

CBSE CLASS X
Social Science (087)

ANSWER KEY

AI-generated question paper

Code: 1WL5R1

Questions: 35

Maximum Marks: 100

Generated: 2026-06-26 09:37

SELECTIONS USED

Subject	Social Science
Lessons	4 Political Parties
Level of understanding	Thorough understanding
Question selection	Curated chapter coverage (~5 questions per section + 8 synthesis)
Model	claude-sonnet-4-6

Composition — Difficulty: 2 straightforward · 15 medium · 18 deep | Types: 24 Short · 5 MCQ · 5 Long · 1 Very short

Q1. deep thorough-understanding § Overview / Introduction

[3]

Despite being among the most visible institutions in a democracy, political parties are also among the least trusted. Why do you think widespread visibility of political parties fails to translate into public trust? Use your understanding of what parties do and how citizens experience them to justify your answer.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:18 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Political parties are highly visible because they contest elections, form governments, shape public opinion, and provide people access to government welfare schemes. Citizens interact with them constantly during elections and local governance.

However, visibility breeds criticism, not trust. Citizens experience parties as **partisan** — they represent only a section of society and divide people along social lines. Key challenges further erode trust: **lack of internal democracy, dynastic succession, money and muscle power** in elections, and **little meaningful policy difference** between parties. These flaws make parties appear self-serving rather than public-serving.

Thus, people feel *close* to parties for practical access but do not *trust* them, as parties are seen as the root cause of corruption and divisions in democracy.

Source: Chapter 4 — Why do we need political parties?, Challenges to political parties

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to **link visibility to its cause** (functions parties perform) and then **contrast it with low trust** (challenges/flaws).
- Three key points to hit: (1) parties are visible due to their functions, (2) but citizens experience partisanship, corruption, dynastic politics — eroding trust, (3) the textbook distinction between feeling "close to a party" vs. "trusting" a party is crucial evidence here.
- Avoid writing a general essay; ground every claim in textbook content (functions list + challenges list).

Q2. straightforward thorough-understanding § Why do we need political parties?

[1]

[mcq] Which of the following most accurately distinguishes a political party from other groups such as pressure groups or interest groups?

- (A) A political party seeks to influence government policy without directly contesting elections.
- (B) A political party tries to win governmental power by contesting elections in its own name.
- (C) A political party represents only the economic interests of a particular social class.
- (D) A political party is formed exclusively to oppose the ruling government.

- A To organise social welfare programmes for citizens
- B To contest elections and hold power in the government
- C To advise the Election Commission on policy matters
- D To represent pressure groups in the legislature

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:18 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(B) A political party tries to win governmental power by contesting elections in its own name.

As defined in the textbook: "A political party is a group of people who come together to **contest elections and hold power in the government.**" This distinguishes it from pressure/interest groups, which only influence policy without directly seeking power.

Source: *Why do we need political parties?*, Chapter 4

Explanation

The key distinguishing feature of a political party is that it **contests elections in its own name** and seeks to **hold governmental power** — not just influence it. Pressure groups and interest groups lobby or influence policy but do not directly contest elections. Examiners expect you to quote or closely paraphrase the textbook definition. Options A, C, and D describe partial or incorrect features.

Q3. medium thorough-understanding § Why do we need political parties?

[2]

Political parties are described as 'partisan' by nature. Explain what this means and why partisanship is inseparable from the very idea of a political party.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:18 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The word **partisan** means being strongly committed to one side, party, or viewpoint, with an inability to take a balanced view.

Partisanship is inseparable from a political party because a party represents **a part** of society — it stands for particular policies, upholds certain interests, and supports specific sections of people. A party must take sides; without partisanship, it would have no distinct identity or purpose.

Source: *Democratic Politics – II*, Chapter 4, 'Meaning' section

Explanation

Examiners look for two things: (1) a clear definition of 'partisan/partisanship' using the textbook's own language, and (2) the logical link — the word "party" comes from "part," so representing a part of society and taking a side is the very essence of a party. Quote or closely paraphrase the boxed definition in the textbook. Do not pad with examples of specific parties.

Q4. medium thorough-understanding § Why do we need political parties?

[3]

Imagine a country where all candidates contest elections as independents and no political parties exist. What specific problem would arise regarding accountability for national policy, and why would that problem be difficult to solve?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:18 · grounding rag

Model Answer

If all candidates contest as independents, **no one would be accountable for national policy**. Individual elected representatives would be accountable only to their own constituency for local matters, but no single person or group could be held responsible for how the country is run as a whole.

This problem would be difficult to solve because, without parties, no candidate can make credible promises about major national policy changes before elections. There would be no collective body to form a stable government with a common programme, and voters would have no way to reward or punish any group for national decisions.

Source: *Democratic Politics*, Chapter 4, "Why do we need political parties?" — Necessity

Explanation

The textbook directly states: *"Elected representatives will be accountable to their constituency for what they do in the locality. But no one will be responsible for how the country will be run."* This is the exact problem to name. The difficulty arises because parties are the mechanism that groups representatives, forms a government with a shared programme, and gives voters someone collective to hold responsible — none of which exists without parties. Examiners want you to (1) name the problem clearly (no accountability for national policy) and (2) explain *why* it is unsolvable without parties (no collective body, no promises, no one to blame/reward).

