PSIR OPTIONAL · UPSC CSE

EDITION 2026

PYQ Vault

560	50	10
questions	days	years of PYQs

DAY 23 Planning & Economic Development · 12 questions

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

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION UPSC 2016 · 20 marks

Land reforms have failed in the eradication of rural poverty. Comment.

FLOW SNAPSHOT *– how the answer moves*

Intro routes

R1 land reform = chief instrument of redistributive justice → charge of failure holds, but cause is implementation, not design

R2 four pillars: intermediary abolition + tenancy + ceilings + surplus redistribution → failure real, lies in political will, not the idea

Body flow

zamindari abolition: ~20 mn became owners → but gain stops at the top (**Rudolph & Rudolph**: marginal tenants/labourers left out) → tenancy reform: oral tenancies went underground → ceiling laws: high ceilings, benami, exemptions, litigation → surplus never reaches landless → **Kohli**: state lacked capacity to confront propertied classes

Counter-view

Kerala & West Bengal: strong political movements → redistribution reached the poor (**Varshney**); **Bardhan**: reforms can cut poverty + raise productivity when implemented

Conclusion routes

R1 failure real but partial → of the will to enforce, not of the idea

R2 where political will existed, land reform did dent rural poverty → the gap is one of implementation

Land reform was framed as the chief instrument of redistributive justice in rural India. It led to abolition of intermediaries, tenant protection, ceilings on holdings and surplus land for the landless.

The verdict of failure holds substantially, but its cause lay in implementation and political will, not in the design of reform. Abolition of zamindari removed intermediaries and made roughly 20 million tenants into landowners. But the gain reached only the upper tiers of the village.

Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph argued that "marginal tenants, dwarf holders and agricultural labourers did not benefit from intermediary abolition. Change occurred at the top and near the top of the agrarian pyramid.

The rural poor, in whose name it was framed, were left untouched. The two components meant to reach them fared worst. Tenancy reform collapsed because most tenancies were oral. The surplus land that should have gone to the landless never moved.

Atul Kohli argued that the state lacked the capacity to confront the propertied classes it depended upon. In view of Ashutosh Varshney in Kerala and West Bengal, where strong political movements backed reform, redistribution did reach the poor.

Pranab Bardhan holds that land reforms can reduce poverty and raise agricultural productivity when implemented. The failure is real but partial, it not of the idea, but of the will to enforce it.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION — UPSC 2017 · 10 marks

In the post-liberalization era, Indian politics is moving from ascriptive politics to developmental politics.

FLOW SNAPSHOT *— how the answer moves*

Intro routes

R1 liberalisation brought development to the centre (jobs, growth, FDI, infrastructure, welfare) → shift real but partial

R2 earlier axis = caste / religion / region / birth → post-1991 economic issues now drive competition → movement incomplete

Body flow

developmental turn → ideological dilution + growth agenda accepted → pocket-book voting → leaders judged on performance / inflation / jobs / welfare → turnout up, gender gap down → digital media diversifies information

Counter-view

ascription not gone → **Kanchan Chandra**: ethnicity modernised, not eliminated → caste + religious mobilisation, dynastic parties, weak representation of weaker sections, **Sachar Committee**

Conclusion routes

R1 developmental politics widened the agenda, but did not displace ascription

R2 shift = expansion and coexistence, not replacement

MODEL ANSWER

Liberalisation pushed development to the centre of Indian politics. Jobs, entrepreneurship, growth, FDI, infrastructure, private-sector expansion and welfare delivery shape political competition.

The claim of a shift is real, but the movement is partial rather than complete. Several changes support the developmental. Parties diluted their ideological positions and accepted the growth agenda. Pocket-book voting rose, with voters judging governments by economic performance, inflation jobs and welfare delivery.

Voter turnout increased, the gender gap in voting narrowed and digital technology and social media diversified political information. According to Kanchan Chandra, ethnicity has been modernised, not eliminated.

As per Sachar Committee caste and religious mobilisation, dynastic parties and the weak representation of weaker sections persist. Developmental politics has therefore widened political agenda, but it has not displaced ascriptive politics.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION UPSC 2017 · 15 marks

What do you understand by Green Revolution? Do you think that a Second Green Revolution is needed to adequately address the agrarian challenges in contemporary India? Examine.

