ForumIAS

Mains Marathon

3rd Week June, 2025

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
POLITY
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
GEOGRAPHY AND ENVIRONMENT

INDEX

The 'in-house procedure' for judicial oversight, citing independence, faces criticism for lacking public accountability. Analyze its implications for judicial credibility, rule of law, and balancing autonomy with transparency in governance.

Introduction

While judicial independence is a cornerstone of constitutional democracy, the opaque 'in-house procedure' for judicial oversight in India raises critical concerns about transparency, public accountability, and institutional credibility.

The 'In-house Procedure': Background

1. The **'in-house procedure'**, formulated in 1997 by the judiciary, governs the internal mechanism for handling complaints of misconduct against judges of High Courts and the Supreme Court.

2. It mandates that only judges examine complaints, with no statutory backing or scope for public scrutiny. This process was intended to preserve **judicial independence** by insulating the judiciary from executive or legislative interference.

3. However, recent cases—such as the incident involving **Justice Yashwant Varma**, where sacks of unaccounted cash were discovered, or the **2019 sexual harassment allegations** against former CJI **Ranjan Gogoi**—highlight significant shortcomings of this internal mechanism.

4. These include lack of transparency, absence of procedural fairness, and no public disclosure of findings or standards of inquiry.

Implications for Judicial Credibility and the Rule of Law

1. **Erosion of Public Trust:** Secrecy surrounding judicial inquiries weakens public confidence in the impartiality and accountability of the judiciary. Justice must not only be done but **seen to be done**.
2. **Inconsistent Application of Standards:** Unlike disciplinary mechanisms for civil servants or MPs (e.g., CVC, Lokpal, or Ethics Committees), the judiciary lacks a statutory framework to ensure consistent and fair outcomes.
3. **Threat to Rule of Law:** Rule of law mandates that **no one is above scrutiny**, including judges. Shielding judicial officers from transparency undermines this foundational principle.
4. **Lack of Procedural Fairness:** In the case of the complainant in Justice Gogoi's matter, **denial of legal representation**, lack of access to the report, and subsequent reinstatement without explanation point to procedural arbitrariness.

Balancing Autonomy with Transparency

India's Constitution under **Article 124(4)** and **Article 217** provides for impeachment of judges through a Parliamentary process, but this is rare and politically cumbersome. Only one judge (Justice V. Ramaswami, 1993) faced an impeachment motion, which failed due to abstentions.

Therefore, a **balanced framework** is needed:

1. **Institutional Independence with External Oversight:** Establish an **independent Judicial Complaints Commission** with retired judges, legal experts, and civil society representation to ensure impartial inquiry while safeguarding independence.
2. **Statutory Backing for Inquiries:** Codify the 'in-house procedure' through a **Judicial Standards and Accountability Bill** (pending since 2010), incorporating due process and public reporting.
3. **Mandatory Disclosure of Findings:** Make non-classified portions of inquiry reports public to ensure transparency and reduce misinformation.

4. **Citizen's Right to Know:** As per **RTI Act** and **Article 19(1)(a)**, citizens are entitled to information on the conduct of public officials, including judges.
5. **Global Best Practices:** In the **UK**, the **Judicial Conduct Investigations Office (JCIO)** handles complaints independently and publishes outcomes. **Canada's Canadian Judicial Council** operates similarly.

Conclusion

Institutional autonomy must not come at the cost of public accountability. A transparent and fair oversight mechanism is essential to uphold the rule of law and preserve the judiciary's moral legitimacy.

India's uneasy balancing act in the Bay of Bengal risks undermining cooperative regionalism by using trade for political displeasure. Analyze its implications for India's foreign policy goals and regional stability.

Introduction

India's recalibration of trade access to Bangladesh in the Bay of Bengal signals strategic assertion, but such economic politicization could erode regional trust and derail its broader goals of cooperative regionalism.

India's Maritime Strategy and Recent Shifts

1. India's **Act East Policy**, **Sagarmala Project**, and leadership in **BIMSTEC** (Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation) underline its ambition to emerge as a regional integrator between South and Southeast Asia.

2. The **BIMSTEC Maritime Transport Cooperation Agreement (2024)** marked a milestone in promoting seamless trade and connectivity.

3. However, India's **revocation of Bangladesh's transshipment facility** in April 2024 and subsequent import restrictions have sparked diplomatic tensions.

4. Though officially justified on logistical grounds, the timing — soon after Dhaka's overtures to China and assertions about being the Northeast's maritime gateway — suggests political undertones.

Implications for India's Foreign Policy Goals

1. **Undermining Cooperative Regionalism:** India has historically advocated for **rules-based regionalism** in South Asia and BIMSTEC. Politicization of trade threatens this narrative, making India's leadership appear conditional rather than constructive.
2. **Erosion of Strategic Trust:** Bangladesh is a key partner in India's regional outreach. It participates in **BBIN**, hosts **connectivity corridors** like the India-Bangladesh Protocol Route, and collaborates on security. Sudden trade restrictions create distrust, encouraging Dhaka to **hedge with China or ASEAN**, weakening India's strategic leverage.
3. **Impact on BIMSTEC Credibility:** If India, as the largest economy in BIMSTEC, uses its infrastructure as leverage, smaller states like **Nepal, Bhutan, and Myanmar** may question the neutrality of BIMSTEC's framework. It could mirror the dysfunction of SAARC.
4. **Loss of Moral High Ground Against China:** India criticizes China's **"debt diplomacy"** and **strategic coercion** under the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). If India uses trade as a geopolitical tool, it risks mirroring the very behavior it opposes, diminishing its soft power.