Q5. medium thorough-understanding § Why do we need political parties? [3]

[short answer] The majority party or coalition in a legislature is almost always formed by the party or parties that won the most seats in the election. How does this electoral-legislative link shape both the content of laws that get passed and the accountability of those who make them? Explain with reasoning.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:18 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The electoral-legislative link means the party or coalition winning the most seats forms the government and controls law-making. This shapes **content of laws** because the ruling majority passes legislation reflecting its own ideology, manifesto promises, and the interests of its voter base — for example, BJP's focus on cultural nationalism or INC's emphasis on secularism and welfare of weaker sections.

For **accountability**, voters can punish poor performance by voting out the ruling party in the next election. Additionally, mechanisms like mandatory affidavits, anti-defection law, and Election Commission oversight ensure elected representatives remain answerable. However, in coalition governments, multiple parties must balance competing interests, sometimes slowing reform but broadening representation.

Explanation

The question tests understanding of how electoral outcomes directly determine who legislates and whether they remain accountable. Examiners look for: (1) the link between election results and majority formation, (2) its effect on law content (party ideology/manifesto), and (3) accountability mechanisms (elections, anti-defection law, affidavits). Use examples from the chapter — BJP, INC, coalition governments — to support points. Avoid writing a general civics essay; stay anchored to the textbook content on political parties and electoral democracy.

Q6. medium thorough-understanding § Why do we need political parties? [1]

Which of the following best explains why large, complex societies especially need political parties, compared to small, simple ones?

- A Large societies have more corruption, so parties are needed to control it
- B Large societies produce too many individual opinions that need to be grouped and channelled into governable policy positions
- C Large societies have more elections, so they need parties to manage the election schedule
- D Large societies distrust governments more, so parties act as watchdogs

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:18 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Answer: B

Large societies produce too many individual opinions that need to be grouped and channelled into governable policy positions.

Explanation

The passage directly states: "large societies need representative democracy... they needed some agency to gather different views on various issues and to present these to the government." It also says a party "reduces a vast multitude of opinions into a few basic positions." Option B captures this exactly. Options A, C, and D are not supported by the passage.

Q7. deep thorough-understanding § Why do we need political parties?

[5]

Opponents of political parties argue that they only divide society. Using the functions parties actually perform, construct a counter-argument explaining why the divisions parties create are, in fact, necessary for a democracy to work.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:18 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Opponents claim parties only divide society, but these divisions are both inevitable and necessary for democracy to function.

First, parties **reflect real divisions** that already exist in society — on policies, interests, and values. Rather than creating these divisions, parties give them organised expression. A party "reduces a vast multitude of opinions into a few basic positions," making governance possible.

Second, **competition between parties** ensures the opposition voices different views and criticises government failures, holding power accountable. Without this, there is no check on the ruling group.

Third, parties **aggregate opinions**: without them, every candidate would be independent, unable to make policy promises, and no one would be responsible for how the country is run.

Fourth, parties **shape public opinion** and provide citizens — especially ordinary people — access to government machinery and welfare schemes.

In short, the divisions parties create channel social conflict into peaceful, electoral competition, which is the very foundation of democratic politics.

Source: Chapter 4 — Functions and Necessity sections

Explanation

The examiner expects you to **use the textbook's listed functions** (contesting elections, aggregating opinions, opposition role, shaping public opinion, providing access) as direct evidence in your counter-argument — not just list them, but link each to *why division is necessary*. The key insight the textbook gives is that parties reflect pre-existing social divisions and organise them productively. Also note the "imagining a situation without parties" argument from the Necessity section — that's a strong point to include. Avoid vague statements; tie every point to a specific function.

Q8. deep thorough-understanding § Why do we need political parties?

[3]

[short_answer] In some democracies, all candidates contest elections as independents without any party affiliation. Yet observers find that these independents naturally form informal groups and alliances before and after elections. What does this pattern suggest about the relationship between political parties and the fundamental requirements of representative democracy? Explain.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:18 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The pattern of independents forming informal groups reveals that political parties are not merely optional but are a **fundamental requirement** of representative democracy.

As the textbook explains, if every candidate contested as an independent, "no one will be able to make any promises to the people about any major policy changes" and "no one will be responsible for how the country will be run." The same tendency is observed in non-party panchayat elections, where villages naturally split into factions that put up panels of candidates — which is exactly what a party does.

This shows that large, complex societies need an agency to gather diverse opinions, group similar views, form responsible governments, and make leaders accountable. Political parties fulfill these needs. Therefore, parties are a **necessary condition** for democracy — wherever representative government exists, party-like structures inevitably emerge.

Source: Chapter 4 — Why do we need political parties? (Necessity section)

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to connect the observed pattern (independents forming groups) to the **textbook's argument about necessity of parties**.
- Key points: the panchayat example from the textbook directly mirrors the question's scenario — use it.
- Mention: accountability, policy promises, responsible government — these are the core reasons parties become inevitable.
- Avoid generic statements; anchor every point in what the passage says.
- End with the textbook's conclusion: "parties are a necessary condition for a democracy."

Q9. deep thorough-understanding § Why do we need political parties?

[3]

The role of opposition parties is sometimes seen as merely negative — criticising and obstructing the government. Explain why, from a democratic standpoint, this role is actually a positive and necessary function.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

In a democracy, the opposition party plays a vital and positive role, not merely a negative one. According to the textbook, "those parties that lose in the elections play the role of opposition to the parties in power, by voicing different views and criticising government for its failures or wrong policies. Opposition parties also mobilise opposition to the government."

This is essential because:

- It keeps the ruling party accountable and prevents misuse of power.
- It ensures alternative policies and views are heard.
- It acts as a check, protecting democratic functioning from authoritarian tendencies.

