

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.

1. A HEALTHY LOYALTY IS NOT PASSIVE AND COMPLACENT, BUT ACTIVE AND CRITICAL.

During my college days, I was passionate about research in human behaviour. I had an erudite research team, whose members became my closest and most loyal friends. The project that I had worked on for about a year was nearing its end.

To give a justified closure to my work, I decided to write a research paper for the same, to submit it to a reputed conference. I toiled for days to create a paper that I considered to be a masterpiece. I showed it to my entire team and they liked it too, but did not give many comments.

So my horses, the paper was rejected by the conference. The critical feedback provided to me made me angry and irrational. I blasted out at my team accusing the conference of being biased. My teammates did not say anything, possibly thinking that I might lash out at them as well.

I submitted the paper as it is to another conference, which rejected it too. Distracted and broken, I went to my team. My teammates told me that I never accepted their criticisms and always defended my work to a fault. Hence they stopped giving me feedback.

I realised how I had created an echo chamber from myself and created an environment unaccepting of constructive criticism. Hence my friends, though loyal, had

turned passive and complacent.

I apologized to my team and requested them to be more active and critical about my work. Which they did, and my paper was finally accepted in my next submission, because I acted on their advice and took the criticism positively. I had thus created an environment which encouraged criticism and dissent, not passivity and complacency.

The above incident taught me a lot about behaviour, like my research. This essay aims to take it forward. First, we examine what loyalty means. Looking at its characteristics, we see how passive and complacent loyalty leads to downfall. We also see the reasons behind the same, and how we can encourage an active and critical loyalty. We look at

its importance ~~and~~ in bureaucracy, and finally justify its ethical perspective.

LOYALTY: CAN MAKE OR BREAK INDIVIDUALS

loyalty refers to the trust and faith that one individual or group confers to another. It is considered a valorous virtue, and disloyalty is considered as cowardice.

Loyalty can take many forms. A friend is loyal when he/she stands by you in your times-good or bad. Friends give you advice and steer you onto the right path if you go astray. That is healthy loyalty.

An individual may be loyal to a political party, meaning that she votes for it, propagates its agenda, etc. Here, a healthy loyalty would imply calling out the party's actions when she considers them wrong.

An unhealthy loyalty would mean turning a blind eye to the party's activities, even if they are nefarious.

Thus, loyalty takes various forms - a person may be loyal to many entities at the same time, some 'healthy' and some 'unhealthy'. We explore these terms next.

UNHEALTHY LOYALTY: PASSIVE AND COMPLACENT

As with the research paper incident, unhealthy loyalty is the one where the 'loyalists' are passive, i.e. not well responsive, or complacent, i.e. contented to a fault.

As an example, the House of Lords of Britain failed to criticize General Dyer and the Government over the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre of 1919, and even raised a sum of money for him. This is a classic example of complacency in their unhealthy

loyalty towards the British Government.

The dispensation of Indian MPs and MLAs towards their executive is another example. The MLAs and MPs that represent the ruling party do not criticize the policies of their government. Hence the legislature fails to keep the executive accountable. This is an example of passive unhealthy loyalty.

What causes such unhealthy loyalty to flourish? It is usually an individual who himself creates a toxic environment where unhealthy loyalty flourishes.

First, the loyalists might be loyal out of fear or favour. Past incidents might have shown compliance and complacence being rewarded and dissent being punished. The Anti-Defection law and presence of whip punishes dissent and hence creates an army of passive loyalists.

Second, an individual might himself be hostile to criticism. This again happens when being 'yes men' is ~~being~~ rewarded. This regularly happens in China's politics where the top leaders of CCP are hostile to criticism.

So what does passivity and complacency lead to? Why ~~is~~ is it bad?

First, if an individual goes astray, the loyalists fail to get him back on track. For example, China's loyalty to Pakistan shows up in its blocking of India's attempts to designate Some Pakistani Nationals as terrorists in the UNSC. This leads to Pakistan continuing to fund terror activities, resulting to domestic terrorism as well as sanctions threat by FATF (grey-list).

Second, it leaves little room for the growth of the individual or the group he represents. For example, the revivalist

Socio-cultural reform movements wanted to perpetuate the ills of Indian society - sati, caste system and child marriage. This passive loyalty proved to be highly regressive for the religion.

