



VISION IAS

www.visionias.in

SUBJECT:	ESSAY	Test Code:	1	2	5	2		
Name of Candidate	ANGAD MEHTA							
Medium Hindi/Eng.	ENGLISH	Registration Number	4	6	1	6	0	9
Center	DELHI	Date	3	0	0	7	1	9

INDEX TABLE				INSTRUCTIONS
Q. No.	Page No.	Maximum Marks	Marks Obtained	
				1. Do furnish the appropriate details in the answer sheet (viz. Name, Registration Number and Test Code).
				उत्तर पुस्तिका में सूचनाएं भरना आवश्यक है (नाम, प्रश्न-पत्र कोड, विद्यार्थी क्रमांक आदि)।
				2. All questions are compulsory.
				सभी प्रश्न अनिवार्य हैं।
				3. The number of marks carried by a question/part is indicated against it.
				प्रत्येक प्रश्न/भाग के अंक उसके सामने दिए गए हैं।
				4. 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. No marks will be given for answers written in medium other than the authorized one.
				प्रश्नों के उत्तर उसी माध्यम में लिखे जाने चाहिए जिसका उल्लेख आपके प्रवेश पत्र में किया गया है और उस माध्यम का स्पष्ट उल्लेख प्रश्न-सह-उत्तर (क्यूसीए) पुस्तिका के मुख्य पृष्ठ पर अंकित निर्दिष्ट स्थान पर किया जाना चाहिए। उल्लिखित माध्यम के अतिरिक्त अन्य किसी माध्यम में लिए गए उत्तर पर कोई अंक नहीं मिलेंगे।
				5. Word limit in questions, if specified, should be adhered to.
				प्रश्नों में शब्द सीमा, जहाँ विनिर्दिष्ट है, का अनुसरण किया जाना चाहिए।
				6. Any page or portion of the page left blank in the Question-Cum-Answer Booklet must be clearly struck off.
				उत्तर पुस्तिका में खाली छोड़ा हुआ पृष्ठ या उसके अंश को स्पष्ट रूप से काटा जाना चाहिए।
Total Marks Obtained:				
Remarks :				

16-B, 2nd Floor, Above National Trust Building, Bada Bazar Marg, Old Rajinder Nagar, Delhi-110060

M-1/4, Plot No-A-12/13, 1st Floor, Ansal Building, Dr. Vidya Sagar Homoeopathic Clinic, Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi-110009

EVALUATION INDICATORS

1. Contextual Competence
2. Content Competence
3. Language Competence
4. Introduction Competence
5. Structure - Presentation Competence
6. Conclusion Competence

Overall Macro Comments / feedback / suggestions on Answer Booklet:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

All the Best

THE CONUNDRUM OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

One of the defining debates of the 20th and 21st century is the paradox of environment protection and economic development, in which both these policies came to be widely perceived as exclusive.

Early 19th century understanding of nature was of something that needed to be tamed and conquered to human needs. Indeed, the ravages of nature were so fearsome that the idea of environmental protection would have been incomprehensible to 19th century Europeans.

Yet the reality today is that nature ~~today~~ is recognised as partner, not a foe.

Sustainable development that takes care of the needs of future generation requires a change to the model of extraction and environmental degradation that underpins ~~the~~ the world economy.

The paradox however is politically fraught with divisions that are both global and internal. The historical development of the Global North means that its responsible for the vast majority of atmospheric emissions, while the underdeveloped and developing Global South ~~is~~ has yet to begin its journey of economic development. This principle is recognised as CBDR (common but differentiated responsibility) under the Kyoto Protocol but has begun to come under challenge, most recently at the COP 24 ~~at~~ in Paris (2015).

Increasing demands are made for emissions reduction on the part of the Global South which has stoutly defended its position and undertaken some adaptation measures, in contrast to absolute emissions reduction.

Yet a more divisive but invisible faultline is that between classes in every nation.

Research indicates that the top 10% of Indians pollute as much as Americans

while the bottom 50% are condemned to penury. Any demand for reduction has to be made on the most wealthy sections but their ability to resist expansive curbs has prevented a radical change in our lifestyles, while the poor and the vulnerable bear the brunt of the increasing heatwaves, storms and floodings as a result of Climate Change.

The dramatic transformation of the Asian Tigers from destitution to abundance was captured best by Lee Kuan Yew's autobiography - "From Third World to First World".

The model of export-oriented manufacturing growth is predicated on a vast extraction of minerals and natural resources that destroys landscapes and pollutes our environment. From 2012 - 2015, China produced 3 times the concrete that the US had produced in the entire 20th century!

Production and extraction has destroyed all balance in nature. The goal of \$5 trillion economy by 2024 is economically feasible but it's important to recognise that the Indian economy cannot double every 5 years for an indefinite period of time.

