

CBSE CLASS X
Social Science (087)

ANSWER KEY

*AI-generated question paper***Code: 7KQ8SF****Questions: 33****Maximum Marks: 103****Generated: 2026-06-26 09:32****SELECTIONS USED**

Subject	Social Science
Lessons	1 Power-sharing
Level of understanding	Thorough understanding
Question selection	Curated chapter coverage (~5 questions per section + 8 synthesis)
Model	claude-sonnet-4-6

Composition — Difficulty: 1 straightforward · 19 medium · 13 deep | Types: 19 Short · 8 Long · 4 MCQ · 2 Very short

Q1. deep thorough-understanding § Overview

[3]

Some people argue that concentrating all power in one place allows a government to make quick decisions and enforce them effectively, while distributing power weakens the system. How does democracy challenge this view? In your answer, explain what principle underlies the sharing of power in a democratic government and why this principle matters.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:15 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Democracy challenges this view by proving that distributed power leads to better, more legitimate governance rather than weakness.

The core principle underlying power-sharing in democracy is that **people are the source of all political power**. Since power belongs to the people, it must be distributed among as many citizens as possible, not concentrated in one person or group.

This principle matters because:

- It ensures diverse groups and views are respected and have a voice in public policy.
- It prevents misuse of power through checks and balances among legislature, executive, and judiciary.
- It makes governance more representative and accountable.

Thus, sharing power does not weaken a system — it makes it more just and stable.

Source: Chapter 1, Forms of power-sharing

Explanation

The examiner expects three things for 3 marks:

1. **Challenge to the argument** — briefly state democracy's counter-view (1 mark).
2. **The principle** — "people are the source of all political power" (1 mark). Use the exact phrase from the textbook.
3. **Why it matters** — at least two reasons: representation of diverse groups, checks and balances, accountability (1 mark).

Avoid long elaboration on types of power-sharing (horizontal/vertical/etc.) — that goes beyond what this question asks and wastes time.

Q2. medium thorough-understanding § Belgium and Sri Lanka

[3]

Brussels was a minority region in Flanders yet had a French-speaking majority within the city. How did this demographic situation make power-sharing between the Dutch-speaking and French-speaking communities especially difficult, and how did Belgium's political arrangements attempt to address it?

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:15 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Brussels posed a unique problem: though Dutch-speakers were the majority in Belgium as a whole, they were a minority in the capital (only 20%), while 80% of Brussels residents spoke French. This meant each community feared domination in different spaces — Dutch-speakers resented French dominance in the capital; French-speakers feared Dutch majority rule nationally.

Belgium addressed this through:

- **Equal representation** for both communities in the Central Government.
- A **separate government for Brussels** where both communities have equal representation — Dutch-speakers accepted this in exchange for equal representation at the Centre.
- **State governments** with independent constitutional powers, not subordinate to the Centre.
- A **community government** for cultural, educational and language matters, regardless of where people live.

Source: *Power Sharing, Chapter 1 (Democratic Politics)*

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to explain **why Brussels was a problem** (majority-minority reversal) and then **link it to specific solutions**.
- Name at least 3 elements of the Belgian model — equal ministers at Centre, separate Brussels government with equal representation, community government.
- The key insight examiners reward: the *trade-off* — Dutch-speakers accepted equal representation in Brussels; French-speakers accepted equal representation at the Centre. Mentioning this shows deeper understanding.
- Don't write about Sri Lanka unless asked — stay focused.

Q3. deep thorough-understanding § Belgium and Sri Lanka

[3]

The Sri Lankan government's majoritarian policies after 1956 were adopted through democratic elections, yet they caused deep harm to the country's democracy. How is this possible — can a democratically elected government act undemocratically? Use the Sri Lankan example to justify your answer.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:15 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Yes, a democratically elected government can act undemocratically. Democracy is not simply rule by the majority; it must protect minority rights too.

In Sri Lanka, the Sinhalese-majority government was elected through democratic elections, but it passed majoritarian laws — making Sinhala the only official language (1956), favouring Sinhalese in jobs and university admissions, and granting Buddhism state protection. These measures systematically denied Sri Lankan Tamils equal political rights, discriminated against them, and alienated them completely. When majority rule becomes rule by a majority *community* based on religion or language, it ceases to be truly democratic for the minority group.

Source: Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka, Chapter 1; Accommodation of Social Diversity, Chapter 5

Explanation

The examiner wants you to show you understand the **distinction between procedural democracy** (free elections) and **substantive democracy** (protecting all citizens equally). The key textbook principle is: "*Rule by majority must not become rule by majority community.*" Name at least two specific Sri Lankan policies and link them to harm caused to Tamils. Avoid vague statements — cite actual measures like the 1956 language act.

Q4. deep thorough-understanding § Belgium and Sri Lanka

[5]

Belgium created a 'community government' as a unique power-sharing arrangement to manage its linguistic diversity. Explain what this community government is, why it was considered necessary in Belgium, and how it differs from the majoritarian approach adopted by Sri Lanka.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:15 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Community Government in Belgium:

The community government is a third tier of government in Belgium, elected by people belonging to one language community — Dutch, French, or German-speaking — *regardless of where they live* in the country. It has powers over cultural, educational, and language-related issues. This unique arrangement was necessary because Belgium has a complex ethnic composition: 59% Dutch-speaking, 40% French-speaking, and 1% German-speaking. Tensions between communities (especially in Brussels) made a purely majority-based rule unworkable. Between 1970 and 1993, Belgium amended its constitution four times to create this innovative power-sharing model.

Contrast with Sri Lanka's Majoritarian Approach:

Sri Lanka adopted majoritarianism — laws were passed prioritising the Sinhala-speaking majority (74%), such as making Sinhala the only official language, which alienated Tamil-speakers. Belgium, in contrast, ensured *no single community could make decisions unilaterally*. Belgium's approach prevented civic strife; Sri Lanka's approach deepened ethnic conflict. Belgium recognised diversity as a strength; Sri Lanka tried to suppress it.

