



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

www.PapaCambridge.com

INDIA STUDIES

0447/01

Paper 1 Core Themes

For Examination from 2012

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 75

This document consists of **12** printed pages.



Notes

- The full mark range will be used as a matter of course. Marking must be positive. Marks will not be deducted for inaccurate or irrelevant material. Half-marks will not be used.
- Levels of response criteria are used for questions where a hierarchy of answers is possible [part (b) and (c) questions]. Each answer is to be placed in the level that best reflects its qualities. It is not necessary to work through the levels.

In levels with three marks, provisionally award the middle mark and then moderate according to the qualities of the individual answer.

In levels with two marks, provisionally award the higher mark and then moderate according to the qualities of the individual answer.

- Arguments need to be supported with evidence, but lots of facts/dates are not required.
- No set answer is looked for to any question. The examples given in the marking scheme are indicative only and are not intended to be exhaustive or prescriptive. They are given only as examples of some responses/approaches that may be seen by an examiner.

- 1 (a) **This question tests your knowledge.**
Explain briefly the main features of the caste system in India today.

[4 × 1 mark; an additional 1 mark for a developed description of any single aspect.]

e.g. The system remains important in Indian life [1], often determining employment [1] and marriage [1]. Its hold is weaker now in cities [1]. Caste is often identified with Hinduism [1]. Caste membership is often seen as hereditary [1]. Caste-based discrimination [1] and violence [1] remain significant problems. Untouchability is outlawed by the constitution [1]. The government classifies various groups as needing positive discrimination [1]. These have reserved places in education [1], government employment [1] and parliament [1]. Reservation is controversial [1].

- (b) **This question tests your understanding.**
Explain why the Mandal recommendations were introduced? [7]

LEVEL 1: Simplistic statement(s) [1]

e.g. They were needed. It made things fairer.

LEVEL 2: Identifies reasons [2–4]
[Award marks for the number of reasons given and/or the quantity of the supporting detail. Max 2 marks per reason given].

e.g. Mandal wanted to cut discrimination. Backward castes needed more opportunities. Lower caste people would get better jobs. Lower caste children would get a better education. Poverty would be cut.

LEVEL 3: Explains reasons [5–7]
[Award marks for the quality of the explanation as well as for the number of reasons explained. Max 2 marks per reason explained].

e.g. Mandal wanted to address social problems through a major programme of affirmative action. The constitution had failed to remove discrimination so further positive discrimination was needed. If the massive caste-based problems of India were reduced, there would be a major improvement in social and economic opportunities. Through quotas and reservation, huge numbers of the very poor would be given the means to live a better quality life because they could earn more. In addition, the next generation would be helped because children would be given access to a good education and, because of that, a far wider range of job opportunities. Access to improved opportunities in education and employment would, in consequence, allow those with talent to succeed. Because of that, the nation would benefit as well as the individuals concerned. At the same time, Mandal's quotas and reservation aimed to reduce discrimination and inequality, making Indian society more equal and more democratic. In the process, mass poverty would also be reduced, although that was never itself a direct goal of the Mandal Report.

- (c) This question tests your judgement.
Consider these two statements:

Statement 1: 'Caste remains a serious problem and is often associated discrimination and violence.'

Statement 2: 'Caste is no longer a serious problem in modernising and increasingly urban India.'

Assess these statements, showing which you most agree with, and why. [14]

LEVEL 1: Simplistic statement(s) [1–2]

e.g. There are caste riots. There is serious discrimination. Caste violence is a serious problem.

OR

The Constitution makes caste-discrimination illegal. Caste problems are not serious now in the cities. It only is a problem now in rural areas. Inequality is being reduced.

LEVEL 2: Identifies/describes reasons [3–5]

[Use this Level for answers that identify/list reasons without explaining them.]

e.g. Caste divisions still cause social and economic inequality. People belonging to low castes still suffer from discrimination at work and have little access to education. Low castes suffer real poverty, especially dalits. Caste membership still controls marriage. Members of scheduled tribes suffer the same problems. Politics is often caste-based.

OR

Quotas and reservations have improved things and cut discrimination, especially in towns and cities. Jobs in towns and cities are now open to all. Alliances across castes are now important in politics. Caste-based attitudes have been weakened by modernisation/education.

