrants. Parekh argues culture is important for all & thus favours rights to all.

Feminists like Maeion Iris Young have too focused on 'differentiated citizenship' for women & proposes affirmative action by state to give 'differential quality to equalise the differences'.

Present globalised world must incorporate multiculturalism, as seen in Canada (1st multicultural state officially).

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.1(d) **M.N Roy conceived of humanism as scientific, integral and a radically new worldview. Comment. (10 Marks)**

MN Roy is one of the most original thinkers, who while deviating from continuity tradition of Indian political thought, gives his 'New humanism - a manifesto' with 'Radical humanism' concept.

While 'humanism' that keeps human's needs & conditions at the centre is seen historically in Sophist Protagoras who believes 'man is the measure of everything', it is Roy who gives a new worldview of humanism.

Roy's humanism is given with an aim of emancipation of man, to free man from burden of identities and fear of super-natural.

He, after taking inspiration from Turgot,

Scanned with CamScanner

postulates on liberating influence of science. Science and rational thinking can tell humans on what is right & wrong. This critical reasoning will eliminate fear of supernatural. He proposed scientific education.

His humanism was scientific but also radical. It focused on 'radical', naked or original man without identity of class or nation. Since, he separates man, it is radical, away from political & social norms of seeing humans in communitarian and collective India.

But, since Roy's focus is on human beings' freedom – something integral to man's development, it is integral humanism, (similar to Mill view).

Roy is criticised however for his unfavourable views on Gandhi, but he provided the Marxian or socialist tradition in India.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.1(e) Critically Analyze Hannah Arendt's view on ideology. (10 Marks)

Hannah Arendt is a heterodox thinker, who with her 'thinking without barriers' has given her views on ideology in book 'On utilitarianism'.

Arendt is 20th century philosopher, a contemporary of Hitler & totalitarian world. Before Arendt, the ideology that started as scientific study of 'ideas' by Tracy, was called as 'false consciousness' by Marx in German ideology'.

However, it was later Marxists' views such as Lenin, Gramsci, Kuckas who believed that even working class needs an 'ideology'. liberals as Arendt & Popper give liberal view of ideology.

Arendt argues that ideology & terror combine to make a totalitarian state.

Scanned with CamScanner

More than terror, it is ideology that plays major role as it legitimises the use of terror. Superfluous masses (crackpots) who have lost critical reasoning & spirit of enquiry fall prey to this ideology. They believe these false fabrications as true. These atomised men 'mass', under ideology end public sphere & totalitarianism begins.

Her views that ideology is 'false propaganda' by totalitarian state is countered by sociological view of Karl Mannheim who argues that all ideologies are from perspective of a particular class, one is ideology (of dominant class) & other is utopia (of subordinate class).

Oakshott argues that political science is "bottomless & borderless sea" & no one ideology can explain it.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.2(a) **How does the debate around the Rawlsian notion of justice have made justice a pluralistic concept? (20 Marks)**

Justice is the architectonic concept of Political Science. Rawls gave his 'theory of Justice' in 1971 reframing the dominant theory of Utilitarianism's 'greatest happiness of greatest number' in liberalism.

Rawlsian notion of justice is derived by social contract (Lockean tradition) between Kantian men. It is a procedural theory to determine distribution of primary goods in society based on inviolability of human dignity.

Rawls gives his 3 principles of justice in lexical order – decided by people in their original position and under veil of ignorance. These are –

1. All should get maximum possible liberty. The inequality is justified if –
2. Equality of opportunity to all

Scanned with CamScanner

3. results into maximum advantage for least advantaged (difference principle)

Rawls argues that since Rawlsian men were under veil of ignorance and in original position, they are rational. Principles of justice are thus universal.

The debate on Rawlsian notion starts as Communitarians like Michael Walzer & Sandel criticise Rawls. They argue that man is not unencumbered self / atomistic but 'embedded self', part of community

Thus, man is never rational, his choices a product of his community. Also, man can never be in the original position & thus no universal theory of justice. Sandel argues 'different goods ought to be distributed differently according to different principles'. They vowed for pluralistic theory than monistic, universal theory of justice.