Without opposition, no mechanism would exist to question or restrain the government, making democracy hollow.

Source: *Why do we need political parties?*, Chapter 4

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to cite the **function of opposition** from the textbook (Function 5) and explain **why** it is democratically necessary — not just describe it.
- Key phrase to use: "voicing different views and criticising government for its failures or wrong policies."
- Link it to accountability and checks on power — that's what makes it "positive," not negative.
- Avoid writing a vague essay; 3 structured points after an opening line is ideal for 3 marks.

Q10. medium thorough-understanding § How many parties should we have?

[3]

India has evolved a multiparty system while the USA and UK follow a two-party system. Why has India not converged to a simpler two-party system like these countries, despite being a democracy for decades?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

India has not converged to a two-party system because its **social and geographical diversity is too vast** to be absorbed by just two parties. India's multiparty system evolved due to its **regional divisions, caste, religion, language, and historical political differences**, which require representation through multiple parties.

As the textbook states, "party system is not something any country can choose — it evolves over a long time, depending on the nature of society, its social and regional divisions, its history of politics and its system of elections." The USA and UK have more socially homogeneous societies, allowing two parties to broadly represent public opinion. In India, regional parties (State parties) have grown stronger, and no single national party could win a Lok Sabha majority on its own until 2014, making coalition governments necessary.

Source: Chapter 4, "How many parties should we have?" and "State parties"

Explanation

- The **key point** examiners expect: party systems are not chosen but evolve from a country's specific social, regional, and historical context.
- Mention India's **diversity** (caste, religion, language, region) as the root cause — this directly answers "why."
- Quoting or closely paraphrasing the textbook line about party systems evolving naturally scores well.
- Don't write a general essay on political parties — stay focused on the comparison and the reason for multiparty evolution.

Q11. deep thorough-understanding § How many parties should we have?

[5]

A multiparty system is often criticised for causing political instability. Yet, many political scientists argue it is better suited for a country like India than a two-party system. Do you agree? Justify your answer by weighing both the drawback and the advantage of a multiparty system in the Indian context.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Yes, I agree that a multiparty system is better suited for India, despite its drawbacks.

Drawback: A multiparty system often appears messy and leads to political instability. Coalition governments formed by multiple parties can be fragile, as alliance partners may have conflicting interests, making governance difficult.

Advantages in the Indian context:

- Reflects diversity:** India has vast social, regional, linguistic and religious diversity. A two-party system cannot easily absorb this diversity, whereas multiple parties give representation to varied interests and opinions.
- Strengthens federalism:** State/regional parties have become key coalition partners at the Centre. Since 1996, nearly every State party has been part of a national coalition, strengthening federalism and democracy.
- Evolved naturally:** India's multiparty system was not chosen — it evolved due to the country's social and geographical diversity. Party systems cannot be changed quickly; each country develops one suited to its own circumstances.

Thus, while instability is a real concern, a multiparty system ensures broader representation and federal balance, making it more appropriate for India.

Source: Chapter 4 — Political Parties, "How many parties should we have?" and "State parties" sections.

Explanation

- Examiners expect **both sides** — name the drawback (instability/messy coalitions) and then outweigh it with India-specific advantages.
- Key phrases to use: "*social and geographical diversity,*" "*coalition,*" "*federalism,*" "*variety of interests and opinions.*"
- The textbook explicitly states: "*if India has evolved a multiparty system, it is because the social and geographical diversity in such a large country is not easily absorbed by two or even three parties.*" Quote or paraphrase this — it is the core justification.
- Do not list parties unnecessarily; one or two examples (NDA, UPA) are enough for illustration.

Q12. deep thorough-understanding § Popular participation in political parties

[3]

Survey data shows that in India, political parties rank among the least trusted institutions, yet membership in political parties is higher than in many advanced democracies like Canada and Japan. How would you explain this apparent contradiction?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

This apparent contradiction can be explained as follows:

Low trust does not mean low participation. Citizens may distrust political parties as institutions — finding them corrupt or self-serving — yet still join or support them because parties remain the most effective way to secure political representation and influence policy. In India, political parties are not just electoral bodies; they are deeply embedded in social and community life, making membership a practical necessity for many. Additionally, survey evidence shows that the proportion feeling 'close to a political party' has steadily increased over three decades, suggesting emotional or identity-based attachment even without institutional trust.

Source: *Democratic Politics, Chapter 4 — Popular Participation in Political Parties*

Explanation

The examiner wants you to resolve the contradiction using the **two dimensions** from the passage: *trust* (institutional credibility) and *participation/membership* (personal engagement). Key points:

- Low trust is a **global trend**, not unique to India.
- Membership is driven by practical/social reasons, not just trust.
- Don't just restate the contradiction — **explain the gap** between the two measures.
- Cite the SDSA survey evidence to ground your answer.

Q13. straightforward thorough-understanding § National parties

[1]

[very_short_answer] A party claims it deserves national recognition because it secured 2% of Lok Sabha seats from three different states. Is this claim valid? Justify your answer with reference to the criteria used by the Election Commission of India.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

No, the claim is **not valid**. To be recognised as a national party, a party must secure at least **6% of total votes** in Lok Sabha/Assembly elections in four states **and** win at least **four Lok Sabha seats**.

Explanation

The question tests knowledge of ECI's recognition criteria. The party only mentions seats (not the 6% vote share) and covers only 3 states (not 4). Both conditions must be met simultaneously — missing either makes the claim invalid.