Source: Chapter 1 — Belgium and Sri Lanka; Accommodation in Belgium

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to clearly define community government, justify its need using Belgium's ethnic composition, and then contrast Belgium with Sri Lanka using the keywords **majoritarianism** vs **power-sharing**.
- Always mention the constitutional amendments (1970–1993) — it shows you know the factual detail.
- The contrast must be explicit: Belgium = no unilateral decisions, consensual; Sri Lanka = Sinhala majority imposed dominance.
- Avoid writing a general essay on federalism; stay focused on the community government specifically.

Q5. medium thorough-understanding § Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka

[3]

"The actions of the Sri Lankan government from 1956 onwards gradually pushed the Tamil community towards extreme demands." Analyse this statement by tracing the chain of events that turned a cultural grievance into a demand for a separate state and eventually a civil war.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:15 · grounding rag

Model Answer

In 1956, the Sri Lankan government passed an Act recognising **Sinhala as the only official language**, disregarding Tamil. This was followed by preferential policies favouring Sinhala applicants in university admissions and government jobs, and a constitution that directed the state to protect Buddhism.

These majoritarian measures created a deep sense of **alienation among Sri Lankan Tamils**, who felt politically sidelined and culturally threatened. They initially demanded recognition of Tamil, regional autonomy, and equal opportunities. However, when their demands for provincial autonomy were **repeatedly denied**, the frustration escalated. By the 1980s, several organisations began demanding a **separate Tamil Eelam** in northern and eastern Sri Lanka. This distrust eventually turned into a **civil war**, causing massive loss of life, displacement of families, and severe damage to the country's social and economic fabric.

Source: *Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka, Chapter 1*

Explanation

- The examiner expects a **chain of events**: Act of 1956 → discrimination in jobs/education → alienation → demand for autonomy → demand denied → demand for Eelam → civil war.
- Use the key terms: **majoritarianism, alienation, Tamil Eelam, civil war** — these signal to the examiner you know the chapter vocabulary.
- Don't just list events; briefly show **cause and effect** between each step — that's what "analyse" means.
- At 3 marks, 3 clear connected points in 2–3 sentences each is ideal.

Q6. deep thorough-understanding § Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka

[3]

Sri Lanka is a democracy where the Sinhala-speaking community forms a clear majority. A student argues: 'In a democracy, the majority should have the right to make decisions for the whole country — so the Sri Lankan government's policies were perfectly democratic.' Do you agree? Justify your answer using the concept of majoritarianism.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

No, I do not fully agree with the student's argument.

While Sri Lanka is a democracy, the government's policies were an example of **majoritarianism** — the belief that the majority community can rule in any way it wishes, disregarding the needs of the minority. The Sri Lankan government recognised only Sinhala as the official language (1956), gave preferential treatment to Sinhala applicants in jobs and universities, and promoted Buddhism through the constitution. These measures alienated the Tamil minority, led to civil war, and caused immense suffering.

Democracy is not simply majority rule. Rule by majority must not become permanent domination based on religion, race, or language. True democracy requires the majority to work with the minority so that every citizen has a chance of being in the majority. Sri Lanka's policies violated this principle, making them undemocratic in spirit.

Source: Chapter 1 (Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka); Chapter 5 (Accommodation of social diversity)

Explanation

- Examiners want you to **define majoritarianism**, **cite the Sri Lankan examples** (Sinhala Official Language Act, job preference, Buddhism clause), and **explain why this is undemocratic** (alienation, civil war, minority rights denied).
- The key conceptual point from Chapter 5 is: majority rule ≠ rule by majority *community*; every citizen must have a chance to be in the majority. State this explicitly.
- Don't just narrate the Sri Lanka story — you must **evaluate** it using the concept of majoritarianism. That earns the full 3 marks.

Q7. medium thorough-understanding § Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka

[1]

The Sri Lankan Tamils' demands escalated from autonomy and language recognition in the 1950s to a call for a separate state by the 1980s. What does this escalation reveal about the relationship between power-sharing and national unity?

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

When the majority community ignores minority rights and denies power-sharing, it creates alienation, escalating demands from autonomy to separatism, ultimately destroying national unity.

Explanation

The examiner wants you to link the **cause** (majoritarian policies denying power-sharing) to the **effect** (escalation to separatism and civil war). Key phrase to include: "alienation" — the textbook uses this word directly. Don't write a paragraph; one sharp causal sentence is enough for 1 mark.

Q8. medium thorough-understanding § Accommodation in Belgium [3]

In Belgium's power-sharing arrangement, why was it necessary to give the French-speaking minority equal representation in the Brussels government, even though the Dutch-speaking community is the majority nationwide?

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Brussels presented a special problem: 80% of its population is French-speaking, yet the Dutch-speaking community forms the majority nationwide. If equal representation were not given to French-speakers in Brussels, the Dutch majority could dominate the capital's government, worsening ethnic tensions.

To prevent this, Belgian leaders worked out a **reciprocal arrangement**: French-speaking people accepted equal representation in Brussels, while the Dutch-speaking community accepted equal representation in the Central Government. This mutual compromise ensured no single community could make decisions unilaterally, thereby avoiding civic strife and a possible partition of the country.

Source: Power Sharing, Chapter 1 – Accommodation in Belgium

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to explain **why Brussels was a "special problem"** (majority–minority reversal in the capital) and the **logic of reciprocal concession**.
- Key phrase to use: *"no single community can make decisions unilaterally"* – it directly comes from the textbook and scores marks.
- Avoid writing about Sri Lanka here; the question is specifically about Belgium's Brussels arrangement.
- 3 marks = roughly 3 distinct points: (1) Brussels' unique demographic situation, (2) the risk of domination, (3) the reciprocal deal that made it acceptable to both sides.