Scanned with CamScanner

Rawls changed his theory in 'Political liberalism' & argued that principles will be valid in democratic societies where people will build 'overlapping consensus' on principles in political sphere.

Rawls' concept was also debated by feminists. Carole Pateman called his theory as masculinist & Carole Gilligan called for including ethics of care. They rejected a monistic theory where injustice of women is not dealt. Marion Iris Young later argues for 'differentiated citizenship' - pluralistic justice.

Rawls theory and his universalist application is criticised by Amartya Sen, who argues for a functional theory. Sen gives justice as equality of capability, whereas Dworkin gives resource egalitarianism — to make initial distribution fair.

Scanned with CamScanner

Thus, debates around Rawls' along with 'neo liberal entitlement theory' by Nozick argued that equality & liberty are non compatible as given by Rawls.

These debates rejected how universal theory of justice - a monistic theory is still not achieved. We can only have pluralistic theory of justice - that differs according to various societies, sections (example women - give multicultural rights) and various sectors (political, economical) etc.

However, Rawls' theory revived political philosophy, established post behaviouralism & so called Father of Political science in contemporary times.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.2(b) **Human rights are those political parameters which act as a guide for governments and institutions as to how to treat people .Critically examine the given statement. (15 Marks)**

Human rights' concept was envisaged after world war 2 in form of 'Universal declaration of human rights' (UDHR) in 1948.

These rights are universal, based on equality so available to all humans irrespective of caste, creed, race, etc. & across all nations.

These rights in recent times have become the political parameters that guide the governments on what rights can be guaranteed in their nations & given status of fundamental rights (Part III in India).

These guide on how nations should treat

Scanned with CamScanner

their people. This is because it is derived from theory of natural right of locke and categorical imperative by Kant, which argue that rights are nature given & thus must be proftected by states. Kant argues that 'human dignity' is imperative for all humans.

However, many nations argue for 'culture relative' rights. Nations such as China, SE Asia (e.g- Mahathir Mohammad) argue that human rights are not Asian values, & refuse to incorporate human rights are guidance to treat people.

Culture relativists argue that rights to people should be given according to culture they are part of, as human is 'embedded self'. Asian values of collectivism, guided democracy, focus on society are different from western nations

Scanned with CamScanner

of individualism. liberty, importance to man over society. Thus, different values & culture demand different rights. Recently, Taliban banned education of girls beyond 6th - reasoning that it is Shariat law based.

These nations thus call human rights as propaganda by west for regime change and cultural imperialism. This has led to human right violations eg- Uighur Muslims, China.

Amartya Sen criticises 'Asian values' as propaganda to contenue authoritarianism. human rights are integral to humans & thus some basic rights must be given to all irrespective of "culture" too

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.2(c) **"Nationalism is immortal; Nationalism cannot die, because it is no human thing."(Aurobindo). Discuss Aurobindo's theory of nationalism in the light of above statement. (15 Marks)**

Aurobindo Ghosh spiritualised the national movement and was the first one to give a "spiritual theory of nationalism" with respect to India.

Aurobindo gave his theory as a critic to Moderates' view that 'India is still a nation in making' (Surendranath Banerjee). Aurobindo argued that India is & was always a nation. His theory of nationalism was inspired from Herder's cultural nationalism, Vivekananda's 'Neo-Vedantism' & Bankim C.C.'s 'Bharat mata'.

Aurobindo is a great synthesiser. He argued in his theory of nationalism that existence of nation is not dependent

Scanned with CamScanner

of Congress pandals or politics. For him, nation is not intellectual timepass, but "nation is spirit, it is divine, it is immortal".

Ghosh believed that nation is a spirit- & since no spirit ever dies, India is a nation. India & other nations have own spirits & are part of the universal spirit. While Romans show beauty dimension, fascists show animalistic dimension, India represents the 'spiritual dimension' of universal spirit.

Thus, Nation is not a human thing or made up political entity as Moderates believed but spirit, that is immortal. India's spirit was under 'tamas' but has now risen & chosen by the universal spirit to spread its spiritual message.

Scanned with CamScanner

Aurobindo argued that India's national spirit is found across the subcontinent. Because of which there is 'unity in diversity' due to spiritual unity (Vivekananda). He arose the patriotic sentiments of masses by his theory.

