

GENERAL STUDIES

Name Of Candidate

SAMIKSHA SARWARI

Roll No.

1910084590

Date:

06/08/2022

Time Allowed: Three Hours

Maximum Marks: 250

INDEX TABLE			INSTRUCTION
Q. No.	Max. Marks	Marks Obtained	1. Please do furnish Name, Email, Roll No and Mobile in the answer sheet.
Q.1			2. There are TWO Sections. Each Section has MULTIPLE topics printed in English & Hindi. You have to write on 1 topic from Each part
Q.2			3. One question in each part is compulsory.
Total:	250		4. The number of marks carried by a question/part is indicated against it.
Evaluator's Discretion:			5. Answers must be written in the medium authorized in the admission Certificate, which must be stated clearly on the cover of this Question-Cum-Answer (QCA) Booklet in the space provided.
			6. Word limit in questions, if specified, should be adhered to.
			7. Any page or portion of the page left blank in the Question-Cum Answer Booklet must be clearly Struck off.
			Any specific messages for ForumIAS Mentors/Evaluators with respect to your copy? Write it here.

Total Marks:			For Student Only
			Start Time 2:00 pm
			End Time 5:25 pm
			Mode Of Examination: Online <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Offline <input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluator's Discretion: This is the marks awarded at the discretion of the evaluator based on your overall impression, on the basis of (but not limited to) your handwriting, presentation, use of diagrams, flowcharts, facts and figures or absolutely anything that he/she liked in your copy.			For Office Use Only
			ECN CODE:
			EG:
			Evaluation Date:

MARKING SCHEME

<i>Parameter/Criteria</i>	<i>Aspects Considered</i>	<i>Total Marks</i>	<i>Essay 1</i>	<i>Essay 2</i>
<i>Basic Format</i>	Introduction + Conclusion	10		
	Body	15		
<i>Content</i>	Data/Facts/Interpretation/ Analysis	25		
<i>Organisation</i>	Flow of ideas/ Absence of Deviation from the topic	25		
<i>Language Skills</i>	Punctuation/Grammar/ Sentence Formation/Spellings	25		
<i>Examiner's Discretion</i>	Perception/ Innovation/ Engaging	25		

<i>Parameters</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Poor</i>
<i>Coherence</i>				
<i>Language</i>				
<i>Handwriting</i>				
<i>Pre-writing</i>				

<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Average</i>
120 and above	100-120	Below 100

**SECTION - A**

1. Patience, persistence, and perspiration make an unbeatable combination for success.

धैर्य, लगन और कठोर परिश्रम सफलता के लिए एक अपराजेय मेल बनाते हैं।

2. Knowing others is intelligence, knowing oneself is true wisdom.

दूसरों को जानना बुद्धिमत्ता है, स्वयं को जानना सच्चा ज्ञान है।

3. Humans are irrational creatures gifted with the power of rationality.

मनुष्य तर्कहीन प्राणी हैं जिन्हें तर्कसंगतता की शक्ति का उपहार दिया गया है।

4. Peace is the virtue of civilisation whereas war is its crime.

शांति सभ्यता का गुण है जबकि युद्ध इसका अपराध है।

HUMANS ARE IRRATIONAL CREATURES

GIFTED WITH THE POWER OF RATIONALITY

Yuvak Noah Harari, in his book (Homo) 'Sapiens', has highlighted how the power to reason has set humans apart from other animals. However, the primitive instincts still manifest themselves in irrational behaviours that humans exhibit all too often.

In common parlance, we associate irrationality with behaviors motivated predominantly by desires and emotions, while rationality is ordinarily seen as 'thinking dispassionately using brain for one's own good'.

Many philosophers have delved into the study of human cognition — particularly the power of rationality.

For John Rawls, rationality is the power to think without getting biased because of one's position or experiences — that is — being able to put oneself behind a 'veil of ignorance' and think like a human undifferentiated by one's life circumstances.

For Immanuel Kant, rationality is the ability to reason in order to reach

that objective moral principles which would make the world a better place for everyone, in the long run.

Underpinning these theories is the idea that rationality is the use of reason to achieve common good. How this reconciles with the ordinary, rather myopic, definition of rationality as being one's own good - is the fact that in the long run, what is good for everyone is indeed good for oneself.

Notwithstanding the fact that we possess the power to reason, and appreciate the importance of being rational, we largely remain a prisoner of our instincts, desires and emotions.

In our personal lives, anger is the most common form of irrational behaviour, which hardly does anyone any good. The only good form of anger is a deliberate, well-reasoned 'display of anger' for a desirable objective - such as teaching a kid not to beat up his sibling - by showing anger as a message of disapproval of the kid's action.

In the political sphere, a relevant example is the lure of irrational freebies. This works because of the inability of voters to think of 'long term', 'sustainable', 'common good' because the instinctive desire of 'short-term', 'instant', 'personal gain' is so overpowering.

