



APSC MAINS TS'24 - TEST 9 (ESSAY)

Duration: 3 Hrs

NAME:	ATLANTA CHOUDHURY	APSC ROLL NO: 4402015
DATE:	2/09/25	PHONE NO:
EMAIL ID:		

(Please fill your details correctly)

Medium:

English

Assamese

INDEX NUMBER			INSTRUCTIONS
Q.NO.	Maximum Marks	Marks Obtained.	<p>Please read each of the following instruction carefully before attempting the questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essay paper will consist of two Sections, each Section containing of 4 Essay topics, out of which the candidates will be required to write one topic from each of the sections A and B, in about 1000-1200 words each. Each Essay will carry 125 marks. There will be word limit and page limit for the essays. The duration of the test is 3 hrs.
Section A	125		
1			
2			
3			
4			
Section B	125		
5			
6			
7			
8			
			Remarks <i>CA</i>
			Signature of the Student: <i>Atlanta</i>
			Invigilator's Signature:
			<u>NOTE: EVALUATION PERIOD FOR THE MAINS TEST SERIES COPY IS 10 DAYS.</u>
TOTAL:	250		



Brief report of Performance Evaluation of student in the paper

Parameter / Criteria	Aspect Considered	Total Marks	Essay 1	Essay 2
Basic Format	Introduction + conclusion	10		
	Body	15		
Content	Data/ Facts/ Interpretation/ Analysis	25		
Organisation	Flow of Ideas / Absence of Deviation from the topic	25		
Language skills	Punctuation/ Grammar/ sentence Formation / Spellings	25		
Examiner's Discretion	Perception / Innovation / Engaging	25		

Parameters	Very Good	Good	Average	Poor
coherence				
Language				
Handwriting				

DETAIL FEEDBACK

ALL THE BEST

SECTION: A

Q1. Digital Public Infrastructure and the New Fault Lines of Inclusion
প্রশ্ন ১: ডিজিটেল ৰাজহুৱা আন্তঃগাঁথনি আৰু অন্তৰ্ভুক্তিৰ নতুন চ্যুতি ৰেখা।

Q2. Insurgency in the Northeast: Towards a Lasting Resolution
প্রশ্ন ২: উত্তৰ-পূবত বিদ্রোহঃ এক স্থায়ী সমাধানৰ দিশে

Q3. The Economy as a Theatre of Modern Conflict
প্রশ্ন ৩: আধুনিক সংঘাতৰ মঞ্চ হিচাপে অৰ্থনীতি

Q4. The True Cost of Conservation
প্রশ্ন ৪: সংৰক্ষণৰ প্ৰকৃত মূল্য

(1200 words)

Q3). In the modern world, the term 'conflict' has taken new dimensions - moving away from strict traditional connotations that only equate it with some form of tangible violence. One of these dimensions is the economy of a region.

The state of a nation's economy is a crucial determinant of its growth and of its relative importance in the world. Thus, a country with a strong economy is perceived to be an important global player. On the other hand, weak economies are viewed as nations that can

(Don't write anything beyond this margin)

(Don't write anything beyond this margin)

be dragged along, as they lack the ^{wealth} necessary for independent decision making.

In a globalized world economy, different relationships exist, i.e.,

- Trade: Where different countries engage in import and export for monetary benefits
- Technology transfers
- Migration, etc.

But, increasingly, the economy has emerged as more of a theatre of modern conflict, than of cooperation.

The reason for such a trend is simple, the inherent human greed, talked about by philosophers like Immanuel Kant. One of the most central problems of an economy is that resources are limited, while human wants are unlimited. This explains why modern conflicts are centred primarily around economic concerns. Such an explanation holds true for historical

episodes as well. In the ^{latter} early half of 18th-19th century, there was an increased competition among European powers like the British, Portuguese, French and Dutch, for resources of the East Indies (including India). These powers fought many Wars (eg. The Carnatic Wars in India) to gain control over ^{the} vast wealth of Eastern countries and solidify their positions. A similar scramble for resources was witnessed in Africa.