Implications for Regional Stability

1. **Strategic Churn in the Bay of Bengal:** The Bay is witnessing heightened geopolitical interest, with **China investing in Kyaukphyu (Myanmar)** and **Payra (Bangladesh)** ports. If India's actions are perceived as coercive, regional states may welcome China's investments more readily, increasing external influence.
2. **Trade Disruptions and Economic Fallout:** Bangladesh's **ready-made garment sector (85% of its exports)** faces higher costs due to the closure of Indian routes. Such economic fallout in fragile economies can fuel domestic unrest, indirectly affecting India's border stability and refugee management.
3. **Fragmentation of Regional Supply Chains:** The Indo-Pacific strategy hinges on building **resilient supply chains**. Creating uncertainty around logistics corridors undermines the effort to decouple from China and regionalize production.

Way Forward

1. **Rules-Based Trade Mechanism:** India must institutionalize a **transparent and apolitical framework** for trade facilitation in the region, restoring credibility.
2. **Economic Statecraft with Responsibility:** Use economic tools to **build interdependence**, not impose costs. Strategic interests must be pursued through **dialogue, not denial**.
3. **Leverage Soft Power and Infrastructure Together:** With superior port infrastructure and connectivity, India should **lead by example**, offering access as a regional public good.

Conclusion

India's credibility as a regional leader rests on trust and predictability. Weaponizing trade jeopardizes regional stability and dilutes cooperative regionalism, undermining its long-term strategic and diplomatic aspirations.

Amidst mass devastation, a paralysis of moral faculties and impunity mark dangerous new thresholds. Analyze the implications for global governance, humanitarian intervention, and the principle of state accountability in preventing human suffering.

Introduction

According to the UNHCR, global forced displacement crossed 114 million in 2023 — a grim testament to rising conflicts, erosion of international norms, and the crumbling architecture of global governance and accountability.

The Paralysis of Moral and Legal Order

In recent years, a distinct shift has emerged in international relations — from **norm-based diplomacy to raw power politics**. Conflicts in **Gaza, Ukraine, Iran, and Myanmar** reveal a global system adrift, marked by **impunity, nihilism, and strategic supremacism**, as seen in the West's selective invocation of international law and the strategic opacity of regimes like Russia, China, and Iran.

Erosion of Global Governance

1. **Weakening of Multilateral Institutions:** Institutions like the **UN Security Council** remain paralyzed by veto politics. On Gaza, multiple resolutions failed due to U.S. vetoes; similarly, Russia blocks any meaningful resolution on Ukraine. This corrodes institutional legitimacy.
2. **Failure of Preventive Diplomacy:**The **Responsibility to Protect (R2P)** norm, meant to prevent mass atrocities, has failed post-Libya. No robust mechanism now exists to intervene effectively in Syria, Sudan, or Gaza, where civilian casualties soar.

3. **Double Standards and Credibility Crisis:** The selective application of international norms, such as in the **International Criminal Court's arrest warrant for Putin**, while ignoring Israel's alleged violations, fuels a perception of Western hypocrisy and undermines global consensus.

Humanitarian Intervention at Crossroads

1. **From Solidarity to Strategic Silence:** Humanitarian interventions today are no longer motivated by cosmopolitan morality but by geopolitical calculus. In Gaza, over **37,000 Palestinians have died** (UN data, 2024), yet aid convoys are blocked and ceasefire calls ignored.
2. **Weaponization of Aid and Access:** Humanitarian corridors in conflict zones like Syria or Tigray are frequently manipulated by both state and non-state actors. Humanitarian principles — neutrality, impartiality, and independence — are routinely violated.
3. **Information Warfare and Dehumanization:** The language of humanitarianism is diluted. Palestinians are invisible despite heavy reporting; Ukrainians are valorized. Civilians are redefined based on group identity, violating the **Geneva Conventions**' core tenets.

State Accountability and the Crisis of Justice

1. **Disregard for International Law:** The targeting of nuclear sites, a violation of the **1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)** and **international humanitarian law**, is normalized. Drones and precision weapons now blur lines between combatants and civilians.
2. **Shrinking Civic Space and Authoritarianism:** Rising surveillance, militarization of urban spaces, and digital censorship — seen in India, Turkey, and Russia — reflect how governments exploit security threats to **suppress dissent and avoid accountability**.
3. **Global South and Non-Alignment 2.0:** India, China, Brazil, and others have failed to articulate a moral alternative. While proclaiming sovereignty, their silence on Gaza or Myanmar reflects **strategic narcissism over principled diplomacy**.

Way Forward

1. **Reviving Multilateralism**: Reforming the **UNSC** to include voices from Africa, Latin America, and Asia is vital for inclusive decision-making.
2. **Codify and Enforce R2P**: A binding global protocol must establish when and how humanitarian intervention is legitimate, not just politically convenient.
3. **Reinforce the ICC and ICJ**: Universal jurisdiction and the depoliticization of global justice mechanisms are essential for credible state accountability.

