

Appendix

I. Framing across the 3 sets of texts: What is said in relation to one particular (or very similar) theme

Eg: 'Challenges'. This table attempts to highlight what it is that the three sets see as challenges. How they are (or are not) explicitly related/connected with Democracy in the texts is also significant.

	Challenges before Indian Democracy (1998)	Challenges of Communalism and Casteism (2003)	Challenges to Democracy (2005)
Framing (subheadings)	pp.77-85, 1. Religious communalism 2. Minority Rights 3. Regional Aspirations and Regionalism 4. Caste and Untouchability 5. Inequality of Women 6. Poverty in Towns 7. Unemployment 8. Population 9. Nepotism and Bribery	p.147, 1. Communalism 2. Casteism	pp. 101-107 1. Foundational Challenge 2. Challenge of Expansion 3. Challenge of deepening democracy 4. Different contexts, different challenges
Comment	The challenges to democracy are numerous and they are enumerated. A list of unconnected issues	The challenges highlighted for attention are two fold. (Major Challenges before the Indian Economy figures as a separate chapter. However, framing of neither topic makes any easily obvious reference to democracy) Drastic impoverishment of the set of issues	The challenges are highlighted in a conceptual manner - i.e. a connecting of issues, through use of models/theory - corresponding to stages of democracy, explained in relation to issues examined in all the previous chapters and from various parts of the world.

The Discourse on the ‘Challenges’ in the opening paragraphs of the 3 sets of texts

Challenges before Indian Democracy (1998)		Challenges of Communalism and Casteism (2003)		Challenges to Democracy (2005)	
Text	Meaning	Text	Meaning	Text	Meaning
<p>p.77...the democratic system in India is <i>built upon the basic principles of equality, egalitarianism, socialism and secularism</i>. The constitution of India has made <i>adequate provisions</i> to ensure that these principles are realised. It has also tried to reflect the major concerns of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by United Nations in 1948. <i>When all these principles are realised substantially</i> the democratic system becomes sound, successful. But <i>history teaches us that these are not realised easily</i>. Our democracy also faces a number of difficulties.</p>	<p>The principles of Indian democracy are equality, egalitarianism, socialism, secularism. There are institutional support structures for these principles. The principles have not yet been realised in practice. This is to be expected and reasons for this being the case can be sought in a historical/comparative analysis.</p> <p>A fairly simple message, predominantly optimistic. Without international comparison.</p>	<p>p.146, The Republic of India is a land of heterogeneous racial, lingual, religious and social groups, which are further <i>divided</i> among various <i>castes, classes and sects</i>. Running through all these <i>diversities</i> is the thread of India’s <i>basic unity</i> which makes it a big <i>nation of a rich composite culture</i>...there exists <i>Indianness</i> which holds the bond of <i>oneness</i> across all the cultures of the country. Our <i>unity in diversity</i> is the backbone of national development.</p>	<p>Divisions and diversity in the polity are bound together by unity. Nation, Indianness, oneness, unity and national development (as against people or Indians or inequalities among them) are emphasised.</p> <p>An optimistic message; diversity is a source of richness not a fundamental problem. No perspective beyond India.</p>	<p>p.102, ...At least one fourth of the globe is still not under democratic government. The challenge for democracy in these parts of the world is very stark. These countries face the foundational challenge of making the transition to democracy and then instituting democratic government. This involves bringing down the existing non-democratic regime, keeping military away from controlling government and establishing a sovereign and functional state.</p>	<p>One fourth of the world that is not democratic must move towards this ‘ideal’ of democratic form of government through what is largely an institutional mechanism (structural and historical features of democracy not mentioned).</p> <p>A qualified message, with a serious international perspective</p>

Challenges before Indian Democracy (1998)		Challenges of Communalism and Casteism (2003)		Challenges to Democracy (2005)	
Text	Meaning	Text	Meaning	Text	Meaning
<p>p.77 As we understand, democracy means <i>equality among citizens</i>. All kinds of <i>inequalities are detrimental to a democratic society</i>...we must first clearly <i>distinguish between inequality and a simple variation</i>. Democracy is not against variation between people. On the contrary, it implies that <i>differences</i> between people – in their habits, customs, beliefs and opinions – <i>ought to be respected</i>. One group of people should <i>not try to impose their way of life on others</i>. There are lots of differences among Indians. Indians speak different languages, belong to different regions, have distinct culture, follow different religions. But here we are mainly concerned with inequality – which are creating obstacles in the working of democracy.</p>	<p>Democracy is about equality among citizens. Inequalities work against democracy. Yet, a distinction has to be made between inequalities and differences. Differences in ways of life are seen as deserving of respect in a democratic set-up. The difficulty in respecting differences is seen as the tendency of one group using its way of life to impose itself on the others (and not a secular/neutral third way that is equidistant from all being adapted). It is inequality and not differences that challenge democracy (with nothing said about inequalities that come about from respecting differences).</p>	<p>146. In ancient times, migration of different people from different places at different stages has enriched Indian culture. Long centuries of intermixing, assimilation and adjustments have evolved a broad ethnic uniformity among all Indians. = We are a we</p>	<p>Suggestive of pre-existing 'Indian' landmass and culture into which people were assimilated (as against what constitutes 'Indian' itself being an amalgam). Suggestive of ethnic uniformity as opposed to the distinct ethnic groups that continue to inhabit India.</p>	<p>p.102. Most of the established democracies face the challenge of expansion. This involves applying the basic principle of democratic government across all the regions, different social groups and various institutions. Ensuring greater power to local governments, extension of federal principle to all the units of the federation, inclusion of women and minority groups, etc, falls under this challenge. This also means that less and less decisions should remain outside the arena of democratic control. Most countries like India and other democracies like the US face this challenge.</p>	<p>India and the US (a curious pairing!) are established democracies The challenge for them is ensuring greater decentralisation of power and more representativeness of the polity (women, minorities) in decision making structures. Unlike in the 1998 book, democracy is far more than having some central institutions</p>