Ghosh argues that rise of India as a nation is inevitable and actually beneficial for the whole world as our spirit is of Vasudhaiva Kutumbkam (cosmopolitan outlook). This is relevant today to fight global challenges as terrorism, climate change. his concept is 'unification' is also valid here.

Tagore thus called Aurobindo 'the messenger of India' to spread the idea of India by his writings.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.3(a) **The general aim of deliberative democracy is to provide the most justifiable conception for dealing with moral disagreement in politics. Explain with reference to the views of Habermas. (20 Marks)**

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.4(a) **"Aristotle differs from his master Plato, much more in the form and method than in the substance of his thought"(Dunning). Critically examine. (20 Marks)**

Aristotle and Plato belong to Socratic tradition of ancient Greece. While Aristotle was a disciple of Plato, he was also the biggest critic of Plato.

Aristotle & Plato differ in form and method of their political theories, as Dunning points out. Plato is an idealist for whom 'reality is the shadow of idea'. His epistemology thus is 'reason' & 'method of dialectics'.

For Plato, only idea is real, and matter is illusion. It is because true knowledge is possible only for permanent world & this is world of change. Plato believes in 'dualism' & that idea is transcendental & universal, can exist without matter.

Scanned with CamScanner

Aristotle is a physician and empiricist he believes that idea is real but even matter is real (golden mean — theory of matter). This world is changing but we can study it as change is "teleological" where potentiality converting to actuality.

Since, matter is real, his method (epistemology) is empirical. Aristotle observes the change rather than search for it in his soul (reason in soul) like Plato.

Aristotle thus calls that king/ruler should be not only wise in the world of ideas but also worldly wise. Thus, they differ in form (matter real for Aristotle & idea for Plato) & method (rational or empirical for Aristotle).

However, Plato & Aristotle are similar in substance of their political thought. Both believe in Socrates tradition of

Scanned with CamScanner

'idealism' where man is a social or political animal. Man is part of state & state is prior to individual. For both, there is continuity in ethics & politics.

However, Dunning is wrong to propose that substance of both thoughts is similar in all ways. While Plato is radical & extremist, seen in his theory of Philosopher king (even Queens) who he gives absolute power. But, he puts guardian class under communism of property & family.

Aristotle criticises the best ideal state of philosopher king/monarchy as it is difficult to find such king & also as power corrupts. He argues that "law is reason without passion" & thus proposes 'Polity' as best ideal state.

Scanned with CamScanner

While both doubt the individual intellectual capacity (Plato's myth of metal), Aristotle believes 'collective decision' can be wiser than by an individual. For him, 'authority of statesman is different from master'.

Aristotle is conservative & states gradation in theory of citizenship and theory of property (against Plato's communism) he gives theory of revolution & believes justice is 'treating equals equally & unequals unequally'.

Aristotle & Plato thus differ widely in their thoughts but are child of their times. As Whitehead mentions 'western political thought is nothing but footnotes of Plato & Aristotle', shows their importance.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.4(b) **With reference to Foucault's concept of Governmentality, explain why Foucault says "Power is everywhere"? (15 Marks)**

Foucault is a post-modern scholar who has traced the evolution of exercise of power from juridico-legal to disciplinary power.

Foucault's view of power is 'structural view' of power. He argues that power is exercised not by individual's intentions but by structures, such as structure of governing & governed.

Irrespective of personality, power will always be exercised in the relation of governing & governed by governing authority. The governed will follow as is under 'governmentality'. Such as doctor is governing patient (even a king) shall listen to doctor, so exercise of power according to structure of society.

Scanned with CamScanner

Power in foucault is everywhere, it flows through the society as 'blood through capillaries'. Foucault explains it by his concept of disciplinary power.

He argues that from initial power of 'Right to death' now power is 'right over life'. This is exercised not only by state but by infinite institutions of society. This power acts on mind and is not coercive.

This power is productive, ie; it produces identity. Converts man into useful member of society by exercising power through norms, such as by institutions of school, church to behave in a particular way (disciplinary power)

This view of power is 'sociological view'

Scanned with CamScanner

of power, takes into account society. It is post-modernist view, micro view of power than macro view. This is structural view where power is everywhere & exercised according to structure of society.