Conclusion

In a world where truth is tribal and war is gamified, the greatest casualty is our shared humanity. Rebuilding moral clarity in global governance is no longer optional — it's existential.

Science must be unfettered to be useful. Analyze how government procurement norms, like GeM, impact the autonomy of scientific institutions, affecting research freedom and India's innovation ecosystem.

Introduction

India ranks 40th in the Global Innovation Index 2023, reflecting growing R&D capacity. However, bureaucratic procurement norms like the Government e-Marketplace (GeM) often constrain scientific autonomy and innovation output.

The Nexus of Scientific Freedom and Procurement Regulation

The Government e-Marketplace (GeM), launched in 2016 to ensure transparency and cost-efficiency in public procurement, became mandatory for scientific institutions by 2020. While rooted in principles of good governance, the one-size-fits-all approach of GeM has often come at the cost of research flexibility, scientific accuracy, and timely innovation.

GeM and the Challenges to Scientific Autonomy

1. **Low-Cost, Not High-Quality Approach:** GeM mandates lowest-price bidding (L1), sidelining quality-specific procurement critical to research. For example, different grades of **sodium chloride** are chemically similar but differ in purity, impacting experimental outcomes significantly.
2. **Vendor Limitations for Specialized Equipment:** India lacks a deep industrial base in **high-precision lab instruments** or **biological molecules**, and GeM often does not list the vendors required for cutting-edge work. Procuring **customised CRISPR kits** or **nano-scale lithography tools** becomes unfeasible through GeM.
3. **Delays in Procurement and Lost Research Windows:** Time-sensitive research — such as **viral genome sequencing during pandemics** — suffers due to lengthy procurement processes. In competitive global science, such delays can derail entire projects and collaborations.

Institutional Impact on India's Research Landscape

1. **Loss of Reproducibility and Research Integrity:** Reproducibility — a cornerstone of scientific reliability — is undermined if original materials cannot be sourced. Labs may be forced to use alternate chemicals or machines, diluting results and causing research wastage.
2. **Discouragement of Ambitious Research:** With constrained access to high-grade materials, institutions often scale down project scope, focusing on what is feasible rather than what is visionary. This stifles **breakthrough innovations**, particularly in sectors like **space research**, **biotech**, and **AI hardware**.
3. **Demoralization and Brain Drain:** Talented Indian researchers, particularly in elite institutions like IISc, IITs, and CSIR labs, express frustration over procurement bottlenecks. This contributes to **brain drain**, as scientists migrate to more enabling ecosystems abroad.

Recent Corrective Measures and the Way Forward

1. **Exemption for Scientific Institutions (2024):** The government's recent order exempting research institutions from GeM norms marks a turning point. It aligns with earlier autonomy models where institutions could directly engage trusted vendors based on project needs.
2. **Balancing Accountability with Flexibility:** Procurement reforms should embed **scientific discretion within transparent oversight**, allowing domain experts to define vendor requirements while maintaining auditability.
3. **Encouraging Domestic Manufacturing Through Innovation Hubs:** Instead of restrictive mandates, support for **technology incubators** and **public-private partnerships** can organically build domestic capability in scientific equipment, thereby enhancing self-reliance without stifling science.

Conclusion

Science thrives not under coercion but freedom. Procurement norms must enable, not encumber, innovation. India's innovation destiny hinges on freeing science from bureaucratic chains while ensuring transparent, mission-driven governance.

Governments revise GDP base year to accurately reflect economic structure. Analyze how India's proposed 2026 revision impacts economic growth assessment, data credibility, and its implications for global investment and policy formulation.

Introduction

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is the most widely used metric to assess economic size and growth. India is set to revise its GDP base year to 2022–23, effective from 2026.

Why GDP Base Year Revisions Matter

1. GDP is the total monetary value of all final goods and services produced in a country during a specific time. However, as economies evolve structurally — from agrarian to industrial to service-based — older base years may fail to reflect the contemporary realities.

2. To ensure more precise estimations, governments periodically revise the base year, incorporate improved datasets, and update methodologies in line with international standards such as the United Nations System of National Accounts (SNA).

India's History of GDP Base Year Revisions

Since 1951, India has revised its GDP base year seven times, with the most recent being the shift from 2004–05 to 2011–12 in 2015. Each revision attempts to:

- Incorporate updated data sources (e.g., MCA-21, NSSO surveys),
- Capture emerging sectors (e.g., digital economy, gig work),
- Reflect changes in consumption patterns, prices, and production structure.

The upcoming 2026 revision will set 2022–23 as the new base year for GDP, Index of Industrial Production (IIP), and Consumer Price Index (CPI), replacing the current 2011–12 benchmark.

Implications of the 2026 Revision

1. Better Economic Growth Assessment: Sectors like fintech, digital services, and clean energy are underrepresented in the current series. Updating price deflators and production indices allows more accurate estimation of real growth (inflation-adjusted), avoiding overestimation due to price changes.

2. Improving Data Credibility: The 2015 revision to 2011–12 faced criticism for allegedly overstating GDP. Critics like former CEA Arvind Subramanian and economist R. Nagaraj argued that reliance on MCA-21 data introduced upward bias. Accurate and transparent methodological updates — with peer-reviewed justifications — can restore domestic and global faith in Indian statistics.

