

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.

Topic : There never was a good war or a bad peace.

Using some numbers and arguments,

They'll always try to justify war.

'It is for a just cause', they'll say

But is it the only way?

These lines try to depict the reality of a war process. Historically speaking, the concept of war can

be traced back to the ancient times.

Wars, although at a small scale,

were fought to protect and

control cattle. In India, the same

was termed as 'gavishti'. Over the years, wars have been fought for various reasons or causes.

For instance in the medieval times of Delhi Sultanate, Mughals, Egyptian empire and the likes, war was often fought in the name of 'religion' - 'jihad'.

What has been a constant feature throughout, is the fact that there has always been some reason which has been stated to justify war. ~~and hence~~ These attempts were made to classify the wars as 'good wars'

A good war can said to be one where the end goal or ulterior motive might be a legitimate one. ~~similar~~ is However, be it good or bad, the relation between war and peace has always been antithetical. Where there is war, peace can never exist.

On the same lines, the concept of 'bad peace' can be defined as peace which might lead to some negative consequences - tangible or intangible. For example, holding onto peace in the face of brutal oppression might have its psychological implications.

Good War and Bad Peace - A Myth

On close observation and analysis, one may realize that indeed there never was a good war or a bad peace.

There are several reasons to justify this claim.

Firstly, from an ethical perspective, Means do not justify ends. However good the end goal maybe, the path chosen must also be a good one, or else it becomes ethically wrong. For example, during the World War II, countries such as Britain and USA attempted to justify the war as a

'good war'. They said that the aim of the war was to protect the world from authoritarian regimes and dictators such as Hitler and Mussolini.

Secondly, the fact that there are no winners in a war, it is humanity that loses, makes one realize that there can never truly be a good war. The number of people that died during the two global wars is indicative of the same.

Thirdly, war undoes almost the progress that mankind has made over the centuries. The recent Ukraine-Russia war is the

the example of the same. It severely disrupted the decades of peace and global cooperation that the world had maintained after World War II.

Next, the manifold and multidimensional impact (negative) that war has prevents it from ever becoming a good war. At the psychological level, war causes anxiety, depression and post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Considering the social aspect, war leads to issues such as displacement, loss of brotherhood and refugee crisis. In fact, the refugee issues

during the conflict between East Pakistan and West Pakistan was the very reason why there ended up being an Indo-Pak War.

Economically, wars cause loss of livelihood and lead to poverty and widening inequality. For example, countries in Africa such as Niger, Chad and Cameroon which are war prone are countries where poverty and hunger are maximum. Moreover, these regions remain highly under-developed.

Similarly, bad peace too often remains a myth. One of the primary reasons behind this is that

peace is the only lasting and sustainable solution. India's freedom struggle (non-violent) led by Mahatma Gandhi is indicative of the same.

Moreover, peace, truly brings people and the world together. It leads to flourishing of universal humanism and brotherhood. Nelson Mandela's peaceful struggle in South Africa is an example of the same. And another example is how Martin Luther King Jr. after being inspired by Gandhiji fought peacefully for the rights of Blacks.

Additionally, it can be said that peace leads to development in all spheres and walks of life. How is it that peace can be categorized as bad? One need only look a few decades back to realize this.

After the second world war, Japan amended its constitution to add a provision that prohibits Japan's participation in any war. This led to a renewed focus on development and peace. And today, Japan is one of the most developed and successful countries in the world.

However, a question that arises is whether 'good war' & 'bad peace' can never occur? or has never happened?

Always some exceptions

Although the occurrences are rare and few, from one perspective there have been instances of 'good war' and 'bad peace'. One of the reasons behind the same is that the terms good and bad are highly subjective. Therefore, strict classification becomes extremely difficult.

One example of a good war can

be the global war on terrorism led by United States of America after the 9/11 attacks. There are many who argue that a global war is indeed necessary to effectively curtail & eradicate terrorism.

Similarly, an example of 'bad peace' can be the peace agreement between USA and Taliban that happened just a year back. It led to downfall of the democratically elected Afghanistan government and rise of the authoritarian Taliban regime. Here, as one can clearly see, peace was indeed bad. Even today the oppression by Taliban continues.

What one may realize from this is that some times things are not black and white, especially in this grey world. That being said, it is also imperative to understand that it is war that should remain an exception and peace should always be the priority.

At the national level, countries need to learn from Japan and strive towards a 'no war policy'. Similarly, India's policy of 'no first attack' is also a positive sign.

At the global level, there need to be strong institutional measures to prevent war (whatever be the cause).