Such in patriarchal structure, power is exercised on all. Since rules in favour of men, women suffer more. But, whoever goes against structure, society's norms exercise power on them.

This governmentality that a person creates as part of structure of society where power is exercised from all directions, disciplines & governs on behalf of governing authority. This is how state is run too.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.4(c) **The Ambedkar-Gandhi debate although has a special place in the academic discourse has become a redundant debate .Discuss (15 Marks)**

Ambedkar and Gandhi are the greatest political thinkers of modern India. Bhikhu Parekh criticises Indian thought on view that different views on various aspects had not allowed 'Political theorisation' by Indians for universal theory.

Ambedkar & Gandhi debate has various facets. They differ on course action and priorities. While Gandhi has truth & non violence based satyagraha as his political weapon, Ambedkar calls it "grammar of anarchy" - especially in independent India.

Ambedkar coined the term 'Dalit' against Gandhi's 'harijan' arguing for it creating false consciousness. Ambedkar believed

Scanned with CamScanner

that transfer of power without 'social revolution' & annihilation of caste would be no 'Swaraj'. He criticised Gandhi for justifying caste as varna system for division of labour, & prioritising political freedom over social revolution.

The debate intensifies with Gandhi's focus on freedom struggle and Ambedkar on "social justice" for downtrodden depressed classes.

The debate however now has become a redundant debate. It is as today India has got political freedom, political swaraj. India today still has 'social swaraj' of Gandhi & Ambedkar's vision of dalit emancipation ongoing, under our transformative constitution.

Scanned with CamScanner

The goal now doesn't need debate of priority as Social revolution was chosen as one of aims of independent India.

The debate of method of peaceful Satya-graha is widely settled with various Gandhian protests around India.

Both focused on education, morality, continuity of ethics & politics, end of untouchability (Article 17) - all of which are base of our constitution and political policy today - seen in Part III and part IV of constitution.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.5(a)

"History repeats itself, first as tragedy, second as farce".(Marx) Comment. (10 Marks)

For Marx, historical materialism gives materialistic interpretation of history. class struggle is the moving force of history.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.5(b) **Write a short note on 'Overlapping Consensus'. (10 Marks)**

Rawls gave liberal theory of justice in 1971 with his book 'Theory of Justice'. His theory gave principles of distribution of primary goods in "lexical order" after reflective equilibrium by Kantian men.

Since, the principles were given by 'procedural theory' where individuals were in their original position under veil of ignorance, Rawls argued for their universality.

Communitarians criticise the 'universalistic' aspect of Rawlsian theory. Michael Walzer argues that man can never be completely rational, in original position and thus "right is not prior to good but determined by good".

Communitarian critique was based on their view that man is not "atomistic

Scanned with CamScanner

of "unencumbered" but embedded self. Thus, until there is "overarching consensus" on way of life, there can never be universalistic principles of justice.

Rawls in his 'Political Liberalism' revised his views & argued that his principles are for developed western societies that are democratic. For him, even people with different backgrounds will have not only "overarching" but "overlapping consensus" on principles of justice - if not all atleast in the political sphere. Thus, in democratic west all will agree to one view of "political justice".

Rawls is criticised by Nozick in his entitlement theory of justice, for being masculinist by feminists as Carole Paterman. Even A. Sen disagrees & questions Rawls' intent to come up with universalist theory.

However, Rawls enriched the idea - architectonic idea of justice" - a tradition that started with Plato.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.5(c) **What do you understand by 'Differentiated citizenship'? (10 Marks)**

Marion Iris Young gave the concept of 'differentiated citizenship'. This lead to the beginning of 'multiculturalism' concept in rights.

Differentiated citizenship opposed universal citizenship' or 'one size fit all' approach of rights. Marion argued that such rights do not help the differences between different sections and cultures.

M.I. Young is a feminist. She emphasised that the situation of women can't improve by similar rights as men — as proposed by 1st wave liberal feminists.

She demanded 'differentiated citizenship', ie; different special rights to women

Scanned with CamScanner

according to their condition for their empowerement. For her 'differential equality' is needed to 'equalise the differences'.

