

1. The attitude of the contemporary political leadership towards India's participation in WWII was different than what it was during WWI. Elucidate. WWII में भारत की भागीदारी के प्रति समकालीन राजनीतिक नेतृत्व का रवैया WWI के दौरान से अलग था। स्पष्ट करें।

Demand of the question:

It expects students to write about the change in attitude of contemporary political leadership towards India's participation in WWII from the approach of WWI.

Introduction:

Indian freedom struggle passed through different phases after each World War. The First World War gave perspective to Indian leadership on politics at the world stage whereas the Second World War provided actual opportunity to contemporary political leadership to play an active role to achieve freedom with the help of prevalent situations.

Body:

Attitude of contemporary political leadership about India's participation during WWI: In the First World War (1914-1919), Britain allied with France, Russia, USA, Italy and Japan against Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey. This period saw the maturing of Indian nationalism.

- Expectation of reward in response to service during emergency need of empire: All the believers in Swadeshi and swaraj it as opportunity to convince colonial leadership about Indian concerns of self government.
- Divided or weak congress at the start of WWI: Congress was not revived to its pre 1907 spirit and energy till start of WWI. Its stand on the issue of participation was pacifist rather than aggressive.
- Moderates supported the empire in the war as a matter of duty; Extremists, including Tilak who was released in June 1914, supported the war efforts in the mistaken belief that Britain would repay India's loyalty with gratitude in the form of self-government. The Home Rule Movement was the Indian response to the First World War in a less charged way.
- Nationalists believed it will provide an opportunity to boost nationalist sentiment among soldiers as they will experience the freedom of European countries and opportunity to use prisoners of war of enemy nations to plot a coup against the colonial government in India.
- The revolutionaries decided to utilise the opportunity to wage a war on British rule and liberate the country. The Indian supporters of British war efforts failed to see that the imperialist powers were fighting to safeguard their own colonies and markets. During the First World War, the Jugantar party arranged to import German arms and ammunition through sympathisers and revolutionaries abroad for 'German Plot' or the 'Zimmerman Plan'. The Jugantar party raised funds through a series of dacoities which came to be

known as taxicab dacoities and boat dacoities, so as to work out the Indo-German conspiracy. During the First World War, Rash behari Bose was involved as one of the leading figures of the Ghadr Revolution.

- War was seen by Indian capitalist class as mean to benefit as supply lines of continental Europe was disturbed due to war.

Changed attitude of contemporary political leadership:

- Gandhiji at the start of the war: Gandhi, who had all sympathy for Britain in this war because of his total dislike of the fascist ideology, advocated unconditional support to the Allied powers. He made a clear distinction between the democratic nations of Western Europe and the totalitarian Nazis and fascists. He said that he was not willing to embarrass the British government during the war.
- Gandhiji after Cripps mission decided to adopt more extremist stand of launching Quit India movement and refused to formally call off movement despite of violence.
- Influence of Socialism: Rise of socialism in 1920s due to disillusion created by abrupt end of Non cooperation movement and influence of Russian revolution. Subhash Bose and other socialists, such as Acharya Narendra Dev and Jayaprakash Narayan had no sympathy for either side in the war.
- Understanding of colonial nature of rule: Contemporary political leadership understood; war was being fought by imperialists on both sides; each side wanted to protect its colonial possessions and gain more territories to colonise, so neither side should be supported by the nationalists. In fact, they thought it was the ideal time to launch a civil disobedience movement, to thus take advantage of the situation and snatch freedom from Britain.
- Middle path of Jawaharlal Nehru and insistence on Purn Swaraj i.e. complete independence: He was not ready to accept the opinion of either Gandhi or of the socialists. He was clear in his mind about the difference between democratic values and fascism. He believed that justice was on the side of Britain, France and Poland, but he also believed that Britain and France were imperialist powers. He, therefore, advocated no Indian participation till India itself was free. However, at the same time, no advantage was to be taken of Britain's difficulty by starting an immediate civil disobedience movement.

Contemporary congress leadership condemned Fascist aggression and also stressed that India could not be party to a war being fought, on the face of it, for democratic freedom, while that freedom was being denied to India.

Conclusion:

The First World War started the phase of nationwide mass movements in India, returned soldiers spread the stories of different free nations among masses, while Second World War hastened the process of India's independence with all out efforts from INA on the external front and Quit India on domestic front.