Q14. medium thorough-understanding § National parties

[2]

The Election Commission grants recognised parties a 'unique symbol'. Why is this privilege significant for a party during elections, and what would a candidate lose by not having it?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The Election Commission grants a unique symbol exclusively to official candidates of a recognised party. This is significant because voters — especially less literate ones — identify and vote for a party by its symbol. A candidate without this privilege cannot use the party's recognised symbol, losing instant voter recognition and the credibility associated with an established party.

Source: Political Parties, Chapter 4

Explanation

The key points examiners look for: (1) the symbol is exclusive to official party candidates, (2) it aids voter recognition (especially among less educated voters), and (3) a candidate without it loses this recognition advantage. Keep your answer focused — no need to elaborate beyond these two aspects for 2 marks.

Q15. medium thorough-understanding § National parties

[3]

A newly formed party wins 7% of votes in the Legislative Assembly elections of one state and secures three seats in that assembly, but contests no Lok Sabha seats. Which category of recognised party — national or state — can it claim, and why?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The party can claim recognition as a **State party**.

As per the Election Commission's criteria, a party is recognised as a **State party** if it secures **at least 6% of total votes** in a State Legislative Assembly election **and wins at least 2 seats**. This party wins 7% of votes (above 6%) and secures 3 seats (above 2) in one state's assembly — both conditions are satisfied.

It **cannot** claim national party status because it has not contested Lok Sabha elections at all, and has not won at least 4 Lok Sabha seats or secured 6% votes across four states.

Source: *Democratic Politics, Chapter 4 — National parties / State parties*

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to **name the category** (State party), **quote the exact numerical criteria** from the textbook, and **apply them** to the given data — all three steps for 3 marks.
- A common mistake is confusing "6% in one state assembly + 2 seats" (State party) with "6% in Lok Sabha/4 states + 4 Lok Sabha seats" (national party). State clearly why national party status is ruled out.
- Keep figures precise: 6%, 2 seats, 4 seats — examiners check these.

Q16. medium thorough-understanding § National parties

[3]

[short_answer] The Bahujan Samaj Party and the Bharatiya Janata Party occupy very different spaces in India's political landscape. Compare the two parties on: (i) the social sections they primarily seek to represent, and (ii) the core ideology or philosophy that guides their politics.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

BSP vs BJP — Comparison:

(i) Social sections represented:

- **BSP** seeks to represent the *bahujan samaj* — dalits, adivasis, OBCs, and religious minorities, i.e., the socially and economically oppressed sections.
- **BJP** draws support broadly across society, but has historically been strong among upper castes, urban middle classes, and Hindu communities; its base has since expanded to rural areas and southern/eastern India.

(ii) Core ideology/philosophy:

- **BSP** draws inspiration from Sahu Maharaj, Mahatma Phule, Periyar, and Babasaheb Ambedkar, focusing on social justice and welfare of oppressed people.
- **BJP** is guided by *integral humanism* (Deendayal Upadhyaya) and *cultural nationalism* (Hindutva), seeking to build a modern India rooted in ancient Indian culture and values.

Source: *National parties*, Chapter 4

Explanation

- The question tests direct recall of party descriptions from the textbook — quote key terms like **bahujan samaj**, **Hindutva**, **integral humanism**.
- For BSP's ideology, name at least one or two thinkers (Ambedkar, Phule) to score full marks.
- Don't confuse BSP's social base (oppressed/marginalised) with BJP's (broader Hindu nationalist appeal).
- At 3 marks, cover both (i) and (ii) clearly — examiners look for correct contrast between the two parties.

Q17. medium thorough-understanding § National parties

[3]

The Indian National Congress is described as a 'centrist' party. What does this mean in terms of its ideological position, and how does the party's stand on new economic reforms reflect this centrist orientation?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

A **centrist party** is one that is neither rightist (conservative/right-wing) nor leftist (radical/left-wing) in its ideological orientation. The Indian National Congress occupies a middle position on the political spectrum.

In terms of ideology, the INC espouses **secularism** and **welfare of weaker sections and minorities**, which reflects a left-leaning social concern, while also accepting market-oriented policies, which is a right-leaning economic tendency.

Regarding new economic reforms, the INC **supports new economic reforms but with a human face** — meaning it accepts liberalisation and market reforms, but insists they must be accompanied by social protection and benefits for the poor. This balanced stance — neither fully free-market nor socialist — reflects its centrist orientation.

Source: *Democratic Politics – II, Chapter 4 (National Parties)*

Explanation

- The key phrase from the textbook is "**centrist party (neither rightist nor leftist)**" — write this directly.
- The second key phrase is "**supports new economic reforms but with a human face**" — examiners expect this exact phrase.
- Link the two: centrist = balance between market reforms AND social welfare. That connection earns the third mark.
- Avoid writing a long essay; three focused points covering definition, ideology, and economic stand are sufficient.

Q18. deep thorough-understanding § National parties

[3]

[short_answer] The Aam Aadmi Party emerged from an anti-corruption movement, while the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) grew out of a regional cultural and social identity movement. How do these contrasting origins illustrate the idea that political parties in a democracy arise to represent different kinds of interests and demands?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Political parties emerge to represent the diverse interests and demands of different sections of society.

The **Aam Aadmi Party (AAP)** arose from public anger against corruption, representing citizens who demanded clean, accountable governance. The **DMK** grew from the Dravidian movement, representing Tamil cultural identity, social justice, and opposition to Brahminical dominance.