3. Policy Formulation and Public Investment: A reliable GDP estimate enables better fiscal planning, resource allocation, and poverty estimation. For example, schemes like PM-KISAN or NITI Aayog's SDG index rely on granular economic data for effective targeting. Updated GDP figures can better inform GST compensation estimates and state finances.

4. Global Investment and Economic Positioning: India is projected to become the world's **third-largest economy** by 2027–28 (IMF forecast). Investors and rating agencies will scrutinize the revised GDP closely. Consistency with international standards boosts investor confidence, enhances India's bond ratings, and facilitates FDI inflows.

Way Forward

1. **Transparent Methodology:** Publish underlying datasets, assumptions, and validation results for public scrutiny.
2. **Regular Updates:** Adhere to the National Statistical Commission's recommendation of rebasing every five years.
3. **Strengthen Statistical Institutions:** Empower MOSPI, NSSO, and CSO to function with autonomy and adequate resources, as recommended by the Rangarajan Commission (2001).

Conclusion

India's 2026 GDP revision is more than statistical housekeeping; it's a test of transparency and reliability. A credible data system is the cornerstone of sound policy and global economic leadership.

The revamped Green India Mission faces the challenge of integrating livelihoods with ecological security for vulnerable ecosystems. Analyze the environmental and socio-economic strategies required to achieve sustainable conservation and inclusive development."

Introduction

India's Green India Mission (GIM), revamped in 2024, aims to restore degraded ecosystems like the Himalayas, Aravallis, and Western Ghats while balancing environmental rejuvenation with livelihood generation for forest-dependent communities.

GIM: A Dual Mandate

1. Launched in 2014 under the National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC), the **Green India Mission** targets: **Increasing forest/tree cover by 5 million hectares**, **Improving ecosystem services** including biodiversity, water, and carbon sequestration and **Enhancing livelihood options** for 3 million forest-dependent families.

2. However, criticisms have focused on its **plantation-centric approach**, lack of local participation, and limited livelihood integration. The 2024 revamp addresses these gaps with a **region-specific**, **community-inclusive**, and **ecosystem-based restoration model**.

Environmental Strategies for Sustainable Conservation

1. **Micro-Climatic Zone Mapping & Native Species Plantation**: The new GIM emphasizes **ecological zoning**—prioritizing native, climate-resilient species. Example: Restoration of **shola forests in the Western Ghats**, critical for water regulation and endemic biodiversity.
2. **Protection of Eco-sensitive Regions**: Such as **western ghats**: Facing deforestation, mining, and landslides (e.g., 2023 Wayanad tragedy). **Himalayas**, hit by cloudbursts, landslides; enhanced green cover can stabilize slopes. **Aravallis**, desertification is advancing toward NCR due to quarrying and forest degradation.
3. **Climate Adaptation and Carbon Sequestration**: Forests act as **carbon sinks**. India's NDC targets under the Paris Agreement include creating an **additional carbon sink of 2.5 to 3 billion tonnes of CO_2-equivalent** through forest cover.
4. **Community Forest Management (CFM) and Biodiversity Protection**: Empowering **Joint Forest Management Committees (JFMCs)** and Gram Sabhas under the Forest Rights Act, 2006 ensures **bottom-up conservation**. Involves integrating traditional ecological knowledge (TEK).

Socio-Economic Strategies for Inclusive Development

1. **Livelihood Generation Linked to Restoration**: NTFP (Non-Timber Forest Produce) value chains (e.g., bamboo, honey, medicinal plants). **Eco-tourism** and **agroforestry** opportunities, especially in fringe forest communities. MGNREGA convergence for **watershed management and afforestation jobs**.
2. **Skill Development & Capacity Building**: Training locals in nursery development, forest firefighting, biodiversity monitoring. Promote **rural green enterprises** under the Startup India mission or Lakhpati Didi initiative.
3. **Financial and Policy Convergence**: Integrate GIM with **CAMPA**, MGNREGA, Jal Shakti Abhiyan, and State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCCs). Decentralized budgeting and disbursement via **district-level eco-restoration cells**.
4. **Conflict Resolution & Developmental Balancing**: Learning from failed implementation of the **Madhav Gadgil and Kasturirangan Committee** recommendations, policies must **align environmental protection with human development goals**. Include robust **social impact assessments** alongside EIA processes.

Way Forward

1. Strengthen **community ownership** by involving Van Dhan Kendras and SHGs.
2. Build **monitoring frameworks using GIS, drones**, and citizen science.
3. Enforce **legal compliance** to curb mining/quarrying in fragile zones.

Conclusion

The success of the revamped GIM lies in harmonizing ecological restoration with economic dignity. Sustainable conservation must walk hand-in-hand with inclusive livelihoods to secure India's environmental and developmental future.

India's critical mineral vulnerability necessitates fast-tracked domestic exploration for strategic autonomy. Analyze the economic, technological, and policy challenges in achieving self-reliance in securing these vital supply chains.

Introduction

In the era of clean energy and digital transition, critical minerals like lithium, cobalt, and rare earths underpin strategic technologies. India's dependence on imports threatens its economic security and technological autonomy.