On the other hand, healthy loyalty can do wonders for economic and spiritual growths, as we will see next.

HEALTHY LOYALTY: ACTIVE AND CRITICAL

For loyalty to be healthy, the 'loyalists' need to be active, i.e. well responsive and proactive as well as critical, i.e. unequivocal and analytical, with no hesitation to criticise.

For instance,
The opposition party in a democracy takes the role of 'active criticism', being loyal to the office of the executive and to the country. Loyalty need not be towards the person holding the office, but to the office itself in this case.

What causes such loyalty to flourish? It requires the creation of an environment free from nepotism, where individuals show high emotional intelligence and the 'voice of dissent' is not muted.

First, it requires high emotional intelligence on the part of both the leader and the loyalists. For example, the Nehru Report of Motilal Nehru (1929) was dissented to by his own son Jawaharlal Nehru, who even stepped out of Congress temporarily. This shows ~~that~~ high emotional intelligence encouraging active and critical loyalty.

Second, the environment should lack nepotism, where individuals can contribute without fear or favour. For example, Akbar had Birbal among his advisors, who taught Akbar to correct many wrongs through his wit. Since Akbar was not hostile to criticism,

Birbal was able to criticize him without fear or favour, improving the king's governance.

As seen in the example above, dissent and criticism improved the king's governance. Similarly, healthy loyalty has many virtues: it allows growth for the leader and the loyalists. Activity and critical thinking is encouraged which improves the analytical abilities of the loyalists. These are essential virtues in today's age, and we shall see how.

HEALTHY LOYALTY: INDIA AND ITS BUREAUCRACY

India, being a parliamentary democracy, is founded on the principles of checks and balances; in other words: active proactivity and criticism. Time and again, India has shown that it stands for healthy loyalty.

For instance, while India and Israel are considered loyal partners, India

does not step back on its criticism of Israel's human rights violations in Palestine. The Non Aligned Movement is another example of India's principled loyalty.

The bureaucracy, which is the bedrock of Indian administration, has to maintain highest standards of healthy loyalty. Passive and complacent loyalty to the government will ruin India's developmental story.

The bureaucracy needs to possess high levels of integrity and emotional intelligence, call out nepotism, be critical of policies where necessary, and be proactive in their work and assessment.

We must always remember the ancient saying

"Satyam bruyad, Priyam Bruyad,
Na Bruyad Satyam Apriyam"
Priyam cha narbitam bruyadesha dharma
sanatana"

"(Speak the truth, Speak the good, Do
not speak good which is untrue), ~~do not~~
do not speak the disrespectful truth.
this is bñi dharma)"

X

7) "HE WHO WILL NOT ECONOMIZE WILL HAVE TO AGONIZE"

It is not without reason that history remembers Muhammad Bin-Tughlaq as the "mad king". Through a slew of untested, improperly planned, and uneconomic measures, he managed to leave the economy in shambles. First, he decided to shift the capital of the Sultanate from Delhi to Daulatabad in the Deccan. However, he had failed to properly assess the economics of the move. Thousands of buildings like rusthousers, markets and palaces had to be built, logistics of migration of scores of people to the new city had to be managed.

Since the king had failed to economize before making the decision, the

move was a massive failure. Thousands died of heat and starvation on the way. The building of the new capital left the coffers almost empty. Famines aggravated the already dire situation. Tughlaq had to reverse the move, but the damage could not be reversed.

In another ill-conceived decision, he introduced a bronze token currency. Little was done to economize and plan before the decisions were made. This move turned out to be a massive failure as well, since people started to counterfeit the currency and it further lost value. The king was forced to recall the currency, and it is said that there were heaps of coins lying outside the palace at one point!

These incidents left the economy in

a hopeless state, and revival proved difficult even for the future kings. It clearly shows how important it is to economize, and what can happen if one fails to do so. The ideas might not have been bad, but the lack of planning rendered them unsuccessful.

This essay aims to explore the how, what and why of economizing, and what its absence leads to. First, we look at some historical instances where not economizing led to agony. Then, we see how this agony need not be just for one person, but can affect billions. Then, we examine why economizing need not deal only with money. Then, we take an ethical perspective of the issue at hand. Finally, we understand what is needed for effective economizing and how it can pave way for a better future.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO "ECONOMIZE"

Every decision that we make has consequences. Some of these consequences might be "unintended", which means that they do not serve the exact purpose for which the decision was made. For example, recently, the 'National Mobile Monitoring System' app was introduced in MNREGA for digitized attendance collection, but an unintended consequence was that many female MNREGA mates stopped coming due to absence of smartphones.