Challenges before Indian Democracy (1998)		Challenges of Communalism and Casteism (2003)		Challenges to Democracy (2005)	
Text	Meaning	Text	Meaning	Text	Meaning
<p>p.77, There are <i>various kinds of inequalities in our social life</i>. There is inequality between the <i>rich and the poor</i>, inequality of income or of wealth. There are inequalities between the so called <i>upper castes</i>, <i>the so called lower castes</i> and those who are called the <i>untouchables</i>. There is inequality between <i>man and woman</i>, between <i>literate and illiterate</i>....people suffer from these <i>inequalities because of no fault of theirs</i>. It is the responsibility of a democratic society to ensure equal opportunities to all the citizens.</p>	<p>The diverse kinds of inequalities are those between the rich and poor, various groups in the caste hierarchy, men and women, and those who can and cannot read and write.</p> <p>These inequalities are not something that people suffer because they deserve to. (ie: implicitly negating the religious/traditional world view of why people are where they are.) Implied is that inequalities which ARE deserved are not anti democratic.</p> <p>Equal opportunities to all citizens is something democratic societies ensure.</p>	<p>146....Today India is an independent political entity. The country as a whole is governed by one constitutional document. The British ruled India on the policy of “divide and rule” and created tensions among <u>the Indian people</u>. The contemporary problems of communalism, casteism, regionalism and lingualism have their roots in the colonial background.</p>	<p>Realist IR and institutionalised governance are a reference point for political legitimacy as a country. All internal conflict can be blamed on the British (as if none existed before, and as if British conquered a unified India. Divide and rule was the sequel to ‘Conquer the divided’.) The divide and rule policy is singled out as a major legacy. <u>the Indian people</u>. (An important ‘the’.) The caste system from the Vedic age and Linguistic states and reorganised regions which came only in 1956 are also seen to have colonial roots. (Hence are not so deep and can be overcome?)</p>	<p>102. The third challenge of deepening of democracy is faced by every democracy in one form or the other. This involves strengthening of the institutions and practices of democracy. This should happen in such a way that people can realise their expectation of democracy. But ordinary people have different expectations of democracy in different societies. Therefore, the challenge takes different meanings and paths in different parts of the world. In general terms, it usually means strengthening those institutions that help peoples participation and control. This</p>	<p>Deepening democracy means different things in different parts of the world. Ie; whatever it takes for people to realise and experience democracy. This in turn is interpreted as <i>reducing the control of rich and powerful people</i> (as against empowering the poor and marginalised/ addresseing cultural and social bottlenecks to participation: a silence on caste and religion as debilitating influences on Indian Democracy)</p>

				requires an attempt to bring down the control and influence of the rich and powerful people in making governmental decisions.	
Challenges before Indian Democracy (1998)		Challenges of Communalism and Casteism (2003)		Challenges to Democracy (2005)	
Text	Meaning	Text	Meaning	Text	Meaning
		pp.146-147...event of freedom struggle was unique in the world as it was carried out on the Gandhian principles of ahimsa. All patriotic Indian rose above their parochial considerations of caste, creed, religion and language and made sacrifices to liberate their motherland. But the unity and harmony that existed during the freedom struggle lost its grip after independence was achieved. Today, we witness some caste clashes, communal riots, regional violence and ethnic animosity disturbing our social peace and amity. Casteism and communalism are the	The freedom struggle was an event that mobilised Indian polity across their differences. Now that unity has been lost. Casteism and communalism are 'threats' (not a malaise or challenge) that explain the state of affairs. Comment: interesting that the after/before independence aspect of communalism is highlighted since Gandhi was specifically opposed and finally killed by some Hindu groups precisely because he rose above religion (in a factional sense).		

		most potential sources of social tension and sectarian violence which pose serious threat to our national unity, social cohesion, secular and federal structure, and democratic ethos.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

II. Religion and Caste: Examining Inclusion and Exclusion via Framing

The three sets of books are found to have

- a. Reference to Religion and Caste under different Chapters/ Topic listings. This is one level of framing
- b. Within the larger framing of (a) above there is a second level of framing through inclusion of religion and caste in certain subtopics/subheading (and not others)
- c. So also, by not including reference to religion and caste under other subtopics (where they might find space for discussion)

Textbook	Set 1	Set 2	Set 3
Chapter (framing a)	Challenges before Indian Democracy (1998)	Challenges of Communalism and Casteism (2003)	Challenges to Democracy (2005)
How/ Where do overt references to the entry points of religion and caste (or very similar things) figure? (framing b)	1. Religious communalism 2. Minority Rights 4. Caste and Untouchability	1. Communalism 2. Casteism	Cases and contexts Reforming politicians Redefining democracy
Where do silenced but logical references to the entry points of religion and caste exist? (framing by exclusion – c)	5. Inequality of Women 6. Poverty in Towns 7. Unemployment 9. Nepotism and Bribery		Thinking about political reform

What is said with comparable frames?

The 1998 and 2003 books have some commonalities in the framing of content so these are tabulated here with common headings.

Communalism

Set 1	Text	p.77-78, One great hindrance to Indian democracy is religious communalism. Communalism means placing one's own community above others, even above the nation.
	Meaning	<i>A fairly neutral definition of Communalism and how it affects Indian democracy</i>
Set 2	Text	p.147. Communalism has been fatal as it led to the split of the nation in 1947. Thousands of innocent lives were lost. Families displaced from their homes became refugees. This communal carnage made children orphans and women widows. Even after over five decades of independence, India has not been able to overcome the problem of communalism. Communalism accompanied by terrorism and separatism poses danger to our national unity and integration. Mixing of religion with politics has given a setback to the secular democracy. Communal violence and bloodshed create a sense of insecurity among all. India cannot afford to fall victim to fear, panic and suspicion.
	Meaning	<i>The split of the 'nation' informed by demand for the Islamic state of Pakistan, hence implicitly, the Muslims are communal here. Riot affected put down as 'thousands' as against the reality of millions. Terrorism and separatism are things minority communities as opposed to the majority Hindus in India are seen to indulge in. Communalism 'accompanied by' terrorism and separatism seems to implicate minorities. If majority communalism were seen as generating minority terrorism would 'accompanied by' be the most appropriate here?</i>

British Rule

Set 1	Text	p.78, During British rule, India was one country. During national freedom movement people belonging to all religions fought against the British for the national freedom. Those who led the movement, those who fought for it on the streets, the martyrs who died for it, belonged to different religions. However, at the time of independence, the British split the country into two states – India and Pakistan. At the time of partition of the country ghastly communal riots broke out and thousands of innocent people were killed and many more were forced to leave their homes. Thousands of Hindus from Pakistan and Muslims from India had to leave their homes in which they lived for generations. They had to leave their jobs, their property and had to flee to an unknown area to live as refugees. This left a long trail of hatred among the two religious communities.
	Meaning	During British rule, India was one country. (<i>as against India being an administrative unit or colony... an entity that gained an identity only on account of British rule</i>) ... the British split the country into two states – India and Pakistan. (<i>partition as an act of British malevolence, and not communal sentiment in pre-partition India</i>) This left a long trail of hatred among the two religious communities. (<i>the ill-will persists not between the citizens of the two countries but the religious communities</i>)
Set 2	Text	p. 146, The British ruled India on the policy of ‘divide and rule’, and created tensions among the Indian people. The contemporary problems of communalism, casteism, regionalism and lingualism have their roots in the colonial background.
	Meaning	A sweeping indictment of the British for several ills, even those that they clearly had nothing to do with (caste, language identities)