This concept in 1980s, led to evolution of multiculturalism - seen in Will Kymlicka. They too demand special culture specific rights for 'cultural minorities' such as self governance rights, representation rights & ethnic rights (seen in Article 29, 30 of Indian constitution).

Differentiated citizenship has led to women specific policies, schemes such as reservation in PRIs (India) or gender budgeting.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.5(d) **Compare Austin's theory of Sovereignty with that of Pluralists (10 Marks)**

The concept of 'sovereignty differentiates modern nation states from medieval political system. Hobbes is known as first modern thinker as gave theory of sovereignity.

Hobbes theory & Austinian theory are similar - as propose 'monistic theory of sovereignity. For Austen, state is absolute, it is the only source of law (positive law). Austin gives Sovereignity to state which is absolute, inseparable & non-transferable. This is seen is Hobbes' Leviathan.

Pluralists like Laski criticise the monistic theory of sovereignity for promoting states as Nazi Germany, wars

Scanned with CamScanner

and human right violations. They thus propose division of sovereignity.

Philosophical explanation is provided by Laski who argues that since man is multi-dimensional, society is federal, authority should also be federal.

Thus, state's sovereignity should be divided among various associations, & hence political obligation too. 'State is one of many associations' for Pluralists. Macher even argues that political obligation should only be to 'service state'.

This concept of Pluralists is closer to medieval Europe. This has however been the inspiration before formation of regional (EU) & international, multilateral forums (as UN).

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.5(e) **Write a short note on 'Legitimation crisis'. (10 Marks)**

Legitimacy is regarded when rule by state is by consent of governed. The power thus exercised is legitimate.

Even when democracies have elected governments - that hold elections to show consent, may still face legitimisation crisis (habermas).

habermas gives his concept of 'legitimisation crisis' & argues that crisis tendency is visible in democratic west with economic recession, less voter turnout, rise of ultra-right, etc.

habermas points out that even after formation of welfare state, these liberal west nations will face

Scanned with CamScanner

revolution amid legitimisation crisis.

he argues that this is due to contradictory system of these nations. Here, the social system, political system is based on socialism, welfarism; the economic system is based on Capitalism

The capitalists are giving progressive taxation, however due to political pressure of democracy the parties promise excessive rewards for electoral gains. These will have to be paid by capitalists. But after some time it would become unsustainable and lead to lapse of legitimacy.

Habermas thus argues for welfare state with deliberate democracy - communication action in "ideal speech situation"

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.6(a) **'Equality of what'? ...This question has provided a momentum from procedural equality to a substantive notion of equality. Elaborate. (20 Marks)**

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.7(a) **Freedom is both the primary end *and* the principal means of development. In context of the given statement, discuss how Amartya Sen makes a philosophical case that freedom-centered development can create a better society and economy? (20 Marks)**

Freedom & liberty is the central value of dominant ideology of liberalism and western society. The concept of liberty has however changed from positive & negative liberty.

The change catered to the historic debate between liberty & equality. This debate was taken up by Rawls in his theory of Justice (1971) who integrates liberty & equality.

Rawlsian notion of justice gives liberty and accomodates equality - creating a welfare state. Under welfare state, the focus is on positive liberty, trend started by modern liberals (TH Green).

Scanned with CamScanner

Rawlsian theory however lacks as it distributes primary goods but does not make initial distribution faire.

For Sen, the initial distribution needs to be faire for equality is substantive terms, and substantive freedom. The purpose of theory of sen is to bring down deprivations of society.

Sen argues that no amount of goods' distribution (Rawls) or compensation for brute luck (Dworkin) will make distribution faire. This cannot be done till there is "equality of capability".

Capability for sen, is ability to do something that gives a sense of well-being. When this ability is missing, such as to read, write no amount of resources/goods such as books, tables

Scanned with CamScanner

can achieve equality or freedom.

Sen defines freedom or liberty as positive liberty. It is the freedom that increases under state as state focuses on "capacity development". This freedom will give man capacity to "utilise" resources & goods — to development & reducing deprivations as poverty. This is what he defines "freedom-centred development".

