

Q 4. A lion does not concern himself with the opinion of sheep.

The zenith of the Roman Empire was described by Shakespeare, as the ascendancy of Julius Caesar to the throne of Rome. opinion Good hood

Caesar commanded popular support, he stood for the voice of masses, he was nothing short of Rome's Lion. But his appetite of power blinded him. The very source of his

power, the common man, began to
be perceived by mere ¹ sheep by
him. And his dislike towards
plebeianism, led him to his grave.

Caesar was not alone in
mistakenly perceiving himself as the
mighty ~~lion~~ and others as sheep.
Napoleon Bonaparte's downfall can also
be attributed to the same.

Hence we see that despite
being the "King of the Jungle", a
lion shouldn't dismiss the opinion of
sheep. Rather, a sheep's perspective
proves to be supremely beneficial too.
However, in quest of attaining a balance,
neither a lion nor a sheep should
lose their individuality.

In the above context,
a lion can be described as

Good
core
argument

one who is powerful and mighty.

It can be an individual leader, a ~~humungous~~ ~~powerful~~ group or catel, or even nations with formidable power. Likewise,

as context "sheep" can be described as entities that follow "herd mentality"; are "submissive" and "lack the capacity to lead".

In light of the above contextualization, let us pause for a brief moment and reflect upon the veracity of the ^{core} statement, that before being prescriptive about it.

Undoubtedly, in today's world "A Lion Does Not concern ^{himself} with opinion".

of the sheep". In the wilderness,
where "Survival of the fittest" is the
governing dictum, a sheep is the
prey of the mighty lion. This is
so because a ~~jungle~~ "lion" lacks
the "cognitive understanding" and
evolutionary feature of "collective func-
tioning" of humans.

In the wilderness, a lion
is a solitary creature. Unlike
its female counter-part, a lion rarely
roams around in packs. Leave alone
"a sheep", a "lion", in its most rudimen-
tary form, doesn't concern himself
with opinion of anyone.

But the "nature of State"
is different from the "state of
nature", isn't it? In a civilized

apt State, a lion is representative of an ideal leader. A leader who is inclusive; has high emotional intelligence; one who yields power not to further his own interests, but for welfare of his people, "the sheep".

Such a lion, in our civilized worlds, cannot afford to not account for the opinion of the sheep, as the lion attains his position of power, due to this very opinion of the sheep.

To illustrate, the ascendency to power of many leader, starting from Abraham Lincoln to Jawaharlal Nehru,

from Martin Luther King Jr. to Nelson Mandela, from Hellen Keller to Judith

Good Murthy; each individual who has
the power to influence the masses, ~~never~~
has never disregarded the sanctity of
their
opinion.

Moreover, an ideal leader
was described by Lao Tzu as one
* who ~~also~~ assumes all responsibility,
finishes the work successfully and
silently in such a manner that the
people would feel they did it themselves
and wouldn't even know much about the
leader's identity.

Hence, a leader cannot
succeed without espousing the cause

of the masses. If it did so, it
would change into a dictatorship.

And the world is testament to the
futility of dictatorships, starting from

Hitler, Mussolini, Saddam Hussain or
Gaddafi.

However, this isn't to say
that a lion needs to lose its
true nature, in the quest of assimilating
or adapting to the opinion of the sheep.

An ideal leader needs to
be equipped with foresight, realism,
pragmatism and the ability to take/make
tough calls and choices. In ~~several~~ ^{several}
~~stra~~ of such cases, accounting for

opinions of people at large might
not be feasible or practicable.

For instance, PM Lal Bahadur
Shastri stood on sidelines of principles

Good
example

when he chastized US's invasion of Vietnam.
Resultantly, a nation already reeling with
malnutrition and food insecurity was cut off
from PL-480 food aid.

ent

Likewise, the recent amendment
to Forest Conservation Act, 1980 seeks to

undermine popular opinion of tribals. But
the same is being done to secure the
strategic interests of India facing regular

threats from India and China.

whether
in a
balanced
way!

Moreover, at several occasions,
the opinion of the sheep is
quite divided and lacks a unanimous

front. In such cases, the Lion

could maintain a neutral stand,
till the sheep can sort out the
issue amongst themselves.

