

# **GSSCORE**

**An Institute for Civil Services**

## **IAS TOPPER'S**

**TEST COPY**

**DIPANKAR CHOUDHARY**

**RANK - 166**

**ESSAY**



**www.iasscore.in**

## ESSAY MOCK TEST

Time Allowed: 3 hrs.

Max Marks: 250

### ***Instructions to Candidate***

- Both sections are compulsory.
- Attempt one essay from each section.
- Each essay carries 125 marks.
- Write each essay in about 1000-1200 words
- After finishing the first essay, attempt the next on a fresh Page.
- Any page left blank in the answer-book must be crossed out clearly.

### **Remarks**

(Examiner will pay special attention to the candidate's grasp of his/her material, its relevance to the subject chosen, and to his/her ability to think constructively and to present his/her ideas concisely, logically and effectively).

65+5<sup>c</sup>  
x  
open

Name Dipanter chandhary

Mobile No. \_\_\_\_\_

Date 26 Aug 2018

Signature Dipanter chandhary

1. Invigilator Signature

2. Invigilator Signature \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION - A**

1. Prayer does not change God, but it changes him who prays.
2. Not all those who wander are lost.
3. Our lives begin to end, the day we become silent about things, that matter.
4. We don't see things as they are; we see them as we are.

**SECTION - B**

1. Bureaucracy is a giant mechanism operated by pygmies.
2. Protest beyond the law is not a departure from democracy; it is absolutely essential to it.
3. More law, less justice.
4. The increasingly rapid pace of life is creating more problems than it solves.

Not all those who  
wander are lost

Not all those who wander are lost,  
Deep roots are not reached by foot.

—J.R.R Tolkein, the  
fellowship of the ring.

When Tolkein wrote these profound words, he did not intend to confine the term "wandering" to getting lost, losing way or wandering aimlessly. Wandering has a very wide connotation. It means to explore, to venture, to enter the dire straits, uncharted territory and to anticipate the unexpected. Nor is it confined to any one single vocation or idea but covers everything under the sun, from science to art, music and philosophy.

Remarks

In other words, any quest for knowledge or truth can be equated with "wandering".

Wandering is thus, a risky affair for it can lead to both success and failure. While it might not always

lead to success, but it is equally true

~~(that it is a pre-requisite for all success)~~

since all success is preceded by some

sout of wandering. Every success

story is unique in itself. One can't

achieve success by blindly emulating someone else who has been successful.

This in turn leads us to conclude that

~~since~~ since every success/story is unique ergo every wandering story is unique.

Remarks

Consider this, Gandhi returned to India from South Africa at the age of 45 while Bhagat Singh had already sacrificed his life at the age of 23 for his motherland. While both took diametrically opposite paths and different time, yet their contribution to our independence stands on an equal pedestal. Similarly J.S. Mill wrote his first book, "An ~~encyclopedia~~ encyclopedia of British law" at the age of 12, while Immanuel Kant wrote his first major work - 'The critique of pure reason', at the age of 57. Yet who would say that one is a lesser mind or a lesser philosopher.

↓  
Bringing too many  
example means  
+ miss concepts

Remarks

than the other.

Thus what matters is not the path we take but that we simply take some path, or to rephrase it, we simply wander off. Going into the unexpected opens our mind to the unexplored possibilities. It helps us to think outside the box. It helps us to challenge the stultifying conformities or traditions the society imposes on us. Thus, the person who "wanders off" does not only attain truth and knowledge for himself but also pushes the society forward. New ideas can be generated when older ones are

Remarks

questioned and/or replaced. "Wandering off" is thus, how humanity progresses.

While, the arguments presented above do illustrate the importance of wandering; it can also lead one to a misjudgement that "wandering off" is always for some predefined individual or social goal.

Nothing can be farther from the truth. Exploration is not contingent upon rewards. Consider Galileo; his inquisitive mind led him to challenge the church by his astronomical observations. The end result was death for him. But even in the face of certain death, he continued w/ his exploration, not for fame or adoration, but simply

Remarks

because he enjoyed the process.  
~~that's the matter~~ Or for that matter,  
let us take the example of  
Michael Angelo. Before he started  
painting the Sistine Chapel, he certainly  
didn't happen to have a well thought  
out blue-print. He started the process  
and kept exploring and diversifying  
as and where things happened.

~~Fear of uncertainty or failure is  
anti-thetical to exploration. Wandering  
should be done for the sake of  
wandering and not for ulterior motives~~

So if "wandering" is such an  
important attribute of success then  
it begs the question as to why

Remarks

~~How talk  
about importance  
of Journey~~

don't more people have the courage/excuse  
to go exploring? likely don't we see  
 innovation coming from every corner?  
 In other words, what prevents one from  
 wandering off? The answer to these  
 questions lies in the quotation  
 itself as everyone who wanders off  
 is considered 'lost' by the society.  
 at large.      ~~#~~  
 society puts huge amount of pressure on us  
 to conform to its rules and ideals.  
 earn a honest day's living, get  
 married, don't take unnecessary  
 risks, raise kids, pay taxes, obey  
 the law, pray, ... the list goes on.