This development will allow freedom (positive liberty or capacity) as a means to achieve the primary end of freedom. True liberty from deprivations and opportunity to utilise Rawls 'equal maximum liberty', will come after capacity development.

Scanned with CamScanner

Amartya Sen's theory led to change of definition of term 'development' - from not just economic growth, but to also include capacity development (eg- health, education) by UNDP in HDI index (started in 1990).

Social liberals like Sen thus argue that India to reap benefits of globalisation & achieve demographic dividend must invest in education, health, i.e. capacity building of individual. This is similar to 3rd way or 'Clintonomics' after Neo-liberalism & its inequalities (thomas Piketty).

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.7(b) **"One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman."(Simone de Beauvoir). Comment. (15 Marks)**

Virginia Woolf defines feminism as the belief that women should get rights & opportunities similar to men. This thought is of 1st wave of liberal feminism (Mary Wollstonecraft).

This was followed by 2nd wave of Radical feminism by Betty Friedan in 'Mystique feminism'. Radical feminists differentiate between sex and gender, calling out to end the 'patriarchal basic structure' of society (Shula S. F.)

Simone De Beauvoir, a radical feminist, in her book 'the second sex' says that 'one is not born but becomes a woman'. She argues that the 'sex'

Scanned with CamScanner

of someone is biological, however 'gender' is social. The 'essentialism' prevalent in patriarchal societies gives an "essence" to child as soon as it is born depending on biological features.

Essentialism argues for certain essential features of a woman. A 'female' child on birth, is not allowed to choose own 'existence' but given essense. She has to live according to society's essence of what is right for a woman, & regularly conform to societal norms. One is thus not born woman but becomes a woman by accomodating to society's essentialism.

Simone also says that the identity of of woman is provisional, done with respect to men, she has no independent existence in patriarchal society. She is not second but secondary sex.

Scanned with CamScanner

Radical feminists show how patriarchy is perpetrated by myths, violence and even knowledge such as Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytics — similar to Foucault's knowledge power connection.

They call for ending the patriarchy structure. Demand of 'personal is political' by carole hanisch is central to radical feminism. They demand state's intervention in private sphere.

While some suggestions of Radical feminism as ending family were radical, state intervention has seen women empowerment such as Sabrimala judgment or 'triple talaq' judgement by Supreme Court of India.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.7(c) **"Right is prior to good". Critically examine. (15 Marks)**

Locke is the father of liberalism. Liberalism however is a meta-ideology that has constantly evolved from classical to modern to neoliberal but with liberty as central theme.

The slogan 'right is prior to good' is of classical liberals like Locke. They believed that humans are rational & so require autonomy of individual self, capable of decision making & need freedom/liberty from society & state.

Locke argues that since man is rational, has natural rights in state of nature, thus state should be nightwatchman or minimal state. The state thus will have to respect right of all individuals.

Scanned with CamScanner

This is because right is prior to good. Right of all individuals are prior to the total good of society. Good is defined as 'greatest happiness of greatest number' by Utilitarians as Bentham.

Bentham believes good is prior to rights. And thus rights of few can be sacrificed for good. It is majoritarian & hence against Kant's categorical imperative.

Locke is of natural right tradition & for him right of no one should be compromised for greater good. He gives equality - legal, moral and of opportunity, making rights prior to good.

This view stems from Locke's aggregative

Scanned with CamScanner

and artificial view of society. Since, society & state are artificial & man is creator, man & his rights should be prioritised. He proposed 'necessary evil' 'police state'.

Modern liberals talk of giving not formal equality but substantive equality by establishing welfare state & bring concept of positive liberty.

'Right is prior to good' is revived under Nozick's 'entitlement theory of Justice'. In 'anarchy, State & utopia', he calls welfare state as immoral, against personality of man & demands absolute right to property that is legally acquired (historical view).

Today's welfare states are established on following rights of all — on Kant's categorical imperative but 'good' (progressive taxation) is prior to right.

Scanned with CamScanner

Que.8(a) **Ambedkar is not a doctrinal Marxist or socialist. He evolves his own brand of socialism in which not only the economic aspects but also the social aspects are emphasised. Elaborate. (20 Marks)**

Scanned with CamScanner