Communalism and the Majority

Set 1	Text	p.78, Some people want India to be a Hindu state, because they feel Hindus are in a majority. But this is a wrong idea. Because India is as much a country of the Hindus as of the Muslims, Christians and others who have been born and lived here. In fact, Indians have a very rich culture precisely because it is not the culture of any one community but of many. (Gives 2 examples – of cultural artefacts (Konark temple and Taj Mahal) and art (classical music) which all Indians are proud of)
	Comment	<i>No reference to the radical Dalit rejection of the notion of ‘the Hindus</i>
Set 2	Text	p.147, Amidst religious pluralism of India, the Hindus constitute majority and other religious groups constitute minority with the Muslims being the largest one. Communal confrontations start coming on surface when a particular religious or sub religious group tries to promote its own interest at the expense of others. Attempts of promoting vested interests and identity by a particular community breeds social tension. In communal frenziness and hysteria, one turns hostile to one’s fellow brethren. A religious person is not necessarily communal, rather communalism is certainly anti-religious. To talk in terms of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs or communalism of minority or majority is not only misleading but also fraught with danger. Fundamentalists project their religious community distinct and separate from the rest of the religions. They give precedence to their

		interest over common interest. They perceive and deal with citizens not individually but communally. ... An aggressive communalism, if unchecked at a certain stage leads to a separatist tendency.
	Comment	<i>While most sentences can apply to either the majority or the minority here, the last one suggests aggressive communalism to be a tendency of the minority.</i>

Caste

Set 1	Text	p.79 (and Untouchability) It is good to be proud of one's heritage. But one must not do it blindly. It is equally important to be critical about it. A practice is not good simply because it has been there for a long time. Whereas we have a great cultural heritage, many things in our traditional society are bad, and these must be changed, if we are to progress and have a democratic society
	Comment	<i>caste and its derivatives as an unfavourable feature of Indian society</i>
Set 2	Text	p.147, Social structure of India is based upon the caste system.
	Comment	<i>caste seen as related to social structuring rather than irrational/unjust hierarchy or discrimination</i>

The Varna System

The occupational categorization of the Varna system derives from the theory of Karma, a central tenet of Hindu philosophy which subscribes to an action-reaction or cause-effect (as against accidental) explanation for birth, life and all human experience. In effect, the theory holds human beings are where and what they are, on account of their own past actions that are conceptualised as forming a sheath for the transmigrating 'soul' (equated to breath or life energy) of all living forms. The goal (and unique potential) of human life in the Hindu world view is to break the bondage of more Karma brought on by the existing sheath of Karma, through the pursuit of dharma-artha-kama-moksha. This can be roughly interpreted as the emphasis on the 'right mix' of righteous action, pursuit of wealth and of sensual pleasure, in order to attain liberation. 'Righteous action' or dharma is linked to ones station in the varna system. The 4 paths of Karma, bhakti, yoga and jnyana 'marga's' (pursuit of ordained work, the path of devotion, path of yoga or path of spiritual learning) depending on ones inclination, are to be simultaneously pursued to lead to the goal of self-realization or liberation/moksha. Moksha is about realising unity and oneness with all creation. The debate between the critical traditionalists (and the orthodox too on the same side, but with less credible reasons) and the modernists would be about how hierarchy and discrimination is not built into this theory versus how the determinism and rigid stratification that the operation of this system brought to bear, to the extreme privilege of the upper castes and exploitation and penury of the lower castes. The Gandhian endeavour to emphasize redistribution of wealth, compassion and non-violence in the spirit of unity was clearly directed at redeeming the former. The discourse on the varna system in both sets of texts

- Refer to it as an occupational categorisation. There is an ambiguity in dealing with ‘Inequality between the categories’ and ‘existence of categories’ per se. This obscures how ‘inequality’ stems from the nature of the occupation that people were slotted into by the caste system.
- Both in 1998 and 2003 the Atishudras are omitted as a fifth category. It is they, who were outside the Varna system and considered untouchable. The nature of their occupations, where dealt with is not revealing of the real state of affairs.
- Finally, the manner in which the nature of the discrimination stemming from inequality is described

Set 1	Text	<p>p. 80, One of the great problems facing our democracy has been the rigid caste system. It had divided our society into so called high and low castes. Thousands of years ago the Hindu society was divided into four categories: <i>Brahmanas, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas</i> and <i>Shudras</i>. These categories have been known as the <i>Varnas</i>. However the caste system and not so much the Varna system, has been responsible for maintaining the social inequality in India. The caste system had ordained professions by the accident of birth in a given family and jati. It has been believed that the four major caste categories have had four types of work in every society. The Brahmins would do rituals, worship and educate the young. The Kshatriyas would learn warfare and defend the country. The vaishyas were supposed to carry on trade. And finally, the Shudras the lowest of the four categories were to do all other types of work which needed physical labour – like agriculture and other menial work. We all now accept that such a system is not good for our society. This kind of inequality is entirely unjustifiable as the most important activities of a society include agriculture and the production of other necessary things. And is it not unjust to treat those people who produce these things for the rest of society as the lowest of all? Besides how does one say that skills of the mind and the body travel in the family? The caste system which existed in ancient India was thus a very unjust system.</p>
	Meaning	<p><i>‘We all now accept’, who is we and do we? Indeed, the most narrowly interpreted and widely practised notion of caste based society was used to give shape to and justify privilege for few and penury for many. Karma became equated with fatalism and servile acceptance of subjugation of the oppressed, and a whip with which the powerful sections subjugated them. These powerful sections are still far from acknowledging the system as ‘not good’ as it serves clear material interest in a populated society with limited resources.</i></p> <p>caste system had ordained professions by the accident of birth in a given family...<i>a secular argument (accident of birth)is juxtaposed here with a non-secular worldview (caste as a preordained destiny based on past deeds, and no accident)</i></p> <p>This kind of inequality is entirely unjustifiable <i>The focus here is on the inequality that the categorisation facilitates and not so much the categories per se... the Gandhian argument. This takes attention away from how the degrading treatment meted out was/is a concomitant of the menial occupations that people were slotted into</i></p> <p>most important activities of a society include agriculture and the production of other necessary things. <i>(but it is not so much agriculture and production that the atishudras were assigned to... it was the most menial cleaning (skinning dead animals, working with hides, in crematoriums and manual scavenging, that continues till this day inspite of laws being enacted)...</i></p> <p>how does one say that skills of the mind and the body travel in the family? <i>Not very convincing... even genetics is used to substantiate such a claim for higher order skills being hereditary. At best, this amounts to suggesting that all people are entitled to equal</i></p>