Why Critical Minerals Matter

1. Critical minerals are essential inputs for: **Electric vehicle (EV) batteries** (e.g., lithium, cobalt, nickel), **Renewable energy infrastructure** (e.g., rare earths, copper), **Electronics and AI technologies** (e.g., graphite, silicon, tin), **Defence and aerospace sectors** (e.g., titanium, tungsten, rare earths).

2. According to the **International Energy Agency (IEA)**, demand for critical minerals could rise by **up to 400% by 2040** under global clean energy transitions.

3. India, with ambitions of becoming a global hub for **clean energy, semiconductors, and defence manufacturing**, cannot afford to remain import-dependent in these sectors.

India's Critical Mineral Vulnerability

1. **Heavy Import Dependence**: India imports 100% of its lithium needs, primarily from **Australia and Argentina**. Over 90% of rare earth processing is controlled by **China**, a geopolitical rival. Even basic minerals like copper, vital for electrical infrastructure, are largely imported.

2. **Supply Chain Risks: China's dominance** poses strategic risks. Example: In 2023, Beijing restricted gallium and germanium exports—both vital for semiconductors. Global supply is **highly concentrated**—Congo (70% cobalt), Indonesia (50% nickel), China (60% rare earths mining, 90% processing).

Economic and Technological Challenges

1. **Underexploration**: Only 10% of India's total **Obvious Geological Potential (OGP)** has been explored in detail. Lack of baseline geospatial data and high-resolution surveys delay new discoveries.
2. **Limited Processing Capacity**: India lacks **refining infrastructure** for many critical minerals. No operational **rare earth separation plant** of commercial scale exists in the country.
3. **High Initial Costs & Delayed Returns**: Mineral exploration is **capital-intensive** and time-consuming. Private sector participation is low due to **policy uncertainty and land acquisition bottlenecks**.

Policy and Strategic Constraints

1. **Outdated Policy Framework**: Until recently, **critical minerals were not classified separately** under the **Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act**. Exploration by private players was discouraged due to regulatory ambiguity.
2. **Slow Licensing and Clearances**: Multiple overlapping approvals (environmental, forest, land) delay exploration and mining. Average time to begin commercial operations is over **5-7 years**.
3. **Global Investment Hesitancy**: Unpredictable taxation and royalty regimes deter foreign investment. Lack of strategic stockpiling policy unlike **Japan or South Korea**.

Way Forward: A Strategic Roadmap

1. **Policy Reform and Fast-Track Clearance**: Implement **National Mineral Policy 2019** with urgency. Operationalize the **Critical Minerals List (2023)** and enable a **single-window clearance system**.
2. **Domestic Exploration Push**: Scale up airborne geophysical surveys via the **Geological Survey of India (GSI)**. Incentivize private exploration under the new **Revenue Sharing Model** introduced in 2023.
3. **Build Processing Ecosystem**: Invest in **Rare Earth Element (REE) separation plants**. Collaborate with countries like Australia, Argentina, and Chile for **technology transfer** and **joint ventures**.
4. **Strategic Reserves and Recycling**: Create **strategic reserves** of key minerals like cobalt and lithium. Promote **urban mining** and **battery recycling**, especially for lithium-ion batteries (LiBs).

Conclusion

India's critical mineral strategy must ensure secure, self-reliant supply chains through exploration, processing, and policy reform. Strategic autonomy in this domain underpins the nation's technological future and global competitiveness.

India's significant propulsion gap and import reliance affect strategic autonomy. Analyze the technological and policy challenges hindering indigenous engine development, impacting national security and defense modernization efforts.

Introduction

India's inability to develop indigenous propulsion systems for military platforms poses a major threat to its strategic autonomy, delaying defence modernization and undermining national security in a volatile geopolitical environment.

India's Propulsion Gap: A Strategic Concern

Despite its rising defence ambitions, India remains critically dependent on foreign engine technologies across its **air, land, and naval** platforms. The reliance on **GE F404 and F414** engines for Tejas variants, **MTU engines** for Arjun tanks, and **foreign marine propulsion** for Indian Navy vessels underscores a structural incapacity.

This dependency compromises:

1. **Military readiness** due to delays (e.g., GE's delay in F404 delivery).
2. **Export autonomy**, with engines requiring **third-party clearances**.
3. **Technological sovereignty**, as foreign suppliers rarely share cutting-edge tech like **single-crystal blades or advanced cooling systems**.

Case Studies of Indigenous Shortfalls

1. HF-24 Marut (1960s–1990): India's first indigenous jet fighter was crippled not by design, but by **underpowered British Orpheus 703 engines**. Resulted in limited deployment and early retirement.

2. Kaveri Engine Programme: Launched in 1989 by DRDO's GTRE to power the LCA. Spent ₹2,032 crore but **failed to meet thrust-to-weight and thermal benchmarks**. Over 3,000 hours of testing and 73 flight hours yielded no operational engine. Collaborations with **Safran (France)** and **Snecma** failed over tech transfer issues.

Technological Challenges

1. **Materials Science Limitations**: India lacks expertise in manufacturing **single-crystal turbine blades**, **thermal barrier coatings**, and **high-temperature alloys**.
2. **Testing Infrastructure Deficit**: Advanced test beds like those in the U.S., Russia, or France are missing. Long gestation periods for validation and certification hinder progress.
3. **R&D Ecosystem Fragmentation**: Lack of integrated effort among **GTRE**, **HAL**, private sector, and academia. Private players are under-incentivized due to the absence of risk-sharing mechanisms.