Such conflicts have continued (if not magnified) in the modern world - where ^{such} tensions have acquired more innovative forms, instead of direct wars.

Most important in the modern conflicts, is what economists called a Tariff War. It is a situation where countries continuously hike tariff rates against each other, significantly impacting global economy. This was witnessed recently when the US President had imposed

reverse tariffs on China and the latter continued to impose reciprocal tariffs. But, sometimes such unilateral hikes of tariffs are also met with responses of acceptance - as the weaker economies do not have a choice, and ^{in such} disgust cases like India - with criticism. Economists believe that such unilateral tariff hikes are often ways of manipulation - to achieve economic interests that other countries might not concede otherwise. For instance, in India's case, the 50% tariff hike is seen as an attempt to get India to open up agricultural and dairy sectors for US imports.

But, conflicts based on economic interests may take up forms of war as well. This is evident from ongoing geopolitical conflicts like Russia-Ukraine war, Israel-Hamas, Israel-Iran and so on.

Russia's aggressions against Ukraine, for example, seem to be primarily motivated by a desire to control resource rich Ukrainian lands. ^{Chinese} ~~South~~ ~~East~~

also ~~have~~ ^{aggression} ~~permissi~~ ^{on} along the South China Sea, is primarily motivated by a desire to control the region, not only rich in resources, but also home to the Malacca Strait - through which a large volume of world trade is channelled out.

In many of these situations, the countries may also engage in techniques like Blockades - as seen in the Israel blockade over Gaza. Such measures create conditions of famines and significantly weaken the economic position of a region. Thus, the economy, in these cases, is utilized directly as an arena of conflict.

But, there are also other more indirect way, in which economy ^{has emerged} is being used as a theatre of conflict.

The global strengthening of immigration laws can be seen as one such means. The economic concern with immigration, primarily centers around the notion that a nation's resources

belong only to the native population. Thus, in this context, any encroachments by foreigners is seen as an 'loot' of ^{native} their resources. This

This also brings us up to another new means, that of weaponizing one's own economic strength in terms of natural resources, manufacturing capacities and overall economic prosperity. Such a tactic is the best description of countries like China which aim to dominate the world economy. ~~Also~~ known as a powerful manufacturing hub, China often ~~waters~~ ^{floods} foreign markets with its cheap, yet attractive products. This serves a dual purpose - one, it promotes Chinese exports and thereby prosperity. But, it also has a more sinister aim, ^{ie,} of crippling the economy of countries that it exports to. Domestic markets of such countries, are flooded with cheap and attractive products, which reduces demands for home grown goods and thus negatively impacts

local artisans and traders.

These are Domestic manifestations of the trend of Economic warfare as well.

In India, for example, frequent conflicts arise between the central and state governments on economic issues. Some of these include - conflicts over decreased revenue allocation to states by the Centre, issue of GST compensation mechanism for states, etc. In some cases, the central government may exercise its greater powers -
Eg, denying funds to Punjab government ^{for} Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan due to the state's refusal to implement NEP.

Moreover, issues like ^{the} immigration problem in Assam and growing regionalism in Southern states can be considered indirect manifestations of economic conflicts.

This increasing emergence of economy as an

arena of conflict has significant international and national ramifications.

Tariff wars and unfair tariff hikes for one, serve to increase protectionism in world economies and thus promote de-globalization. While, conflicts like Russia-Ukraine and Israel-Gaza, have adverse implications not only on their respective economies, but also to the global economic order. Increased oil prices due to the Russia-Ukraine war and decreased energy security due to Israel-Hamas war are only few examples. Domestically, in India, conflicts in the economic domain ^{between Centre & States} hinders the spirit of Federalism, as well state's revenue capacities.

Such a grim picture of state of world affairs however should not deviate us from the positives of world ^{and Indian} economy - witnessed in many levels of economic cooperation.

