

PSIR OPTIONAL · UPSC CSE

EDITION 2026

# PYQ Vault

560 previous-year questions, decoded over 50 days.

**560**

questions

**50**

days

**10**

years of PYQs

**DAY 9**

**Political Ideologies** · 10 questions

Every question carries a **Flow Snapshot** — and a handwritten model answer on the channel. No PYQ will be unfamiliar.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2017 · 10 marks

## Comment on the Eco-Feminism in about 150 words

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Define eco-feminism as the perspective linking women's subordination to ecological degradation through a shared patriarchal logic.

**R2** Open with **Françoise d'Eaubonne** coining the term to name a common root of feminist and ecological crises.

## Body flow

Shared patriarchal logic — women & nature as objects of control → **Françoise d'Eaubonne** coins the term, names the common root → **Carolyn Merchant** — modern science & capitalism deepen both dominations → **Vandana Shiva** — Global South: industrial patriarchy displaces women → Critique of dualisms — male/female, human/nature, culture/nature → Alternative ethics — nurture, reciprocity, sustainability

## Counter-view

Risk of essentialism — treating women as naturally closer to nature reinforces the very gender stereotype feminism seeks to dismantle.

## Conclusion routes

**R1** Eco-feminism's value lies in exposing the common logic behind two dominations.

**R2** A non-essentialist eco-feminism links gender and ecological justice without naturalising women's role.

Eco-feminism is a political and ecological perspective that connects women's oppression with the degradation of natural environment. Its central argument is that the same patriarchal logic that treats women as objects of control also treats nature as a resource to be exploited. Francoise d'Eaubonne coined the term, identifying this shared logic as the root of both feminist and environmental crises.

Carolyn Merchant traced the historical parallel between the domination of nature and the domination of women, showing how the rise of modern science and capitalism reinforced both. Vandana Shiva extended this critique to the Global South, arguing that industrial patriarchy destroys local ecosystems and displaces women who depend on them for sustenance.

Eco-feminists also attack the dualisms - male/female, human/nature, culture/nature - through which Western thought has organised inequality.

Many strands of eco-feminism emphasise nurture, reciprocity, sustainability and earth-centred ethics as alternatives.

The main criticism is that eco-feminism risks essentialism - the assumption that women are naturally closer to nature reinforces the very gender stereotype that feminism seeks to dismantle.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2017 · 15 marks

Define Socialism. Discuss the salient features of Fabian Socialism.

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Define socialism as social control over the means of production (**Tom Bottomore**), then position Fabianism as one distinctive strategy within it.

**R2** Open with **C.E.M. Joad's** image of socialism as "a hat that has lost its shape," then locate Fabianism as its British gradualist form.

## Body flow

Socialism defined — **Bottomore**: equal access, minimal domination → vs capitalism — market allocation vs equality of outcome → Fabianism — British gradualism (**Fabius Cunctator**, 1884) → **Sidney & Beatrice Webb, Shaw, Wallas, Wells, Besant, Pease, Cole** → constitutional, parliamentary road — not revolution → gradual socialization; the state as instrument of reform → middle-class intellectuals lead the case → nationalization, municipal reform, welfare → Labour Party & welfare state

## Counter-view

Fabianism stayed confined to intellectual circles, lacked mass energy, and set aside the labour theory of value and class conflict Marxists held essential.

## Conclusion routes

**R1** Fabianism's significance is its constitutional, evolutionary route that shaped the welfare state.

**R2** It shows reformist socialism's strength — durable institutions — and its limit — no mass-revolutionary base.

Socialism is a socio-economic doctrine that advocates collective or socio control over the means of production in place of private ownership. Tom Bottomore defined it as a social order that ensures feasible equality of access to economic resources, knowledge and political power with the minimum possible domination of one group over another. Against capitalism's emphasis on market allocation and private accumulation. C.E.M. Joad captured its breadth and ambiguity when he remarked that socialism is "like a hat which has lost its shape because everyone wears it" - a doctrine elastic enough to accommodate many strategies, of which Fabianism is one of the most distinctive.

Fabianism is the British, gradualist form of socialism named after Fabius Cunctator, the Roman general known for patience and strategic delay. Founded in 1884 & associated with Sidney Webb, Beatrice Webb, George Bernard Shaw, Graham Wallas, Herbert George Wells, Annie Besant, Edward R. Pease & G.D.H. Cole, it represented a middle-class, intellectual approach to socialist transformation.