~~V. good~~  
 & people socio-  
 cultural factors  
 to not leave by citing  
 safety fears  
 & societal exploration

Any deviation from these norms  
earns you the label - "lost".  
Modifying even a single social  
structure normally takes the  
strength and courage beyond a  
single person's capabilities. On the  
other hand, it is easy for the  
~~Leviathan called "society" or "norms"~~ to  
kill his initiative at the blink of an  
eye.

The next reason why people wouldn't  
venture out to explore your  
~~Options~~ is inherent in the nature  
of "wandering" itself. As mentioned,  
wandering is not a well laid out,

planned and a straightforward path. As pressure mounts, courage falls, proportionately. It is easy to be optimistic when things are smooth, but in the face of adversity, the real test of optimism happens. People simply give up, thinking it's not worth the risk. How many JK Rowling does the society truly have, who ~~would~~ face 12 rejections for her bestseller series - Harry Potter.

Moreover, the path is long and winding. The fear of uncertainty is the next big factor. No one really knows what he/she might encounter on

their next step? But surprisingly, this is also the most positive aspect. No Many a times we are closer to success than we actually think we are. It is just round the corner, waiting on our next turn. While this optimism sounds good, it doesn't practically work always.

When people start seeing all their effort & was for nothing and they stop finding meaning in all their travails, <sup>and</sup> they are on the verge of giving up. While one can live without freedom or happiness, ~~as one gives up without meaning~~. This is perhaps the reason why rich and successful

people like Robin Williams (actor) or Anthony Bourdain (celebrated chef) committed suicide. Thus, the third reason why people would give up or simply won't venture out is "lack of meaning". Wandering brings suffering and suffering without any reason or meaning kills the spirit. The first two reasons, as mentioned were, societal pressure and lack of courage.

Tolkien's golden words, "Not all those who wander are lost", in a way aims to counter all the three reasons for giving up once thirst for

Remarks

exploration. You shouldn't succumb to societal pressure, loose hope and meaning because you are not lost.

The wandering will lead you to some end, somewhere, sometime. It might not be the end you anticipated but like you already mentioned, wandering should not be contingent on some ulterior motive or end result. It is a process which needs to be enjoyed and appreciated for its inherent value. Had christopher columbus bogged himself down with the possibility of outcomes he

would <sup>not</sup> be remembered as ~~the~~ one of  
the greatest explorers. His ideas  
sum it up even more succinctly:-

"You can never cross the ocean unless  
you have the courage to lose sight  
of the shore"

- Christopher Columbus.

Excellent.  
To round:  
If you maintain this level  
in space - you will go good.  
Very controlled writing.  
Happy to read such work  
Hari

65

Section B

Bureaucracy is a giant mechanism  
operated by pygmies.

Franz Kafka in his celebrated work,  
 "The trial" has ~~performed~~ <sup>performed</sup> a very bleak  
 description of bureaucracy. As per him,  
 it is this underlying, meaningless  
 and vastly complex labyrinth of rules,  
 regulations and people. However, not  
 all descriptions are so bleak. Max  
Weber, the foremost scholar on  
 bureaucracy thinks of it as a  
 collection of rules, laws, men, needed  
 for a well organised progressive society.  
 As per him, every modern organisation  
 needs a bureaucracy.

One can argue about the 'Telos' or

the purpose of a bureaucracy; whether it is a liberating or an oppressive instrument; but there's hardly any difference of opinion on the fact that it is ubiquitous. Perhaps this is

the reason behind Ronald Reagan declaring, while running for president, that his aim was to, "Get the government off their back".

~~One of the reasons why people don't really understand how pervasive the bureaucracy is because, first, they think that only government employees form the "bureaucracy" and second, Information technology and e-governance has created a facade where a "net" screen has replaced the world over.~~

Remarks

*very difficult  
you start with  
now government  
across the world  
Security more  
and will be more  
with these*

assumptions are wrong. All organisations, whether private or public, if it has to survive, needs a bureaucracy. Some large private sector companies are massive bureaucracies such as Amazon. Next, e-governance may replace the front desk clerk but the bureaucratic rules, regulations and processes still operate behind the back. In other words, almost all our adult lives are spent dealing with bureaucracies, that's how giant it is.

But does it have to be so giant and huge? In a way, yes. Humans have replaced every technological innovation of 18th and 19th century with modern gadgets. But surprisingly bureaucracy

has stuck around with no replacement in sight, except for, maybe Artificial intelligence, in an equally scary, far off future.

