



Contact Details: 9163228921/8910154148

ESSAY TEST 2

Name of the Candidate	Saijya K. Das	Roll No.	0621263
Email ID	[REDACTED]	Date	2/7/23
Mobile No.	[REDACTED]		

INDEX TABLE			COMMENTS OF EVALUATORS	
Q.No	Max.Marks	Marks Obtained		
1	125	54		
2	125	53		
4				
5				
7				
8				
9			<p>Any specific message from Educrat IAS Mentors/Evaluators with respect to your copy? Mentor's Remarks:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19			Start Time:	End Time:
20			Mode of Examination:	Online <input type="checkbox"/> Offline <input type="checkbox"/>
Total Marks		107	TEST CODE:	Medium of Examination:

Too much democracy detrimental to dev.

Intro small hamlet ruled by a council
 → decision to build a canal for the village
 → they decided to vote

- ① Princely state integration -
- ② Decision making quick: pandemic
- ③ Netaji view - eg: corporate culture.
- ④ - Utopian → Khalistan.
- ⑤ - India's diversity - feasible.
- ⑥ - Economic → Joke packaging Act
- ⑦ security: war → integrated theatre commands
- ⑧ slippery slope
- ⑨ mob rule: crowd control
- ⑩ violence → master & slave become one
- ⑪ is too much? slippery slope

Weber
Bureaucracy

Too many ^{coops} ~~boards~~
 ↓
 spoil the brota.
 state of perpetual confusion.

teel

Opp

- ① → dictatorship Nazism.
- ② → majoritarianism
- ③ → unilateral view
- ④ → dev itself will stifle
- ⑤ → multi stake holder approach

⑫ can't follow democracy for the sake of conclusion of democracy

⑬ Child parent r-ship in classroom. → social democracy

⑭ reasonable restrictions →

Democracy aspect for and of the people

⑮ brandeis

↓
 leadership: take unpopular actions.
 eg: called off Non cooperation
 — a mass movement → built on pressure of ⑮

Too much Democracy is detrimental to Development.

Many years ago, there was a small village ruled by a Council of Minutemen called the Sabha. The village was an epitome of democracy. Before taking any major decision all the residents were consulted and a peaceful, inclusive environment prevailed.

On one occasion, there was a discussion to build a canal connecting it to the river. Since it was a major decision, the matter was put to vote.

A few residents had gone out to other villages and the matter was put on hold till their arrival.

After a few months the matter was put to vote again. Some members were again absent as they had travelled out for some work delaying the matter again. This went on — whenever there



was a decision to vote, some members were absent. Ultimately the canal was never built.

The above incident clearly highlights the fact that "too much democracy is not always good". If we try to consult everyone involved, it will lead to a situation of imminent delays.

This can be seen in the context of India as well. India takes pride in being the largest democracy. However, it has survived as a democracy by ensuring that too much of it does not challenge the very existence of the nation.

For instance, at the time of independence India had more than 500 princely states. Were all states integrated through a consultation based mechanism of plebiscite?

No — in most cases democratic



mechanism prevailed, yet force was applied too. In Hyderabad, police action had to be used. Democratic ideals were subverted for national unity.

Similarly, Mahatma Gandhi promoted grassroot democracy to attain Ram Rajya. His ideals were based on ensuring democratic participation at the lowest level in society. Yet, he understood that too much of anything can be detrimental.

For instance, during Non cooperation Movement he withdrew the movement abruptly without consulting anyone. A mass movement whose very crux was democratic participation was withdrawn unilaterally. Had he consulted the masses, India would have faced a 2nd Jallianwallah Bagh incident.

Following democratic ideals at all times and with utmost

participation is utopian. It is neither desirable nor feasible. Today, in India, multiple secessionist forces operate like Khalistan groups. Should they be allowed to form a separate nation? Should there be a vote on this matter?

It is not advisable as it can threaten the very existence of our country. Historical leaders have also claimed that an over reliance on democracy cannot contribute to development.

For instance, Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose who was the leader of Indian National Army, an army made of civilians, preferred dictatorship to democracy. At a nascent stage of development, democracy will create more problems than it solves and lead to under development.

Too much of democracy

can lead to delays in decision making.
If everyone is allowed to take decisions,
there will only be a state of
perpetual confusion. Sometimes, unilateral
✓ quick decisions are better than a
broad based democratic approach

This was seen during the
Pandemic. An abrupt lockdown in wake
of COVID 19 might have been viewed
as dictatorial. But it resulted into
saving thousands of life. A disease
as contagious as corona would have
engulfed the entire nation had a
participatory approach been followed
to impose lockdown.

It is rightly said - "Too
many cooks can spoil the broth".

In a country as diverse as India
it is impossible to have a
✓ democratic process at all times.

There will always be multiple
views and an all accommodating

approach is utopian.

This excessive of democracy and its negative impact can be seen not only in the political arena, but in other walks of life as well.