In the international sphere, the fight against climate change is yet to pick up desired pace because of the failure of national leaders to see that no action will leave everyone worse off — that this is not a zero-sum game.

This is a classic example of Prisoner's dilemma — where a purely selfish approach is a defeatist strategy.

This brings us to game theory — which gives a mathematical treatment to the theory of rational and irrational choices, and consequences thereof.

There are many game-designs in Game Theory, where everyone making a 'rational' choice for oneself leads to an optimal overall solution — called

the 'Nash Equilibrium'. This is much in-line with the premise on which Milton Friedman's economic theory is based — everyone acting in their own self interest will lead to the maximum common good.

But there are many 'Prisoners' Dilemma' like real-life situations that defy this logic.

This theory suggests that if everyone is incentivised to be selfish, everyone loses, and if everyone is nudged to cooperate — everyone wins.

Despite philosophy and mathematics squarely establishing the relevance and desirability of rational behavior, what keeps us from applying it to our daily life. And

Can something be done to encourage rational behavior and thinking?

There are many reasons inhibiting rational thought and behavior.

First is evolutionary - we may be better, more rational versions of our species' older selves, but not quite there yet. The primitive survival instincts still ^{get} manifested as fear, anger and sometimes violence.

Secondly, there are limits to humans' cognitive abilities. It is not quite easy to decide what is rational in the first place - how do we conclusively know what would be good in the long run?

And thirdly, when not everyone acts rationally, an ^{ideal} rational choice may do ~~one~~ more harm than good. For example, if not all nations cooperate to fight climate change, the few nations who do may lag behind economically. It would become a lose-lose scenario for such countries.

So, how do we harness the power of rationality of the essentially irrational creatures that we are?

Historically, rational behaviors have been 'enforced' using the instruments of societal norms, laws and religion. The ideas of tolerance, justice, equality, ^{peace} can be said to be largely rational. These institutions have been instrumental

in creating and sustaining civilisations.

The constraints to human imagination into the future can be overcome partly by learning from past. Learning from consequences of irrational decisions in the past, like world wars, can be a good guide for the future. (Of course, with constant subjection to reasoning and scrutiny, to make it contemporarily relevant).

Technology can be immensely helpful in overcoming our computational constraints. It can help us to verify our hypotheses using large data sets so that biases and generalisations — very common human tendencies — can be checked.

Generally, rational thought can be encouraged by inculcating critical thinking skills in children.

Reasoning and logic sciences can be taught, along with social studies — which makes for a good practice ground for rational thinking applications.

Discovering and nurturing our power of rationality is essential to be able to realize our full potential as human beings.

A rational society only can address the challenges confronting the world today, and build a peaceful and sustainable present and future.

— x — x —

ROUGH SPACE

Humans — Irrational creatures
power of Rationality

Introduction — irrational
(Yuval Noah Harari)

Examples —
 personal — tact
 political — freebies
 global — IR, env.

Theory —
 Buddha's "think"
 Kant
 Prisoner's dilemma

Features —
 Irrationality — Instinctive feelings/emotions driven
 Rationality — Reason informed

ways to Exercise rationality —
 curb irrationality | ~~div.~~ put to rat. use
 ex. rationality — sports aggression
 codes & tech — economy greed
 — lifestyle

towards a better future —
 society | technology
 environment

Dimensions —
 Rationality vs Irrationality
 Diff. versions/meanings of Rationality
 Manifestations in society
 Game Theory
 Technology

Feedback

Feedback to be provided in terms of (1) Introduction (2) Sentence Constructions (3) Paragraph Formation (4) Legibility (5) Deviation from Topic (6) Coverage of dimensions (7) Simplicity / ease of reading

**SECTION - B**

1. The most valuable of all capital is the one invested in human beings.

सभी पूंजियों में सबसे मूल्यवान वह है जो मानव में निवेश की जाती है।

2. Massive poverty and obscene inequality are the social evils of contemporary times.

अत्यधिक गरीबी और कठोर असमानता समकालीन समय की सामाजिक बुराईयों हैं।

3. Climate change is just not a political but an intergenerational justice issue.

जलवायु परिवर्तन सिर्फ एक राजनीतिक नहीं बल्कि एक अंतर-पीढ़ीगत न्याय का मुद्दा है।

4. Globalisation needs a new Asian champion.

वैश्वीकरण को एक नए एशियाई चैंपियन की आवश्यकता है।

CLIMATE CHANGE IS NOT JUST A POLITICAL

BUT AN INTERGENERATIONAL JUSTICE ISSUE

A conversation from the future —

Ryan : Mumma, let's go to a hill station like Manali, or the Kashmir valley these summers. It gets too hot here in Delhi to play outside.

Mother : That may not be possible...

Ryan : But why?

Mother : We don't have enough carbon currency to take a flight.

Ryan: Can't we buy some carbon points?

Mother: There are things money can't buy, and that's only fair...