Q9. medium thorough-understanding § Accommodation in Belgium

[3]

Belgium introduced a 'community government' as a unique tier of power-sharing that is not based on territory but on linguistic identity. What kinds of issues does such a government handle, and why are these issues better decided at this level rather than by the central or regional governments? Explain with examples.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The community government in Belgium is elected by people belonging to one language community — Dutch, French, or German-speaking — regardless of where they live. It handles **cultural, educational, and language-related issues**.

These issues are better decided at this level because they are specific to a linguistic community, not a geographic territory. For example, decisions about the medium of instruction or cultural practices concern Dutch-speakers across different regions equally. If the central or regional government decided these matters, one linguistic community could dominate another — as tensions between Dutch and French-speaking Belgians had already shown. The community government ensures each group controls matters closest to its identity, preventing unilateral decisions and reducing conflict.

Source: Chapter 1 (Power Sharing), Belgian Model section

Explanation

- Examiners expect: (1) definition/nature of community government, (2) specific issues it handles (cultural, educational, language), and (3) **why** this level is appropriate — the key reasoning point.
- Quote or closely paraphrase the textbook: "*elected by people belonging to one language community... no matter where they live.*"
- Give a concrete example (e.g., medium of instruction) to show application — this earns the reasoning mark.
- Avoid vague phrases like "better representation"; be specific about linguistic identity and preventing majority domination.

Q10. deep thorough-understanding § Accommodation in Belgium

[5]

In Belgium, the Dutch-speaking community is the majority nationally, yet the constitution ensures equal numbers of Dutch and French-speaking ministers in the central government. A student argues: 'This is undemocratic because it gives the smaller community disproportionate power.' Do you agree? Justify your answer using the principles of power-sharing.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

No, I do not agree with the student's argument. The Belgian arrangement is democratic and is justified by the principles of power-sharing.

Why it is democratic:

- Power-sharing does not mean equal shares for numerically equal groups; it means ensuring **no single community can make decisions unilaterally**.
- Belgium's constitution guarantees equal Dutch and French-speaking ministers so that the French-speaking minority is not dominated by the numerical majority. This prevents majoritarianism.
- Special laws require support of majority members from **each** linguistic group, protecting all communities.
- This arrangement avoided civic strife and a possible partition of the country, proving it strengthened rather than weakened Belgium.

Key principle: True democracy is not simply rule by numerical majority. The majority must work with the minority so that government represents the general will. Giving a minority a fair voice is accommodation, not undemocratic privilege.

Source: *Democratic Politics – I, Chapter 1 (Accommodation in Belgium)*

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to **disagree** with the student and defend power-sharing using the textbook's arguments.
- Key points to hit: (1) no unilateral decisions, (2) majoritarianism is anti-democratic, (3) the outcome — unity and no civil war — validates the model.
- Don't just define power-sharing; **apply** it to the Belgium example directly.
- The phrase "no single community can make decisions unilaterally" is directly from the textbook — use it.

Q11. deep thorough-understanding § Accommodation in Belgium

[5]

Compare the Belgian and Sri Lankan models of power-sharing. What do these two contrasting approaches reveal about the relationship between political accommodation of diversity and long-term national unity? Which model, in your view, offers a better lesson for a diverse democracy, and why?

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Belgian Model: Belgium amended its constitution four times (1970–1993) to accommodate its Dutch, French, and German-speaking communities. Key features include equal representation of linguistic communities in the central government, devolution of powers to regional state governments (not subordinate to the centre), equal representation in Brussels, and separate "community governments" for cultural and educational matters. This model is proactive and power-sharing is constitutionally guaranteed.

Sri Lankan Model: Sri Lanka adopted a majoritarian approach, where the Sinhala-speaking majority imposed its dominance — making Sinhala the official language and favouring Buddhists — excluding Tamils from power. This led to prolonged civil strife and weakened national unity.

Lesson: Belgium shows that respecting diversity through accommodation prevents conflict, while Sri Lanka shows that majority dominance destroys unity. For a diverse democracy, the Belgian model offers a better lesson — constitutionally guaranteed power-sharing builds trust, prevents division, and keeps democracy truly inclusive for all communities.

Source: Chapter 1 (Power Sharing), Chapter 5 (Outcomes of Democracy)

Explanation

- Examiners expect a **direct comparison** followed by a **conclusion with justification** — not just description.
- Key terms to use: *majoritarian, power-sharing, accommodation, constitutional guarantee, community government*.
- The opinion question ("which model is better") requires a **reasoned stance** — state it clearly. Don't be vague.
- Cite both Belgium's success and Sri Lanka's failure as evidence for your conclusion.

Q12. medium thorough-understanding § Why power sharing is desirable?

[3]

A country's ruling majority community argues: 'We won the election fairly, so we have the right to govern entirely on our own terms.' Using the concept of majoritarianism, explain why this argument is flawed and what long-term danger it poses to the country.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The argument is flawed because winning an election gives the majority the right to govern, **not** the right to ignore or override minority groups. This is called **majoritarianism** – when the majority community uses state power to impose its will on minorities, disregarding their interests and identity.

Why it is flawed: A democratic government must represent the general view of all citizens, not just the majority. Rule by majority should mean different groups forming the majority on different issues – not one permanent community dominating all others.

Long-term danger: Imposing the will of the majority community may seem attractive in the short run, but in the long run it **undermines the unity of the nation**. It generates conflict, resentment, and political instability, ultimately harming even the majority community.

Source: Chapter 1 – *Why power sharing is desirable*; Chapter 5 – *Accommodation of social diversity*

Explanation

- The key concept to name is **majoritarianism** – examiners expect the term used correctly.
- Two distinct points are needed for 3 marks: (1) why the argument is logically/democratically wrong, and (2) the specific long-term danger (national unity, instability). Both are directly from the textbook.
- The Sri Lanka example can be added if space allows, but is not essential here.
- Avoid writing a general essay on democracy; stay focused on the flaw and the danger.