2. Examine the series of incidents and the prevalent geopolitics that led to the Indo-China war of 1962.

घटनाओं की श्रृंखला और प्रचलित भू-राजनीति की जाँच करें जिनकी वजह से 1962 का भारत-चीन युद्ध हुआ।

Demand of the question:

It expects students to write about the series of incidents and the prevalent geopolitics behind the Indo-China war of 1962.

Introduction:

Recent face-off between India and China in Galwan valley has awakened the memory of 1962 war. China attacked India over multiple points across the border in 1962, leading to a month-long standoff between 10,000 to 20,000 Indian soldiers and 80,000 Chinese troops. Unprepared for the offensive, India lost nearly 4,000 soldiers in the war and suffered its most humiliating defeat.

Body:

The main cause of the war was a dispute over the sovereignty of the widely spread Aksai Chin and Arunachal Pradesh border regions.

Series of incidents that led to Indo-China war of 1962:

- Following India's independence, British left behind a disputed legacy on 3,488km long boundary between India and then Tibet which laterally occupied by China. Dispute especially on McMahan line and Johnson line because of no mutually agreed border.
- The first sign of discord between India and China came in 1950 when China invaded Tibet. This was blatant aggression, Tibetans looked up to India for help but India's feeble protest merely antagonised the Chinese without helping the Tibetans.
- Occupation of Aksai Chin: Opportunities to negotiate a border settlement in the fifties existed, but were not seized. India entered into the Panchsheel Agreement with China in 1954, hoping to put an end to Chinese provocations but that was not to be. On the contrary, China illegally occupied the Aksai Chin and completed construction of their Western Highway through it in 1957.
- Asylum to Dalai Lama: In 1958 rebellion of Tibet led to the exodus of the Dalai Lama to India, which led to first armed clash with China occurred at Longju in the east. China perceived India is acting with both USSR and USA to destabilise Tibet.
- Forward policy: To counter continued Chinese aggression, India embarked on a policy of establishing a series of small posts all along its Northern and Eastern borders with China, to prevent further incursions. Called the 'Forward policy', most posts were not capable of giving a fight to the Chinese and were logistically unsustainable. Coupled with this, India neglected the improvement

of infrastructure in the border areas, which was to cost the country dear when the conflict started in 1962.

- By 1959-60, Chinese had made up their mind that since India was not negotiating the border issue to their satisfaction, which was basically bartering the Aksai Chin in Ladakh for Chinese acceptance of the McMahon Line in Arunachal Pradesh, they would “teach India a lesson”.

Prevalent geopolitical situations behind Indo-China war of 1962:

- China wanted to show the world who is real master of Asia. It allowed India to take leadership in Bandung Conference of 1954 and maintained low profile till the completion of western highway connecting Xinxiang with Tibet.
- After the failed talks between India and China in 1960, China was quite convinced that it has to fight war with India. Success of Chinese armed forces in the long drawn civil war against Chang kai shek, Japan in Manchuria and against US forces in Korea boosted their confidence for expansion on Indian front.
- Cold War peak: China chose time to execute its intension in the month of October when Cuban Missile crisis kept super powers busy in Atlantic and for the first time created threat of cold war becoming hot. It created nuclear panic across the world.
- By 1960, relations between China and the USSR had also deteriorated to a point where their respective leaders were trading insults publicly. The reasons included USSR’s friendship with India as India had received more economic and military assistance than China. Another reason was the USSR’s neutrality in the Tibet border dispute.
- Chinese perception of India as major threat to stability of Tibet. China perceived that India might acting at the haste of United state in giving asylum to Dalai Lama.
- India was more isolated than China due to faith in Non alignment movement. India's defence capacity as compared to china was weak as we undermined Chinese threat.

Conclusion:

India and China are two growing Asian powers and hence a clash of interests is inevitable. The key is to keep it manageable and not allow it to flare up into another border war. It will be tough test for our diplomacy in the prevailing situation.