For example, International institutions like IMF, World Bank, WTO, etc and their

continued relevance, ^{and near universal membership implies} that the world economy remains cooperative. The World Bank, for instance, helps ^{poor} countries in need, IMF helps out member countries facing Balance of Payment crises, while WTO promotes cooperation in world trade. Similar functions are performed by regional institutions like New Development Banks. Moreover, emerging regional groupings like BRICS, SCO, ASEAN, etc, ^{indicate} indicate greater levels of economic integration in the world.

Despite such welcoming signs, the inevitable truth remains - In the 21st century, the economy has emerged as a theatre of modern conflict. Combating such a harmful trend, requires inculcation of values of mutual trust, harmony - cooperation, etc. India's philosophy of 'Varudava Kutumbakam' (viewing the entire world as one family) will surely help in this regard.

SECTION: B

Q5. Diplomacy without Brinkmanship: India's Foreign Policy
প্রশ্ন ৫: অস্থিৰতাবিহীন কূটনীতি: ভাৰতৰ বৈদেশিক নীতি

Q6. Justice for Children: Enforcing POCSO in Assam
প্রশ্ন ৬: শিশুৰ বাবে ন্যায়: অসমত প'ক্স' বলৱৎ

Q7. Learning to Learn: Rethinking Self-Education Today
প্রশ্ন ৭: শিকাৰ সেতু শিক্ষণ: সাম্প্ৰতিক সময়ত আত্ম-শিক্ষাৰ পুন: চিন্তন

Q8. When the World Sneezes, the North East Catches Cold
প্রশ্ন ৮: বিশ্বই যেতিয়া হাঁচি মাৰে, উত্তৰ-পূবত জ্বৰ উঠে

(1200 words)

Q5) Diplomacy without Brinkmanship: India's Foreign Policy

Diplomacy is a critical tool in the modern world marked by a plethora of economic, political and security ^{tensions} concerns. It helps countries to engage with each other for mutual benefit and thereby helps maintain peace and amiability in the global order.

India's Diplomacy, frequently viewed as one without Brinkmanship has evolved over a period of time. India has never really been a risk taker when it comes to Foreign policy.

This is illustrated by events after independence. Internationally, India focused on the Non-Aligned movement (NAM) and thus avoided the risk of alignment with the US or Soviet Union. In the domestic realm as well, the wars fought by India with its neighbours like China and Pakistan, were the result of their aggressions and not vice-versa. India, instead focused on doctrines like Panchsheel, which provides for mutual respect for sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, and so on.

Not much has changed today. India's Foreign Policy has been described as Diplomacy without brinkmanship. This means that, in engaging with global powers, India tries to avoid pushing a dangerous situation to the "brink" (edge), just to achieve a favourable outcome. Brinkmanship involves taking risky actions or threatening other countries, to get them to back down. An example of this can be cold war politics.

But India's refusal in such critical decisions taking, is underlined by its Foreign policy motto of varudaina Kutumbakam - which is a philosophy that views entire world as one family. And,

family is deeply valued in India.

Indian Foreign policy ^{advocates, including the PM} constantly describe the 21st century, as "not an age of conflict, but of peace". In this context, India maintains friendly relations with all countries and its foreign policy focuses on multilateral partnerships. So, with Russia, India has a 'special and privileged Partnership', while also maintaining equally strong ties with the US. India also engages positively with its neighbours, giving them primacy through its 'Neighbourhood First Policy'.

Another important dimension of India's Foreign Policy, is its increasing focus on enhancing

South-South Cooperation, with an overarching aim of emerging as the leader of the Global South.

Such peaceful dimensions of the nation's Foreign policy, certainly points towards a lack of Bunkerian ~~the above~~.

The absence of risky actions however shall not construct a negative perception of Indian foreign policy as weak.

India often takes risks, but is careful, not to let them escalate beyond the desired level. For example, one of the ~~the~~ ^{fundamental} aims of Indian Foreign policy is to counter Chinese aggression and influence in the Indo-Pacific. India, for one, often speaks against Chinese aggression in ^{forums} ~~forums~~ like QUAD, while demanding a rules-based Indo-Pacific. It also takes various measures to counter Chinese influence in the region - through ^{infrastructure} ~~programs~~ and capacity building in neighbouring regions.