Q13. medium thorough-understanding § Why power sharing is desirable?

[3]

Power sharing is described as the 'very spirit of democracy.' Do you agree? Justify your answer by distinguishing between the moral and prudential reasons for power sharing.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Yes, I agree that power sharing is the 'very spirit of democracy.' Two sets of reasons justify power sharing:

Prudential Reason: Power sharing reduces conflict between social groups and ensures political stability. Imposing majority will may seem attractive in the short run, but undermines national unity. For example, Sri Lanka's refusal to share power led to civil conflict.

Moral Reason: Power sharing is intrinsically valuable. People have a right to be consulted on how they are governed. A legitimate government is one where citizens participate and acquire a stake in the system. Indian federalism reflects this principle.

Thus, prudential reasons focus on *better outcomes*, while moral reasons stress the *act of sharing* as valuable in itself.

Source: Chapter 1 — Power Sharing, 'Why Power Sharing is Desirable?'

Explanation

- Examiners look for: (1) a clear 'Yes I agree' stance, (2) one prudential reason with example, (3) one moral reason with example, and (4) a clear distinction between the two.
- Key distinction: **Prudential = outcome-based** (avoids conflict/instability); **Moral = value-based** (right of people to participate).
- Sri Lanka and/or Belgium are the standard textbook examples — use at least one.
- Don't write a long essay; tight paragraphs with the distinction clearly stated earn full marks.

Q14. deep thorough-understanding § Why power sharing is desirable?

[5]

Two students debate power sharing:

Riya says: 'A country should share power only when there is a real risk of ethnic or communal conflict. Otherwise, it just slows things down.'

Arjun says: 'Even a completely peaceful and homogeneous society needs power sharing.'

Whose position is better supported, and why? Use both the prudential and moral reasons for power sharing in your answer.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Arjun's position is better supported.

Prudential Reason (against Riya): Power sharing is not only a crisis-management tool. As the textbook states, "imposing the will of the majority community over others may look like an attractive option in the short run, but in the long run it undermines the unity of the nation." Even a peaceful society can descend into conflict if power is concentrated — Sri Lanka is proof that ignoring minority interests eventually led to civil war. Power sharing prevents such instability before it begins, making it prudent for *every* society, not just conflicted ones.

Moral Reason (against Riya): Power sharing is "the very spirit of democracy." People have a right to be consulted on how they are governed. A legitimate government is one where citizens participate and acquire a stake in the system. This right does not depend on the existence of conflict — it exists in all democracies, homogeneous or not.

Therefore, like Ouseph's conclusion in the textbook, **every society needs power sharing**, regardless of diversity or conflict.

Source: Chapter 1 — *Why Power Sharing is Desirable?*

Explanation

- The question tests whether you know **both** reasons: **prudential** (practical/outcome-based) and **moral** (rights/principle-based).
- Examiners want you to explicitly use these terms and link them to Riya's and Arjun's positions.
- The textbook passage directly says power sharing is "the very spirit of democracy" — quote or paraphrase this for the moral reason.
- Riya's view matches Thomman's (wrong) conclusion in the textbook exercise; Arjun's matches Ouseph's (correct) — you can reference this to show examiner you've connected the dots.
- Do **not** just list the reasons — show *why* they refute Riya and support Arjun.

Q15. medium thorough-understanding § Why power sharing is desirable?

[1]

Imposing the will of the majority may seem beneficial in the short run, but can harm the majority itself in the long run. Which of the following best explains this idea?

- (A) The majority community loses its cultural identity when it shares power with minorities.
 - (B) Tyranny of the majority creates political instability and conflict that ultimately damages the entire nation, including the majority.
 - (C) The majority loses electoral advantage once minorities are given equal representation.
 - (D) Sharing power forces the majority to adopt the language and customs of minority groups.
- A The majority community loses its cultural identity when it shares power with minorities.
B Tyranny of the majority creates political instability and conflict that ultimately damages the entire nation, including the majority.
C The majority loses electoral advantage once minorities are given equal representation.
D Sharing power forces the majority to adopt the language and customs of minority groups.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(B) Tyranny of the majority creates political instability and conflict that ultimately damages the entire nation, including the majority.

Source: *Why power sharing is desirable?*, Chapter 1

Explanation

The passage directly states: "*Imposing the will of majority community over others may look like an attractive option in the short run, but in the long run it undermines the unity of the nation*" and "*Tyranny of the majority is not just oppressive for the minority; it often affects majority adversely as well.*" Options A, C, and D are not supported by the text and introduce incorrect ideas about cultural loss or electoral disadvantage.

Q16. medium thorough-understanding § Khalil's dilemma

[3]

Lebanon distributes its top government posts permanently among its major religious communities. Critically examine this power-sharing arrangement: does permanently fixing offices by religion strengthen or weaken democratic principles? Support your answer with a reasoned argument.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Lebanon's system of permanently fixing top government posts by religion **weakens democratic principles**, though it was designed to ensure peace.

Arguments against:

- It violates the democratic principle of equal opportunity — a capable person like Khalil cannot become President regardless of merit or public support.
- Permanently fixing offices by religion institutionalises communalism, making religion the basis of political identity rather than individual choice.
- Since Muslim population is now a clear majority, the arrangement no longer reflects actual representation.

However, elders argue it prevents communal violence by guaranteeing every community a share in power — a short-term compromise for stability.

Overall, permanent religion-based allocation contradicts democracy's core idea that power should be distributed based on citizens' will, not fixed religious identity.

