

EVALUATION INDICATORS

1. Contextual Competence
2. Content Competence
3. Language Competence
4. Introduction Competence
5. Structure - Presentation Competence
6. Conclusion Competence

Overall Macro Comments / feedback / suggestions on Answer Booklet:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

All the Best

Section A

Ans-1

1) If the only tool you have is a hammer, you tend to see every problem as a nail

Stories through ages - Ram was the head of a tribe in the stone ages, and had developed practice of killing all animals that wandered near his tribe as the only way for their safety. But it was a difficult task as they were already short on people, and the wild animals, especially the much dreaded elephants, were in large number in the wild. Things changed for the better when his brother Ramesh successfully domesticated the elephants, making it easier to kill the other wild beasts

Similarly in modern India, the British had followed policies of suppression, till that led to the Great Revolt of 1857.

It was then that someone suggested the policy of divide and rule, that created forces - ~~on~~ communal and casteist - that supported British rule in India till independence.

These examples ~~in~~ indicate how using force to solve problems is not always the best decision.

In this essay, we will understand the philosophy of the hammer, its ill effects, other tools that can be used, and finally, the need for balance.

The philosophy of Hammer - Hammer is the embodiment of brute force that maybe used to ~~the~~ put down the nail (the problems).

It is a very useful tool, but not if it is the only tool one has, because that makes the person see every problem as a nail.

Depending on different situations, different tools, including the hammer, are required to be used for optimal results.

Fate of those with only hammer -

History is full of such men, and the consequences of their actions are often such that the nails

continue to pop out, or the structure being repaired itself breaks down.

Starting with our ancient epics, the first example that comes to mind is of Ravana. During different points of the war with Lord Ram, he could have used diplomacy for favourable results. But he instead chose to act rashly and forcibly crush every problem, including throwing out his brother, who played major role in his defeat.

Then during the times of Tanepades, there was the arrogant king Dhanananda. His single-minded methods of crushing all opposition

led to the fall of the mightiest ruler of that time at the hands of the young Chandragupta Maurya, supported the master strategist Kautilya.

During the medieval times, when King Jaychand became at odds with Brithviraj Chauhan, he became part of Mod. Ghori's hammer in striking Brithviraj down, and the result was his (Jaychand's) death at the hands of Ghori the very next year.

Alauddin Khilji, the man who brutally crushed all opposition during his time, was killed by his most trusted servant, Melik Kafur. Who was in turn

poisoned by his bodyguards following his reign of terror. Not learning from his predecessor's mistakes, Mohammed Bin Tughlaq undertook series of decisions that made him infamous as the most whimsical and autocratic failed rulers in history, despite having been a highly learned person.

In the Mughal empire, it was Aurangzeb who showed the world what happens when the ruler is eager to crush even the slightest bit of opposition to his rule. His constant wars with all neighbouring kingdoms, in an effort to bring

back the empire the prestige it enjoyed during Akbar's time, leads to the beginning of the end of rule of Mughals.

Then there were the Rathwas - brave and skillful, yet not knowledgeable about the benefits of diplomacy and power sharing.

They eagerly crushed other rulers of those times, not even sparing the Scindias, Gaekwads, Holkars and Blonsles, who were their allies, leading to their defeat in the Third war of Panipat.

At the global level, French emperor Louis XVI tried to forcibly crush the people's

movement, leading to his downfall and subsequent execution. He could have simply negotiated with them and have extended his rule.

Similarly, the Czar of Russia in 1905 brutally suppressed the ~~few~~ peaceful demonstrators, leading to a revolution, that finally culminated in the downfall of feudalism in Russia in 1917.

In the post-independence India, there was the much dreaded emergency in 1970s, that led to the first non-Congress government at centre.

Finally, the Ukraine war today, is a clear show of what happens when countries at advantage (US and its allies) hammer down the relatively weaker powers (Russia) beyond a certain extent.

This tendency to solve problems by force is also observed in parenting styles of many people, where slightest dissent of children is hammered down, until finally, the children learn to use the hammer themselves

benefits of other tools - There are other tools such as diplomacy and

negotiations that when used at the right place, turn rails turns into coat-hangers.

For example, Samudragupta of India, conquered many states, but didn't try to take over the North-Western states as they served as buffer with the Huns, leading to sustainable victories.

Then in modern India, there was the East India Company that mixed flattery and diplomacy to make fools out of the Indian kings, and bring the whole of India under their rule.

At the world level, one of the most cunning strategist

the world has ever seen was Hitler, ^{the} man who started the Second World War. His masterstrokes of diplomacy made Germany the greatest power of Europe at that time, although he also succumbed to the temptations of the hammer.

Like these, there are many examples that demonstrate the utility of tools other than hammer.

but is the use of hammer always bad?

Balance between tools - The best results are obtained when a person uses the right tools at the right time.

Apprehension of Muslim League by
the British and West's Munich
fact with Germany, are grave
reminders of the harms of
diplomacy where it is not desired.