FLOW SNAPSHOT *— how the answer moves*

Intro routes

- **R1** GR = HYV-seed + input + assured-price package (mid-1960s), **Swaminathan/Borlaug** → ‘begging bowl’ to ‘grain bowl’, self-sufficiency → but gains narrow, model now exhausted
- **R2** GR ended food scarcity and famine fear → yet its costs bred today’s distress → so the question is what *kind* of second revolution, not whether to repeat

Body flow

gains carried costs → **Frankel**: economic gains + political costs → regional imbalance (Punjab/Haryana/W-UP vs eastern + rainfed) → **Shiva**: ecological price (groundwater / soil / monoculture) → chemical-heavy path → today’s crisis (suicides, debt, low profitability) → SGR needed, not a repeat → **Swaminathan**’s “Evergreen Revolution”: productivity without ecological harm → eastern + dryland focus, watershed, micro-irrigation, diversification, climate-resilient / organic

Counter-view

technology alone cannot settle a political-economic crisis → **Dreze & Sen**: rising availability ≠ fair distribution

Conclusion routes

- **R1** yes, needed — but only as an Evergreen Revolution tied to procurement/MSP reform, public investment and secure land tenure → seeds alone insufficient
- **R2** a second revolution for eastern/rainfed India and sustainability, yet the crisis is political-economic → success rests on institutional reform, not technology alone

MODEL ANSWER

The Green revolution was the modernisation of Indian agriculture from the mid-1960s through high-yielding variety seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, assured irrigation, institutional credit & remunerative prices.

With the contribution of M.S. Swaminathan in India & Norman Borlaug abroad, it raised foodgrain output sharply and carried the country from a "begging bowl" to a "grain bowl" of self-sufficiency.

Francine R. Frankel argued that the economic gains came bundled with political costs; benefits concentrated in Punjab, Haryana and western UP.

Vandana Shiva criticised the ecological price i.e. groundwater depletion, soil exhaustion & monoculture.

This uneven, chemical-heavy path appears as farmer suicides, rising debt and falling profitability.

A second Green revolution is therefore needed, but not a repeat of the first. It must be Swaminathan's "Evergreen Revolution" i.e. raising productivity without ecological harm. Centred on eastern and dryland India through watershed management, micro-irrigation, crop-diversification and climate-resilient, organic practices.

Technology alone cannot settle a crisis that is political-economic. Jean Dreze and Amartya Sen viewed that rising availability never guaranteed fair distribution. A second revolution will work only if joined to procurement and MSP reform, public investment and secure land tenure.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION — UPSC 2018 · 20 marks

Examine the various causes of agrarian crisis in India.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — *how the answer moves*

Intro routes

- **R1** visible distress (suicides, marches, migration) → crisis of profitability
- **R2** farming no longer viable → causes structural & policy-driven, not natural

Body flow

unreformed land base (failed reforms, fragmentation, tenant exclusion / PM-Kisan) → state retreat (falling investment, weak irrigation, no extension) → **Dhanagare**: dependence shifts landlords → markets, state fails to regulate → liberalisation exposure (WTO, subsidised imports, price shocks, input costs, moneylenders) → **Gulati**: farmer gets ~25% of consumer price → climate stress (drought, groundwater) → rainfed suicides Maharashtra/Karnataka

Counter-view

Sen & Bhagwati: subsidies mainly aid rich farmers, remove them → fault is misdirected support, not its absence

Conclusion routes

- **R1** **Sainath**: neoliberal policy + corporate input costs, not natural failure
- **R2** **Swaminathan**'s remedy: procurement + C2+50% MSP as the corrective

MODEL ANSWER

The agrarian crisis shows in farmer suicides, the Nashik-Mumbai and Delhi marches, distress sales, indebtedness and migration. Agriculture is no longer sufficiently profitable for many cultivators.

Its causes are structural and policy-driven. Land reforms failed, holdings fragmented and landlessness persisted. Insecure tenants are excluded from schemes like PM-Kisan because land records do not recognise them.

Due to this public investment fell, irrigation stayed thin, rural infra remained poor and extension services vanished. D.N. Dhanagare argued that after the 1900s farmers were no longer dependent on landlords but on markets and the governments failed to regulate these markets.

Liberalisation deepened this exposure i.e. WTO limits on subsidies, subsidised imports and global price shocks, while input costs rose & institutional credit gave way to moneylenders.

Ashok Gulati argued that farmers receive as little as 25% of the final consumer price.