These contrasting origins show that democracy is not one-dimensional — some groups prioritize good governance, others prioritize cultural dignity or social equality. Parties thus serve as vehicles that channel different aspirations into the democratic process, ensuring varied interests find political representation.

Source: Chapter 4, *Democratic Politics*

Explanation

- Examiners expect you to briefly describe each party's origin, then link both examples to the broader principle about parties representing diverse interests.
- The key concept to demonstrate is: **parties as representatives of varied social, cultural, and political demands** — not just electoral machines.
- Avoid writing a long essay; three focused points (AAP origin → DMK origin → conclusion linking to democracy) is the ideal structure for 3 marks.
- Since AAP and DMK are not explicitly detailed in the source passages, you may draw on general knowledge, but keep the democratic-representation principle (which IS from the chapter) as the anchor.

Q19. deep thorough-understanding § State parties

[3]

Over the last three decades, the growing number and strength of State parties has meant that national parties are increasingly compelled to form alliances with them to govern at the Centre. How has this shift strengthened both federalism and democracy in India? In your answer, explain the connection between coalition politics and the representation of diverse regional interests.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Over the last three decades, the number and strength of State (regional) parties expanded greatly, making Parliament more politically diverse. Since no single national party could secure a majority in the Lok Sabha on its own, national parties were compelled to form alliances with State parties. Since 1996, nearly every State party has been part of one or another national-level coalition government.

This strengthened **federalism** because regional parties brought the concerns and interests of their states directly into the central government. It strengthened **democracy** by ensuring diverse regional voices gained representation in governance, making the system more inclusive and responsive.

Source: Democratic Politics – II, Chapter 4 (State Parties section)

Explanation

- The textbook directly states that coalition politics between national and State parties "contributed to the strengthening of federalism and democracy." Quote or closely paraphrase this.
- Key link to make: State parties = regional interests → coalition = those interests represented at Centre → federalism + democracy strengthened.
- Avoid over-explaining; 3 marks = ~3 clear points. Examiner looks for: (1) growth of State parties, (2) compelled alliances, (3) strengthened federalism and democracy with a brief reason why.

Q20. medium thorough-understanding § Challenges to political parties

[1]

Which of the following best explains why dynastic succession in political parties is considered a challenge to Indian democracy? (A) It prevents qualified outsiders from rising through merit, weakening internal democracy. (B) It increases the number of political parties competing in elections. (C) It leads to the formation of pressure groups within the party. (D) It strengthens the ideological commitment of the party to its voters.

A It means the party will always lose elections because voters dislike family rule.

B People without adequate experience or popular support come to hold positions of power, weakening democratic accountability.

C It forces ordinary members to leave the party and form rival parties, creating instability.

D It reduces the funds available to the party since family members do not raise money effectively.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Answer: B

Dynastic succession brings people without adequate experience or popular support to positions of power, weakening democratic accountability and fairness to other party members.

Source: *Challenges to political parties, Chapter 4*

Explanation

The textbook explicitly states that dynastic succession is problematic because "people who do not have adequate experience or popular support come to occupy positions of power." Option B mirrors this reasoning. Options A, C, and D are not supported by the passage — the text says nothing about fund-raising, election losses due to family rule, or members leaving to form rival parties. Always anchor your answer to the textbook's exact language.

Q21. medium thorough-understanding § Challenges to political parties

[3]

A political party in a democracy consistently nominates only wealthy candidates and receives large donations from big corporations. How does this practice undermine the party's core purpose in a democracy?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

A political party's core purpose is to represent the people, promote collective good, and implement policies that reflect public interest through democratic elections.

When a party consistently nominates only wealthy candidates and accepts large corporate donations, it undermines this purpose in the following ways:

- 1. Exclusion of common citizens:** Only rich candidates get nominated, denying ordinary people fair representation.
- 2. Policy capture:** Rich donors and corporations gain influence over the party's decisions and policies, which should serve public interest, not private profit.
- 3. Electoral malpractice:** Focusing on money over merit is a short-cut that corrupts the democratic process.

As the textbook notes, "Rich people and companies who give funds to the parties tend to have influence on the policies and decisions of the party," directly compromising its democratic role.

Source: Political Parties, Challenges to political parties — Chapter 4

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to link the practice to the **third challenge** (money and muscle power) described in the chapter.
- Quote or closely paraphrase the textbook line about rich donors influencing party policy — it shows you've read the source.
- Name the core purpose of a party first (collective good, representing people) before explaining how the practice violates it. That contrast earns marks.
- Three clear points fit a 3-mark answer well; avoid bullet overload or padding.

Q22. deep thorough-understanding § Challenges to political parties

[3]

In many democracies, the major parties have moved closer to each other in their economic policies over time. Why does this narrowing of ideological difference pose a challenge specifically to voters, rather than just to the parties themselves?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:19 · grounding rag

Model Answer

When major parties reduce their ideological differences, **voters lose meaningful choice**. Parties are supposed to offer distinct policies and programmes so voters can select what suits them. But when parties converge — for example, when all major parties agree on economic policies — citizens who want genuinely different policies have **no option** to vote for. They cannot even elect different leaders, as the same leaders keep shifting between parties. This challenge falls directly on voters because it undermines the very purpose of elections: choosing between real alternatives.