And the ability to decide on the
right tools is developed
through experience, and
requires virtues of tolerance,
patience and control over
one's emotions.

Conclusion - The virtues needed
for making right
decisions should be inculcated
in children from a young
age by allowing them
to experience such scenarios
through activities.

And emphasis should be there on promotion of Indian culture that has long helped us develop self control and tolerance.

Finally, the virtue of having multiple tools, in addition to hammer, ~~becomes~~^{is} important for India in today's times when the world is again moving towards a ~~most~~ polarised order, ready for conflicts.

As Grandhiji said, "when restraint and courtesy are added to strength, the latter becomes irresistible".

Section BAns-6

The best is the ~~the~~ enemy of the good

Lata was a weightlifter who was predicted to win the silver medal in the Olympics as she was quite good in the sport. But she wanted to win the gold, so she started training with weights well beyond her capacity, and the result was that she was not even able to qualify the games in Tokyo in 2021 due to excessive fatigue.

Around 1900 CE, there was a young boy who was good in

mathematics and physics, but he wanted to be the best.

This inspired him to undertake researches that changed the face of physics as the world knew, and brought unprecedented benefits for mankind. The world knows that young men as Albert Einstein.

These incidences highlight how the best can be both the enemy, as well as the future, of good.

In this essay, we would examine the difference between the good and the better, how the quest for better can be disastrous or fruitful, and

the right balance to avoid
conflict between the two

Good versus best — Best is the
next level
of something that is good,
as is a sign of ambition and
greed.

but often, being overambitious
leads to losing even the
good thing in the quest for
the best one.

As the saying goes — "A bird
in hand is worth two in the
bushes"

Good to worse in the quest for
best — Ambition can be there
in people in all fields,
but there have been many

cases where it led to things
getting worse

In the field of geopolitics,
Austria-Hungary (erstwhile) is a
good example of what happens
when rulers are overambitious.

From a major superpower, the
kingdom was reduced to state
of a minor player in the
international arena by the
World War I.

Then in 1939, Hitler decided
to make Germany the greatest
power, although it was already
a major one at that time.

His endeavours made Germany the
best in Europe, but the quest

for being the best in the world led to Germany's defeat in World War II (WW II).

And Japan, an ally of Germany during WW II, ~~also~~ in its quest for being best in Pacific region, has reached a state ~~who~~ today where it has to host military base of a foreign country for its security.

Similarly, Ukraine's ambitions for more power, with the support of NATO, has led to its current state where it is being ravaged by Russia.

In the field of economic matters, the case of the rise and

fall of Anil Ambani is a clear example of what happens when a person bites off more than what he can chew in quest for being the best.

Also, India's unsustainable growth, during the period between 1991 and 2008 in the quest for being the fastest growing major economy, has led to high levels of inequality - \$ top 10% hold 57% of the wealth, and the bottom 50% hold only 13% according to World Inequality Report 2022, that posed the danger of pushing India in the middle income trap.

As a real life incident, my uncle told me how ~~that~~ there was a guy in his college (AIIMS, Delhi) who bribed the clerk for increasing his marks in the exam. # But was caught (and later committed suicide) after he "topped" the exams several times.

In the area of environmental welfare, the world is moving from ~~an~~ good existing renewable energy technologies to solar power, touted as the best currently. This is leading to large scale problem of solar waste, with IRENA predicting India to be one

of the top 5 solar waste
generators by 2050.

All these examples are grim
reminders of how being
overambitious can lead to loss
of the existing good situations.
But is ambition always bad?

Benefits of ambition - When ambition
is sustainable,
it can lead to welfare of
communities.

For example, USA's ambitions
led to it becoming the
sole superpower, and causing
different developing and
developed nations to adopt
its culture. Today, USA is

the largest economy in terms of GDP and the global financial system is dollar-dominated.

In the field of science and technology, works of ambitious scientists have opened up new frontiers in the areas of biotechnology, electronics and quantum physics, positively impacting the lives of millions eg- GM crops for food security.

In India, ISRO's ambitions were what led to the success of the Mars Orbiter Mission, making India the first country to achieve this in its first try.

And finally, it is ambition that has enabled India to stand toe head to head with world's greatest powers, only 75 years after the British ~~fe~~ left it devastated and impoverished.

Avoidance of conflict between good and best - In most of the cases, the quest for best leads to losing the good when the methods are unsustainable, and contain high degree of uncalculated risk.

The main factor for conversion of good to best is experience in decision making, and humility to heed constructive advices.

~~And~~ avoidance of greed and Mrs, objectivity in thinking contribute to success.

Conclusion - Well said by someone - "Ambition is the quality of great men", the saying reflects that one should not be discouraged by failures, and think big for being successful.

Even Article 51(j) of the Constitution of India encourages its citizens to be ambitious, while being level headed and objective in their approach.

And it is this attitude of

sustainable growth that is
required for prosperity of India in
the days to come.

As Jawaharlal Nehru said - "
Being too cautious is the greatest
risk of all "

VisionIAS