Rainfall dependence, drought and groundwater depletion drove rainfed suicides in Maharashtra and Karnataka. Amartya Sen & Jagdish Bhagwati both held that subsidies mainly benefit rich farmers and should be removed.

P. Sainath viewed it as the product of neoliberal policy and corporate input costs, not natural failure. Therefore, M.S. Swaminathan's call for procurement and a C2 + 50% MSP remains the corrective measure.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION — UPSC 2019 · 15 marks

Comment on the relevance of the Directive Principles of State Policy in an era of liberalization and globalization.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — *how the answer moves*

Intro routes

R1 DPSP = Part IV, Arts 36–51 → **Austin**'s "conscience of the constitution" → liberalisation makes them *more* necessary, not redundant

R2 DPSP = welfare / social-justice directions to the state → post-1991 market shift puts their place in question → they gain relevance instead

Body flow

state after 1991: protector → regulator/facilitator → market fundamentalism + rising inequality + welfare retreat → DPSP hold welfare character against roll-back → supplement FRs with socio-economic guarantees (work, food, education, health, environment) → Arts 39(b)/39(c) resist wealth concentration → **Cox**'s *internationalisation of the state* → welfare under external pressure → equity matters more → proof in MGNREGA, NFSA, RTE + *Air India Statutory Corporation v. United Labour Union* (DPSP read as human rights)

Counter-view

market-fundamentalist call to "roll back the state" + welfare retrenchment → are DPSP outdated? → no: state's retreat and widening inequality make the welfare compass more needed, not less

Conclusion routes

R1 DPSP ensure growth does not override social justice

R2 globalisation raises the stakes → DPSP keep a retreating, market-driven state tied to equity

MODEL ANSWER

The DPSP in Part IV, Articles 36-51, direct the state towards social and economic justice. Granville Austin called them, together with Fundamental Rights, the "conscience of the constitution".

Liberalisation has not made this conscience redundant; it has made it more necessary. After 1991 the state moved from protector of the public sector to regulator and facilitator. Market fundamentalism grew, inequality widened and the retreat of welfare raised the private cost of health and education.

Against this, the DPSPs keep the state's welfare character alive amid demands to roll back the state. They supplement rights with socio-economic guarantees of work, food, education, health and a clean environment, while Articles 39(b) and 39(c) resist the concentration of wealth in a few hands.

Robert Cox's idea of the internationalisation of the state shows that domestic welfare works under external pressures, so a constitutional commitment to equity matters more, not less. Their continuing force shows in rights-based laws such as MGNREGA, the NFS act and the RTE and in judgments like Air India Statutory Corporation vs. United Labour Union, which view as the Principle as part of fundamental human rights.

The Directive Principles thus ensure that growth does not override social justice.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION UPSC 2020 · 15 marks

'Liberalisation of Indian economy has not been accompanied with adequate reforms.' Comment.

FLOW SNAPSHOT *– how the answer moves*

Intro routes

R1 1991 ended License Raj → opening confined to trade & industry → complementary reforms left undone

R2 reform real but partial → product markets opened, institutions & factor markets untouched → statement captures the gap

Body flow

1991 changes real: delicensing, tariff cuts, financial liberalisation, FDI → growth, reserves, IT/telecom/services → **Ahluwalia**'s defence → but no matching reform in agriculture, labour, land, credit, social sector → weak governance, slow courts, exposed regulators, bank bad loans → jobless & regionally uneven growth, vulnerable informal sector, cronyism in land/resources/PSUs → **Acemoglu & Robinson**: institutions decide long-run success → middle-income-trap risk

Counter-view

defenders' case (**Ahluwalia**): real growth + falling poverty vindicate 1991 → set against incompleteness: gains stayed narrow because deeper reform never followed

Conclusion routes

R1 statement holds → reform partial, not misdirected → unfinished agenda remains

R2 **Ahluwalia**'s agenda — factor markets, state capacity, human capital → adequacy still pending

MODEL ANSWER

The 1991 reforms ended the License Raj and opened a closed economy. But the opening stayed confined to trade & industry.

The complementary reforms needed to make that growth broad-based and durable were left undone. The changes of 1991 were delicensing, steep tariff cuts, financial liberalisation & foreign investment lifted growth, rebuilt foreign exchange reserves and powered IT, Telecom and services.

Montek Singh Ahluwalia defended them as genuine growth accompanied by falling poverty. But liberalisation was not matched by reform in the areas that decide inclusion.