		<i>opportunities. However, such a stand is not explicit. Such treatment undermines the stigma and power structures in society trying to keep 'people in (caste-allotted) place'</i>
Set 2	Text	p.147, The caste system as originally conceived was different from what it is today. Earlier it was a four fold order (Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya, Shudra) based on occupation. It was purely a vocational classification of society based on duty But today it has become a four fold gradation of society based upon ones birth in a particular caste.
	Meaning	Earlier (<i>when? No historicity to substantiate claim</i>). vocational classification of society based on duty ('duty' as against occupation brings in a moral/normative dimension. It is suggestive of the religious worldview rather than the secular one on caste) today (<i>or for hundreds of years?</i>)...gradation of society based upon ones birth in a particular caste. (<i>Underplays both the continuing strong linkage between caste and traditional occupations...especially among the lower caste. It is not just 'ones birth' in this or that caste group, but also that this then very often ties people to traditional occupations and concomitant status.</i>)

The social expression of caste that shapes norms of interaction, status differentials and early socialisation into perception of in-group and out-group. *Endogamy* as a very rigid principle to ensure lineage and continuity of caste.

Set 1	Text	p.80, With the passage of time, the caste system has become very complicated. Instead of four castes there are now innumerable castes. Each caste has its own rites and ceremonies that distinguish it from others. They ask their boys and girls to marry within their caste and not to outsiders. Each caste has many sub castes. Accordingly people have to lead their lives under very odd restrictions. They cannot eat from others or with others. It means, people belonging to one caste treat others with hatred and suspicion.
	Meaning	(Explained in 1998 and made light of as 'odd restriction' rather than operative reality of students lives; not really dealt with in 2003.)
Set 2	Text	p.147, Castes are further divided into subcastes each having a distinct place in social hierarchy. Caste system is closely associated with the Hindus and also to some extent exists among the Muslims, Christians and Sikhs. Caste creates social gradations and social groupings, which lead to social distinction, discrimination and disintegration.
	Meaning	(<i>Much briefer, indeed perfunctory and less critical</i>)

How and why of caste based discrimination (Its linkage to occupation and notions of purity and pollution, not really addressed at all in both 1998 or 2003)

Set 1	Text	p.80, Worst of all has been a system called untouchability. People of the upper castes would not even touch those of the lower castes. It was a shameful and inhuman aspect of our old society. People belonging to the lowest caste would not be given any education. They could not eat with others. They had to live outside the villages. Sometimes they could not even use the wells from which other people drew water. Yet often they were doing some of the most important works for the society. They tilled the land of other people because they were too poor to have land of their own. Society treated them most unjustly although it benefited out of their labour. But it did not treat them as equal to others.
-------	------	--

	Comment	<i>Notable are the condemning tone and framing that avoids mention of the most menial occupations that people assigned to the lowest castes really did</i>
Set 2	Text	p.147, The British exploited casteism to keep Indians divided and to perpetuate their rule over India. The caste of a person is <u>determined by</u> the caste of the family in which he or she is born (<i>more descriptive than a standpoint</i>). If someone happens to be born in a caste which was considered low, he or she is subjected to many discriminatory and inhuman treatment(s). His or her caste becomes a curse for life without any fault of his or her.
	Comment	<i>Framing that avoids the very mention of untouchability.</i>

Key frame: Discussion of caste in relation to democratic politics.

Set 1	Text	pp.80-81,...people of the lower castes were poor. Because of their poverty, they were unable to have education and as a result, they could not get better jobs. To offset this our Constitution has included certain provisions under which, some jobs are reserved for those belonging to the Scheduled Castes.... Some seats can be reserved for them in educational institutions also. This is a way of undoing the injustices that the society had done to them for centuries. (<i>reservation as undoing inequality, rather than a crutch in the absence of structural change to address socio-economic deprivation and its continued reproduction</i>)...As long as discrimination against these castes remain, there can be no real democracy. It violates the principle of dignity of the human being. It goes against the main principle of a democratic society that all human beings should be treated as equals.
	Meaning	
Set 2	Text	p.147, Caste discrimination has drastically declined but conversely the importance of caste consideration has increased. Caste appears to be declining in importance as a social factor[Caste equated only to caste discrimination and exclusion! – caste’s role in channelling the mega-transition of urbanisation is not even considered] but it is increasing in importance as a political factor. (<i>No mention of reservation at this stage. Rather, ‘caste consideration’ in politics portrayed in unfavourable light</i>)
	Meaning	

Minority Rights

(Both sets of books speak of minority rights as if the minority were homogenous within itself. They do not deal with how religious and cultural rights may impede democratic rights of sections within the minority community, eg: women.)

Set 1	Text	p.78, India is a land of many religions and languages. This creates some special problems for our democracy. Democracy works on two principles which are of equal importance. First it is a government based on the majority principle. Only those decisions which the majority supports is implemented. Second, democracy is a government based on tolerance and consensus. It does not make people do things by force. The second principle of democracy is the basis of minority rights...These rights are universally treated as important Human Rights. The question of minorities have come up very much in two fields – religious communities and cultural groups. if you take India as a
-------	------	---

		whole, Hindus are in a majority; but there is a large number of minority communities like Muslims, Sikhs, Christians etc. It is because of this situation that the constitution gives a fundamental right to the religious and linguistic minority communities to establish their own educational institutions. It is important to note that in our country the rights of minorities are adequately protected. The intolerance of the majority can also harm democracy.
	Meaning	
Set 2	Text	p.148, Constitutional Provisions for Safeguarding the interests of Minorities, Weaker Sections and Backward Classes (subheading detailing these over 3 pages) ...These constitutional arrangements ensure protection of their varied interests, removal of their social disabilities and promotion of their welfare and development. [So they have little or nothing to complain about]
	Meaning	