The Economic Survey 2018-19 views the Asian Tigers and China as models of growth, ~~but~~ completely disregarding the fact that all Asian Tigers had authoritarian regimes that crushed dissent and any pluralism.

Taiwan under Chiang-Kai shek, Japan under the dominant one party of LDP, China under the Communist Party and Singapore under Lee Kuan Yew's PAP were strong authoritarian states that guided private enterprises through effective state control and ~~pro~~ support.

This model of growth is simply not possible in a vibrant and fractious democracy like India with multiple actors like politicians, bureaucrats, NGOs, industrialists, activists, etc.

But these actors also cannot ignore the demands of demography. India's average age is 27 and this burgeoning population needs organised sector jobs with social security and a good standard of living.

Latest figures released by the PLFS show that unemployment stands at 6.1%, a 45 year high while economic growth has stagnated to 5.8% last quarter of 2018.

An activist middle class environmental movement such as NBA (Narmada Bachao Andolan) of Medha Patkar that aligns itself on the side of the marginalised tribal communities confronts the lower middle classes of our fast urbanising nation.

This social cleavage between the dispossessed and the urban intelligentsia on the one hand & the rising aspirations of our citizens has led to considerable tension, with uneasy settlements by the judiciary and the politicians at State and Centre.

A possible path out of this confrontation is the promise of new technologies that will fundamentally alter our relationship with nature and de-link environmental degradation and economic growth.

Green energy - such as solar, wind and tidal are the future of a non-fossil fuel power production grid.

E - Vehicles - electronic lithium batteries that power our transportation system with zero emissions.

Fusion Power - the current ITER program funded by an international Consortium of nations that holds the promise of unlimited energy.

The mass adoption of these technologies along with ancillary technologies could end mining of coal, oil, gas & other carbon polluting fuel sources that pose a menace to our eco-systems healthy functioning.

The adoption of technology to mitigate climate change is ~~the~~ one of the core concepts of the Paris Treaty of 2015 - "mitigation".

Mitigation as well as "adaptation" are the pathway for us to resolve this challenge and realise our commitments under the treaty:

1. 40% of power generation from non-fossil fuel technologies → with inclusion of Large Hydro as Renewables we have achieved this goal.
2. 25-30% reduction in carbon intensity of our emissions by 2030.
3. New carbon stock of 2 billion tonnes by planting and restoring forests.

Moreover, under the Global Stocktake held every 5 years there will be constant peer ~~a~~ ambition to upgrade commitments so India will have to deploy these technologies expeditiously.

These environmental arguments are not merely teleological, in the sense that the only purpose of restraint is human self-interest by ending the scourge of Climate Change.

Environmental theorists such as Loveck who advanced the Gaia Hypothesis held that the environment is a deeply interconnected single ecosystem that is a living being. A sustainable world is only possible if humans and the Earth live together within careful limits that recognise the essentiality of each other.

Movements such as Extinction Rebellion have forced the UK Government to announce a climate emergency and call for a net neutral carbon emissions Britain by 2050. This call has also been echoed by EU members. Measures such as these will gain momentum internationally as disasters increase in number & intensity.

In conclusion, we have to recognise that the old models of development that mandated stages of agrarian, industrial and post-industrial development no longer work.

India is already at a stage of pre-industrial de-industrialisation unique in the world, where the economy has transitioned to services straight from agriculture.

The future of carbon-neutral, creativity and innovation based post-industrial societies is the only one that can lead us away from the toxic model of extractive manufacturing. Western nations can encourage and support this transition with technology, finance and adaptation measures to create a sustainable world economy that goes hand in hand with environmental protection.

LEADERSHIP and INSTITUTIONS

Leadership and institutions are better understood as a continuum rather than as separate entities. Institutions are entities with distinct regulations and functions that serve a specific function.

Institutions are headed by their leadership who display agency and initiative but are themselves constrained by the very institutions they lead. As human society has evolved we have discovered and created new forms of institutions to serve desired functions, but leadership has remained a constant yet enigmatic puzzle. Their behaviour, action or inaction, weakness or strength is the crux of human history.

And yet in the vast landscape of history, civilisations that have survived ~~millennia~~ ^{millennia} successfully are the ones based upon institutions and not the occasional

flashes of brilliant leadership. The Roman, Chinese or Hindu civilisations that have survived the ages in different forms realised that creation of institutional specialisation was crucial to civilisational survival. The codes of Manavadharmashastre (Manusmriti) or Confucius laid the basis of Rule of law within which all had to live. Social and political functions were specialised and differentiated to avoid concentration of authority and create a primitive system of checks and balances to guard against the excesses or weakness of leadership.