Agriculture, labour, land, credit and the social sector saw little change. Governance remained weak, courts slow, regulators open to interference and public banks burdened by bad loans.

Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, in Why Nations Fail, argue that institutional quality decides long-run success; without it, India risks the middle-income trap.

The reform of 1991 was partial, not misdirected. Ahluwalia's unfinished agenda i.e. reforming factor markets, rebuilding state capacity and investing in human capital is what adequacy demands.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION UPSC 2022 · 10 marks

High concentration of economic activities and consumption patterns in post-liberalisation period has led to the failure of environmental movements in India. Elucidate.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — *how the answer moves*

Intro routes

R1 earlier mass base: Chipko / Appiko / NBA / Silent Valley → post-1991 base weakens

R2 liberalisation reorders priorities → growth placed over ecology → movements lose ground

Body flow

liberalisation concentrates industry / mining / infrastructure + FDI-driven extraction → tribal belts (Jharkhand / Odisha / Chhattisgarh / Andhra) → deforestation + displacement → growth prioritised over ecology → **Arun Kumar**: state–MNC nexus + weak enforcement + quick clearances + fragmented, expert-led mobilisation → consumption patterns: hyper-consumerism / food waste / rising Gini → **Meadows**: environmentalism never an organized movement, media can't cover it

Counter-view

failure only partial → Supreme Court jurisprudence fills the gap → polluter pays / precautionary principle / Article 21 "right to environment"

Conclusion routes

R1 concentration + consumption together displaced mass ecological mobilisation

R2 revival needs stronger enforcement + wider public participation + democratic ecological planning

MODEL ANSWER

Chipko, Appiko, the Narmada Bachao Andolan and the Silent Valley movement once gave Indian environmentalism a broad ecological base. Post - liberalisation, this base weakened.

Liberalisation concentrated industry, mining and infrastructure, while FDI accelerated resource extraction; tribal belts in Jharkhand, Odisha, Chattisgarh & Andhra Pradesh faced deforestation and displacement. Economic growth received priority over ecological balance.

Arun Kumar traces the failure of recent movements to the state-multinational corporation nexus, reinforced by weak enforcement, quick industrial clearances and fragmented, expert led mobilisation with little common participation.

As Donella Meadows observed, "environmentalism was never an organized movement, which media could not cover.

The failure, however is only partial. The Supreme Court built environmental jurisprudence i.e. polluter pays, the precautionary principle and a "right to environment" under Article 21.

Concentration and consumption together displaced mass ecological mobilisation. Revival now depends on stronger enforcement, wider public participation and democratic ecological planning.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION — UPSC 2023 · 10 marks

Comment on the functions of District Planning Committee.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — *how the answer moves*

Intro routes

- **R1** Art 243ZD + 73rd/74th Amendments → DPC as constitutional bridge between local self-government and district planning
- **R2** core task = consolidate Panchayat + Municipal plans → one draft district development plan (rural + urban + sectoral)

Body flow

decentralised + sectoral planning (agriculture, infrastructure, watershed, health, education, women–child) → spatial planning + resource sharing + environmental conservation + coordinated resource management → four-fifths elected from local bodies (rural–urban proportion) → participatory character → "planning for economic and social justice"

Counter-view

mandate vs reality → many DPCs poorly constituted / non-functional → weak technical capacity + no qualified District Planning Officers → functions stay on paper

Conclusion routes

- **R1** design sound → gap lies in implementation, not mandate
- **R2** functions deliver only with proper constitution + technical support → then real grassroots planning

MODEL ANSWER

The District Planning Committee, created under Article 243ZD through the 73rd & 74th Constitutional amendments, is the constitutional link between local self-government and integrated district planning.

Its central function is to consolidate the plans prepared by Panchayats and Municipalities into a single draft development plan for the district, connecting rural, urban and sectoral efforts. Its functions cover decentralised and sectoral planning across agriculture, infrastructure, watershed development, public health, education and women and child care.

Since four-fifths of its members are elected from Panchayats and Municipalities in rural-urban proportion, the body carries a strong participatory character. Its work is aimed at "planning for economic and social justice."

But many DPCs remain poorly constituted or non-functional, weakened by limited technical capacity & a shortage of qualified District Planning Officers. Their functions, therefore, often stay on paper rather than in practice.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION UPSC 2023 · 15 marks

How does NITI Aayog as a 'policy think tank with shared vision' visualize the reorganization of planning in India? Justify your answer.