Source: Chapter 1 (*Khalil's dilemma*); Chapter 3 (*Communalism*)

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to take a clear position and support it with reasoning from the passage.
- Key points: Khalil's argument (merit/elections), the elders' argument (peace), and why permanently fixing offices differs from temporary power-sharing arrangements.
- Mentioning that the Muslim majority is now ignored adds analytical depth and scores well.
- Avoid simply describing the Lebanese system — the question says "critically examine," so evaluation is essential.

Q17. deep thorough-understanding § Khalil's dilemma

[3]

Khalil argues that Lebanon should simply hold open elections where anyone, regardless of religion, can become president. His elders, who lived through civil war, disagree. Whose position is better supported by the prudential reasoning for power sharing discussed in this chapter? Justify your answer.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The elders' position is better supported by prudential reasoning for power sharing.

Prudential reasoning means avoiding outcomes that are harmful, not just doing what is morally right. Lebanon experienced a devastating civil war due to inter-community conflict. The power-sharing arrangement — fixing top posts for different religious communities — ensures no single community dominates, preventing renewed violence.

Khalil's open-election system risks permanent majority rule by one community, which the textbook warns against: "rule by majority must not become rule by majority community." The elders' system guarantees every community a stake in government, making it the more prudent choice for maintaining peace.

Source: Chapter 1 (Khalil's Dilemma); Chapter 5 (Accommodation of Social Diversity)

Explanation

- **Prudential vs. moral reasoning:** Examiners expect you to use this distinction. Prudential = practical, harm-avoiding; moral = right/wrong in principle. Khalil uses moral reasoning (fairness); the elders use prudential reasoning (avoiding civil war).
- **Key textbook point:** Majority rule must not become permanent dominance by one religious/ethnic group — cite this directly.
- **Lebanon context:** The civil war and the post-war power-sharing pact are the factual basis of your answer.
- Don't just describe the system — explicitly state *why* it qualifies as prudential reasoning.

Q18. medium thorough-understanding § Khalil's dilemma

[1]

The Muslim community in Lebanon has grown into a clear majority, yet the original power-sharing pact giving equal representation to Christians remains largely intact. Which of the following best explains why this is consistent with the spirit of power sharing in a democracy?

- (A) Majority communities are legally bound by international law to share power with minorities.
- (B) Maintaining the agreement prevents renewed conflict and ensures the stability that benefits all communities, including the majority.
- (C) In a democracy, the majority community always has less political power than the minority.
- (D) Power sharing is a temporary arrangement that applies only until one community becomes a clear majority.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:16 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(B) Maintaining the agreement prevents renewed conflict and ensures the stability that benefits all communities, including the majority.

Explanation

The Lebanon passage states that "elders who have seen the bloodshed of the civil war" consider the power-sharing pact "the best guarantee for peace." Power sharing is about prudent management of social diversity to prevent conflict, not just majority rule.

Q19. deep thorough-understanding § Khalil's dilemma

[5]

Lebanon's power-sharing arrangement permanently assigns key government offices to specific religious communities, even as the population balance between those communities has shifted over time. Belgium, on the other hand, uses a negotiated federal structure with constitutionally defined representation. Compare these two approaches to power sharing, discussing how each deals with changing demographic realities and the long-term challenges each model may face in sustaining inter-community harmony.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Lebanon vs Belgium: Two Models of Power Sharing

Lebanon uses a **confessional system** where top government posts are permanently assigned by religion — e.g., the President must be Maronite Christian, the Prime Minister Sunni Muslim. This arrangement was based on the population census of 1932. As demographic balances have shifted over decades, this rigid formula has become increasingly unrepresentative, creating frustration among communities whose numbers have grown but whose political representation remains frozen.

Belgium, by contrast, negotiated a **flexible federal model** through four constitutional amendments (1970–1993). Power is shared through equal ministerial representation, constitutionally guaranteed regional autonomy for Flemish and Walloon governments, and separate community governments for cultural/educational matters. No single community can decide unilaterally.

Long-term challenges: Lebanon's static model risks irrelevance and conflict as demographics change. Belgium's model, while complex, is adaptable but risks administrative inefficiency. Belgium demonstrates that negotiated, constitution-backed power sharing sustains harmony better than permanent, birth-based allocation.

Source: *Belgium and Sri Lanka, Chapter 1; What is Federalism?, Chapter 2*

Explanation

- The question is a **comparison question** — examiners expect you to explicitly contrast both models, not just describe them separately.
- The key evaluative point is **flexibility vs rigidity**: Belgium's model can evolve through constitutional negotiation; Lebanon's cannot easily adapt to demographic change.
- Mention the **four amendments** for Belgium — it shows you know the text and signals analytical depth.
- Always end with a **conclusion/judgement** line; examiners award the final mark for that synthesis.
- Lebanon is *not* in the textbook passages provided, so keep those points brief and logical; ground Belgium answers firmly in the source text.

Q20. medium thorough-understanding § Forms of power-sharing

[3]

In a democracy, the legislature makes laws, but judges can strike down laws that violate the constitution, even though judges are appointed by the executive. Which principle of power-sharing does this illustrate, and why is it necessary in a democracy?

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

This illustrates the **horizontal distribution of power** (separation of powers and checks and balances) among different organs of government — the legislature, executive, and judiciary.

In this arrangement, each organ operates at the same level but exercises different powers, ensuring no single organ has unlimited authority. Although judges are appointed by the executive, they can strike down unconstitutional laws made by the legislature. This system of **checks and balances** prevents arbitrariness, protects citizens' rights, and ensures that power is not misused by any one organ.

Source: Chapter 1, Forms of power-sharing

Explanation

- **Key term to use:** "Horizontal distribution of power" and "checks and balances" — examiners specifically look for these.
- The question has two parts: *name the principle + why it is necessary*. Address both clearly.
- The necessity angle should mention: prevents unlimited/arbitrary power, protects constitutional rights, ensures accountability.
- Avoid writing about federalism (vertical division) — that is a different form.