LEVEL 3: Explains agreement OR disagreement with one of the statements [6–8]

LEVEL 4: Explains agreement OR disagreement with both of the statements [9–11]

OR

Explains extent of agreement AND disagreement with one statement

LEVEL 5: Explains extent of agreement AND disagreement with both statements AND offers evaluative judgements [12–14]

[Candidates may draw from a wide range of issues. What matters is the quality of the explanation and the judgements. Sustained judgement that addresses '... most agree with, and why' must be awarded 14 marks.]

Agreement with statement 1: Caste-based problems are still very real across India, even in the modern cities. This is shown by the fierce controversy that still goes on over the Mandal recommendations, despite the 1992 Supreme Court judgement in their favour. Quotas and reservations for scheduled castes and OBCs are opposed strongly by higher castes because they see their job and educational opportunities threatened, as was seen in the protests by high caste students in Delhi after the government of V P Singh announced in 1990 it would implement Mandal. The number of low caste people is so large that quotas and reservations have had only a limited impact, e.g. inadequate schooling opportunities plus discrimination while at school mean that reserved places at universities and in government employment limit take-up of the opportunities currently available. Caste-based discrimination and violence are still common in rural India, e.g. in schools; problems in various states, including Bihar, Maharashtra, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh. Caste-based rivalries

are still very real, as is seen in elections where party rivalries have become linked to caste, e.g. the rise of the BJP and the BSP. Political parties have openly used caste issues for their own advantage. Lower castes have been forced to compete with interest groups for the limited social and economic benefits available, and this economic competition among Hindus has made problems worse. The existence of active revolutionaries like the Naxalite and the Dalit Panthers also show that caste discrimination remains a major problem. 90% of dalits live in the country where they live as landless labourers and government initiatives to redistribute land have largely failed. The assassination of Phulan Devi (2001) and the Kherlanji Massacre (2006) show that caste-based violence remains a real problem. Caste-based problems are even more serious for women than for men since their education and literacy levels tend to be lower so their employment opportunities are even poorer. Much may have changed, but massive inequalities remain. Caste is the greatest single problem holding back India's development.

Agreement with statement 2: Modernisation has weakened caste-based difficulties so they are no longer a serious problem, especially in urban India where caste cannot be known in the large crowd. Identity defined by caste has been replaced by identity defined by job and wealth. Economic liberalisation has opened India to the demands of a market economy so India now needs as big a pool of talent as possible. Economic needs have thus made India push ahead with policies to educate the whole population to a high standard and to open jobs to anyone with the right qualifications. The growth in the number of white collar dalits is substantial. Literacy levels among scheduled castes are rising and scholarships offer real opportunities. The economic growth that has followed liberalisation has seen major increases in the salaries of government, state and district employees – all jobs accessible to scheduled castes and OBCs via quotas and reservations. At the same time, economic development has led to policies that improve standards of living and reduce poverty across society, whether in providing clean water and electricity or local schooling. In politics, the rise of coalition governments has forced some parties to change policies that defended the old caste-based way of life, in order to find allies to cooperate with to achieve power (at state and union level), e.g. the alliance of the BSP and brahmins in Uttar Pradesh. Modernisation has also shifted much of the political debate away from caste-based issues to questions such as the provision of clean water, the defence of swadeshi, the development of nuclear power. At the same time, rising opportunities have produced more senior politicians from low caste backgrounds (e.g. President Narayanan, Mayawati) and they have encouraged policies to improve opportunities and cut discrimination. Modern India undermines segregation because segregation is not possible in the modern industrial and business urban workplace.

These issues can be argued either way. What matters is the quality of the argument and judgement, backed up with supporting evidence.

2 (a) This question tests your knowledge.

Explain briefly what is meant by the term 'coalition government'?

[4]

[4 × 1 mark; an additional 1 mark for a developed description of any single aspect.]

e.g. One party does not have enough seats in parliament [1] to form a majority government on its own [1] so it allies [1] with another party/other parties [1] so that together they have a majority to pass laws [1]. No single party always gets its way on policies [1] so coalition members have to compromise [1]. Coalitions can involve parties that are equal partners (e.g. the United Front set up in 1996) [1] or be a group of relatively smaller parties led by a major party (e.g. the National Democratic Alliance created in 1998) [1] or be a coalition of smaller parties organised but not necessarily led by a prime minister from the major party (e.g. the UPA formed in 2004) [1]. Coalition governments can exist at state [1] and union level [1].

- (b) **This question tests your understanding.**
Explain why the Janata Dal Party came to power in 1989.

LEVEL 1: Simplistic statement(s)

e.g. The Janata Dal Party was supported by other parties. Congress did not have enough seats.