A case in point could be
the incessant debate on the "Govt Laws"
of the USA and how no decisive stand
has been taken yet. Similarly, the
status of LGBTQIA+ community in India
faces a similar issue. Though the Hon'ble
SC has decriminalized same sex marriage,
due to fragmented public morality on the issue,
Indian Government is yet to take a stand on it.

In addition to this, there
are other times when the sheep's
opinion lacks credibility. For example,
when people privatize and religious propagate

harmful religious practices of female
genital mutilation under the garb
of "essential
of religious practices", practices of
"Sarpanch Pati" under notion of female
empowerment and propagation of
separatist tendencies like the Khatolan
issue, in the name of inequity.

^{missel opportunity}
But when such instances
of violence, riots etcetera occur, the
duty incumbent upon a leader is
to analyze the root cause of such
trigger. ~~Nelson~~ Martin Luther King Jr. had
said, "No violence is good. But the very
act of violence is a manifestation of hate
and discontentment".

In such cases, the
leader has to treat the violence, not
as a problem, but as a symptom of a

Good
bigger issue of "non-inclusivity"
of governance. Non-Inclusivity is
not only a breach of Rule of Law;
It also violates the solemn promise
of protection, a leader or Nation, makes
to its citizens, under the "Social Contract"
concept.

As a matter of fact, James
Robinson attributes "non-inclusivity" at
different levels, as the cause of breakdown
of nations, in his book "Why Nations Fail?"
Thus, an ideal lion has to possess
multiple qualities. In Arthashastra, Kautilya
says that the lion has to be strategic
yet ethical; Whereas Nicholas Machhiaveli
believes that an ideal leader needs to

very
good
contrast

possess the unningness of a fox, along with might of a lion, to be able to effectively navigate the evolving aspirations of billions of sheep.

Hence we see that the need of the hour today is of co-existence of qualities of a lion and sheep, in both the leader and the masses. To rule effectively, a leader (be it an individual or state) has to empathize with the sheep, to be inclusive.

Likewise, the sheep has to be pragmatic as a lion, to facilitate ease of governance for the lion. After all, the modified rendition of "Vishwa Guru" today is a lion who espouses the cause of "shared Growth and Prosperity".

Because, a Real Lion knows that it doesn't take a miracle for a mere sheep to ^{become} the next lion.

Q8. A great deal of the world is
just the stories we tell about it.

Voltaire's "Candide" is
an vivid testament to the fact
that the stories or narratives we
weave about the world, leave an
ever lasting impact ^{us and the world.} upon ~~us and the world.~~ Voltaire
proves his point by highlighting this
through "over-optimist" nature of Dr. Pangloss
and contrasting it with that of Candide,
whose hard life teaches him that
the "world is friendlier" to realists and
skeptics.

This lucid, yet effective
portrayal of reality makes us pause

and ponder a little about which story we'd like to narrate. Whether we'd want to subscribe to optimism or pessimism, to facts or narratives or find a way to solve the "fact" - "story" dichotomy that exists in this world.

A way to perhaps to do would be balancing the liberty to tell stories, which shape the world, without distorting

the facts. — Core argument is good

This brings us to wonder about what exactly are 'stories'?

Do stories always refer to hypothetical constructs? Or do stories merely represent

a narration of facts from a personal

perspective? Stories actually refer to a mix of both.

ant ✓ Would it be wrong to claim that this world we live in, is a "House of Narratives" and "Stories"? Certainly Socrates believed so, when he described his understanding of knowledge, which according to him was the ideal way to understand the world.

ant ✓ Socrates said, knowledge is nothing but a form of dialectics or face-off between "thesis", "anti-thesis" and the final product of "synthesis". Each of these "thesis" and "anti-thesis" are the stories or narratives people hold, leading to synthesis of a beautiful story.

Starting from theories
explaining the origin of the
Universe, wasn't the "Big Bang
Theory" also a kind of story we heard
~~and~~ about the world. Only to be
complemented with the story of "Constantly
Expanding hypothesis" and ~~consequently~~
countered with narratives of "Shrinking
Capacity of the Universe due to existence of
Gravity and Black Holes"?

Keep
Q+

Simple
and
effective

Such diverse narratives
can either leave us utterly
confused about what to believe. Or
they may leave us in absolute awe
of the beauty of man's cognitive
capacities, no two of which are the same.