Q21. straightforward thorough-understanding § Forms of power-sharing

[1]

[mcq] In Belgium, a government body has jurisdiction over cultural and educational matters for people of a particular language community, regardless of where they reside in the country. This arrangement is best described as — (A) Federal division of power between central and state governments (B) Horizontal distribution of power among different organs of government (C) Power-sharing among different social groups through community government (D) Power-sharing among political parties through coalition government

- A Power shared among different organs of government
- B Power shared among governments at different levels (federal division)
- C Power shared among different social groups
- D Power shared among political parties through a coalition

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(C) Power-sharing among different social groups through community government.

The community government in Belgium is elected by people of a particular language community regardless of where they live, and handles cultural and educational matters — exactly matching option C.

Source: Accommodation in Belgium, Chapter 1

Explanation

The key phrase is "regardless of where they reside" — this rules out federal/state division (which is territory-based). The passage explicitly states the 'community government' is elected by language communities and handles cultural and educational issues. This is the textbook definition of power-sharing among social groups, not among organs, levels, or political parties.

Q22. medium thorough-understanding § Forms of power-sharing

[3]

India has a system of reserved constituencies for weaker sections and women in legislatures. How does this arrangement relate to the broader purpose of power-sharing in a democracy?

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Reserved constituencies are a form of **power-sharing** that ensures disadvantaged groups — Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, OBCs, and women — get adequate representation in decision-making bodies.

In a democracy, power-sharing means distributing power among different sections of society, not just the majority. When weaker sections and women are systematically excluded from public life due to social inequalities, reservation corrects this imbalance. For example, one-third of seats in Panchayati Raj bodies are reserved for women, resulting in over 10 lakh elected women representatives. This ensures their issues receive political attention and gives them a direct voice in governance — fulfilling the democratic principle that those affected by decisions should participate in making them.

Source: Chapter 3 (Gender and Politics — Women's Political Representation); Chapter 2 (Decentralisation in India)

Explanation

- The examiner expects you to **link reservation to the concept of power-sharing**, not just describe it.
- Key points: social inequalities prevent fair participation → reservation as a corrective mechanism → connects to broader democratic principle of inclusive governance.
- Mention the **Panchayati Raj example** (one-third reservation) as it is directly from the textbook and shows the idea in practice.
- Avoid writing only about gender; you may briefly mention SC/ST/OBC reservation too, as the question says "weaker sections and women."
- Do not exceed ~90 words in the actual exam answer.

Q23. deep thorough-understanding § Forms of power-sharing

[3]

A student argues: 'Coalition governments are unstable and inefficient, so they weaken democracy.' Using your understanding of how political parties and alliances share power, explain why this view is incomplete.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The student's view is **incomplete** because coalition governments, despite their challenges, actually strengthen democracy in important ways.

Power sharing among political parties ensures that **power does not remain in one hand**. When parties form alliances and coalition governments, diverse social groups and ideologies get representation, reducing the risk of majority tyranny and social conflict.

As the textbook notes, power sharing is the **very spirit of democracy** — people have a right to be consulted on how they are governed. A coalition may slow decision-making, but it ensures more voices are heard, making governance more legitimate and inclusive.

Thus, while coalitions can be unstable, they reflect genuine democratic representation, which is more valuable than the efficiency of concentrated power.

Source: Democratic Politics, Chapter 1 (Forms of Power Sharing, Why Power Sharing is Desirable); Chapter 4 (Political Parties)

Explanation

What examiners look for (3 marks):

- One point acknowledging the student's concern (coalitions can be slow/unstable) — shows balance
- Two clear reasons why the view is incomplete, linked to power-sharing concepts: prevents concentration of power + fulfils democratic spirit
- Use textbook terms: "coalition government," "power sharing," "tyranny of majority," "prudential/moral reasons" — at least 2 of these

Key trap to avoid: Don't just list coalition drawbacks. The question asks you to *refute* the argument using power-sharing principles. Always connect back to why sharing power matters in a democracy.

Q24. medium thorough-understanding § Forms of power-sharing

[3]

[short_answer] Power-sharing is sometimes justified on prudential grounds and sometimes on moral grounds. Using the argument that 'concentrating power leads to conflict and instability,' explain which justification this represents and how it supports the case for power-sharing in a democracy.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The argument that "concentrating power leads to conflict and instability" represents a **prudential justification** for power-sharing.

Prudential reasons are based on careful calculation of gains and losses, focusing on outcomes rather than principles. When power is concentrated in one group, it often results in the tyranny of the majority, social conflict, and political instability. As seen in Sri Lanka, imposing Sinhala dominance over Tamils led to prolonged civil conflict. Power-sharing prevents such outcomes by giving all social groups a stake in governance, thereby ensuring political stability and national unity.

Source: *Democratic Politics II, Chapter 1 – Why power sharing is desirable?*

Explanation

- **Key distinction to remember:** Prudential = outcome-based (stability, avoiding conflict); Moral = principle-based (right to participate). Examiners want you to correctly identify the type and explain *why* it fits.
- Always link the argument to a real example (Sri Lanka works perfectly here as the textbook uses it).
- Don't confuse the two: this argument is prudential because it talks about *consequences* (conflict, instability), not about rights or values.

Q25. medium thorough-understanding § Forms of power-sharing

[2]

Pressure groups representing farmers or industrialists are not elected to office, yet they are considered part of power-sharing arrangements in a democracy. Explain how this is possible.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Pressure groups like those of farmers or industrialists are part of the fourth form of power sharing. They influence governmental decisions either by **participating in governmental committees** or by **bringing pressure on the decision-making process**. Though unelected, they represent key social and economic interests, ensuring that power is not concentrated only with elected representatives.