Fabianism rejects violent revolution and class struggle in favour of a constitutional & parliamentary road to socialism. It seeks the gradual socialization of key industries and argues that the state, rather than being dismantled, should be used as the principal instrument of reform. The Fabians supported nationalization of essential sectors, municipal reform, labour regulation & welfare provision - measures that shaped the British Labour Party and the post-war welfare state - without demanding total bureaucratic control over all of social life.

The criticism is that Fabianism remained confined to intellectual circles, lacked mass energy and set aside the labour theory of value and class conflict that Marxists held essential to socialist transformation.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2017 · 20 marks

What do you understand by Multiculturalism? Discuss Bhikhu Parekh's view on Multiculturalism.

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Define multiculturalism as the active recognition and accommodation of cultural diversity — beyond mere tolerance.

**R2** Begin with the limit of universal abstract citizenship — that ignoring difference can itself be unjust — and present multiculturalism as the response.

## Body flow

Multiculturalism vs tolerance, and vs value pluralism → critique of abstract universal citizenship → **Will Kymlicka** — three minority rights: self-government, polyethnic, representation → **Charles Taylor** — politics of recognition → **Bhikhu Parekh**, *Rethinking Multiculturalism* — humans are culturally constituted → non-static view — cultures revise through inter-cultural dialogue → institutions — multicultural education, affirmative action, *operative public values*

## Counter-view

**Susan Moller Okin** — group rights can shield practices harmful to women; **Amartya Sen** — risk of ghettoization that reduces individuals to a single identity.

## Conclusion routes

**R1** Parekh's contribution is a path between assimilation and relativism — recognition plus accountability to shared civic norms.

**R2** Multiculturalism is best read as a framework of dialogue, not a licence for cultural enclosure.

Multiculturalism is the political recognition and accommodation of cultural diversity within a single political community. It goes beyond mere tolerance by demanding that the state actively respect cultural identities rather than absorbing minority cultures into a dominant mainstream. Unlike value pluralism, which deals with competing values within a broadly shared moral universe, multiculturalism addresses the coexistence of distinct cultures with separate practices and claims on public life. Will Kymlicka responded by proposing three categories of minority rights - self government, polyethnic and special representation rights - while Charles Taylor developed the politics of recognition, arguing that equal respect for cultures is both a moral and a political necessity.

Bhikhu Parekh, most systematically in *Rethinking Multiculturalism*, offers a philosophically grounded pluralist defence. His starting point is that human beings are culturally constituted: identity and self-understanding are shaped by the communities into which individuals are born, so dignity cannot be separated from cultural recognition.

From this he draws concrete institutional implications : multi-cultural education to build a shared but non-homogenised public sphere, affirmative action for fair inclusion and a common framework of constitutional and civic values - what he calls operative public values - that provide cohesion without demanding cultural uniformity.

Susan Moller Okin argued that group rights can shield harmful practices against women. Amartya Sen warned against ghettoization that reduces individuals to a single cultural identity. Parekh's contribution lies precisely in navigating between assimilation and relativism : cultures deserve recognition & remain answerable to shared civic norms, making multiculturalism a framework of dialogue rather than a license for cultural enclosure.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2018 · 10 marks

Comment on the "Nothing against the State, nothing over it, nothing beyond it." – Mussolini in 150 words

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Read the maxim as the philosophical core of fascist totalitarianism, reversing the liberal individual–state relationship.

**R2** Open from the interwar crisis that made fascism's total subordination of the individual possible.

## Body flow

Reversal of the liberal premise — the state precedes & absorbs the individual → "nothing against" — no right to opposition; dissent becomes treason → "nothing over" — no rival authority: church, constitution, international law, conscience → "nothing beyond" — abolition of the private sphere → **Giovanni Gentile** — the state as highest ethical reality; the individual has duties, not rights

## Counter-view

**Hannah Arendt** — absolute statism is the engine of totalitarian terror; **Harold Laski** — such a state shields the economic oligarchy while destroying civil liberties.

## Conclusion routes

**R1** The maxim crystallises totalitarianism — the state as an end in itself.

**R2** It endures as a warning: when the state becomes its own justification, the conditions for tyranny are complete.

Mussolini's maxim is the philosophical core of fascist totalitarianism. Emerging from the interwar crisis, fascism rejected the liberal premise that the individual precedes and limits the state. This slogan reverses that relationship entirely.