What is said within non-comparable frames

Frame	The pedagogical approach fostered	Text	
Democratic deficits	Open ended critical thinking	p.105, Saudi Arabia: women not allowed to take part in public activities, no freedom of religion for minorities. Yugoslavia: Ethnic tension between Serbs and Albanians on the rise in the province of Kosovo. Yugoslavia disintegrated. US, Civil Rights: Blacks have won equal rights, but are still poor, less educated and marginalised.	
People determine the success of institutions	Dialogue	p.110, Reforming politicians (subheading) Rose: "...Aren't those mean politicians responsible for all the problems in our country? I mean corruption, defection, casteism, communal violence, criminality....everything" ... "there should be strict laws to curb corruption and wrong practices like appeals to caste and community"	

		<p>Lyngdoh Madam:... “there is already a law banning any appeal to caste and religion in politics. Politicians find a way to bypass that. Laws can have little impact unless people resist attempts to mislead and divide people in the name of caste and religion. You cannot have democracy in the real sense unless people and politicians overcome the barriers of caste and religion”</p> <p>(Placing responsibility on citizens...assuming they are free of the herd mentality)</p> <p>(Redefining democracy)</p> <p>-this choice (to elect and change rulers) and opportunity should be available to all the people on an equal basis</p> <p>-the exercise of this choice must lead to a government limited by basic rules of the constitution and citizens rights</p>	
Misc		<p>-... power sharing between governments and social groups is necessary in a democracy</p> <p>-... democracy cannot be the brute rule of the majority</p> <p>...respect for the minority voice is necessary for democracy</p> <p>-...beyond the government and its activities...eliminating discrimination based on caste, religion and gender is important in a democracy. (<i>sole reference to caste and religion in this chapter outside of the Lyndoh conversion in different font from the main text</i>)</p>	

Democratic Rights (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
p.96,Elections and institutions need to be combined with a third element-enjoyment of rights – to make a government democratic. Even the most properly elected rulers working through the established institutional process must learn not to cross some limits. Citizens democratic rights set those limits in a democracy.			
p.97, Life without rights (subtitle 1)			
p.97, Prison in Guantanamo Bay (narrative 1)		Concern, surprise, empathy, feeling for injustice, feeling against American impunity to human rights violations	Democratic rights that people normally have in their countries are trampled over by the US
p.98, Citizens Rights in Saudi Arabia (narrative 2)		All the conditions for democratic governments discussed so far are not satisfied by the case.	
p.98, Ethnic massacre in Kosovo (narrative 3)		Shock, horror and sorrow, empathy and concern. Interesting activity and exercise suggested for this section. Critical lens on India, empathy built. Yet, the fate of framing as ‘activity’, ‘exercise’ etc requires examining classroom transactions, which is beyond the present scope.	Democratic elections can bring into power people who violate the democratic rights of sections of the polity

Democratic Rights (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
p.99, Rights in a democracy (subtitle 2)			
p.99-100, What are rights? (subheading) Rights are claims of a person over other fellow beings, over the society and over government. ...a right is possible when you make a claim that is equally possible for others. You cannot have a right that harms or hurts others. You cannot have a right to play a game in such a way that it breaks the neighbour's window. The Serbs in Yugoslavia could not have claimed the whole country for themselves. The claims we make should be reasonable. They should be such that (they) can be made available to others in equal measure. Thus a right comes with an obligation to respect others rights.	Others, ie: 'other citizens'	<p>Could be linked to the exclusivist notions of nationhood of the political Right based on religion in India.</p> <p>Could also be linked to special provisions via reservations etc. Are those 'rights' right? What are the issues involved. What makes a claim 'reasonable'?</p> <p>Simplified presentation: A has the right to divorce B even if that hurts B, and to not vote for C even if that hurts C</p>	
p.100, Just because we claim something it does not become our right. It has to be recognised by the society we live in. Rights acquire meaning only in society.		Who has the upper hand here? Society or the individual claiming rights? Is society more of a 'check' on undesirable demand for rights, or an impediment to the rights of individuals? Which individuals, if so? Individuals or groups?	
p.100, Every society makes certain rules to regulate our conduct. They tell us what is right and what is wrong. What is recognised by society as rightful becomes the basis of rights.		Who is 'society'? What of 'society' telling that dalit not to have access to well water? Or women that going out alone is asking for trouble? How does 'recognition by society' of rights come about? What within society works against it? Tradition, religion, power, resources...none of these are examined.	Society decides what can be a right.

Democratic Rights (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
p.100, That is why the notion of rights changes from time to time and from society to society.		Can the notion of what are rights afford to change from society to society? Does society seem to have the upper hand here?	Rights are not static.
p.100, Two hundred years ago anyone who said that women should have right to vote would have sounded strange. Today, not granting them vote (voting rights?) in Saudi Arabia appears strange.		What was it about two hundred years ago that informed the norm that existed then? What changed, how and why? What has not changed for the Saudi women?	
p.100, When the socially recognised claims are written into law they acquire real force. Otherwise they remain merely as natural or moral rights.		What counts as 'social acceptance'? Who has power to determine this? What about things that do not have social acceptance that are written into law?	
p.100, Rights are reasonable claims of persons recognised by society and sanctioned by law. (emphasis as in original)		Notions of 'reasonable', 'recognised by society', 'sanctioned by law' confuse the issue of who/what takes precedence...society or the individual?	But suppose society gives precedence to the individual
p.100, Why do we need rights in a democracy? (sub title) Rights also perform a very special role in a democracy. Rights protect minorities from the oppression of majority. They ensure that the majority cannot do whatever it likes. Rights are guarantees which can be used when things go wrong. This usually happens when those in the majority want to dominate those in the minority. The government should protect the citizens rights in such a situation.		The minorities and majority have been cast as uniform categories. To speak of 'Rights of the minorities' hides contradictions of unequal power and denial of rights within the traditional structures that give them an identity as a minority. (eg: religious law and women's rights)	Rights (strangely?) explained not in relation to the individual and the church/state but in terms of minority and majority.