Policy and Institutional Barriers

1. **Overcentralization & Bureaucracy**: R&D is monopolized by DRDO without effective industry or academic partnerships. Example: DRDO's refusal of Safran's co-development offer due to "institutional pride."
2. **Funding Volatility**: Defence R&D allocations are **less than 6% of India's total defence budget**, limiting long-term, capital-intensive projects like engine development.
3. **Absence of Strategic Vision**: Lack of a dedicated national propulsion mission similar to ISRO's focused space programme. No **time-bound mission-mode approach** akin to China's AVIC or the U.S. DARPA-led initiatives.

Impact on Defence Modernization

1. **LCA Mk1A, Mk2, and AMCA** timelines are directly affected.
2. India's squadron strength is already down to **30 from a sanctioned 42.5**; propulsion delays worsen the gap.
3. Naval warships and tanks rely heavily on **foreign-origin engines**, weakening deterrence and self-reliance.

Way Forward

1. **Launch a National Jet Engine Mission**: On the lines of the **Semicon India initiative**, with international collaborations, shared IP, and risk financing.

2. **Leverage Quad/Strategic Partnerships**: Deepen defence tech ties with France, UK, and the U.S. for **joint R&D with ToT** clauses.
3. **Boost R&D Investment**: Allocate **1.5-2% of GDP to defence R&D**, with **PPP models** for engine testing and material science labs.
4. **Skill Development**: Establish **aerospace engineering universities and dedicated propulsion centres** to build human capital.

Conclusion

India's propulsion gap is a critical vulnerability. Bridging it demands political resolve, long-term investment,

India's quantum technology advancements, like QKD, highlight immense potential. Analyze how administrative reforms are critical to fostering scientific innovation and securing strategic technological capabilities for national progress.

Introduction

India's recent demonstration of quantum key distribution (QKD) marks a strategic leap in secure communications. However, bureaucratic hurdles threaten to impede its progress in quantum innovation and national technological sovereignty.

Quantum Technology and National Potential

1. Quantum technology, encompassing computing, communication, and sensing, is set to revolutionize sectors such as **cybersecurity**, **healthcare**, **finance**, and **defence**. India's **National Quantum Mission (NQM)**, approved in 2023 with an outlay of ₹6,003 crore (till 2031), aims to position the country among leading quantum innovators.

2. The **IIT-Delhi–DRDO demonstration** of **Quantum Key Distribution (QKD)** over 1 km of free space reflects this promise. QKD allows ultra-secure transmission of encrypted data, leveraging quantum principles like superposition and entanglement.

3. If scaled, such technology could make **India's satellite and defence communication systems** virtually immune to cyberattacks, a significant strategic edge in the era of quantum computing.

Challenges Hindering India's Quantum Ecosystem

Despite these strides, administrative bottlenecks remain major impediments:

1. Delayed Fund Disbursement: Only a **small fraction** of the ₹6,003 crore allocated for the NQM has been disbursed. Bureaucratic layers delay crucial funds, undermining time-sensitive research.

2. Lack of Single-Window Clearance: Indian scientists face **cumbersome approval processes** for project proposals, equipment procurement, and foreign collaborations, leading to lost time and competitive disadvantage globally.

3. Just-in-Time Funding Issues: Quantum research often involves unpredictable R&D trajectories. Rigid and delayed funding models are ill-suited for such dynamic innovation environments.

4. Foreign Hardware Dependence: Critical components—such as **cryostats, single-photon detectors, and sensors**—are mostly imported. The lack of domestic quantum manufacturing capabilities exposes India to **strategic vulnerabilities** and supply disruptions.

5. Talent Retention Crisis: India's quantum scientists face **pay disparities** compared to global counterparts. Absence of long-term career pathways and delayed access to equipment compels top talent to seek opportunities abroad.

Comparative Global Commitment

India's investment pales in comparison to quantum powerhouses:

1. **China**: Over **$25 billion** in quantum initiatives, including satellite-based QKD (e.g., **Micius satellite**).
2. **USA**: Committed **$1.2 billion** under its National Quantum Initiative Act (2018), further boosted by private sector partnerships.
3. **Europe**: The EU has allocated **€1 billion** to its quantum flagship initiative.

India's current investment (~$730 million) must be matched with **structural reforms** to generate impact.

Administrative Reforms: The Need of the Hour

1. **Quantum Innovation Hubs:** Establish autonomous, flexible **innovation clusters** with independent hiring, funding, and R&D authority (like ISRO's model).
2. **Fast-Track Approvals**: Introduce **single-window digital portals** for R&D clearances, international collaborations, and startup facilitation.
3. **Industry-Academia Synergy**: Incentivize **PPP models** to translate quantum research into deployable technologies.
4. **Indigenous Capability Building**: Support domestic startups through **quantum venture funds**, reduce import reliance via **Make-in-India incentives** for quantum components.
5. **Global Talent Collaboration**: Create **reverse brain drain** schemes by offering competitive fellowships and global project mobility.

Conclusion

India's quantum ambitions demand more than scientific breakthroughs—they require enabling ecosystems. Administrative reforms are imperative to unlock innovation, secure strategic technologies, and elevate India's standing in the quantum future.