Attempts must be made to strengthen global cooperation by transparent and open participation in organizations such as United Nations.

One must always recall the words of Wilfred Owen, who in his poem 'Dulce Et Decorum Est'

exposed the myth of a 'just war'

"My friend, you will not tell with such high zest

The [Old Lie]: 'Dulce Et Decorum est pro patria mori'

Meaning: (Its sweet & fitting to die for your country)

Section B

Topic : He who will not economize
will have to agonize.

Both India and Pakistan
achieved freedom in 1947. Thereafter,
the two newborn nations had
a huge task at their hands.

While India chose a very carefully
planned approach, the same was
not the case with Pakistan.

The result today is evident.
India is one of the fastest growing
economies in the world, whereas

Pakistan is still struggling with poverty, growth and economic crisis. While India chose to economize, Pakistan's approach was more of being a combination of ad hoc and wasteful.

The Indian experience, clearly highlights the need to economize.

However, before further substantiation, it is imperative to understand the term economize.

In the narrow sense the term is generally associated with finance. It means to practice thrift, reduce wasteful expenditure and have a planned approach.

However, in a broad sense, the term can be extended to many fields. For example, recycling of waste (circular model) is an example of economization. What Japan did during the Tokyo Olympics 2020 speaks of the same. Japan had created the medals by extracting valuable metals from ewaste.

Similarly, in the energy sector, saving energy, practicing 'earth hour' are examples of economization.

The same can be said about saving natural resources such as water

Additionally, the term economization can also be extended to governance. In a sense the concept of 'Minimum government - Maximum governance' can be said to resemble economization.

Need to economize

There are a couple of primary reasons that justify the need to economize. Firstly, the fact that resources are limited but wants are unlimited makes it imperative to economize. In the context of India - India has only 2.4% of global land but has to support 17% of the global population.

Secondly, economization is extremely important to achieve sustainable and long lasting growth.

The ^{term} concept 'sustainable' refers to fulfilling the needs of today without compromising the needs of tomorrow.

In fact, if the world wishes to achieve the target set during Paris conference (limit temperature rise to 1.5°C) - the world has to economize both financially as well as with respect to energy and natural resources.

No economization = Agony

It is indeed true that he who will not economize will have to agonize. And this can be looked at different levels for having better clarity.

At the individual level, one who does not economize will face manifold economic and social issues. It will lead to poverty and a reduced standard of living. For example wasteful expenditure and lack of planning often leads to a viscious cycle of poverty and debt.

At the level of family or an organization, non-economization can lead to severe distress, loss of employment and bankruptcy. A family that does not economize simply passes down its agony to the next generation.

The example of Vijay Mallya and Kingfisher airlines highlights the same. Lack of economization led to unsustainable debt - over 500 crores and eventually led to bankruptcy. This caused agony not only to the employees of the company

who lost their jobs but also to the lenders who had lend their money.

Next, at the societal level too non-economization has negative consequences which leads to agony. Lack of economization plays a part in perpetuating inequality and causing issues such as hunger. The reports such as Global Hunger Index and World Inequality Report paint a grim picture.

Moving up, nations that do not economize face manifold problems. Before the 1991 reforms, India faced a Balance of Payment crisis

due to lack of economization. Similarly, Sri Lanka today is witnessing severe economic crisis due to the same reason. Sri Lanka's populist measures completely discarded the need to economize and it has led to severe distress.

Lastly, at the international level, the world suffers agony in the form of issues such as climate change, loss of biodiversity and reduction in resources leading to threat of conflict and war. IPCC's 6th assessment report has talked of irreversible changes that have already

taken place.

The way Forward

It is evident by now that ^{the} way forward is to economize. Certain steps/measures if taken can help in the process of economization.

Firstly, economization has to be made an institutional quality. The basic process of budgeting can have a remarkable effect. Preparing and sticking to a budget leads to a better control over expenditure and usage.

Secondly, the need to economize should be clearly conveyed to children

right from the younger days. In schools, students must be taught ~~the~~ about the importance of practicing thrift.

Thirdly, good efforts made by people/organizations with respect to economization must be recognized & encouraged. Offering awards or some economic or other benefits can truly bring a positive change in people. People need to obtain walk on a middle path between spending and saving.

Lastly, the words of Mahatma Gandhi can act as a guide for all on the path of economization. He had said 'There is enough in the world for everybody's needs but not for their greeds'. In this light, one can learn and practice the quality of economization to have a peaceful, happy and agony free life.