For instance, social democracy mandates that within families all decisions should be discussed before taking action. While it is necessary, to overcome the unequal structure prevalent in families, it will not always lead to growth.

Parents are seen taking many major decisions for their children. It is undemocratic but necessary at certain times. A child demanding "more screen time" for instance is often shushed by parents. Is it not for the child's own good? Too much power and liberty to the child

Good
answer

will negatively impact his own health.

Similarly, certain decisions are taken by the government without any consultation. For example, under Sugarcane Price Control Act, the government has mandated farmers to sell their produce to the mill within 15 km. The decision was not taken in agreement with farmers or mill owners.

Yet, it is important to promote inclusive development of both the participants as well as the region. Had it been left to the farmers and owners, it would have led to cashalisation and distress sale.

Subversion of democracy to some extent here has provided economic development rather than underdevelopment.

Even during times of war, can democratic process be followed and

is it even logical? During such times of crisis, including civilians in decision making will lead to erosion of democracy itself as the political system that guarantees it might not survive.

Here, even too little democracy can pose to be a threat. The decision during the heat of the moment is taken by commander - the soldiers are not consulted rather ordered. Too much democracy is undesirable here.

Giving more power in the hands of the people, supporting too much democracy can also lead to a 'mob rule' which can never contribute to development. It can lead to media trials, mob justice thus threatening both democracy and development.

Similarly, democratisation of technology can and will not

always be beneficial. Today with Industrial Revolution 4.0, technology has become diffused. But it has posed challenges to development — deepfakes, cybercrime and misusing AI.

While it is clear that "too much" democracy is detrimental to development, it poses a serious dilemma as well. How much is too much? How do you quantify democracy? Limiting democracy is the name of development is a slippery slope and is itself a huge problem.

Nazi Germany is an apt example of this conundrum. The genocide against Jews for ethnic cleansing was perpetrated in hope of a developed Germany, a better future. Democratic institutions were scrapped and dictatorship

prevailed as a trade off against
development. The result is still seen
as the most horrific incident in
history.

Once the process of diluting
democracy comes into play, there
is no guarantee as to where it will
end. It can lead to majoritarianism.

It can promote authoritarianism
and a unilateral view. Decisions
will be taken by a handful of
people for everyone.

Excessive democracy might
not be good for our growth, but too
little of it will be more detrimental.

It can lead to shrinking space for
dissent. Anyone against the idea
of development will be charged
with sedition. For instance, increasing
attack on journalists going against
established ideals.

Neither too much, nor

Try to
explore this
point with
an example

too little is desirable. Today, in a globalised world we strive for a multi-stakeholder approach. — taking into account the needs of all nations. However, it is not desirable to listen to everyone, rather focus should be on substantial aspect and not procedural aspect.

For instance, there is an increasing demand to reform UNSC as veto power by PS nations has led to stagnation in dealing with emerging issues. Here, too much democracy is dehimental to the global world.

An overreliance on anything cannot be a solution

"Democracy is a government of the people, by the people and for the people" — Abraham Lincoln.

While there is a focus on 'of the people' it should not be allowed to

PS - Actually saw UNSC as example of democracy

dominate the goal of 'for the people'.

Democracy cannot and should not
be followed always for the sake
of democracy itself.

(Not
Needed)

Could have
ended here →
The impact of
this last
sentence itself
was good.

'The past' is a permanent dimension of human consciousness and values.

"The seeds of present decay is contained in the past" —
Karl Marx. According to him, in order to understand and change the present society, it is imperative to understand the history of evolution of the society.

The past represents that dimension of human consciousness and values that is over, yet continues to exist. The current structure of society, traditions, polity — do not exist in vacuum but are rather seen as a continuation of past itself in an evolved form.

In this essay, we will try to understand the ways in which the past continues to exist in the present in nuanced forms and the

ways in which it has changed over time.

History is a storehouse of wisdom and knowledge. Our current consciousness is influenced by our past values. This is clearly reflected in the continuity of tradition.

Religion is a tradition that has remained resilient since its development thousands of years ago. Today, religion is a major source of human values and ~~was~~ acts as a guide to a proper way of life.

Simple values like "promoting peace" has a religious source but is still relevant today. Our present actions are shaped by this dimension of past.

The permanent aspect of 'past dimension' influencing values is clearly visible in the doctrine

of 'karma'. It clearly states that our present condition is shaped by our previous actions. For instance, the values like resignation to destiny, acceptance of low status among Dalits was inculcated using this doctrine → their past life shaped their present value system.

Similarly, today India's constitution reflects not only present situation of independence and sovereignty, but also a hope for a bright future. Yet, we find remnants of past values in the constitution. Values like secularism have been shaped by the horrific history of Partition. The constitution is a continuity of past shaping our present consciousness.

Also, our nation's socio-economic structure is guided by historical experiences. For instance, colonialism led to India adopting a closed economy for almost 40 years.