Each clause carries specific weight. "Nothing against the state" denies the right of opposition - dissent becomes treason. "Nothing over it" removes every competing authority: church, constitution, international law, individual conscience. "Nothing beyond it" erases the private sphere entirely; no domain of life - family, culture, economy - escapes state regulation.

Giovanni Gentile, Italian philosopher, gave this claim theoretical grounding by treating the state as the highest ethical reality in which individual existence finds its only meaning. The individual has duties, not rights.

Critics responded sharply. Hannah Arendt identified this absolute statism as the engine of totalitarian terror. Harold Laski argued that such a state protects economic oligarchy while destroying liberties.

The maxim remains a warning: when the state becomes an end in itself, the conditions for tyranny are complete.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2019 · 15 marks

Distinguish between liberal feminism and radical feminism.

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Frame both as responses to women's subordination that diverge on its origin and its cure.

**R2** Open on the decisive fault-line — legal exclusion versus patriarchy as the root of oppression.

## Body flow

Shared starting point — the subordination of women → Liberal feminism — site is legal inequality & institutional exclusion → equal access; **Wollstonecraft, J.S. Mill, Friedan, Harriet Taylor, Okin** → state as instrument; accepts the public-private distinction → Radical feminism — root is patriarchy as structural male domination → **Millett, Firestone, Dworkin, MacKinnon** → **Carol Hanisch** — "the personal is political"; rejects the public-private divide

## Counter-view

They part on three counts — site (institutions vs patriarchal structure), scope (public sphere vs private life), and method (reform vs structural transformation).

## Conclusion routes

**R1** Liberal feminism seeks inclusion; radical feminism demands dismantling the gendered order that makes exclusion possible.

**R2** Read together, they are complementary — reform secures access, structural critique exposes its limits.

Both liberal feminism and radical feminism respond to the subordination of women, but they disagree fundamentally on where that subordination originates and how it must be ended. This difference in diagnosis produces two very different political programmes.

Liberal feminism locates the problem in legal inequality and institutional exclusion. Working within liberal-democratic structures, it demands equal access to education, employment, voting rights, property rights and anti-discrimination law. Mary Wollstonecraft captured its essential demand when she wrote, "I do not wish women to have power over men, but over themselves." John Stuart Mill extended this by arguing that "the legal subordination of one sex to the other is wrong in itself." Betty Friedan, Harriet Taylor and Susan Moller Okin further developed this tradition. Liberal feminism accepts the public-private distinction, concentrating its energy on expanding women's presence in the public sphere.

For Kate Millett, Shulamith Firestone, Andrea Dworkin and Catharine MacKinnon, the root of women's oppression is not legal exclusion but patriarchy itself - a structural system of male domination that pervades sexuality, reproduction, family life and culture. Carol Hanisch's formulation, "the personal is political," crystallises this difference: radical feminism refuses the public-private distinction altogether. What happens inside the family or the bedroom is not outside politics - it is the core site of women's subjugation.

The two streams thus differ on three decisive counts: the site of oppression (institutions vs. patriarchal structure), the scope of politics (public sphere vs. private life), and the method of change (reform vs. structural transformation).

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2020 · 20 marks

## Explicate the ideological components of Gandhism

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Note that Gandhism is not a systematic doctrine (**Humayun Kabir**: a practical idealist) yet forms a coherent ethical-political whole.

**R2** Anchor the answer in its foundations — *Satya* and *Ahimsa* — from which every component flows.

## Body flow

Ethical base — inseparability of means & ends (truth as goal, non-violence as means) → *Satyagraha* — active soul-force; "hate the sin, not the sinner" → **Dashrath Singh**, *Gandhism: A Quest for New Civilization* — *Sarvodaya*, *Swaraj*, *Ahimsa*, *Swadeshi* → *Swaraj* — self-rule with self-restraint → *Sarvodaya* — from **Ruskin's** *Unto This Last*: progress of all → economic core — *Trusteeship* & *Swadeshi* → critique of modern civilisation — **Tolstoy**, **Thoreau**, **Ruskin** → *Ram Rajya* — decentralised moral self-rule, not theocracy

## Counter-view

Often read as unsystematic and anti-modern — resting on moral conversion and a rejection of industrial civilisation rather than on institutional power.

## Conclusion routes

**R1** Gandhism is a comprehensive ideology where ethics, economics and politics are inseparable.

**R2** Its enduring claim is a moral alternative to the coercive modern state.

Gandhism is not a systematic political philosophy in the conventional sense. As Humayun Kabir noted, Gandhi was a practical idealist deeply aware of mass psychology rather than a theorist building abstract doctrine.