Source: *Forms of power-sharing, Chapter 1*

Explanation

The examiner expects you to identify this as the **4th type of power sharing** (political parties, pressure groups, movements). Two key points are needed for 2 marks: (1) pressure groups are interest groups representing sections like farmers/industrialists, and (2) they share power by influencing decisions or sitting on governmental committees — not by winning elections. Quoting or closely paraphrasing the textbook line earns full marks.

Q26. deep thorough-understanding § Forms of power-sharing

[5]

Sri Lanka's majoritarian policies denied provincial autonomy to Tamil-dominated regions, while Belgium transferred significant powers to its regional State Governments. Using these two cases, analyse how the federal division of power can either prevent or contribute to national disintegration.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Sri Lanka — Federal division leads to disintegration:

Sri Lanka's government adopted majoritarian measures — making Sinhala the only official language (1956), preferential policies for Sinhalese in jobs and universities, and state protection of Buddhism. Tamil demands for **regional autonomy** to Tamil-dominated provinces were repeatedly denied. This alienation deepened distrust, ultimately leading to a civil war that lasted decades and caused massive social and economic damage.

Belgium — Federal division prevents disintegration:

Belgium addressed regional diversity by shifting from a unitary to a **federal** system in 1993. Powers were constitutionally granted to regional governments, making them independent of the central government. This gave linguistic and regional communities guaranteed autonomy, reducing conflict.

Conclusion:

Federalism prevents disintegration when power is genuinely shared and constitutionally protected. Refusing regional autonomy, as in Sri Lanka, fuels separatism and national disintegration.

Source: *Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka, Ch. 1; What is Federalism?, Ch. 2*

Explanation

- **Two cases must be explicitly contrasted** — examiners award marks for both Sri Lanka (negative example) and Belgium (positive example).
- Mention key facts: Sinhala-only Act 1956, denial of provincial autonomy (Sri Lanka); constitutional powers to regional governments 1993 (Belgium).
- The conclusion linking federal power-sharing to national unity/disintegration earns the final mark.
- Avoid vague statements — use textbook terms like *majoritarian*, *regional autonomy*, *constitutional powers*, *unitary vs. federal*.

Q27. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

Belgium and Sri Lanka were both democracies facing ethnic tensions, yet their outcomes were starkly different. What was the fundamental difference in the approach their leaders took, and how did that difference determine whether the country moved toward stability or civil war?

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Belgium and Sri Lanka were both multi-ethnic democracies, but their leaders chose opposite approaches to handle ethnic tensions.

Belgium's approach — Accommodation:

Belgian leaders acknowledged regional and cultural differences. They amended their constitution four times (1970–1993) to share power equally. Dutch and French-speaking ministers were given equal representation in the central government; state governments were given independent constitutional powers; Brussels had equal representation for both communities; and a separate "community government" handled cultural and language matters. No community could make decisions unilaterally.

Sri Lanka's approach — Majoritarianism:

Sri Lankan leaders pursued Sinhala dominance. They declared Sinhala the only official language (1956), gave preference to Sinhala applicants in jobs and universities, and promoted Buddhism constitutionally — completely ignoring Tamil interests.

Outcome:

Belgium's power-sharing prevented civic strife and the country remained united. Sri Lanka's majority-rule policy created alienation among Tamils, leading to demands for a separate Tamil Eelam and eventually a brutal civil war that lasted decades.

Key lesson: Majority rule must not become majority *community* rule. Sharing power strengthens, not weakens, national unity.

Source: Chapter 1 — Power Sharing; Chapter 2 — Federalism; Chapter 5 — Outcomes of Democracy

Explanation

Examiners look for:

- A clear **contrast** between the two countries' approaches (not just description of each separately).
- Specific facts: equal ministerial representation, constitutional amendments, Sinhala Language Act 1956, preferential policies, civil war.
- The **reason** why the approach led to its outcome — this is what the question asks for.
- The concept of **majoritarianism vs. accommodation** should be named or clearly implied.
- Avoid padding; use tight points or short paragraphs as done above.

Q28. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

The Belgian constitution guarantees equal representation of Dutch and French-speaking ministers in the central government, equal representation of both communities in Brussels, and a separate 'community government' for cultural matters. Identify which of the four forms of power-sharing each of these three arrangements represents, and justify your answer briefly.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

- 1. Equal representation of Dutch and French ministers in the central government** → This is **power sharing among different organs/levels of the same government** — specifically, it is **horizontal distribution** ensuring no single community decides unilaterally at the central level (sharing between social/linguistic communities within one tier of government).
- 1. Equal representation of both communities in Brussels** → This represents **power sharing among different social groups** (linguistic communities). Both Dutch and French-speaking communities share power equally in the Brussels government, ensuring minority community representation.
- 1. Separate 'community government' for cultural matters** → This represents **power sharing among governments at different levels** (a third tier). The community government is a distinct tier elected by language communities, handling cultural, educational and language issues independently.

Source: *Power Sharing*, Chapter 1, Belgian Model section.

Explanation

The four forms of power-sharing are: (i) among organs of government (horizontal), (ii) among levels of government (federal/vertical), (iii) among social groups, and (iv) among political parties. Examiners expect you to **name the form** and **justify with one reason** for each arrangement. The trickiest is arrangement 3 — the community government is a *separate third tier*, making it vertical/federal-style power sharing. Don't confuse it with social-group sharing, even though it's community-based; the key is it's a *separate government* with its own jurisdiction.

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

[3]

Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka began as a series of government policies but ended in a civil war. Trace this process, explaining why each step made the next one more likely.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

In 1948, Sri Lanka's Sinhala-majority government began asserting dominance through majoritarian policies. In 1956, Sinhala was declared the **only official language**, sidelining Tamil-speaking citizens. Next, preferential policies favoured Sinhalese in university admissions and government jobs, and the constitution directed the state to protect Buddhism.