3. The government’s recent ordinance on contract farming is a win-win for farmers, buyers and even traders. Comment.

अनुबंध खेती पर सरकार का हालिया अध्यादेश किसानों, खरीदारों और यहां तक कि व्यापारियों के लिए एक जीत है। टिप्पणी करें।

Demand of the question:

It expects students to write about the benefits of new contract farming ordinance to farmers, buyers and even traders along with

Introduction:

The ordinance on contract farming is part of the new legal framework for agricultural markets. It is in addition to the other two ordinances that amend the Essential Commodities Act and reduce the power of APMCs, with the aim of setting up a national market for food.

Body:

Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Ordinance Benefits:

Farmers:

- **Market access:** Framework for farmers to enter into direct contracts with those who wish to buy farm produce. So far, in most of the country, a farmer cannot directly sell his produce to consumers or food processing companies; he has to go through a licenced trader. E.g. If a certain kind of potato was needed for potato chips, or a specific variety of oranges was more suited to making juice, or a restaurant chain needed a large quantity of mushrooms or asparagus, it could get into a contract with farmers to grow that particular item and buy it later at prices already agreed upon. Farmers are no longer at the mercy of the traders.
- **Complex structure of APMCs:** Solving the problem of APMC laws which are outdated in several states. Traders find it easy to form cartels in these markets and offer low prices to farmers. Farmers are also left to the vagaries of daily price changes. However, the ordinance states that APMC market laws will only apply in the physical space of the market, and will not govern transactions outside the market. No taxes or fees associated with any APMC can be levied on such transactions.
- **More liberty and freedom:** Farmers can lock in prices and buyers for their produce even before the harvest, and intermediaries can be assured of supply and price at the time of harvest.

Buyers:

- Reduction in intermediaries will reduce the cost of farm produce which will help common buyers to manage their monthly budget.
- Buyers like the food processing industry will get a more secure and flexible environment for procurement of raw materials directly from farmers or farmer producer organisations.
- Similar models have already benefited farmers in selling their poultry livestock and few agriculture commodities to industrial players directly.

Traders:

- **Competition to traders:** While intermediaries play an essential role in meeting supply and demand, it does not prohibit intermediaries or discourage them in any manner. It does not do away with APMCs. However, from now on, they have to compete with other buyers to provide better services or prices.

- Expansion of storage capacity in the private sector: Since the ordinance in addition to other ordinance on the Essential Commodities Act exempts intermediaries from stock limits for contract farming, it will give comfort to large organisations to participate in contract farming. It may also encourage smaller traders to expand capacity.

The idea of contract farming is not new; some states like Punjab have attempted to encourage it through state legislation. Even today, in spite of multiple legal hurdles, the small scale of contract farming in India is playing a positive role for farmers. The agriculture ministry had released a model law to govern contract farming in 2018, but it was a little too prescriptive, the ordinance allows contract farming in any agricultural product, leaves pricing to the parties, and allows for a central e-registration of contracts.

However, the ordinance is a positive move towards freedom of contracting,

- So far, modern retail has been largely purchasing perishable produce from mandis. Since the volumes of fresh produce are still low for modern retail and it has to compete with roadside vendors, it has been reluctant to invest in backend infrastructure.
- Instead of using the regular judiciary for dispute resolution between parties, the ordinance delegates dispute resolution to the executive (sub-divisional magistrate), who will not be bound by rules of procedure. This gives the government more powers than the parties in the case. That would not happen if disputes were required to go to the judiciary.
- The ordinance also creates a window for reintroducing government interference by giving the executive powers to adjudicate disputes through suo motu cases. This violates a fundamental principle of contract law: If the parties to a contract are not complaining, third parties should not interfere in the contractual relationship.
- Violating this principle undermines the commercial relationship between the parties. If the government intervenes in contract farming agreements frequently, buyers may back out.
- Big buyers like processors, exporters, and organised retailers going to individual farmers are not a very efficient proposition. They need to create a scale, and for that, building farmer producer organisations (FPOs), based on local commodity interests, is a must. This will help ensure uniform quality, lower transaction costs, and also improve the bargaining power of farmers vis-à-vis large buyers.

The 1991 reforms saw a fundamental shift in the legal approach to industry and services. A whole host of laws of the licence, permit and inspection raj were withdrawn, and more freedom was given to the participants.

Conclusion:

Agriculture sector was long waiting for reforms. The participants in this sector still live in the old legal regime. The ordinances are a welcome step in giving freedom to farmers to sell their produce without restrictions.