FLOW SNAPSHOT *— how the answer moves*

Intro routes

- **R1** 2015: NITI Aayog replaces Planning Commission → not a renaming but a re-imagining of planning's purpose
- **R2** "policy think tank with shared vision" → planning built *with* states, not handed down

Body flow

change of role (**Maira**: allocation of money → persuasion of change) → change of method (shared vision of priorities with states/UTs → village plans aggregated upward → flexible, outcome- & evidence-based, data/indices/monitoring) → change of paradigm (**Chimhowu**: classical top-down → negotiation-based; NITI moves to second) → **Mathew**: name change → mind change

Counter-view

Balveer Arora: "imperfect clone" → federal bargaining reform incomplete → reorganisation real in design, partial in practice

Conclusion routes

- **R1** reorganisation = shift of role + method: allocator → persuader, command → shared vision
- **R2** paradigm genuinely reorganised, though fully cooperative planning still unfinished

MODEL ANSWER

NITI Aayog replaced the Planning Commission on 1 January 2015. It re-imagined what planning in India is meant to do.

As a policy think tank with a shared vision, NITI Aayog visualises planning that is built with the states rather than handed down to them. Arun Maira described the old Commission as "a force for allocation of money, not for persuasion of change". NITI Aayog steps away from fund allocation and works as an advisory and knowledge body that persuades reform.

Planning is now a shared vision of national priorities, evolved jointly with states and UTs. It aggregates credible village plans upward and stays flexible, outcome-oriented and evidence-based, using data, indices and monitoring.

Chimhowu and others separate classical top-down, science-led planning from communication and negotiation-based planning; NITI Aayog moves towards the second. George Mathew therefore calls it "not just a name change but also a mind change."

However, Balveer Arora treats NITI Aayog as an "imperfect clone", since federal bargaining reform is incomplete. The shift from command to shared vision is real in design, even if cooperative planning in practice stays unfinished.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION UPSC 2024 · 15 marks

The legacy of the Planning Commission still has a bearing on India's development policies. Discuss.

FLOW SNAPSHOT *– how the answer moves*

Intro routes

- **R1** Commission (1950) set state-led, long-term development template → form changed by NITI Aayog, inheritance intact
- **R2** planned development 1950–2014 defined India's growth path → legacy outlives the institution

Body flow

Five-Year Plans (1950–2014) → public sector, heavy industry, infrastructure, strategic sectors → **Kothari**: state authority consolidated, top-down → growth tied to land reform, poverty alleviation, social justice → **Jalan & Sen**: welfare, social indicators → **Santhanam**: centralisation weakened federalism, near-unitary functioning → Finance Commission overlap → Centre–state fiscal strain

Counter-view

Govinda Rao: relevance declined post-liberalisation → NITI Aayog: think tank, cooperative federalism, flexible bottom-up planning → legacy consciously reformed, not discarded

Conclusion routes

- **R1** shift is of method, not aim → state intervention, long-term strategy, welfare goals persist
- **R2** institution replaced, template inherited → legacy still bears on development policy

MODEL ANSWER

The Planning Commission, created by a Cabinet resolution in 1950 to assess resources and frame 5-year plans. It gave India a settled template of state-led, long term development.

From 1950 to 2014, 5-year plans shaped India's strategy through public sector expansion, heavy industry, infra & strategic sectors.

Rajni Kothari argued that the Commission consolidated the state's authority over economic policy, though in a top-down manner that often ignored regional diversity. It also linked growth with land reforms, poverty alleviation & social justice.

Bimal Jalan and Amartya Sen recognised its attention to health, education and inequality i.e. a welfare orientation still visible in development policy today.

K. Santhanam held that uniform planning weakened federalism and produced near-unitary functioning, while the Commission's overlap with the Finance Commission strained centre-state finance.

M. Govinda Rao argued that its relevance declined after liberalisation and NITI Aayog works as a policy think tank promoting cooperative federalism and flexible, bottom-up planning.

However, India still relies on state intervention, long-term strategy and welfare goals inherited from that era. The legacy continues to bear on how development is pursued.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION — UPSC 2024 · 15 marks

The blueprint of Gram Swaraj is the key to understand the Gandhian perspective on planning. Discuss.