Democratic Rights (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
<p>p.100, But sometimes elected governments may not protect or may even attack the rights of their own citizens. That is why some rights need to be placed higher than the government, so that even the government cannot violate these. In most democracies the basic rights of the citizen are written down in the constitution.</p>		<p>Oblique reference to government complicity in perpetuating violence against minorities (Serbia, Gujarat).</p>	<p>Fundamental rights are something governments cannot tamper with. This is ensured by having them enshrined in the constitution.</p>
<p>p. 101, Rights in the Indian Constitution (subheading) The Constitution says that the government shall not deny to any person in India equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws. It means that the laws apply in the same manner to all, regardless of a person's status. This is called the rule of law. Rule of law is the foundation of any democracy. It means that no person is above the law. There cannot be any distinction between a political leader, government official and an ordinary citizen. (comment on the side: Everyone knows that the rich can have better lawyers in the courts. What is the point in talking about equality before law?)</p>		<p>This is a very institutionalist aspect of democracy. It is interesting to see how the contradictory aspects have been dealt with.</p>	
<p>p.101, ...For example, a few years ago a former Prime Minister of the country faced a court case on charges of cheating. The court finally declared that he was not guilty. But as long as the case continued, he had to go to the court, give evidence and file papers, just like any</p>		<p>An attempt to show rule of law as operational in India in relation to power and influence?</p>	

other citizen.			
Democratic Rights (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
p.101, This basic position is further clarified in the Constitution by spelling out some implications of the Right to Equality. The government shall not discriminate against any citizen on ground of religion, caste, sex or place of birth. Every citizen shall have access to public places like shops, restaurants and cinema halls. Similarly there shall be no restriction with regard to the use of wells, tanks, bathing ghats, roads, playgrounds and places of public resorts maintained by the government or dedicated to the use of general public. This might appear very obvious, but it was necessary to incorporate these rights in the Constitution of our country where the traditional caste system did not allow people from communities to access all public places.		This is a critical instance of the meaning of right to equality in the Indian context. It is also situated historically.	(SC) Discrimination against citizens on the grounds of caste <u>was</u> permitted in India by the traditional caste system. - You can use this column more fully, for rebuttals like this (which is not a UA or UC).
p.102, The same principle applies to public jobs. All citizens have equality of opportunity in matters relating to employment or appointment to any position in the government. No citizen shall be discriminated against or made illegible for employment on the grounds mentioned above. You have read in Chapter Five that the Government of India has provided reservations for Scheduled Caste's, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes. Various	Are these reservations against the right to equality? They are not. Various Governments have different schemes for giving preference to women, poor or physically handicapped in some kinds of jobs. For equality does not mean giving everyone the same treatment no matter what they need. Equality means giving everyone an equal opportunity to achieve what they are capable of. <i>Sometimes</i> it is <i>necessary</i> (expedient) to	Not really asking a question, but emphasising one view as the right answer. Obscures how the language of rights in India works around 'grouping', see's these groups as homogenous units, and in the process may discriminate against individuals in all the groups. ie: a poor Brahmin vis-à-vis an SC person, an SC in a village v/s one in the city or belonging to a family that has already availed of reservations for a few	Reservations are about equal opportunities for sections of society that are not socially and economically at par with the rest.

<p>Governments have different schemes for giving preference to women, poor or physically handicapped in some kinds of jobs. Are these reservations against the right to equality? They are not. For equality does not mean giving everyone the same treatment no matter what they need. Equality means giving everyone an equal opportunity to achieve what they are capable of. Sometimes it is necessary to give special treatment to someone in order to ensure equal opportunity. That is what job reservations do. Just to clarify this, the Constitution says that reservations of this kind are not a violation of the Right to Equality</p>	<p>give <i>special treatment</i> (crutches) to <i>someone</i> (the individual as representative of the group) in order to <i>ensure equal opportunity</i> (ensure a semblance of equal outcomes, in the absence of a substantive experience of equality) Just to clarify this, the Constitution says that reservations of this kind are not a violation of the Right to Equality (evoking the constitution to seal the debate)</p>	<p>generations. Implying reservations are these equal opportunities? Are they not crutches in the absence of equal opportunities and the commitment to make opportunities more equal?</p>	
<p>Democratic Rights (2005)</p>	<p>Meaning</p>	<p>Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)</p>	<p>UA/UC</p>
<p>p.102, Activity: Go to the playground of any school or stadium and watch a 400metre race on any track. Why are the competitors on the outer lane placed ahead of those on in the inner lane at the starting point of the race? What would happen if the competitors start the race from the same line? Which of these two would be an equal and fair race? Apply this example in a competition for jobs.</p>		<p>A downright bad example. Being ahead on the outer lane does not change the distance that has to be run to get to the finish (which is equal for all participants) Unlike in competition for jobs through reservations.</p>	<p>Reservations are like the different positioning of the person on the outermost lane of a race track. (which is not true)</p>
<p>p.102, Observe any big public building. Is there a ramp for the physically handicapped? Are there any other facilities that make it possible for the physically handicapped to use the building in the same way as everyone else? Should these special facilities be</p>		<p>By itself, the example is sound. However, can a parallel be drawn to reservations? I would think not. (this is neither suggested, nor is a clear separation made) I see the changes to the building as a structural change, that with regard to the social disability of the SC's</p>	

provided, if it leads to extra expenditure on the building? Do these special provisions go against the principle of equality?		is not made in the Indian context.	
Democratic Rights (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
p.103, (Box) Many forms of Untouchability (a more descriptive account of how untouchability exists today as summarised by journalist P.Sainath, followed by a question-) “All these fall under the definition of untouchability. Can you think of some examples from your own area?”		Draws attention to the finer details, and deals with caste based discrimination as a problem that exists here and now rather than in the past.	
p.106, Right to Freedom of Religion ... Every person has a right to profess, practice and propagate the religion (emphasis as in original) he or she believes in. every religious group or sect is free to manage its religious affairs. A right to propagate ones religion, however, does not mean that a person has right to compel another person to convert into his religion by means of force, fraud, inducement or allurement. Ofcourse, a person is free to change religion on his or her own will. Freedom to practice religion does not mean that a person can do whatever he wants in the name of religion. For example, one cannot sacrifice animals or human beings as offerings to supernatural forces or gods.		How does freedom of religion impact the notion of ‘equality’ of citizens when religious world views sometimes work against it?	