Source: Challenges to political parties, Chapter 4

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to link the narrowing of ideology directly to the **voter's inability to choose**, not just party competition.
- Key phrase from the textbook: *"Those who want really different policies have no option available to them."*
- Mention the India example (economic policies) and/or Britain (Labour vs Conservative) for full marks.
- Do not just say "parties become similar" — explain *why that harms voters specifically* (loss of real choice at the ballot box).

Q23. deep thorough-understanding § Challenges to political parties

[3]

The anti-defection law was passed to stop elected representatives from switching parties for personal gain. However, critics argue the same law creates a new problem for democracy. What is that problem, and why does it arise directly from how the law works?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The anti-defection law creates the problem of **weakening internal democracy within parties**. Since the law states that any MLA or MP who defies the party will lose their seat in the legislature, elected representatives are forced to accept whatever the party leadership decides — even if they personally disagree. This arises directly from the law's mechanism: to punish defection, it effectively silences all dissent. Representatives can no longer vote independently or question party decisions, making them answerable to party leaders rather than to voters.

Source: Chapter 4, *How can parties be reformed?*

Explanation

Examiners want you to identify the **specific problem** (suppression of dissent / weakening of internal democracy) and then **link it causally** to how the law works (loss of seat for changing parties = no room for disagreement). Avoid vague answers like "it harms democracy" — name the exact consequence. The textbook explicitly states: *"this has made any dissent even more difficult. MPs and MLAs have to accept whatever the party leaders decide."* Quote or closely paraphrase this for full marks.

Q24. deep thorough-understanding § How can parties be reformed?

[3]

The Constitution was amended to disqualify any MLA or MP who switches parties after being elected. While this reform reduced defection, it also produced an unintended negative consequence for democracy. What is that consequence, and why does it arise from the very same rule?

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The unintended negative consequence is that it has made **dissent within parties extremely difficult**.

The anti-defection law states that if any MLA or MP changes parties, they lose their legislative seat. This same rule forces elected representatives to accept **whatever the party leaders decide**, even if they personally disagree. Since voting against the party line or openly dissenting could be treated as defection, MPs and MLAs cannot express independent opinions. This weakens internal democracy and makes legislators answerable to party leaders rather than to the people who elected them.

Source: *Democratic Politics, Chapter 4 – How can parties be reformed?*

Explanation

The examiner wants you to identify **both** the consequence (suppression of dissent/internal democracy weakened) and **explain the causal link** — the same rule that stops defection also silences genuine disagreement. The key phrase from the textbook is: *"MPs and MLAs have to accept whatever the party leaders decide."* Quoting or paraphrasing this shows you've read the source. Don't just name the consequence — always explain *why* the rule itself causes it. That's where the 3rd mark usually lies.

Q25. medium thorough-understanding § How can parties be reformed?

[1]

[mcq] A reform requires every election candidate to file a sworn affidavit declaring assets and criminal cases. Which of the following best explains a key limitation of this reform?

- (A) Voters rarely have access to the information declared in the affidavit.
- (B) The Election Commission lacks the authority to enforce filing of affidavits.
- (C) Disclosure of information alone does not prevent voters from electing candidates with criminal records if they remain influential.
- (D) The reform applies only to national elections and not state assembly elections.

- A The Election Commission does not have the authority to receive such affidavits from candidates.
- B There is no reliable mechanism to verify whether the information declared in the affidavit is accurate.
- C Candidates are only required to declare criminal cases, not details of their property.
- D The Supreme Court order applies only to national elections, not state assembly elections.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

B — There is no reliable mechanism to verify whether the information declared in the affidavit is accurate.

Explanation

The source passage states: *"there is no system to check if the information given by the candidates is true."* This directly supports option B. The reform discloses information but cannot ensure its accuracy, making verification the key limitation. Options A, C, and D contradict the passage.

Q26. medium thorough-understanding § How can parties be reformed?

[3]

Two proposed reforms for political parties are: (i) reserving at least one-third of election tickets for women candidates, and (ii) state funding of elections. For each, explain the specific problem it is meant to solve.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(i) **Reservation of one-third tickets for women:** This reform is meant to solve the problem of **under-representation of women** in political parties. Women are rarely given election tickets by parties; this measure would ensure their meaningful participation in electoral politics and decision-making bodies.

(ii) **State funding of elections:** This reform addresses the problem of **excessive dependence on money and corrupt funding** by political parties. Since parties need huge funds for elections, they often rely on illegal or black money. Government funding would reduce this influence and make elections fairer.

Source: *Democratic Politics II, Chapter 4 – Political Parties (How can parties be reformed?)*

Explanation

- The question asks you to **link each reform to the specific problem it solves** — examiners want a clear cause-effect connection for each point.
- For (i): the key phrase is *under-representation of women*; mention that parties rarely give tickets to women.
- For (ii): the key phrase is *influence of money/black money*; state funding reduces parties' need for corrupt donations.
- Keep both answers balanced since the question awards 3 marks total (roughly 1.5 marks each).

Q27. medium thorough-understanding § How can parties be reformed?

[2]

[short_answer] Why is legal regulation considered an insufficient primary tool for reforming political parties in a democracy? Explain with relevant reasoning.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Legal regulation is considered insufficient as a primary tool because **over-regulation can be counter-productive** — it forces parties to find ways to **cheat the law** rather than genuinely reform. More importantly, in a democracy, laws are passed by leaders who themselves belong to political parties, so **political parties will not agree to pass a law that they do not like**.