Art

Even Charles Swindall
had said that Our life in this world

is only 10% of what happens
in it, but 90% of it revolves
around how we respond to the
~~stimulants~~ and the stories we choose
to weave and narrate.

Swindall's notion has
so much merit to it. Our cultures,
history, society is profoundly influenced
~~about~~ by the narratives our fore-fathers
built. Be it Ved Vyasa's Mahabharata or
Valmiki's Ramayana. Our cultural stories
have fuelled our motivation to find
links with Sri Lanka, Thailand and even
countries of Africa, whose values were influenced
by the stories of Rama, the Virtuous King.

apth
written

This brings us to another argument that the nature of stories that are told and circulated, tend to have optimistic leanings, don't they. Most narratives are positive, consisting of joyful or happy stories. The immense velocity of circulation of stories involving India's humanitarian assistance during COVID, or Operation Devi Shakti, are a case in point.

ent But why do such positive stories tend to have such wide reception, one might wonder. May it is because, "Positive" stories tend to rekindle people's "faith" and "hope" that the various global polycrises of the world, can have a happy ending.

On the other hand, Reuters had noted that stories which have

a negative connotation were
circulated with greater velocity.

The way websites like Reddit circulate
videos of 'Al-Qaeda' be-heading doctors
from "Doctors without Borders", or videos
of Ukrainian ^{cities} ~~houses~~ being turned to rubble
by Russian missiles, justify this argument.

Being
in
how
it is
impact
ing!

Maybe the reason ^{why} such
negative narratives ~~such~~ receive some
of the highest TRPs is because "Fear
perpetuates Fear" and the creators of
such stories are well aware of it.

How? This shows us that
stories that shape the world's hopes
and sentiments have more to do with

those who create such stories than
the mere substance of such stories.

Notwithstanding the
presence of honest storytellers like
auto-biographies of leaders like Nelson
Mandela, Gandhi Ji's "My Experiments
with Truth" and Malala Yousafzai's
apt "I am Malala"; A major chunk of

our world's stories and narratives are
manufactured by those yielding power.

Scholars like Derrida have
time and again stated that stories
and narratives are like discourses. And
Power shapes these discourses. For instance,
the subject of International Relations
can be argued to be heavily shaped
by Western ideals. So much so that
political analysts like Kenneth Waltz

have argued that "International Relations is nothing but American political science".

Perhaps this is why, the major stories of International Relations always seem to project the USA as a potential rescuer, be it the Afghanistan issue, or the ongoing Russia - Ukraine issue. But the reality couldn't be further away from such narrow views.

If this is so, then why such "manufactured stories" are generated? Why the digital footprint today is being overwhelmed with fake news, Artificial Intelligence generated

Deep Fakes etcetera?

Perhaps first of all, the moral yardstick of the world has been compromised by the sheer volume of information present. The shrivelling nature of Media ethics, being a case in point.

Secondly, people narrate stories which suit their needs.

For instance, narration of history from the victor's point of view or the narrative of "Climate Change" being a farce, started by big industrialists, are eye openers.

Or maybe, people narrate stories to escape their reality. At an innocent level, J.K. Rowlings "Harry Potter

ant

series provides that relief. Whereas,
when done in the form of
radicalization by extremists group like
ISIS, it has impact of altering definitions
of "hate and peace".

ant

All of these arguments
necessarily state two things. "Facts"
and "factoids" comprise a surprisingly
low portion of the circulating narratives.
And secondly, this is exactly why, the
world today has to ~~be~~ develop the
mental dexterity and maturity to
filter out the credible stories from the
rest.

Hence, stories which shape
our hopes, aspirations and even our

reality are all around us today. There are stories like that of Dr. Kalam which might motivate us to change the course of a nation's strategic powers.

Then there are stories of power-money nexus, corruption, war, which either may push us towards righteousness. Or may counter-productively attract us towards the path of generating a narrative that has destructive potential.

add
conclusion
In today's world, with such plethora of stories, what Einstein had said holds good, "The more I know, the less I know for sure". But even in these circumstances, we can fall back upon Voltaire's golden advice in "Candide". He had said "we tend our own garden". Hence, it is upto us to choose which kind of story to narrate and which to believe.