Hike in MSP alone cannot curb India's vegetable oil import dependence without physical procurement. Critically examine the efficacy of MSP in addressing this challenge and suggest holistic policy measures for self-reliance.

Introduction

India's growing dependence on vegetable oil imports, exceeding 16 million tonnes annually, signals structural inefficiencies. Relying solely on Minimum Support Prices (MSP) without complementary reforms risks undermining true agricultural self-reliance.

The Limits of MSP in Oilseed Sector

1. The **Minimum Support Price (MSP)** is a price floor set by the government to ensure farmers a fair return.

2. While MSP has been effective in crops like **wheat and rice** — backed by assured procurement and distribution under the **Public Distribution System (PDS)** — its efficacy is severely limited in crops like **oilseeds**, due to the **absence of a comprehensive procurement mechanism**.

3. As per **2024-25 trade data**, vegetable oil imports touched **16.4 million tonnes**, costing **$17.3 billion**. Despite MSP hikes, India's oilseed output has not kept pace. For instance: The **MSP of soybean** is ₹5,328 per quintal (≈$615/tonne), yet global landed prices (from Brazil/US) range from **$400–$450/tonne**, making Indian oilseeds **uncompetitive**.

4. Without **procurement support**, farmers have no market assurance and are at the mercy of private buyers, rendering MSP largely symbolic.

5. Moreover, MSP does not address **yield stagnation**. India's average **soybean yield is just 1 tonne/ha**, compared to: 3.4–3.5 tonnes/ha in the **U.S. and Brazil** and 2.6 tonnes/ha in **Argentina**.

Why MSP Hike is Inadequate Alone

1. **No Physical Procurement:** Unlike rice or wheat, oilseeds lack institutional procurement networks. Without assured offtake, MSP cannot correct market failures.
2. **Global Price Volatility:** MSPs that are significantly higher than import prices can lead to **distorted domestic prices**, causing inflation or unsold surplus.
3. **Costly and Unsustainable:** Expanding procurement to oilseeds would strain fiscal resources and storage capacity. Moreover, **storage of oilseeds** is more complex than cereals due to perishability.
4. **Policy Distortion:** Over-reliance on MSP encourages a **cost-plus mindset**, reducing farmers' incentives to improve productivity and adopt sustainable practices.

Holistic Policy Measures for Oilseed Self-Reliance

1. Yield Enhancement through R&D and GM Technology: Invest in research to develop high-yielding, drought-tolerant varieties. **Permit GM crops** like **GM mustard and soybean** under stringent biosafety norms to close the yield gap.

2. National Mission on Edible Oils – Oil Palm (NMEO-OP): Expand beyond oil palm to include **soybean, mustard, groundnut**, etc., with **agronomic support**, processing infrastructure, and market linkages.

3. Decentralised Procurement Model: Adopt the **Price Deficiency Payment Scheme (PDPS)** as in **Madhya Pradesh's Bhavantar Yojana**, where farmers are compensated for price difference without physical procurement.

4. Agro-Ecological Zoning: Promote oilseed cultivation in **non-traditional and fallow areas** like the Eastern Gangetic plains using region-specific agronomic models.

5. Value Chain Development: Support **oilseed processing clusters**, **cold chains**, and **export hubs** through incentives and FPO-led models.

6. Income Assurance over Price Assurance: Shift from MSP-centric policy to **Minimum Income Guarantee Schemes**, like **PM-AASHA**, providing flexibility while reducing market distortion.

Conclusion

True self-reliance in edible oils demands a shift from MSP dependency to holistic strategies focusing on productivity, technology adoption, value chains, and institutional reforms tailored to India's diverse agricultural landscapes.

The Census's omission of a column for Adivasi beliefs is argued to be unconstitutional. Critically analyze how this impacts tribal identity, religious freedom, and the principles of secularism and inclusive governance in India.

Introduction

India's Scheduled Tribes (STs), comprising over 8.6% of the population, possess unique spiritual, cultural, and ecological worldviews. Yet, their exclusion from religious classification in the Census undermines constitutional principles and inclusive governance.

The Constitutional and Cultural Framework

India's Constitution recognises the distinctiveness of tribal communities:

- **Article 25** guarantees religious freedom.
- **Article 26** protects the right to manage religious affairs.
- **Fifth and Sixth Schedules** provide special protections to tribal customs, especially in areas like Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Nagaland, and Mizoram.
- **Articles 371A and 371B** preserve customary laws and practices in Nagaland and Assam.

Despite this robust framework, the **Census of India continues to record only six major religions**—Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Sikhism, Buddhism, and Jainism—relegating all other systems of faith to a vague "Other Religious Persuasion (ORP)" category. This **excludes Adivasi religious systems**, which are predominantly **nature-centric, animist, or ancestor-worshipping**, such as Sarna, Gond, and Donyi-Polo faiths.

Impacts on Tribal Identity and Religious Freedom

1. Cultural Erasure and Misidentification: According to the **2011 Census**, India's ST population stood at **10.43 crore**, but only **0.66% (79 lakh)** were recorded under ORP. The **lack of awareness** and ambiguity around ORP compels Adivasis to identify as Hindus or Christians, diluting their **distinct spiritual identity**. In contrast, **Jharkhand's 2020 Assembly Resolution** demanding Sarna be recognised as a separate religion saw **49 lakh individuals** opt for the Sarna identity—highlighting that **awareness and recognition matter**.