Source: *How can parties be reformed?*, Chapter 4

Explanation

The examiner expects two clear reasons: (1) over-regulation leads to circumvention of law, and (2) parties control the law-making process, so they can block unwanted laws. Avoid over-writing — two crisp points with brief reasoning are enough for 2 marks. Use textbook phrasing where possible (e.g., "counter-productive," "cheat the law").

Q28. deep thorough-understanding § How can parties be reformed?

[5]

[long_answer] Two citizen-centred approaches to political party reform are: (i) pressuring parties from outside through protests, media, and activism, and (ii) joining and transforming parties from within. A student argues that external pressure is more practical for ordinary citizens and equally effective as working from within. Do you agree with this view? Justify your answer, examining the strengths and limitations of both approaches.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

I **partially agree** with the student's argument. External pressure is indeed more accessible for ordinary citizens, but it is **not equally effective** as working from within.

Strengths of external pressure: Citizens, pressure groups, and media can use petitions, agitations, and publicity to push parties toward reform. If parties fear losing public support, they become more serious about change. This is practical since most citizens cannot join parties full-time.

Limitations: External pressure alone cannot bring structural change. Parties may ignore public opinion if all party leaders collectively resist reform.

Working from within: The textbook states that "the problem of bad politics can be solved by more and better politics." Internal participation improves party democracy directly, though ordinary members currently lack influence due to power concentration at the top.

Both approaches are **complementary**, not alternatives. Real reform requires both citizen pressure from outside and active participation from within.

Source: Chapter 4 – How can parties be reformed?

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to **take a position** and then **qualify it** using the textbook — not a one-sided answer.
- Key textbook points to quote/paraphrase: (1) citizens/media/pressure groups can agitate; (2) "more and better politics" is needed — implying internal participation is essential.
- Avoid saying either approach is fully sufficient alone; the text presents **both as necessary**.
- Use terms like "internal democracy," "pressure groups," and "public participation" — these fetch marks.

Q29. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

Political parties are described as both necessary for democracy and widely distrusted by citizens. How do you explain this paradox? Use the functions parties perform and the challenges they face to justify your answer.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Political parties are essential to democracy yet widely distrusted — this paradox arises because parties are indispensable in theory but often fail in practice.

Why they are necessary: Parties contest elections, form governments, make laws, shape public opinion, and provide citizens access to welfare schemes. Without parties, elected representatives would be accountable only to their locality with no one responsible for running the country. They aggregate diverse opinions into workable policies — a function no modern representative democracy can do without.

Why they are distrusted: Parties face serious challenges: (i) lack of internal democracy and concentration of power in a few leaders; (ii) dynastic succession blocking ordinary workers; (iii) growing role of money and muscle power; (iv) shrinking ideological differences giving voters no meaningful choice.

Thus, citizens feel close to parties for access and representation, yet distrust them for failing to uphold democratic values — explaining the paradox.

Source: Chapter 4 — *Why do we need political parties; Challenges to political parties*

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to name the **functions** (at least 3–4) and the **four challenges** specifically — these are textbook headings.
- The "paradox" framing means you must show **both sides**: necessity + distrust. Don't just list functions or just list problems.
- The line about citizens feeling "close to parties even when they do not fully trust them" is directly from the textbook — quoting or paraphrasing it strengthens your answer.
- At 5 marks, ~110–120 words with clear structure is ideal. Avoid writing more than 130 words.

Q30. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

The growth of regional (State) parties over the last three decades has both complicated and strengthened Indian democracy. Justify this statement by linking the nature of India's multiparty system to the functioning of federalism.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Over the last three decades, the number and strength of regional (State) parties has expanded, making Parliament more politically diverse. This **complicated** democracy as no single national party could secure a Lok Sabha majority on its own (until 2014), leading to coalition governments that can be unstable.

However, it also **strengthened** democracy and federalism: national parties were compelled to form alliances with State parties, giving nearly every State party an opportunity to participate in national coalition governments since 1996. This ensured that regional interests gained representation at the Centre, reinforcing the federal sharing of power.

Source: *Political Parties, Chapter 4 (State parties section)*

Explanation

- The examiner wants **two sides** clearly addressed — "complicated" and "strengthened" — both linked to the **multiparty/coalition system** and **federalism**.
- Key facts to include: no single majority until 2014 → coalition compulsion → State parties in national government since 1996 → federal strengthening.
- Avoid writing only one side; the word "justify" means you must support both parts of the statement with evidence from the chapter.
- Do not pad with general statements about democracy — keep it specific to regional parties, coalitions, and federalism as the passage states.

Q31. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[1]

Assertion (A): Even in panchayat elections where political parties do not formally contest, villages tend to split into rival panels of candidates.

Reason (R): Political parties naturally link social divisions and community interests to the electoral process, so informal party-like groupings emerge even where formal party labels are absent.

Choose the correct option:

- (A) Both A and R are true, and R is the correct explanation of A.
- (B) Both A and R are true, but R is not the correct explanation of A.
- (C) A is true but R is false.
- (D) A is false but R is true.

A Both A and R are true, and R is the correct explanation of A.

B Both A and R are true, but R is not the correct explanation of A.

C A is true but R is false.

D A is false but R is true.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(A) Both A and R are true, and R is the correct explanation of A.

Even where formal party labels are absent in panchayat elections, informal rival panels form because political parties naturally link social divisions and community interests to electoral competition.

Explanation

Assertion A is a well-known fact noted in democratic politics — villages split into rival panels even in "party-less" panchayat elections. Reason R correctly explains *why*: political parties by nature connect social groups and interests to electoral processes, so even without formal labels, party-like groupings organically emerge. Since R logically explains A, option (A) is correct.