Democratic Rights (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
p.106, Religious practices which treat women as inferior or those that infringe women's freedom are not allowed. For example, one cannot force a widowed woman to shave head or wear white clothes.		What about religious practices that reinforce gender stereotypes and privileges? (son lighting the funeral pyre for the parents soul to gain liberation) Or those that endorse unfair treatment in routine life (dowry when the daughter gets married, no landed property to the daughter)	
p.106, Cultural and Educational Rights (subtitle)...why were the Constitutional makers so particular in providing written guarantees of the rights of the minorities. Why are there no special guarantees for the majority? Well, for the simple reason that the working of democracy gives power to the majority. It is the language, culture and religion of minorities that needs special protection/ otherwise they might get neglected or undermined under the impact of the language, religion and culture of the minorities.		(from the article on minimum requirement with religious education)	language, culture and religion of minorities are 'vulnerable' things, that need to be protected in the interest of democracy. Implicitly, they are not things that can harm the secular and egalitarian ideal of India's plural polity.
p.107, All minorities have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice. Here minority does not mean only religious minority at the national level. In some places people speaking a particular language are in majority; people speaking a different language are in a minority. For example, Telungu speaking people form a majority in Andhra Pradesh. But they are a minority in the neighbouring State of		Where does socialisation as equal and egalitarian ethos sharing citizens of an integrated polity figure in such minority education institutions (especially with regard to religious minorities?) Is this assumption analysed	

Karnataka.			
p.107, ... Right to Constitutional Remedies. This itself is a Fundamental Right. This right makes other rights effective. It is possible that sometimes our rights may be violated by fellow citizens, private bodies or the government. When any of these rights are violated we can seek remedy through the courts. If it is a Fundamental Right we can directly approach the Supreme Court or the High Court of a state. ... Fundamental rights are guaranteed against the actions of Legislatures, the Executive, and any other authorities instituted by the government. There can be no law or action that violates the Fundamental Rights.	'Can' if we are wealthy, well-informed and/or well-connected		Fundamental Rights are almost sacrosanct.

Democracy and Diversity (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
p.31, Differences, Similarities, divisions (subtitle) cartoon: I met this group of girls from Pakistan and felt that I had more in common with them than many girls from other parts of my own country. Is this anti-national to feel so?		Friendship and conciliation with Pakistan	Pakistani's have a lot in common with Indians from some regions
p.32, Origins of social divisions (subheading) These social divisions are mostly based on accident of birth. Normally we don't choose to belong to our community. We belong to it simply because we are born into it.		A 'secular' argument . Negates the religious argument of predestination by ignoring it.	Belonging to a community has to be understood as a matter of chance
p.32, ...But all kinds of social differences are not based on accident of			Belonging to a social group can also be a matter of choice.

birth. Some of the differences are based on our choices. For example, some people are atheists. They don't believe in God or any religion. Some people choose to follow a religion other than the one in which they were born.			
p.32, Every social difference does not lead to social division (explained with the help of an example)			
p.33, Overlapping and cross-cutting differences (subheading) Social division takes place when some social difference overlaps with other differences...In our country Dalits tend to be poor and landless. They often face discrimination and injustice. Situations of this kind produce social divisions, when one kind of social difference becomes more important than the other and people start feeling that they belong to different communities (different fate of Ireland and Netherlands both of which have Catholics and Protestants, but different distribution of wealth among the 2 groups cited)	Social division born of social differences surface when each difference reinforces and intensifies other differences.	Is this too simplistic? Then why India and Pakistan or Pakistan and Bangladesh?	
p.33, Social divisions of one kind or another exist in most countries.			This is normal. Being accommodative of difference is important.
p.34, Politics of social divisions (subtitle2) How do these social divisions affect politics? What does politics do to these social divisions?At first sight it would appear that the combination of politics and social divisions is very dangerous and explosive.	Social divisions can affect the country in very adverse ways,	Concern and seriousness	
p.34, Democracy involves competition	Political parties can play on social	Negative depiction of parties that play on	Social division leading to open conflict

among various political parties. If they start competing in terms of existing social divisions, it can make social divisions into political divisions and lead to conflict, violence or even disintegration of a country. This has happened in many countries.	divisions. The parties that do this potentially lead the country into conflict.	denominational characteristics.	and disintegration owing to the agenda of political parties is also common.
p.34, Range of outcomes(subheading 2.1) (discusses peace building in Northern Ireland and disintegration in Yugoslavia)			
p.36, ...social divisions of one kind or another exist in most countries of the world. Wherever they exist these divisions are reflected in politics. In a democracy it is only natural that political parties would talk about these divisions, make different promises to different communities, look after due representation of various communities and make policies to redress the grievances of the disadvantaged communities. Social divisions affect voting in most countries. People from one community tend to prefer one party over others. In many countries there are parties that focus only on one community. Yet all this does not lead to disintegration of the country.		<p>Elsewhere also brings in a more nuanced aspect of how divisions that get reflected in politics require interrogation: (through another frame: Challenges to Democracy, 2005)</p> <p>Lyngdoh Madam:... “there is already a law banning any appeal to caste and religion in politics. Politicians find a way to bypass that. Laws can have little impact unless people resist attempts to mislead and divide people in the name of caste and religion. You cannot have democracy in the real sense unless people and politicians overcome the barriers of caste and religion”</p>	India is not alone in facing these challenges. Social divisions lead to lots of fracturing of polity but it still endures.
p.36, Three determinants (subheading 2.2) three factors are crucial in deciding the outcome of politics of social divisions. First of all outcome depends on how people perceive their identities...singular and exclusive	‘or a social community’ (euphemism for caste?)	‘This is how most people in our country see their identity: they think of themselves as Indian as well as belonging to a state or a language group or a social and religious community.’	

terms... (or) multiple and are complementary with the national identity... This is how most people in our country see their identity: they think of themselves as Indian as well as belonging to a state or a language group or a social and religious community.		Counter point: Shah Bano case	
p.36, Second, it depends on how political leaders raise the demand of any community. It is easier to accommodate demands that are within the constitutional framework and are not at the cost of another community.		What about something like religion-specific personal law that is within the constitutional framework (depending on how it is interpreted) but may seem more threatening to some communities than others.	
p.37, Third, it depends on how government reacts to demands of different groups...if the rulers are willing to share power and accommodate the reasonable demands of minority community, social divisions become less threatening for the country. But if they try to suppress the demand in the name of national unity, the end result is often quite the opposite	'reasonable demands of minority community'...at the very minimum, not challenge integrity of the polity. (Not made clear)	What is 'reasonable': again the Shah Bano case	