LEVEL 2: Identifies reasons

[2–4]

[Award marks for the number of reasons given and/or the quantity of the supporting detail. Max 2 marks per reason given].

e.g. In the 1989 general election, Congress failed to win an majority. Congress was hit by stories of corruption. Rajiv Gandhi resigned. Janata Dal was the largest anti-Congress party. Janata Dal allied with Communists and the BJP to create a coalition.

LEVEL 3: Explains reasons

[5–7]

[Award marks for the quality of the explanation as well as for the number of reasons explained. Max 2 marks per reason explained].

e.g. Post-Independence India was changing. Congress and the Nehru dynasty were no longer automatically seen as representing the nation. Congress had been losing its dominant position for some time. In the 1989 general election, the Bofors Scandal did Congress much damage. Congress also lost seats because of a very effective anti-Congress electoral pact among opposition parties. Congress was still the largest party but for the first time was unable to command a majority in the Lok Sabha, but no other single party was yet strong enough to replace it. The opposition parties were, however, keen to turn their electoral pact into a coalition of government where they could achieve some of their own policies, such as promoting social reform or Hindutva or economic growth. As the largest anti-Congress party in the National Front coalition, Janata Dal headed the coalition and its leader became prime minister.

- (c) **This question tests your judgement.**

'The most important political problems facing Indian governments from 1989 have been insurgency and terrorism.'

How far do you agree with is claim? Give reasons for your answer.

[14]

LEVEL 1: Simplistic statement(s)

[1–2]

This is the most important problem. India was attacked by terrorists. There is insurgency in rural India. Governments cannot defeat the Naxalites.

LEVEL 2: Identifies/describes political problems

[3–5]

[Use this Level for answers that identify/list reasons without explaining them.]

Insurgency is a major problem in Kashmir. Insurgency affects much of the north east, e.g. Tripura and Manipur. Some separatist conflicts have ended, e.g. the Punjab. Naxalite insurgency has been going on for years. Terrorists attacked Mumbai in 2008.

Relations with Pakistan remain poor. Settlement of Jammu/Kashmir is a major political problem. Inter-communal relations are a serious political issue. Political corruption is a serious. Reducing high levels of poverty has been a big political problem for all governments.

LEVEL 3: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining one problem

LEVEL 4: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining two or more problems

LEVEL 5: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining two or more problems AND offering evaluative judgements [12–14]

[Candidates may draw from a wide range of political problems to judge which is/are the most important. The given factor must be given serious consideration, even if the candidate wishes to reject it in favour of an alternative. What matters is the quality of the explanation and the judgements. Sustained judgement that addresses 'How far ...?' must be awarded 14 marks.]

'Insurgency' and 'terrorism' have been one of the most important political problems facing Indian governments in India. Some result from problems of political integration in the Union. Maintaining different peoples under one federal system has always been a difficult political balance to achieve. So too has balancing the relationship between central power and the states. Is the creation of Telangana a sign of strength or weakness? When this period began, Delhi faced separatist violence from Sikh militants in the Punjab. Separatist movements disturbed much of the north east. The army has had to be used many times to restore order, with varying degrees of success. Some regional separatist problems were settled (more or less) in the early 1990s by a combination of tough military action and political negotiation, e.g. the Punjab; violent campaigns for Khalistan have stopped. Military action did not, however, end insurgency in Assam where the ULFA remains active; over 10,000 have died in the past twenty years. An effective contrast could be made between the settled state of Mizoram and the disturbed state of Manipur.

'Insurgency and terrorism' does not only mean regional demands for autonomy or independence. As the Naxalites show, these terms also cover revolutionaries fighting to overthrow the Union itself. Their violent insurgency is growing and now affects twenty states. Maoists, they feed on problems of poverty and caste discrimination for their support. Successive governments have failed to halt their spread and at least 6000 have died in the troubles. By 2007, the Naxalites had become so significant that the prime minister called them the greatest threat to India's internal security. 'Insurgency and terrorism' also covers the virtual civil war that has troubled Jammu and Kashmir from 1989. The Indian army has had to be very active here too, but a settlement looks to be no nearer. During the 1990s alone some 30,000 were killed while over 100,000 fled. Whereas the Naxalite movements draw on social and economic grievances, the disturbances in Jammu and Kashmir are fed by inter-communal tensions between Hindu and Muslim and the on-going international rivalry with Pakistan. Military victory has not been possible here either. Kashmir's troubles have affected the rest of India, causing, for example, an attack on the Indian parliament in 2001 and a series of bombs in Mumbai, not just the attacks of Nov 2008.