Q32. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

The anti-defection law, the mandatory filing of affidavits by candidates, and the Election Commission's directive on internal organisational elections each target a different challenge facing political parties in India. Identify the specific challenge each measure is designed to address, and briefly explain one limitation that prevents each from fully solving the problem.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

1. Anti-defection Law:

Challenge addressed: It targets the problem of elected representatives switching parties for personal gain (money/power), which destabilises governments and betrays voters' mandate.

Limitation: It has actually weakened internal democracy — legislators cannot vote against party leadership even on genuine conscience issues, making them fully subordinate to top leaders.

2. Mandatory filing of affidavits by candidates:

Challenge addressed: It tackles the growing role of money and muscle power by making candidates declare their criminal records and assets, giving voters information to make informed choices.

Limitation: Mere disclosure does not disqualify candidates with criminal backgrounds; voters may still elect them, so the problem of muscle power continues.

3. Election Commission's directive on internal organisational elections:

Challenge addressed: It targets lack of internal democracy within parties — parties often do not hold regular organisational elections, concentrating power in one or a few leaders.

Limitation: Political parties resist genuinely implementing these elections; even when held formally, they remain controlled by top leaders, so real power remains concentrated at the top.

Explanation

The textbook (Chapter 4, "Challenges to political parties") identifies four key challenges: lack of internal democracy, dynastic succession, money/muscle power, and lack of meaningful ideological choice. The three measures in this question map onto the first and third challenges primarily. Examiners expect you to name the specific challenge, link the measure to it logically, and give a realistic limitation — not just repeat the measure. Keep each point crisp; one sentence per part is enough at this level.

Q33. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

India has evolved a multiparty system while the USA and UK use a two-party system. Explain why this difference exists and why it would be inappropriate to simply adopt one country's party system in another.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

India has a multiparty system because its vast social and geographical diversity — including regional, linguistic, religious, and caste-based differences — cannot be represented by just two or three parties. The USA and UK have more homogeneous societies historically, making two dominant parties sufficient.

It would be inappropriate to simply copy another country's party system because a party system **evolves over time** based on a country's unique social divisions, history, and electoral system. These factors differ greatly between countries, and no single system is ideal for all situations.

Source: Chapter 4, "How many parties should we have?"

Explanation

- The key phrase examiners look for is that a party system "**is not something any country can choose — it evolves.**"
- Mention India's **social and geographical diversity** as the specific reason for multiparty system.
- Contrast with USA/UK where two parties suffice due to different social conditions.
- Avoid writing a long essay — three focused points are enough for 3 marks.

Q34. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

A political party consistently wins elections and forms a stable government, yet it is dominated by one family, fields only wealthy candidates, and suppresses internal dissent. Does the presence of these challenges cancel out the party's democratic contributions, or can both coexist? Justify your reasoning with reference to the functions and challenges of political parties.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Both coexist — the challenges do not cancel out the party's democratic contributions, but they do weaken democracy.

Democratic contributions: The party performs key functions — contesting elections, forming a stable government, making laws, shaping public opinion, and providing citizens access to government welfare schemes. These are essential for democracy.

Challenges present: Domination by one family reflects **dynastic succession**; fielding only wealthy candidates shows **money power**; suppressing dissent indicates **lack of internal democracy** — all recognised challenges to political parties.

However, the textbook notes that challenges need to be "faced and overcome" to keep parties effective — not that they eliminate democratic functioning entirely. A party can simultaneously serve democracy through its functions while being flawed in its internal working.

Source: Chapter 4 — Functions of Political Parties; Challenges to Political Parties

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to use **specific terms** from the chapter: dynastic succession, lack of internal democracy, money power.
- The key argument is that functions and challenges **coexist** — one does not cancel the other, but challenges must be overcome to strengthen democracy.
- Avoid writing a one-sided answer; 3 marks require a **balanced justified response** with textbook-grounded points.
- Always link back to the chapter's language for full marks.

Q35. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

It has been argued that 'the problem of bad politics can be solved by more and better politics.' Explain how this conclusion follows from an analysis of what political parties contribute to democracy and from the limitations of legal and institutional reforms aimed at improving political parties.

◆ Political Parties

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:20 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Political parties are essential to democracy — they contest elections, form governments, shape public opinion, and provide people access to government machinery. Without them, democracy cannot function effectively.

However, legal and institutional reforms have shown limited success. Anti-defection law made dissent harder; mandatory affidavits lack verification mechanisms; party elections are often a mere formality. Over-regulation can be counter-productive, as parties may find ways to bypass the law.

Therefore, real reform must come from within — citizens pressuring parties through agitations and media, and individuals actively joining politics. Since parties run democracy, only "more and better politics" — greater public participation — can truly improve them.

Source: Chapter 4, "How can parties be reformed?" and "Why do we need political parties?"

Explanation

The question has two parts: (1) why parties are indispensable, and (2) why legal reforms alone are insufficient. Examiners expect you to link both parts to arrive at the conclusion quoted. Key points: parties are a necessary condition for democracy; legal reforms have loopholes or remain formalities; the real solution is citizen pressure + participation. The concluding line from the textbook should be quoted or closely paraphrased.

Available for free from:

<https://cbsegrade10studyguide.com>

<https://github.com/orgs/cbse-free-resources/repositories>

Available for free from:

<https://cbsegrade10studyguide.com>

<https://github.com/orgs/cbse-free-resources/repositories>