The foundation of Gandhism rests on the inseparability of means and ends. For Gandhi, truth is the goal and non-violence is only legitimate means to reach it. Satyagraha - truth force or soul force - is the political instrument this produces. It is not passive submission; it is active, disciplined resistance grounded in courage and moral conviction. "Hate the sin and not the sinner" captures this distinction: the opponent is not an enemy to be destroyed but a person to be converted.

Dashrath Singh, in *Gandhism: A Quest for New Civilization*, identified *Sarvodaya*, *Swaraj*, *Ahimsa*, social harmony & *Swadeshi* as the core elements. *Swaraj* is not mere transfer of British power to Indian hands; it is self-rule combined with self-restraint. *Sarvodaya*, Gandhi's rendering of John Ruskin's *Unto This Last*, means progress of all, not benefit of a few.

The economic dimension is expressed through Trusteeship and Swadeshi. Wealthy individuals are not absolute owners but trustees of social resources, obligated to use wealth for public good. Swadeshi demands self-reliance and local rootedness, opposing the exploitative logic of colonial markets and industrial homogenisation.

Underlying all this is Gandhi's critique of modern civilisation. He rejected utilitarianism for reducing persons to animal appetite, mechanisation for destroying ecological & human balance & the endless multiplication of wants. He drew on dissenting Western thinkers - Leo Tolstoy, Henry David Thoreau and Ruskin - alongside Indian ethical traditions, allowing him to challenge empire without retreating into cultural isolation.

His political ideal, Ram Rajya was not theocratic; it meant decentralised moral self-rule, minimal coercion and justice for all - an alternative to the modern coercive state.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2022 · 10 marks

Comment on the Cultural Relativism in 150 words.

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Define cultural relativism — practices understood within their own cultural context, not judged by another's standards.

**R2** Open with its epistemological claim (**Herskovits**) that no moral vantage point is truly neutral.

## Body flow

Core claim — understand cultures on their own terms → **Melville Herskovits** — judgments mediated by enculturation; no neutral standpoint → **Franz Boas**, *The Mind of Primitive Man* — rejects racial & civilizational hierarchy → corrective force — dismantles Eurocentric assumptions of progress → overlaps with multiculturalism, communitarian thought, the Asian-values debate

## Counter-view

It slides into moral relativism — if every culture is its own moral universe, there is no ground to criticise female genital cutting, caste discrimination, or repression defended as "cultural."

## Conclusion routes

**R1** Cultural relativism must be balanced with universal norms of dignity, justice and rights.

**R2** Understand cultures on their terms without surrendering cross-cultural moral judgment.

Cultural relativism holds that the ideas and practices of a society must be understood within their own cultural context, not judged by the standards of another. Melville Herskovits grounded this epistemologically: all moral judgements are mediated by an individual's own enculturation, so no external vantage point is truly neutral. Franz Boas, in *The Mind of Primitive Man*, reinforced the position by rejecting racial and civilizational hierarchy and insisting on the historical understanding of cultures on their own terms.

The contribution of cultural relativism lies in its corrective force. It dismantles Eurocentric assumptions of progress and challenges the idea that any single culture represents a universal standard. It also overlaps with multiculturalism, communitarian thought and the Asian values debate in defending collective identity and diversity against homogenising liberal universalism.

Its central weakness, however, is the slide into moral relativism. If each culture is its own moral universe, there is no ground from which to criticise female genital cutting, caste discrimination or political repression when these are defended as culturally rooted. Cultural relativism must therefore be balanced with universal norms of human dignity, justice & rights - understanding cultures on their terms but not surrendering the capacity for cross-cultural moral judgment.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2023 · 20 marks

Fascism displays an ambivalent stance towards parliamentary democracy. Explain.

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Frame fascism through its oppositions, then locate the ambivalence — hostile to parliament in principle, instrumental in practice.

**R2** Open with the puzzle — why an anti-democratic ideology contests elections at all.

## Body flow

Doctrinal contempt — parliament as a "talking shop"; competition as disunity; democracy breeds mediocrity → **Mussolini's** dictum — total, concentrated authority → philosophical basis — **Giovanni Gentile** (organic unity of leader, people, state) & **Othmar Spann** (society as a "super-individual") → instrumental use — **Robert O. Paxton**: root within the system, then seize power (March on Rome; Hitler via Weimar) → hollowing out — parties banned, liberties suspended, elections reduced to theatre → **Harold Laski** — fascism arises when democracy is too costly for the economic oligarchy

## Counter-view

The fascist self-justification — that a mystical leader–nation bond is "more democratic" than elections — is refuted by the practice of terror and one-party rule.