Is it not because historical realities influenced present values like trust and security?

✓ Human consciousness can only be understood by repeatedly referring to the past. With changing times, values can evolve. But there can be no complete detachment from it. History represents an abundance of wisdom.

For instance, with rapid development in Science and Technology, a break from the past was predicted. However, it is far from reality. Even today, Ayurveda, Yoga etc continue to appear but in evolved forms. The value of nature based solutions is from the past which is being continued even today.

✓ Even globally, current policies and institutions are based on historical episodes like wars, imperialism etc.

For instance, the very formation

of United Nations was based on principles of equality, peace and anti imperialism. Historical scenarios and past activities created new realities with new values.

However, a journey through history shows that while past is a permanent dimension, in shaping our values, it is only one dimension.

It not only continues in resilient forms like religion, it leads to creation of dichotomous values as well. The present consciousness while being shaped by past can be its very anti thesis.

This can be seen through the episode of Kalinga war. Raja Ashoka was an expansionist ruler. He used violence and believed it to be the most effective means of achieving his goal. The Kalinga

war, however changed his entire perception.

The mayhem caused during the war resulted in him giving up his value system of Bheerghosha and shift towards Shamaghosha. A single episode changed his future course of action. Future historians referred to the war in order to understand this change in his consciousness. It is impossible to understand Ashoka without referring to this past episode.

Similarly, as societies evolve, value system evolve too. The present value system is a result of past values itself.

For instance, earlier practices like sati and dowry were practised due to gendered division of society. Women were seen as subordinate and feeble.

Today, women are seen

as equal partners. This change in values and consciousness can only be understood by adopting a historical lens. Women's education rights was largely due to the episode of Rukhmabai case in colonial India.

Past, thus, represents a permanent dimension which cannot be overlooked. Past allows us to alter our behaviour and actions. The experiences act as a guide to future.

For instance, when 'cyber' boom occurred in society, it was only seen as a technological revolution without taking into account its ethical impacts. This resulted into cyber-bullying, cyber stalking etc.

This experience has now altered the thought process. It gave

a new dimension — ethical and value
implication of technological development.

This learning from past is now
shaping future developments. For

example, ethical guidelines are
now being developed for use of
Artificial Intelligence.

Even at the individual
level, we witness past shaping our
current ideals. There is evolution
not only of biological aspect but also
of value aspect — a form of social
darwinism.

For instance, an apolitical
person might change his value system
if he is affected personally. This
was seen in personalities like
B. C. Pal who changed his ideals from
moderates to extremists. as his
experience in relation to moderate

policy did not yield much result.

Similarly at the global level, we witness change in value systems which can only be understood by referring to the past. For example, there has been a shift from protectionism to globalisation.

Values of isolation and self sufficiency were replaced by interdependence.

How did such a shift occur?

It has to be realised through a historical approach. Global events like BOP crisis, stagnation and losing out on shared benefits led to change in global consciousness.

It cannot be understood as a discrete event. It is due to past events and influenced by it as well.

Humans evolve, ideas

evolve and so does society. It is a unified whole, a continuum. Past, present and future might seem as isolated trends, yet they form a sensible totality.

The slogan of 'Back to the Vedas' was in vogue in India during the 19th century. It clearly reflects the relationship between the past realities and present values. Our current conscience is derived from and shaped by past values itself. The past will always be a permanent dimension.

In the same way, 'Renaissance' was a shift from past values of 'dark ages'. It condemned values of metaphysical reality while holding on to religious values. The totality of history can only be

understood by studying both the aspects -
past and present.

"While the past is akin to
binoculars, the present is similar
to microscope while future is like
a telescope." All have to be

understood to make sense of current
reality. Past interpretations is
affected by current values while
impacting and influencing the
(values themselves.)

(future
itself)

future also always act makes

Past is a permanent dimension of human consciousness & values.

Intro

Past

- experience
- wisdom
- traditions
- wishful
- future course (predictability)
- learn from mistakes
- evolution of thoughts

Intro → past contains the seeds of present decay

① past as a unified whole not dissected

- ③ this essay
- ④ Storehouse of wisdom
- ⑤ Body Present shaped by past values
- ⑥ Freedom struggle values in present, ex
- ⑦ Social - somebody's Rights → Equality → journey
- ⑧ Economy - closed economy due to colonialism
- ⑨ tech - wisdom: Sushrutha deprived Yoga
- ⑩ new values based on past experiences. apartheid → ethnic cleansing
- ⑪ bureaucratic
- ↳ structure.
 - ↳ consciousness: Shakti

- Present
- ⑫ changing past values
- ⑬ teaching from mistakes → change in consciousness due to a past event
- ⑭ At present → now ethics
- ⑮ Atwood's war policy
- radio level
- ⑯ change in ideology referring to past.
- evolution child to adult → grandparents to grandchild

Conclusion

not in vacuum

society evolves

human evolves past permanent