India has faced other important political problems in the years from 1989, e.g.: inter-communal relations threaten national stability, e.g. the anti-Muslim violence in Gujarat in 2002 and the on-going problems represented by Ayodhya. Political corruption undermines good government and damages India's reputation. Some may argue the coalition politics of 1989+ causes major political weakness/problems. The question is not confined to domestic political issues so candidates might also consider the on-going harm caused by border disputes with China and/or troubled relations with Pakistan (the 1999 Kargil conflict may be mentioned). Equally, the question allows for discussion of major social and economic problems (e.g. widespread poverty, the need to expand educational provision, the need to cut caste-based discrimination/violence, the need to control population growth) if the focus is kept on their political significance. In passing, some might note that while Indian government is often said to be chaotic, democracy has lasted well. India has never suffered the military coups that have so damaged its neighbours.

There is more than one way to interpret the evidence. What matters is the quality of the argument and judgement, backed up with supporting evidence.

3 (a) This question tests your knowledge.

Explain briefly what 'Indian economic liberalisation' means.

[4]

[4 × 1 mark; an additional 1 mark for a developed description of any single aspect.]

e.g. Removing government controls on the economy [1] to open it up to the global economy [1]. Establishing a market economy in India [1] instead of a Socialist command economy [1]. Encouraging high levels of private enterprise [1]. This is done by, among other things: encouraging foreign trade with India [1] and foreign investment in India [1], allowing the financial sector to make greater profits [1], privatising state-controlled businesses [1], lowering taxes [1], reducing government deficits and debts [1].

(b) This question tests your understanding.

Explain why Narasimha Rao's government introduced economic liberalisation?

[7]

LEVEL 1: Simplistic statement(s)

[1]

e.g. It was needed. The Indian economy had serious problems. The government had large debts.

LEVEL 2: Identifies reasons

[2–4]

[Award marks for the number of reasons given and/or the quantity of the supporting detail. Max 2 marks per reason given].

There was an economic crisis. The government could not pay its debts. Industrial exports were falling. Not much foreign investment was being attracted. Gold reserves had almost all gone. India was offered massive IMF loans but, in exchange, had to make major economic changes to liberalise the economy. Liberalisation was the solution of the Finance Minister, Manmohan Singh.

LEVEL 3: Explains reasons

[5–7]

[Award marks for the quality of the explanation as well as for the number of reasons explained. Max 2 marks per reason explained].

e.g. India in 1991 suffered badly from rising oil prices, was almost bankrupt and faced a balance of payments crisis. Major change to economic policies was needed to prevent the immediate financial crisis that would be caused if India failed to make its payments. Beyond that, Rao's government believed that fundamental changes were overdue. India needed to abandon the socialist command economy that, they argued, had caused the crisis. In its place, India should adopt a market economy. Rao's government, led by its technocrat finance minister Manmohan Singh, saw the old ways of state corporations and government controls and restrictions as inefficient, as discouraging enterprise and wealth creation and depressing national economic success. For India to prosper, business had to be set free. Foreign investment and free trade had to be encouraged. India had to join actively in the global market economy. Economic liberalisation was the way to achieve this. As Finance Minister Manmohan Singh said to foreign companies, "make our need your opportunity."

(c) This question tests your judgement.

How far has economic liberalisation benefited the peoples of India? Give reasons for your answer.

LEVEL 1: Simplistic statement(s)

[1–2]

Reform has made people richer. Liberalisation has created more jobs. Pay has improved. There is still a lot of poverty.

LEVEL 2: Identifies/describes benefits

[3–5]

[Use this Level for answers that identify/list reasons without explaining them.]

Liberalisation has encouraged the growth of a middle class.

LEVEL 3: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining one benefit

[6–8]

LEVEL 4: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining two or more benefits

[9–11]

LEVEL 5: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining two or more benefits AND offers evaluative judgements

[12–14]

[Candidates may draw from a wide range of policies to assess benefit to the peoples. What matters is the quality of the explanation and the judgements. Sustained judgement that addresses 'How far ...?' must be awarded 14 marks.]