Yet, keeping in mind the long border that it shares with China, India's actions against China rarely venture into the risky zone. This is exemplified by India's continued support to China's official stance on Internal matters like Taiwan issue, or closer to home, recent ^{improvement} ~~issue~~ in its ^{post} ~~and~~ ^{the} Galwan clash. Recent diplomatic talks have brought considerable amiability in ties - undoubtedly a positive impact of reduced brinkmanship.

A similar situation is representative of India's ties with Pakistan. In recent times, India has avoided going to a full-fledged war with Pakistan, despite the provocations by increased cross border terrorism. Even during the Operation Sindoor, which was in response to Pahalgam Terrorist attacks in April 2015, India only targeted terrorist infrastructure of Pakistan. Once they were annihilated,

India quickly agreed to a ceasefire. This indicates a calculative action - ⁱⁿ which, India avoided a full-blown war, which may have ~~escalated~~ ^{escalated} into nuclear warfare.

Such foreign policy actions of India, indicates the nation's priorities - countering harm caused by foreign countries for "self-defence" (as highlighted by ^{union} minister of External Affairs S Jaishankar), but not letting tensions escalate beyond a certain point.

Such Similar lack of brinkmanship is witnessed in other aspects of Indian foreign policy.

In 2024, for example, India repeatedly abstained from voting in the UN, on resolutions concerning alleged ^{genocide} ~~horror~~ in Gaza by Israel. This indicates India's conscious decision to avoid risking its strategic interests. Similarly, India does not formally recognize the Taliban Government of Afghanistan. ^{But not this} ~~this is because~~ ^{is because} of the moral concerns associated with the Taliban. Yet,

India has re-opened its embassy in Kabul, and engages with it in humanitarian matters. This, ~~and~~ ^{is} much like other foreign policy stances of the Indian government reflects a cautious middle path, avoiding both risky action as well as inaction.

All such foreign policy measures prove that Indian Diplomacy is significantly lacking in brinkmanship. This has both positive and negative implications for the country. It is true that the adoption of a 'middle path' by India, has helped it to avoid economic and military standoffs. But, maintaining neutrality in key global concerns ~~has~~ ^{also} poses the risk of being perceived as apathy towards glaring issues.

However, it is important to note that, Indian foreign policy ^{is not} ~~has~~ ^{completely devoid of} ~~has~~ ^{not} taken any risky actions.

here and there. brinkmanship.

One of the most recent examples is in the context of increased tariffs (upto 50%) imposed by the US government. ~~US~~ Economists believe that these are manipulative tactics used by the US to get India to concede to ~~the~~ ^{US} demands of opening up the Indian agricultural and dairy sector for US imports. But, Indian leaders, including PM Narendra Modi, ~~has~~ ^{have} refused to accept such demands and have instead provided further assurances of privatization and protection to Indian farmers - risking further ~~adverse~~ ^{US tariffs}.

India has also declared the US allegations of India funding the Russian war machine, as "unjustified and ~~the~~ ^{unreasonable}" seeing as the US trades with Russia in far greater volumes.

India also refused to back down when Canadian tiers severed, and risked permanent breakdown of ties by withdrawing its ambassadors from the region.

Similarly, India fought valiantly against Chinese aggressions in 2020 - not only militarily, but in other levels like - banning Chinese products, Chinese apps and strengthening its own manufacturing base.

Even in the past, India out of sheer humanitarian concerns helped East Pakistan (present day Bangladesh) to gain independence by fighting the Bangladesh Liberation War, 1971. It also helped Sri Lanka to deal with the threat of militancy that had been created by the operations of LTTE.

Such examples point towards Indian foreign policy initiatives that have sufficient risky elements. Thus, it can be concluded that India's Foreign Policy, while marked by a relative lack of balckmanship, is also not completely ~~and~~ devoid of it.