FLOW SNAPSHOT *— how the answer moves*

Intro routes

- **R1** Gandhian planning ≠ conventional centralised/industrial → self-sufficient village as the blueprint → begin here to read his planning
- **R2** *Gram Swaraj* = village self-rule → the master design from which his whole economic vision follows → hence the key

Body flow

village as the primary unit (economy / politics / moral life) → local production + local resource control + Panchayati Raj, participation → "India lives in villages" → rural reconstruction at the centre → decentralisation / production by the masses (not mass production) / *Swadeshi* → machinery: only labour-displacing & wealth-concentrating opposed → Gandhian Plan (**Narayan & Agarwal**): agriculture, land to tiller, cooperatives, rural credit, khadi — against heavy industry → **Kothari**: free India took the Nehruvian centralised path, village vision overshadowed

Counter-view

Ambedkar: romanticises villages, ignores caste → modern economists: hard to apply in a globalised industrial economy

Conclusion routes

- **R1** not an industrial plan but a moral design for self-reliant villages → *Gram Swaraj* the interpretive key
- **R2** limits notwithstanding → the village republic remains the lens for reading Gandhian planning

MODEL ANSWER

Gandhi's approach to planning cannot be understood through the conventional lens of centralised, industry-led plans. The self-sufficient village and Gram Swaraj or village self-rule, is the design from which his entire economic vision follows.

Development means local production of basic goods, resources controlled locally and Panchayati Raj built on participation.
Since Gandhi held that "India lives in villages", rural reconstruction sat at the centre of his planning.

From this design flow his other principles i.e. decentralised production and Swadeshi. Machinery was not rejected outright; only machinery that displaced labour and concentrated wealth was opposed.

The Gandhian plan of Shriman Narayan and S.N. Agarwal translated this blueprint into a programme of agriculture, land to the tiller, cooperatives, rural credit and Khadi & deliberately opposed to heavy industrial planning.

Rajni Kothari viewed that free India instead followed the Nehruvian centralised path, overshadowing the village vision.

B.R. Ambedkar faulted it for romanticising villages and ignoring caste, and modern economists find it hard to apply in a globalised economy. However, as a moral design for self-reliant villages, Gram Swaraj remains the key to Gandhian planning.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION UPSC 2025 · 10 marks

Land reforms programmes led to some constitutional amendments. Comment.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — *how the answer moves*

Intro routes

R1 land reforms to fix unequal agrarian structure at Independence → grounded in Art 39(b)/39(c) → challenged under fundamental right to property → drove amendments

R2 agrarian justice needed legal protection → reform laws challenged in court under property right → Constitution amended to shield them

Body flow

First Amendment 1951: Art 31 amended, Art 31A + 31B inserted, Ninth Schedule created, 13 state laws protected → *Shankari Prasad* upheld it → *Kameshwar Singh* linked reform to Directive Principles + social justice → Fourth Amendment 1955 elaborated Art 31A → Seventeenth Amendment 1964: acquisition, ceiling, compensation → Seventy-Eighth Amendment 1995: +27 laws to Ninth Schedule → Forty-Fourth Amendment removed property as a fundamental right

Counter-view

landholders' fundamental right to property vs state's Directive Principles and social justice → amendments settled the tension in favour of reform

Conclusion routes

R1 claim holds → agrarian reform steadily reshaped the Constitution

R2 property progressively subordinated to social justice → land reform a chief driver of early constitutional change

Land reforms sought to correct the unequal agrarian structure inherited at independence, drawing on Article 39 (b) and Article 39 (c). It direct that material resources serve the common good and that wealth not concentrate in few hands.

But these reform laws faced challenges under the then fundamental right to property, and this resistance drove a chain of constitutional amendments. The First Amendment Act, 1951 amended Article 31, inserted Articles 31 A and 31 B and created the Ninth Schedule.

Shankari Prasad vs. Union of India upheld this amendment, while State of Bihar vs. Kameshwar Singh linked reform legislation to the Directive Principles and social justice.

The 4th amendment, 1955 elaborated Article 31 A; the 17th amendment, 1964 covered acquisition, ceiling and compensation.

The 78th amendment, 1995 added 27 more laws to the schedule. The 44th amendment removed property as a fundamental right.

The claim therefore holds: agrarian reform steadily reshaped the Constitution, subordinating property to social justice.

All 12 questions — PDF + handwritten answers

The complete Day 23 set — every PYQ with its Flow Snapshot and the handwritten model answer — in one PDF on the channel, free.

Download on Telegram
@psirbyamitpratap

560 questions · 50 days · ten years of PYQs — nothing left out

Tomorrow — Day 24. Don't break the chain.