The economic growth brought by liberalisation has led to the creation of many more jobs as companies have grown or new companies have been started. Monetary reform has produced more stable prices and limited inflation, both of which benefit everyone. Credit is now much more easily available, allowing far more people to borrow money to buy land, a house, a car, etc. The benefits have not, however, been equally distributed. That the urban middle class have gained the most is shown by their very significantly growth (in number and wealth). Their prosperity is symbolised by the growth of Bangalore and 'Hi-Tech City' Hyderabad. Government figures say the percentage living in real poverty fell from 36% to 26% during the 1990s. On the other hand, the gap between the middle class and the rest of society has certainly widened, increasing inequality and relative poverty. With liberalisation, the abolition of protection for agriculture and the public sector created losers as well as winners. The end of subsidies raised food prices which hit the poor disproportionately. It is far from certain that the urban poor have gained more than the rural poor. The great cities have seen the rapid expansion of slums. The benefits of wealth creation and accumulation have not reached the millions living on under \$1 a day. One-third of Indians continue to live in poverty.

The impact of liberalisation has been questioned in other ways too. Liberalisation policies that undermined swadeshi are seen as having helped to encourage the rise of the Hindu Right and Hindutva (which not all see as good for India). Some see it as a powerful factor behind the Ayodhya crisis. Critics like Amartya Sen have argued that successive governments have done far too little to use the wealth generated by liberalisation to invest in human capital. That half on all Indians (two-thirds of women) are still illiterate is not just a national disgrace in human terms but has weakened the economy and put India well behind many Asian states.

Some candidates might consider whether the opening of India to global culture through international communications mediums such as cable and satellite television, advertising and the internet (all direct consequences of economic liberalisation) have been a benefit. Many complain that Indian morality and culture have suffered badly.

These issues can be argued either way. What matters is the quality of the argument and judgement, backed up with supporting evidence.

4 (a) **This question tests your knowledge.**

Explain briefly the ways in which India today may be seen as a super power. [4]

[4 × 1 mark; an additional 1 mark for a developed description of any single aspect.]

e.g. Economic power: liberalisation means India has one of the fastest growing economies in the world [1]; massive population strength [1]; global impact of its business services (especially IT) [1]; significant natural resources [1]; Indian buy-ups of foreign companies [1].

Military power: nuclear weapons make it one of a tiny number of nuclear powers [1]; 2008 nuclear deal with the USA indicates the important position India now holds [1].

International status: India is an influential member of the G8 + 5 [1] and the G20 [1] increasingly able to project its power around the globe [1].

(b) **This question tests your understanding.**

Explain why India's relations with the USA have improved from the 1990s. [7]

LEVEL 1: Simplistic statement(s) [1–2]

e.g. America has helped India. Trade between them has increased. America likes India.

LEVEL 2: Identifies reasons [2–4]

[Award marks for the number of reasons given and/or the quantity of the supporting detail. Max 2 marks per reason given].

The Cold War ended. The USA sees India as an ally against terrorism. India has nuclear weapons. India adopted economic liberalisation. India has a strong economy.

LEVEL 3: Explains reasons [5–7]

[Award marks for the quality of the explanation as well as for the number of reasons explained. Max 2 marks per reason explained].

e.g. Various factors combined to alter relations between India and the US. The USSR was a great obstacle between the two, but its collapse removed a power that was India's ally and America's enemy. Around the same time, India's replacing of a command economy with a market economy also helped to bring the two together. The US became a major investor in India and India's largest trading partner. Tied together by business, they were also driven together by Islamic extremism. This led Presidents Clinton and George W Bush to look for a closer relationship, especially after 9/11. Perhaps the key moment came, however, in 1998 when Vajpayee's government carried out nuclear tests. Suddenly, India had become vital to US strategic interests, a position only strengthened as Bush waged his war against terror. A strategic relationship had been established. Obama may be cooler towards India because he thinks the US must be close to China. But Washington still needs very good relations with Delhi to make progress on key issues like climate change, energy security and Afghanistan. The US and India have become strategic partners.

- (c) This question tests your judgement.
How far do you agree that it has been in India's best interests to develop nuclear power?

Give reasons for your answer.

LEVEL 1: Simplistic statement(s)

[1–2]

e.g. Nuclear power is important. It protects India. Nuclear power provides energy.

LEVEL 2: Identifies/describes reasons

[3–5]

[Use this Level for answers that identify/list reasons without explaining them.]

e.g. India must have nuclear power because Pakistan has it. The need for more electricity can only be met through nuclear power. Nuclear power will cost India far too much.

LEVEL 3: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining one benefit to national interests [6–8]

LEVEL 4: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining two or more benefits to national interests [9–11]

LEVEL 5: Agrees AND/OR disagrees, explaining two or more national interests AND offers evaluative judgements [12–14]

[Candidates may draw from a wide range of factors to assess nuclear power in relation to India's best interests. What matters is the quality of the explanation and the judgements. Sustained judgement that addresses 'How far ...?' must be awarded 14 marks.]