The above anecdote highlights a likely future scenario where everyone is having to cut down on their environmental footprints so much, that they are practically not 'living' a life.

Ryan is having to compromise on every aspect of his lifestyle because his fair share of necessities as well as luxuries was all used up by his ancestors.

Today, despite knowing the science behind climate change, and

having an understanding of how it bodes ill for the future, we are not able to take adequate action. Where are we going wrong?

More than a science issue, climate change is today a political issue. Developed vs developing, rich vs poor, markets vs society — the divisions are all too many.

The most critical of the political debates — stalling progress on collective global action — is ~~to~~ about the responsibilities of developed vs developing countries vis-a-vis climate change.

The poor countries — having contributed the least to the crisis — are unfortunately having to bear

disproportionately higher consequences.

Their poverty makes them more vulnerable and lack of resources leads to inability to take up mitigation and adaptation works.

India, for example, with 16% of global population has contributed to just 3% of historical cumulative emissions.

likewise, the poor - having contributed the least - are having to bear severe consequences. One gets to witness two cities in Delhi, for example. One - the rich Delhi - with people going from Air conditioned homes to AC offices, in AC cars. And the poor Delhi - rickshaw pullers, vendors, etc.

Repeated attempts to take requisite action have failed over political differences. Kyoto Protocol 1997 failed to take off because exemptions to countries like china did not go down well with the developed world.

Market mechanisms like Emissions Trading also began to be used as tools to merely outsouce emissions by developed market into developing countries, without tangibly reducing emissions.

Given the political history over climate change, Paris Agreement can still be called a breakthrough, even if the targets are not binding.

Six years after the Paris Agreement was signed, the IPCC came out with its 6th Assessment Report. It highlights

how even on the current pace, we are still on the 5°C rise trajectory (over 1850-1900 temperatures).

Even under the best case scenario, the 1.5°C limit will be breached, with catastrophic consequences.

The report by Working Group 2 on 'Impacts' (AR6 WGII) has been called the 'Atlas of Human Suffering' by UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres.

We are already seeing climate change play out in California and Australia wildfires, unprecedented heat waves in Europe and the drought-flood extremes in India.

Science is helping provide answers to many political issues in

the debate. One, climate change today is not a matter of belief, but a well-accepted reality, backed by scientific evidence.

And two, with researches in clean energy technologies, the environment vs development binary is losing relevance. Clean technologies, like solar energy, in many places, have in fact become cheaper than fossil fuels.

So, today, it is not only possible, but also desirable, to go the greener way - to 'Build Back Better'.

The poor countries - where maximum infrastructure is yet to be built - can benefit from the latest technologies and research - and save immense retrofitting costs in the future.

This brings us to another political issue related to climate change — that of technology transfer and financial support.

While the developed nations consider their wealth and intellectual property their own, there is also a counter-argument that this wealth and human (and thereby intellectual) capital have been accumulated at the cost of exploitation of the share of carbon space that belongs to all.

There needs to be an understanding that any delay in action, on account of 'taking advantage of one's technological superiority' would only make everyone lose. Unlike conventional wars, here there's no "us vs them".

As the UN Secretary General put it —
"It is a choice between collective action and collective suicide".

Extending the argument further, it would not only be collective suicide, but also collective murder of the future generations.

The global temperatures are on a rise. This means that extreme weather events will become even more frequent, and disasters more severe — in times to come. These future generations will be facing unprecedented displacements and loss of lives — a case of injustice where they're being punished for crimes they didn't commit.

As per UN-FAO, food productivity needs to rise by 60% by 2050 to meet the demands of growing population. On the contrary, climate change is predicted to reduce productivity of food systems by 30% — pushing the future generations into severe food insecurity.

We need to budget the carbon space as well as natural resources — equitably — not just amongst ourselves but also inter-generationally.

Norway is a shining example of sensitivity towards — needs of and justice for — the future generations.

A part of the proceeds from their natural resources goes to the Norwegian Sovereign Wealth Fund —

based on the idea that these resources equally belong to the future generations as well.

As someone rightly said —
 “We have not inherited Earth from our ancestors,
 we have borrowed it from our children” —

we must come together like one family (Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam) to leave behind a better world for our children like Ryan to live in.

— x — x —

Rough SPACE

Climate Change — Political ; Intergenerational Justice

- Anecdote
 - climate — conflicts
 - refugees
- Political
 - developed vs developing
 - rich vs poor
 - markets
- Intergenerational
 - G quote — borrowed not inherited.
- Justice
 - historical resp.
 - developmental needs
 - ex - Congo quote
 - ex - [Poverty quote
 - "our priority is not to save planet": auction land
- Examples — Norway

FORUM

Feedback

Feedback to be provided in terms of (1) Introduction (2) Sentence Constructions (3) Paragraph Formation (4) Legibility (5) Deviation from Topic (6) Coverage of dimensions (7) Simplicity / ease of reading