2. Violation of Religious Freedom: By not recognising Adivasi religions, the Census may be violating **Article 25**, as tribal citizens are not allowed to formally assert and register their spiritual identity. This coerces many into affiliating with **majoritarian religious categories**, **compromising their individual and collective rights**.

3. Undermining Secularism: India's **secular fabric** is based on **equal treatment of all religions**. Excluding indigenous belief systems marginalises **non-Abrahamic, non-Vedic** traditions that predate institutional religions. It violates the **principle of neutrality** in state-religion relations and fuels **majoritarian assimilation narratives**.

Broader Governance and Political Implications

1. The **RSS-affiliated ghar wapasi campaigns**, which aim to 'reconvert' tribals to Hinduism, are often legitimised by such Census omissions.
2. State coercion through **school curricula (Eklavya Schools)** and **temple-building projects** in tribal areas furthers a **one-nation-one-culture agenda**.
3. **CSR-funded education** often comes with ideological conditioning, threatening traditional knowledge systems and **cultural autonomy**.
4. This facilitates **electoral co-option** while weakening **grassroots democratic assertion** by tribal communities.

Recommendations for Inclusive Governance

1. **Add a 'Tribal/Adivasi Faith' Column** in the Census to formally acknowledge ST religious systems alongside the six major religions.
2. **Sensitise enumerators and tribal citizens** about their rights and options in religious self-identification.
3. **Legally codify protections for tribal spiritual practices** through state and central laws, reinforcing the constitutional vision.
4. **Encourage documentation and research** into tribal religions, languages, and rituals through academic and governmental institutions.
5. **Resist homogenisation** by reinforcing **multiculturalism in education and policy frameworks**.

Conclusion

The exclusion of Adivasi beliefs from the Census weakens secularism, distorts identity, and violates constitutional guarantees. Acknowledging tribal faiths is vital to realising India's pluralistic and democratic ethos.

Amidst the escalating Israel-Iran conflict, examine the multifaceted implications for India's geopolitical interests, energy security, diaspora, and the challenges in maintaining its foreign policy balance in West Asia.

Introduction

The Israel-Iran conflict's intensification threatens West Asia's fragile stability. For India, which has deep strategic, economic, and diaspora ties with the region, navigating this crisis demands a nuanced, multi-pronged foreign policy response.

Geopolitical Balancing Act

India shares strong but distinct ties with both **Israel and Iran**, necessitating a tightrope walk:

1. **Israel** is a major defence partner, with arms imports rising from $5.6 million (2015) to $128 million (2024). It also provides surveillance, drone, and radar systems integral to India's national security.
2. **Iran** remains crucial for India's **strategic depth** in Central Asia through projects like **Chabahar Port** and the **International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC)**.
3. India abstained from voting on Gaza-related UN resolutions, avoided SCO condemnation of Israel, and has called for "peace and restraint" without criticising Israel. This illustrates **New Delhi's strategic ambiguity**, aimed at balancing G7 alignments and Global South sensitivities.

Energy Security and Trade Vulnerabilities

India imports over **54% of its crude oil** from West Asia, much of it via the **Strait of Hormuz**, through which **40-50% of India's energy supply** flows. If Iran retaliates by closing or disrupting this chokepoint:

1. **Crude oil and LNG prices will soar**, fuelling domestic inflation.
2. **Insurance, freight, and transport costs will rise**, weakening India's export competitiveness.
3. **India's trade with Iran has already shrunk** from $14 billion (2017) to $1.4 billion (2023), and with Israel from $11 billion (2022) to $3.75 billion, indicating growing vulnerability in bilateral trade.
4. India's ambitious **India-Middle East-Europe Economic Corridor (IMEC)**—announced at the G20 summit—has already stalled due to regional instability. Chabahar's development may also slow down, hurting India's ambitions to bypass Pakistan for connectivity to Central Asia and Russia.

Impact on Indian Diaspora and Remittances

The conflict risks the lives and livelihoods of **35,000 Indians in Iran and Israel**, particularly **25,000 Indian caregivers and workers** in Israel, many of whom replaced expelled Palestinian workers post-October 2023.

1. The Indian government has launched **Operation Sindhu** to evacuate citizens from both countries.
2. However, repatriated citizens require **employment reintegration**, or they may return to conflict zones.
3. Disruptions in the wider Gulf region would impact **remittances from 10 million Indians** in West Asia, which make up nearly **40% of total remittances**.

Regional and Multilateral Diplomacy Challenges

India's **perceived pro-Israel tilt**—evident from abstentions and distancing from critical statements—has raised concerns among **Arab and Islamic countries**, where India has deep economic and diaspora stakes.

1. At the upcoming **BRICS Summit in Brazil**, India must navigate statements from member nations like **Iran, UAE, Egypt, and Indonesia**, who are likely to criticize Israel.
2. Any shift in India's stance could affect its **soft power, image as a neutral player**, and traditional support for the **Palestinian cause**, which it once led as a NAM founding member and was the **first non-Arab nation to recognise Palestine**.

Conclusion

India's strategic, economic, and human stakes in West Asia demand a balanced yet assertive diplomacy. Upholding peace, ensuring diaspora welfare, and safeguarding energy routes are central to India's long-term regional posture.