These successive steps deepened Tamil alienation — each exclusion made the next protest more intense. Tamil demands for equal rights and regional autonomy were repeatedly denied, pushing communities from mistrust to hostility. By the 1980s, Tamil groups demanded a separate state — **Tamil Eelam** — and the conflict escalated into a **civil war**, causing mass casualties and displacement until 2009.

Source: *Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka, Chapter 1*

Explanation

Examiners want a **cause-and-effect chain**, not just a list of events. The key steps are: (1) Official Language Act 1956 → (2) preferential policies in jobs/education → (3) constitutional protection of Buddhism → (4) Tamil alienation and demand for autonomy → (5) denial of autonomy → (6) demand for separate Eelam → (7) civil war. Show how each denial escalated the next response. Bold key terms (Tamil Eelam, civil war) to signal precise knowledge.

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

[5]

A student argues: 'Prudential reasons for power sharing are more practical and therefore more important than moral reasons.' Do you agree? Use examples from Belgium and Sri Lanka to support your answer.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

I **disagree** with the student's argument. Both prudential and moral reasons are equally important for power sharing.

Prudential reasons focus on practical outcomes. In Sri Lanka, the Sinhala-majority government made Sinhala the only official language, denying Tamils equal opportunities in education and jobs. This majority imposition led to prolonged civil conflict, proving that ignoring power sharing causes political instability and violence. Belgium, by contrast, adopted a federal structure and community governments to prevent ethnic conflict — a prudentially sound decision that kept the country united.

Moral reasons state that power sharing is the very spirit of democracy. People have a right to be consulted on how they are governed. In Belgium, French and Dutch communities were given equal representation — not just for stability, but because it was the right thing to do.

Thus, prudential reasons ensure stability, while moral reasons ensure legitimacy and justice. One without the other is incomplete; both are equally necessary.

Source: "Why power sharing is desirable?", Chapter 1

Explanation

- Examiners expect you to **disagree** with the student and defend **both** reasons equally.
- Clearly define/contrast prudential (practical benefit) vs moral (democratic right) reasons.
- Use **Belgium** and **Sri Lanka** as contrasting examples — Sri Lanka shows the *cost* of not sharing power; Belgium shows the *benefit*.
- The textbook explicitly says: "prudential reasons stress better outcomes; moral reasons emphasise the very act of power sharing as valuable" — both matter.
- Don't just list facts; link examples to the type of reason they illustrate.

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

[1]

Which of the following correctly pairs a Sri Lankan government measure with the specific right or interest of Tamil citizens that it violated?

- (A) Making Sinhala the only official language — denied Tamils equal opportunity in government jobs and public life
- (B) Preferential policies for Sinhala university applicants — denied Tamils equal opportunity in higher education
- (C) Constitutional protection of Buddhism — denied official recognition to the religious identity of Tamil communities
- (D) Refusing regional autonomy to Tamil-majority areas — denied Tamils a share in political self-governance

[Correct answer: A]

- A Making Sinhala the only official language — denied equal political rights
- B Preferential policies for Sinhala applicants — denied equal opportunity in jobs and education
- C Constitutional protection of Buddhism — recognised Tamil as a minority religion
- D Denying regional autonomy — forced Tamils to seek union with India

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

(A) Making Sinhala the only official language denied Tamils equal political rights, opportunities in government jobs, and recognition of their language in public life.

Explanation

The passage states Tamils felt government policies "denied them equal political rights" and "discriminated against them in getting jobs." Option A correctly links the 1956 Official Language Act to denial of equal political rights. The other options misstate the effects: B conflates jobs with education policy; C and D are factually wrong per the passage.

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

[3]

The chapter argues that 'tyranny of the majority is not just oppressive for the minority; it often affects the majority adversely as well.' Using Sri Lanka as evidence, explain what this statement means.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

The statement means that when a majority community imposes its will on minorities, it ultimately harms the whole nation, including the majority itself.

In Sri Lanka, the Sinhala-dominated government made Sinhala the only official language, favoured Sinhalese in jobs and universities, and gave Buddhism a special status. This alienated Sri Lankan Tamils, leading to demands for a separate state (Tamil Eelam) and eventually a violent civil war. As a result, thousands from **both** communities were killed, families lost their livelihoods, and the social, cultural and economic life of the entire country suffered a terrible setback — harming the Sinhala majority as much as the Tamil minority.

Source: *Power Sharing, Chapter 1*

Explanation

- The examiner wants you to **link the cause (majoritarianism) → effect on minority → blowback on majority** in a logical chain.
- Key evidence to use: the 1956 language act, preferential policies, civil war consequences (deaths, refugees, economic damage to the whole country).
- The phrase "tyranny of the majority" implies the majority is the agent of oppression, but the civil war's devastation shows it eventually destroyed the majority's own peace and prosperity — that's the point you must make explicit.
- Don't just describe Sri Lanka's policies; you must **explain** how the majority *also* suffered.

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

[2]

Power sharing between the legislature, executive, and judiciary is described as 'horizontal', while power sharing between the central government, state governments, and local bodies is described as 'vertical'. What essential feature of each arrangement does its metaphor capture? Explain with examples from India.

◆ Power-sharing

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 13:17 · grounding rag

Model Answer

Horizontal distribution captures that the legislature, executive, and judiciary operate **at the same level** — none is above the other. Each can check the others (e.g., in India, courts can review executive actions), ensuring no single organ holds unlimited power.

Vertical distribution captures a **hierarchy of levels** — higher and lower — where power flows downward from Centre to States to local bodies (e.g., Union Government → State Governments → Panchayats/Municipalities in India).

Explanation

The key contrast examiners look for: "horizontal = same level, checks and balances" vs. "vertical = different levels, hierarchy." Always support each with an India-specific example. Avoid padding — one crisp example per arrangement is enough for 2 marks.

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>