Other civilisations such as Pharonic Egypt, Alexander's Macedonia or Genghis Khan's Mongolia are now merely footnotes of history. Without evolved institutions to exercise temperance, control or recycle existing leadership, they condemned their societies to the vagaries of history.

Aristotle conducted an empirical study of different constitutions of Ancient Greece and declared polity as the best form of govt, that is, rule by the middle classes who exercised the golden mean in policy without the arrogance of the nobility or the ignorance of the poor. In comparison he strongly discouraged either Aristocracy or Democracy as the domination of one class over the other, but most clearly spelt out the dangers of Monarchy. The rule of one man over all can be the ideal state of Plato or it can rapidly descend into tyranny over many.

This central concern over political forms of State also relates to the problem of political obligation, or why people should obey the State. Personality centric forms such as Monarchy or tribes are very susceptible to character flaws and human misjudgement which have implications for everyone.

In marked contrast, institution based societies have differentiated religious, politico-military and social institutions. The key innovation of the West has been the invention of independent economic institutions of the market, central banks, etc. that have secured them to a large degree from the influence of politico-military institutions. The only Western societies that did not adopt the innovation of economic institutions were totalitarian Nazi Germany and Communist USSR, both of which ultimately perished ~~for~~ by modern-day social Darwinism.

The other key function of political institutions is to secure loyalty / political obligation with the guarantee of internal and external security. As Hobbes mentioned in his concept of the Leviathan or the implicit understanding of Machiavelli is that the Right to Life is the primary guarantee of the

State. The focus ^{is on} is only of external or internal between Machiavelli or Hobbes. Law, Order and Authority are the legitimate tools of power that the State and its institutions wield in order to maintain stability in society.

Yet, in the final instance if leadership and political institutions fail to guard society then social institutions ensure the continuation of society. The social markers of Language, Race, Religion, Ethnicity or Caste ensure that the essential structure of society is able to endure and re-organise to recover once again.

The repeated invasions of India, China and the Romans/Greeks throughout history by nomadic tribesman of Central Asian steppes are evidence of this. The Huns, the Shakas or the Mongols were ~~unable~~

to subdue these great civilisations only momentarily. Their institutions of religion, caste or ethnicity endured and continued the resistance and gained final victory.

This could never be achieved by leadership alone, because great leadership is based upon great institutions that stand the test of time. The shared symbols of culture ensure the longevity of the society and maintains social cohesion. Without social cohesion institutions break down and begin to fragment as alternative institutions are created to serve new functions. for example - the institution of an independent judiciary implementing the Rule of Law.

The judiciary has solved the fundamental question of resolving differences in society. ~~His~~ Before its evolution,

justice was the gift of leaders who often faced situations of conflict of interest. The institution of judiciary has removed this central problem at the heart of parliamentary sovereignty in which a fused executive and legislature can run the risk of legitimising crimes.

The central premise of the argument against the emphasis on great leaders is the realisation of the many flaws of humanity. An inherent scepticism therefore becomes essential when viewing the foundations of society. An outlook similar to Locke which views humans as benign and good has more realistically been countered by Hobbes, Machiavelli, Weber and others who realise the attraction and corruption that power holds, which no man can resist.

While Hobbes' dictum "men's ~~are~~ lives are nasty, brutish and short" may be excessive, it is more pertinent to remember Lord Acton:

"power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Therefore, institutions and their regulations, jurisdictions, institutional history and precedence all serve to constrain the excesses of human nature. But the constraints are not merely internal.

As Montesquieu advocated and ~~Jefferson~~ Hamilton discovered in the US, the separation of power ensures that institutions harness the human folly of self-interest to serve society. All will function within institutional limits because intrusion of jurisdiction would invite a counter response!

In a more rudimentary sense this can be seen in the varna system within Hindu society in India. The hierarchical nature of the system was offset by distributing material resources to Kshatriyas and Vaishyas while the Brahmins were made superior in legitimacy but dependent on sustenance on the other two savarna castes. To a degree, it reflected the functional division of the religious, politico-military and economic spheres, and this balance has no doubt been an important reason for the endurance of this system till today, in marked contrast to systems that arrogate power and resources to one group and invite disaffection and rebellion.

In conclusion, the tendency towards institutions over strong leaders has always been clear. Whether Manusmriti,

Confucius, the unwritten British Constitution or the Indian Constitution, all display a preference for strong institutions, which maintain stability.

The greatest advantage of strong institutions is perhaps this:

they are the final guarantee that old mistakes will never be repeated due to a long institutional memory, and that rights would not be taken away by the whims of leaders.

This ensures that while change can happen, leaders are constrained from going backwards. # Leadership can remain stagnant, or great leadership can build upon great institutions to advance rights and societies into new areas and functions.