Gender, religion and caste (2005)	Meaning	Imagery/ Ethos/ Logos/ Pathos (also Comments/ Questions I ask of the text)	UA/UC
p.39, (Overview)... we look at three kind of social differences that can take the form of social differences and inequalities. These are social differences based on gender, religion and caste. In each case we look at nature of this division in India and how it gets expressed in politics. We also ask whether different expressions based on		Speaks to the schoolchildren as young adults, not as 'kids'	Gender, religion and caste merit special examination as cases of social difference that may lead to social division

these differences are healthy or otherwise in a democracy.			
p.46, Religion, communalism and politics (subtitle 2)...Many countries including India have in their populations, followers of different religions...the religious differences are often expressed in the field of politics.			Religious plurality makes its presence felt in politics
p.46, Consider the following -Gandhiji used to say that religion can never be separated from politics... He believed that politics must be guided by ethics drawn from religion.			The Gandhian legacy posited a unique relationship between religion and politics for India
p.46, - human rights groups in our country have argued that most of the victims of communal riots in our country are members from the religious minorities, they have demanded that the government take special steps to protect religious minorities.			Minorities suffer more human rights violations during communal riots in India
p.46, - women's movement has argued that FAMILY LAWS of all religions discriminate against women. So they have demanded that government should change these laws to make them more equitable.		If all fundamental rights are interpreted simultaneously how can the denial of right to equality (for women) be allowed to bow to right to freedom of religion (for men/ powerful sections of the church)?	All religions family laws discriminate against women (right to equality)
p.46-47, All these instances involve a relationship between religion and politics. But they do not seem very wrong or dangerous....These political acts are not wrong as long as they treat every religion equally.			Relationship between religion and politics per se is not bad
p.47, Communalism (subheading 2.1) the problem begins when religion is seen as			

<p>the basis of the nation...communal politics is based on the idea that religion is the principal basis of social community...in its extreme form communalism leads to the belief that people belonging to different religions cannot live as equal citizens within one nation.</p>			
<p>p.47, This belief is fundamentally flawed. People of one religion do not have the same interests and aspirations in every context. Everyone has several other roles, positions and identities. There are many voices inside every community. All these voices have a right to be heard. Therefore any attempt to bring all followers of one religion together in context other than religion is bound to suppress many voices within that community</p>	<p>Religious groupings are not a monolith: a strong argument for not using them as multi-purpose entities in organising public life</p>	<p>'any attempt to bring all followers of one religion together in context other than religion' : Even bringing followers together in the context of their religion can be problematic as subscription to, and interpretation of dogmas can differ</p>	
<p>p.47, Communalism can take various forms in politics: -...in everyday beliefs...routinely involve religious prejudices, stereotypes of religious communities and belief in the superiority of one religion over other religions.</p>	<p>Communalism is manifest in routine prejudice and stereotypes</p>		
<p>p.47, - a communal mind often leads to a quest for political dominance of ones own religious community. For those belonging to the majority community, this takes the form of majoritarian dominance. For those belonging to the minority community, it can take the form of a desire to form a separate political</p>	<p>Communalism often is manifest in majoritarianism or seperatism</p>		

unit.			
p.47-48, -political mobilisation on religious lines is another frequent form of communalism. This involves the use of sacred symbols, religious leaders, emotional appeal and plain fear in order to bring followers of one religion together in the political arena. In electoral politics this often involves special appeal to the interests or emotions of voters of one religion in preference to others.	Also in electoral politics through appeal to religion/ sectarian interests		
p.48, -sometimes communalism takes its most ugly form of communal violence, riots and massacre. India and Pakistan suffered some of the worst communal riots at the time of partition. The post independence period has also seen large scale communal violence.	Openness – belief that one builds strength through self-criticism rather than self-deception. In some contrast to previous volumes.		The ugliest manifestation of communalism are communal riots.
<p>p.48, Secular State (subheading 2.2)...makers of our Constitution were aware of this challenge. That is why they chose the model of a secular state...reflected in several constitutional provisions...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no official religion for Indian state - ...freedom to profess, practice and propagate any religion, or not to follow any - Prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion - ...allows state to intervene in the matters of religion in order to ensure equality within 		<p>...freedom to profess, practice and propagate any religion : religious dogmas that disturb social harmony/ foster feelings of superiority and prejudice? (No freedom for religion that prevents freedom for other religions which is not mentioned)</p> <p>...allows state to intervene in the matters of religion in order to ensure equality within religious communities : what has the state done about women's rights and family laws?</p>	

religious communities			
p.49,...secularism....This idea constitutes one of the foundations of our country. Communalism should not be seen as a threat to some people in India. It threatens the very idea of India		It was only in 1976, during the 'Emergency' regime of prime minister Indira Gandhi, that the word 'secular' was introduced into the Preamble of the Constitution by the 42 nd Amendment	
p.49, Communal prejudices and propaganda needs to be countered in every day life and religion based mobilisation needs to be countered in the arena of politics.			There is a need to tackle communalism in the private and the public sphere.
p.50, BOX: Social and Religious Diversity of India.There is a common but mistaken impression that the proportion of Muslims in the country's population is going to overtake other religious groups. Expert estimates done for the Prime Ministers High Level Committee (popularly known as the Sachar Committee) show that the proportion of Muslims is expected to go up a little, by about 3 to 4 percent, in the next 50 years. It proves that in overall terms, the population balance of different religious groups is not likely to change in any big way.		<i>Was quite surprised by this inclusion; a direct rebuttal to Right wing propaganda</i>	
p.51, Caste in Politics (subtitle 3)...Caste inequalities (subheading 3.1)...All societies have some form of social inequality and some form of division of labour. In most societies occupations are passed on from one generation to another. Caste system is an extreme form of this.			Caste as an extreme form of institutionalised inequality based on hereditary occupations.
p.49...Members of the same caste group	Outcastes are constituted on the basis of		Caste also has social norms and

<p>were supposed to form a social community that practiced the same or similar occupation, married within the caste group and did not eat with members from other caste groups. Caste system was based on exclusion of and discrimination against 'outcaste' groups. They were subjected to the inhuman practice of untouchability.</p>	<p>the occupation. This is not mentioned. The drudgery and indignity of these occupations and notions of purity and pollution emerging from them were also not mentioned.</p>		<p>practices, discriminatory to out-groups.</p>
<p>p.51...with economic development, large scale URBANISATION, growth of literacy and education, OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY and the weakening of the position of landlords in villages, the old notions of CASTE HIERARCHY are breaking down....The Constitution of India prohibited any caste based discrimination and laid the foundations of policies to reverse the injustices of caste system.</p>			<p>Caste hierarchy in the old sense is being challenged by various developments.</p>
<p>p.51, Yet caste has not disappeared from contemporary India. ...even now most people marry within their own caste or tribe. Untouchability has not ended completely despite constitutional prohibition....The caste groups that had access to education under the old system have done well in acquiring modern education as well. Those groups that did not have access to education or were prohibited from acquiring it have naturally lagged behind. That is why there is a disproportionately large presence of 'upper caste' among the urban middle classes in our country.</p>	<p>The fact of the caste- economic status link: undermines the 'gains' mentioned above from urbanisation and occupational mobility. Being part of the 'middle class' used as a reference point.</p>		<p>Social correlates of caste remain.</p>

Caste continues to be closely linked to economic status.			