

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.


(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).

Remarks

Name Dipankar Chaudhary

Mobile No. _____

Date _____

Signature Dipankar Chaudhary1. Invigilator Signature 

2. Invigilator Signature _____

65+59
124

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. Tolkien, The
fellowship of the ring.

When Tolkien 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 or experiment.
enter the dense 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 then, 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 sort 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

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

Remarks

Consider this, Grandhiji 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 ~~essay~~ 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
examples
things compare.

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 ~~the~~ unexpected opens our mind to the unexplored possibilities. It helps us to think outside the box. It helps ~~the~~ 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. No new ideas can be generated unless older ones are

Remarks

questioned and/or replaced. "Wandering off" is then, 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~~ be further 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 ~~it~~ with his exploration, not for fame or adoration, but simply

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 when 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 tall
 about importance
 of journey.

don't more people have the courage
to go exploring? Why don't we see
innovation coming from every corner?

excellent
prob.

In other words, what prevents one from
wandering off? The answer to these
questions ~~is~~ lies in the quotation
itself as everyone who wanders off

is considered "lost"
at large. #

↓
Go from socio-cultural factors to not level
↑ people, increase by citing societies that who get exploratory
V. Gov

Society puts huge amount of pressure
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.

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 would not venture out to replace your system 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 ^{she}
the society truly have, who ~~was~~ 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.

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, ^{and} they are on the verge of giving up. While one can live without freedom or happiness, ~~no~~ one gives up without meaning. This is perhaps the reason why rich and successful

Remarks

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 "loss 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

exploration. You should not succumb to societal pressure, lose hope and meaning because you are not lost.

The wandering will lead you to some end, somewhere, some time.

It might not be the end you anticipated but like 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 ^{not} 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.
No remark.

If you maintain this level
in exam - you will do good.

Very controlled writing.
Happy to read such essay

May

65

Remarks

Section B

Bureaucracy is a giant mechanism, operated by pygmies.

Franz Kafka in his celebrated work, "The trial" has ^{penned} ~~put~~ 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

Remarks

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

Remarks

why don't you start with
- how govt across the world
became more per-
and less bureau- both these

assumptions are wrong. All organisations ~~where~~ whether private or public, if it has to survive, needs a bureaucracy. Some huge 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 and rights mean nothing unless it can be protected. Thus we need a civic administration, a law enforcement agency and a judiciary. Someone ^{then} has to do the accounting and auditing for them because, self, 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 real 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 in. Any system of organisation will be as good as the men who operate it. Bureaucracy gets subdued by these pygmy men in at least three different ways which

Remarks

Briefly discuss
why we need
genet - &
function 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, perks, tenure and respect; it starts behaving as rulers instead of humble law implementers.

Second, is the fact that it emphasises 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

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 rigorously 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~~ ~~indulging in~~

Remarks

~~the BtD~~
 what motivates ~~indulging in~~
 a ~~po~~ ~~ceel~~ ~~saw~~ ~~indulging in~~
 what ~~our~~ ~~ap~~ ~~ent~~
 says in ~~this~~
 my ~~and~~

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 ~~get in~~ 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 would not only comprise of people from diverse regions, religions, caste, class etc, but also people ~~from~~ having diverse ideas. The whole spectrum from conservatism to liberalism should find a place ~~or~~ 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, now,

Remarks

gradually move towards a system where performance is rewarded.

This does not mean that rules should not 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, micromanagement, surveillance

24/7 etc ~~too~~ 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, Lokayukta, 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-interest behaviour is a part of most human beings. It should not be denounced 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 Sheshan, 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 ~~its~~ ~~flourishes~~ ~~and~~ ~~weaknesses~~ but those aren't sufficient enough a reason to ~~try~~ ~~and~~ ~~dismantle~~ it and thus ~~lead~~ the society into utter chaos.

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.

~~Good~~

~~Analysis could have been better~~

~~59.~~

Remarks

--	--	--	--

Remarks

Remarks

--	--	--	--

Remarks

Remarks

--	--	--	--

Remarks

--

Remarks

--	--	--	--

Remarks

--	--	--

Remarks

--	--	--	--

Remarks

--	--	--

Remarks

<i>Remarks</i>			

Remarks