## Conclusion routes

**R1** Fascism is procedurally opportunistic but substantively hostile to parliamentary democracy.

**R2** It uses democracy as a ladder and kicks it away once the summit is reached.

Fascism is an ideology defined more by what it opposes than by what it affirms; anti-liberal, anti-rational, anti-pluralist & anti-socialist. Its relationship with parliamentary democracy captures this contradiction most sharply: it is hostile to parliament in principle but willing to use it instrumentally, making its stance ambivalent rather than straightforwardly rejective.

At the level of doctrine, fascism treats parliamentary democracy with contempt. Parliament is seen as a "talking shop"—slow, compromising and incapable of decisive action. Party competition is read not as healthy pluralism but as national disunity. Democracy, fascists argue, encourages mediocrity by placing governance in the hands of the masses rather than a superior elite. Benito Mussolini's dictum — "Nothing against the State, nothing over it, nothing beyond it." — captures the fascist preference for total, concentrated authority over the distributed, deliberative logic of parliamentary systems.

Giovanni Gentile developed the idea of an organic unity of leader, people & state that made liberal representation unnecessary.

Othmar Spann treated society as a "super-individual", not a sum of atomistic citizens - a view fundamentally incompatible with electoral democracy.

Yet fascism is not simply anti-democratic in practice. This is where the ambivalence becomes decisive. Robert O. Paxton showed that fascist movements first root themselves within the democratic system. Mussolini's march on Rome & Hitler's rise through the Weimar Republic illustrate this exactly. Harold Laski explained this pattern structurally: fascism emerges when political democracy becomes too costly for the economic oligarchy, and it uses democratic entry to preserve private ownership while crushing liberal freedoms.

Fascism is therefore procedurally opportunistic but substantively hostile to parliamentary democracy - using democracy as a ladder & kicking it away once the summit is reached.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2025 · 10 marks

Mention the difference between Italian and German brands of fascism.

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Note the shared interwar origins and common features, then turn to the substantial differences.

**R2** Open on the single sharpest divide — race — and branch out to doctrine, state, and institutions.

## Body flow

Shared base — authoritarianism, aggressive nationalism, anti-liberalism, leader cult → ideological coherence — **John Pollard** (Italy weaker in doctrine), **Umberto Eco** ("a fuzzy totalitarianism") → race — **Andrew Vincent**: Italian rationalism vs Nazi race-centred irrationalism; racial laws late in Italy → the state — **Gentile's** Italy (state as supreme ethical form) vs Nazism (state instrumental to the racial Volk) → institutions — Italy compromised with Church & army vs total Nazi penetration → terror — the Holocaust & extermination camps without Italian equivalent

## Counter-view

For all the differences, both converge as totalitarian, expansionist, leader-centred regimes — the contrast is of degree and emphasis, not of fundamental type.

## Conclusion routes

**R1** The decisive differences are race and the scale of terror.

**R2** Italian fascism was statist and rationalist; Nazism was racial and exterminatory.

Italian fascism & German National Socialism emerged from the same interwar crisis & shared authoritarianism, aggressive nationalism, anti-liberalism and a cult of the leader. Their differences however were substantial.

On ideological coherence, German Nazism arrived at power with a more defined, if internally inconsistent, worldview. Italian fascism, as John Pollard observed, was weaker in doctrine at the point of seizure & Umberto Eco famously described it as "a fuzzy totalitarianism" riddled with contradiction.

The sharpest difference lay in race. Andrew Vincent noted that Italian fascism rested on a more traditional western rationalism, while Nazism was explicitly irrationalist and race-centred.

Anti-Semitism and biological racism were structural to Nazism; Mussolini adopted racial laws only later, largely under German pressure.

On the state, Italian fascism; shaped by philosopher Giovanni Gentile - glorified the state as the supreme ethical form. Nazism treated the state more instrumentally, subordinating it to the racial mission of the Volk.

Institutionally, Italian fascism compromised with the church & the army, leaving space for autonomous bodies. Nazi Germany penetrated society far more thoroughly, destroying such autonomy. Finally, Nazi terror was qualitatively different - the Holocaust and the extermination camps had no true Italian equivalent.

## PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2025 · 15 marks

Explain how the slogan 'the personal is political' addresses the issue of women's oppression and discrimination?

## FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

## Intro routes

**R1** Present the slogan as second-wave feminism's central claim — that the private sphere is constituted by politics.

**R2** Open with the liberal public/private split the slogan was meant to dismantle.

## Body flow

Liberal public/private divide — politics is public; family & sexuality treated as pre-political → **Carol Hanisch** — essay in *Notes from the Second Year* (eds. **Firestone & Koedt**): personal suffering as structural → **Simone de Beauvoir** — woman as the "Other" → locating oppression — domestic violence, unpaid work, control of reproduction, coercive sexuality as patriarchal → **Kate Millett** — sexual politics through personal relationships → the divide itself serves patriarchy — **Susan Moller Okin, Carole Pateman, Nancy Fraser**

## Counter-view

Collapsing the public/private line raises the worry of erasing a protected private sphere — the feminist reply is that "privacy" had long shielded domination.

## Conclusion routes

**R1** The slogan reframed women's lived experience as the basis for political critique and legislative redress.

**R2** Its lasting force is to make the home a legitimate site of justice claims.

The slogan "the personal is political" is one of the defining formulations of second-wave feminism. It dismantles the liberal separation between public life and private life, showing that what happens inside the home is not beyond politics but is, in fact, constituted by it.

Liberal political theory had long treated the public sphere - government, law, elections as the domain of politics, while family, sexuality and domestic life were considered natural, pre-political or merely personal. Feminists exposed this separation as ideological. Carol Hanisch, whose essay gave the slogan its canonical form - published in *Notes from the Second Year: Women's Liberation*, edited by Shulamith Firestone and Anne Koedt - argued that women's personal suffering is not private failure but a product of structural patriarchy. Simone de Beauvoir had laid an early intellectual foundation: "He is the subject, the absolute; she is the Other." The private sphere, so insulated from politics by liberal theory, was precisely this "othering" was reproduced daily.

The slogan addresses women's oppression by naming its location. Radical feminism made this its central argument: the family is a political institution and patriarchal power within it is as real as state power. Thinkers like Kate Millet showed that sexual politics operates through deeply personal relationships not only through law. Because the liberal state refused to enter the private sphere, women's oppression there went unaddressed - legality masked domination.

Feminists argued, through Susan Moller Okin, Carole Pateman and Nancy Fraser that the public-private divide itself served patriarchal interests: it kept women's concerns off the political agenda, made men appear the natural citizens and pushed women into an unpaid invisible domestic role.

The slogan transformed consciousness-raising into a political act. Lived experience, once dismissed as complaint, became the basis of collective critique and demands for legislative redress on domestic violence, reproductive rights & workplace equality.

♦ FORUMIAS ♦

# PSIR OPTIONAL 2026

Programs Starting This Month

FOR UPSC CSE 2026 ASPIRANTS

## O-AWFG Prime 2026

📅 Started · 2 June 2026

● ONGOING

## O-AWFG 2026

📅 Started · 2 June 2026

● ONGOING

## ATS 2026

📅 Started · 7 June 2026

● ONGOING

## OGP Advanced 2026

📅 Starts · 14 June 2026

○ UPCOMING

## OGP Advanced+ 2026

📅 Starts · 14 June 2026

○ UPCOMING

STRUCTURED MENTORSHIP ♦ ADVANCED ANSWER WRITING ♦ TEST SERIES ♦  
PERFORMANCE TRACKING

Enrolment & Mentorship Queries

📞 **93117 40432**

**Amit Pratap Singh** ♦ PSIR Faculty, ForumIAS

♦ FORUMIAS ♦

# PSIR OPTIONAL 2027

Programs Starting This Month

FOR UPSC CSE 2027 ASPIRANTS

## O-AWFG Prime 2027

COHORT 2

● ONGOING

📅 Started · 8 June 2026

## O-AWFG 2027

COHORT 2

● ONGOING

📅 Started · 8 June 2026

## ATS 2027

COHORT 2

○ UPCOMING

📅 Starts · 14 June 2026

BUILD STRONG FOUNDATIONS ♦ MASTER PSIR CONCEPTS ♦  
DEVELOP ANSWER WRITING EARLY

Enrolment & Mentorship Queries

📞 **93117 40432**

**Amit Pratap Singh** ♦ PSIR Faculty, ForumIAS