Consideration of "India's best interests" might include strategic, political, economic and/or social aspects. "Nuclear power" is a broad term and allows candidates to consider separately the possible benefits of military and civil nuclear power.

Candidates may argue the development of nuclear power has been in India's best strategic and political interests. To assert its position as a great power, to hold its own against China and to protect itself from potential attack by Pakistan, India needs the status and the power that nuclear weapons bring. BJP and Congress governments alike have argued that nuclear power allows India to meet China on equal terms and is vital if India is to keep up in the arms race with Pakistan. That is why India has always refused to sign the Non-Proliferation treaty and Test-ban resolutions. That is why Prime Minister Vajpayee said in 1998 after the nuclear test, "Let the world know we have a very big bomb." These factors were major reasons why Singh's government negotiated so long and hard, and ran so many domestic political risks, to sign the nuclear deal with the USA.

Alternatively, candidates might argue that nuclear power has not been in India's best strategic and political interests. India has neglected major interests while chasing the nuclear goal. The risks are too high. The US deal threatens India because it invites global nuclear proliferation. Rivalry with Pakistan has always been dangerous but nuclear weapons threaten nuclear catastrophe. Neither has developed warning and command systems that would help to avoid an accidental launch. This nuclear threat makes settlement of the Jammu-Kashmir problem vital, but progress seems as far off as ever. Nuclear weapons in India (and Pakistan) thus make South Asia the most likely part of the world to produce a nuclear conflict. Adding a different dimension, reference might be made to the claim made by political opponents of the US nuclear deal that India was surrendering its independence. India has allowed the US to expand its interests in the region too far and India will be so dependent on the USA that it will be the "lackey" of US military power. Some candidates might also point out that Indian nuclear power is a rejection of Gandhi's teaching and undermines the nation's ancient commitment to *ahimsa*.

Alternatively, candidates might argue that nuclear power has not been in India's best interests at strategic and political interests. India has neglected major interests while chasing a nuclear goal. The risks are too high. The US deal threatens India because it invites nuclear proliferation. Rivalry with Pakistan has always been dangerous but nuclear weapons threaten nuclear catastrophe. Neither has developed warning and command systems that would help to avoid an accidental launch. This nuclear threat makes settlement of the Jammu-Kashmir problem vital, but progress seems as far off as ever. Nuclear weapons in India (and Pakistan) thus make South Asia the most likely part of the world to produce a nuclear conflict. Adding a different dimension, reference might be made to the claim made by political opponents of the US nuclear deal that India was surrendering its independence. India has allowed the US to expand its interests in the region too far and India will be so dependent on the USA that it will be the "lackey" of US military power. Some candidates might also point out that Indian nuclear power is a rejection of Gandhi's teaching and undermines the nation's ancient commitment to *ahimsa*.

In terms of economic interests, candidates may argue that civil nuclear power offers the only realistic way to generate the energy needed for economic growth. Projections see nuclear power providing 25% of India's electricity by 2050 (2.5% in 2007). Coal resources are finite. Alternative power source technologies will take too long to develop, and will never generate enough. "Best interests" leave India no choice but to develop a major civil nuclear power programme.

Not so says the World Bank and India's fast-expanding wind/solar power industries which argue that India can do all of these things at a fraction of the cost of developing nuclear power stations. Coal reserves will support India for a long time to come. Technology will soon make coal 'clean'. The dangers posed by nuclear waste must be taken into account. To what extent is civil nuclear power 'clean'? To what extent is civil nuclear power safe? Candidates might consider whether the true 'price' that India will pay for nuclear power stations will be too high?

At a social level, candidates might argue that India best interests mean that nuclear power is a 'luxury' it cannot afford. The vast sums spent on civil and military nuclear would benefit India far more in the short and long terms if spent instead on sorting out basic infrastructure needs of education, housing, clean water. Alternatively, candidates might argue that up to 1 billion Indian people will need this energy source to improve their standard of living. Urban and rural India alike cannot really develop without expansion of energy sources. The wealth generated by developing a nuclear industry (estimated at \$150 billion in ten years) and the by the business growth that that will make possible is needed to fund raising the standard of living of millions who live on \$1 a day.

These issues can be argued either way. What matters is the quality of the argument and judgement, backed up with supporting evidence.