Bureaucracy is inevitable because it organises the society. Rules and laws or a social contract means nothing unless we can enforce it. Liberty ~~are~~ and rights mean nothing unless it can be protected. Thus we need a civic administration, a law enforcement agency and a judiciary. Someone ~~else~~ <sup>then</sup> has to do the accounting and audit it for them because, well, we need an eye over public money. In a nutshell, as society becomes more and more

Remarks

~~This part could have been better~~

complex, bureaucracy would too increase in size and complexity proportionately. In a way social and political progress is intertwined with bureaucracy. It can't happen without it.

The next problem lies in deciphering how this huge and complex Leviathan devolves into an oppressive structure at times. This is where the men who operate it, so called pygmies, fit into. Any system of organisation will be as good as the man who operates it. Bureaucracy gets subdued by these pygmy men in at least three different ways which

Remarks

Briefly discuss why we need & of  
why govt / functions of  
bureaucracy

are also mutually supportive.

First, is the fact that bureaucracy itself becomes a privileged class. It is raised above the pedestal of a common man's life. Being provided with authority, power to punish, rents, tenure and respect; it stands behaving as rulers instead of humble law implementers.

Second, is the fact that it emphasizes too much on every trivial detail, rule and protocol. This causes excessive delays and frustration for the common man, normally referred to as "red-tapism". It forgets

Remarks

that rules were meant for an end i.e. betterment of the society at large. For it, the rules themselves become an end, to be implemented vigorously no matter what the cost is.

Third, it must be realised that bureaucrats are humans too. They too have similar desires and motivations like the rest of us. Simply donning a bureaucratic garb doesn't mean that they won't be guided by self-interest, maximisation of pleasure, prestige and everything else that a common man desires. This is ~~they are indulging in~~

Remarks

# Give by Dr. ~~what motivates them seems indulging in a govt civil service appraiser what says in my mind~~

corruption, try and manipulate people and politicians for better rents, posting, salary, self-interest etc. In other words, they put self-interest above duty.

The challenge then is to deal with these dysfunctions of bureaucracy.

Obviously it is futile to ~~try to~~ get rid of bureaucracy as already discussed; we should then try and capitalise on it for our own betterment.

In a way turn these "pygmy men" to "innovative giants".

To deal with the first problem, i.e.

Remarks

bureaucracy becoming a privileged class, we should try to make it as representative as possible. An ideal representative bureaucracy wouldn't only comprise of people from diverse regions, religions, castes, classes etc, but also people ~~from~~ having diverse ideas. The whole spectrum from conservatism to liberalism should find a place ~~in~~ in it.

Next, to deal with red-tapism, we need to provide the right motivations. At present, the more one follows the rule, the more he is rewarded. We should, instead,

gradually move towards a system where performance is rewarded.

This does not mean that rules shouldn't matter. A broad guideline or a general principle should replace minute rules. Moreover, promoting competition by mutual exchange of people amongst private and public sector, too pushes performance. Also, relentless deadlines, micro management, surveillance 24/7 etc makes one very conscious about small mistakes. Thus, a moderate flexible ~~dead~~ deadline would promote innovation too.

Lastly, the third issue i.e. self-interested

Remarks

behaviour needs systemic and systematic changes. It should begin with internal reform such as Lokpal, Lokayuktas, audit of propriety, vigilance etc. However, it should ultimately lead to the demand side of accountability, normally achieved in India via social audit, Right to information, free and fair media, citizen review, participation etc.

~~'self - interested'~~ behaviour is a part of most human beings. It should not be denigrated as not everyone can be as altruistic as ~~and~~ Mahatma Gandhi. The need is

Remarks

to channelise this via proper motivation, checks and balances.

Once in a while when these motivations do work in sync, we get giants like TN Seshan, or TSR Subramanian from the bureaucracy. While still largely held by people of a "pygmy stature", it has shown remarkable resilience, specially in dealing with the complexities of a country as diverse as India. It has its ~~flaws~~ failings and weaknesses but those aren't sufficient enough a reason to try and dismantle it and thus lead the society into utter chaos.

Remarks

Weber, had concluded that a well-developed bureaucracy is a very stable system and resilient too, so that it is impossible to remove it. We must then make our peace with the fact that bureaucracy is here to stay and think of ways to mould and change it, so as to capitalise on it for productive purposes.

Govt analysts could better have been  
S9'

Remarks

---

*Remarks*

---

*Remarks*

**GS SCORE**

*Remarks*

---

*Remarks*

---

*Remarks*

---

*Remarks*

---

*Remarks*

---

*Remarks*

*Remarks*

---

*Remarks*

**GS SCORE**

*Remarks*

---

*Remarks*