To economize, means to plan, analyze both intended and unintended consequences, to rationalize ^{monetary} expenditure and perform a thorough economic and incidental impact analysis.

WHAT HISTORY TELLS US

As with the case of Tughlaq, history is fraught with examples of the importance of economizing.

During the age of the Mahajanapadas, cattle sacrifice was a common cultural tradition propagated by Brahmanas for Vedic rituals. The Kshatriya kings, in order to give the 'divine stamp' onto their kingship, readily accepted the rituals and sacrifices as the Brahmanas told them.

Soon, cattle sacrifice became so rampant that there was a shortage of cows in the empire, which was their most important source of sustenance. The economy suffered deeply. It was clearly because the kings and the Brahmanas had failed to economize.

Very soon, the damage was controlled with the entry of Sramana traditions and

the evolution of Hinduism to abolish cow slaughter, a practice that turned out to be so economically prudent that it has lived to this day.

Similarly, when the Pandavas lost Draupadi to gambling in the epic Mahabharata, it was because they had failed to economize. Had they planned their game and bets beforehand, they would not have had to face literal agony for losing their wife.

countless examples of pompos kings like the Mughal king 'Rangela' show the importance of economizing. It is rightly said that "Those who do not learn from history are damned to repeat it"

THE ECONOMICS OF BILLIONS

As we saw in the previous instances like of Tughlaq, not economizing can

agonize billions. It can also impact only a small group of people, like in the case of Pandavas. It might not even impact the decision maker itself, as in the MNREGA app instance, where the decision was made by someone but the impact fell entirely on a different group of people, the rural female poor.

However, cases where lack of economizing causes impact to the most number of people, are the most concerning. Take the case of the recent incidents in Sri Lanka. All-conceived policies like tax holidays, overnight shift to organic farming, inter alia, were highly uneconomic and showed clear lack of planning. In the virtual revolution that ensued, the economics of the country and millions of its residents, has fumbled.

Similarly, the Real Estate Bubble, ~~caused~~
of 2000s, caused by uneconomic lending
by American banks, finally burst in 2008
causing the Global Financial Crisis. Millions of
people lost their jobs and this caused
tremendous agony.

Economizing need not always involve
money. Economizing is a law of nature,
as we shall see next.

[NOT JUST MONEY]

Animals economize everyday. You
would never have seen an animal kill
or eat more than is necessary. They
do not hunt for pleasure, but only for
survival.

Animals not economizing would result
in their extinction in the long run, due
to lack of prey. Similarly, their over-eating
would starve the already scarce natural

resources.

The pre-capitalist human society was also similar, especially ancient Indian societies like the Rig Vedic society. Even today, most tribal cultures share a very sustainable life with forests and nature. This is a dear example of economizing.

On the other hand, the so called "developed" society lacks economizing with nature. This has resulted in problems like climate change, loss of biodiversity and pollution. Course correction is required, since failure to economize has already manifested itself in global warming, pandemics and natural disasters, causing widespread agony.

This brings us to an ethical perspective of to economizing, which we shall explore next.

AN ETHICAL PERSPECTIVE

We have seen that the lack of economizing causes agony not just to us but also to others. Usually, not economizing is due to a lack of foresightedness, impudence, greed and lack of compassion. The nature-destroying capitalist society is a classic example, where greed and materialism dominate.

On the other hand, one who economizes is prudent and far-sighted. One needs to look at an issue from its consequences, both intended and unintended. While the unintended consequences at times may be immutable, but they certainly can be predicted. One needs to give enough time, like Einstein said, "I'm not smart, I just sit with problems longer".

Ultimately, good economizing requires good economics and good ethics and a lot of patience. As seen before, it is a good investment of time and money, since the consequences ^{of not economizing} can be devastating. One needs to plan, perform & SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) of any situation before making a decision.

It is said that the poor are the best economists, since they have to economize at every step to sustain their living. It is high time that the rich barons of ~~socio~~ capitalist society learn from them and correct their course, before it's too late.