

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

When we are no longer able to change a situation, we are challenged to change ourselves

"Be the change, you wish to see in others". This quote means that changing oneself to face a challenge or situation which one wants to change is important. For example, Gandhi wanted to eradicate untouchability from Indian society but he realised that he will not be able to change this situation, until he changes himself. For that Gandhi himself practised by living with untouchables and tried to bring a change.

In this essay, first we will explore about the situations when we are not able to change a situation, why we failed, how can changing ourselves help to overcome that situation. Then we will look into other perspectives like is changing ourselves necessary. Then we will conclude with balancing between change and continuity.

First, question rises is that why we are not able to change the situations? what are the challenges in it? In modern state, corruption is prevalent and we want to change this situation, yet we are failing in it.

This failure can be attributed to challenges like lack of political ~~attit~~ will, ignorant social attitude, people accepting corruption as norm etc. ~~But~~

Similarly, social evils like child marriage, untouchability, caste based discrimination etc. are the situations which are not able to change. This is due to traditional beliefs, unscientific social practices etc.

Moreover, we are also not able to change situations like climate change, poverty, Refugee crisis, terrorism etc. which question our methodology

of bringing the change.

Now question raises that how to challenge ourselves to change. The dichotomy is that should we change our attitude and accept the situation as it is or we should we change our method which will lead us to change the situation.

For example, if we are not able to change corruption scenario, should we change our attitude to "chalta hai" type and accept the situation. This change is negative and similar to accept the defeat of one's values.

On the other hand, we should change ourselves to better, which lead us to face the situation better and overcome that challenge. How that change can come?

"change begins at home". An individual the change can come via education, inculcation of positive value system, attitude of never giving up etc. for example Edison failed more than 1000 times to change the situation (failure to make bulb), but he challenged himself to try new method every time and finally succeeded.

In the same manner, Corruption can be tackled if we change our political attitude, bring awareness among citizens, learn from practises of other countries etc.

Moreover, the situations like climate change, terrorism, poverty and inequality will change, if we are challenging ourselves to bring those change. The challenges are like global cooperation, lack of compassion and self interest.

But the next pertinent question is changing ourselves is required to change a situation. For example, During

the freedom struggle of India, leaders were not able to change the situation i.e. colonial rule, yet they didn't change. They persisted and struggled hard to bring a change in situation and finally bore the fruits of freedom.

Above situation, describe that it is not always necessary to change ourselves. Gandhi didn't change his values of non-violence and truth, even if he was not able to change the situation.

As it is said, "change is the only constant", yet the balance between change and continuity is key to overcome

any situation.

The continuity should be based on strong moral - ethical values like integrity, compassion and equality, which must not be changed.

On the other hand, change should be evolutionary which lead to positive revolutionary change in the situation.

But one thing remaining constant, we shouldn't give up in trying to change situations like climate change and terrorism which are concern for global humanity.

It is mentioned in Bhaguet
Geete that "never fear
change" because change
leads to growth and
development.

Section B

Gentle persuasion succeeds
where force fails

"you can shake the world
in a gentle way". This
quote sums up the power
of gentle persuasion. According
to recent report of Indian
home ministry which revealed
that since 2019, more than
800 naxalites have surrendered
and started a new life
in mainstream society. The
report credited this success
to ground level negotiations,
persuasion by local authorities
and positive impact of development
work like schools and hospitals.

In this essay, first we will deliberate on why force fails and how gentle persuasion succeeds when force fails. After that other dimensions like does gentle persuasion always succeed? or can gentle persuasion succeed without force in modern age?, will be explored. After that examining the need of the hour, we will conclude on a positive note.

Force means a hard power based on military strength and economic capabilities etc. On the other hand, gentle persuasion is a soft power. It is an art of solving issues through

communication, negotiations and discussion which are based on principles of humanity, and values like compassion, equality and togetherness.

The first major question rises is that why force fails? for example, USA force failed in Vietnam and Afghanistan. Or At national level, issues of nationalism and north-east insurgents are solved by force.

The answer lies in the fact that force works as an external power. An external power fails to bring internal changes. Force doesn't target the root of the evils. Force attacks what it sees.

Similarly, even at home or in family, a father can not control their child by force. This shows that force doesn't always works well. So when force fails, gentle persuasion comes into picture which lead to success. Let us see how?

Gentle persuasion appeals at emotional level. It tries to bring change in one's thought process and attitude. Soft power skills work at changing heart, which help in bringing long lasting success rather than temporary success achieved by force.

for example, At individual level, changing the attitude of a student in school regarding importance of education and why she needs to study works better than mere physical punishment.

At social level, the eradication of social evils can only be possible with persuasion and attitude change rather than any law. for example, child marriage still exist inspite of laws whereas swechh Bandit Abhiyaan is a success without any law.

At national level, the ever lasting unity of India's was

ensured by Sardar Patel by soft skills like people's support and emotional appeal.

On the other hand, issues like regionalism, naxalism and separatism can not be solved by force or we can say force is the genesis of these developments.

Recent deals with Bodo people and other north-east insurgent group highlights the power of persuasion, convincing and emotional appeal.

Similarly, soft social skills can be used to solve issues of naxalism and communalism as well.

At international level, the development of multilateral institutions like United nations, WTO, BRICS, SCO etc. signify that negotiations, discussions and debate only can bring ever lasting solutions to global problems.

For example, force has failed to eradicate terrorism and nuclear developments. The Russian war on Ukraine is a prime example of use of force, yet Ukraine has not bowed down to force.

On the other hand, deals like TCPoA, Paris climate deal based on soft negotiating skill

can work wonder. But
does gentle persuasion always
succeed ?

The answer to above question
is NO. There is no guarantee
gentle (soft) skills will always
be successful. for example,

failure of JCPOA deal,
funding issue in climate
deal, protectionism inspite
of WTO negotiations, etc.
show that gentle persuasion
may not work as well.

Sometimes, for soft skills
to work (succeed), it require
hard power (force). for
example, negotiations with

the naxelite is not possible if there is no fear of force.

Similarly, to control terrorism, force is necessary. After that negotiations and peace process comes into picture. Otherwise without fear of force, they won't even try to negotiate anything.

This leads us to new argument that where should be line drawn between the force and gentle persuasion. Kautilya in his Arthashastra argued that without force, a

State can not survive for
long.

On the same note, modern
day state requires "smart
power" which is a balanced
combo of "hard" and "soft"
power. This smart power
can be used to solve issue
like terrorism, neoliberalism,
and separatism etc

This smart power derives
its authority from social contract
theory of Rousseau, in which
argued that state need
force to rule over along
with soft skills. The
modern day democracies are
based on smart power concept.

To sum it up, as we argued that failure of force gives chance to soft skills. But soft skills of persuasion, emotional appeal, negotiations, debate and discussion does not work without the presence of force.

As Mother Teresa said,
"Peace begins with smile"
The everlasting impact and
solution require soft power
whereas force can be diverting
as well. Choice is ours !!