

Q1.

Case Study 1:

Lake Nag is the lifeblood for farming villages around it. Due to climate change year in year its waterline was receding irreversibly. A dam was constructed over it to save whatever water possible and use it for irrigation in these villages. The lake is also a seasonal habitat for migratory flamingos who are involved in breeding here. In summer months, water flow from the dam was increased and due to low rainfall to meet the demand for irrigation the entire lake was drained to feed the farms. This led to instant desertification of the lake and lakhs of baby flamingos died triggering protests from wildlife activists and condemnation from international organisations. In the next year, the government was in dilemma whether to release all the meagre water for irrigation or not. Farmer's groups have been wary of any reduction in water. They started a campaign in social media and news channels that, when humans lack water for themselves it is not wrong to use it for their needs, if they don't get water they don't have any other source of food as they are engaged in subsistence farming, they claim killing humans to save flamingoes is the worst crime, nature itself will prefer to serve humans than other species. In a few days, many farmers also started committing suicides to gather support for their standpoint and drive home the gravity of their maladies. In this context, justify the demands and claims of the farmer groups.

(250 words)

20

Candidates
must not
write on
this margin

Candidates
must not
write on
this margin

Candidates
must not
write on
this margin

Candidates
must not
write on
this margin

Q2.

Case Study 2:

One of your 0 nations has suffered religious radicalism and become the hotbed of global terrorism. Slowly the terrorists have brought the territories under its control and recently in a civil war they were able to topple the civil government and establish their government.

Along with many other nations, your nation also stood for civil government in that country and gave all forms of support. But once the terror outfits gained power all other nations started to recognise them and continued diplomatic relations with them. But your nation was driven by democratic and liberal ideals and it was decided that recognising and fostering a terror outfit at power is a moral sin, since non-violence as a value is followed in your nation conscientiously. But recently, a nation on the other side of this neighboring country was hit with a fatal earthquake and the death toll is on rise. It is your friendly nation and it has stood for your nation in many global platforms, some of your countrymen also live there as immigrants. That nation is in dire need of food grains, but you cannot send without passing through the above country ruled by terrorists. This nation has come out strictly that unless you start diplomatic relations and recognise its government it won't allow your grains to pass. There is no other way to pass tonnes of grains, pressure is mounting on your government from locals and also many friendly nations to work as per cost-benefit ratio and not be stubborn about ideals. There are two options:

1. Remain ideal and never compromise the value of non-violence regardless of its effects including being unhelpful to the suffering third nation
2. In light of larger goods, do minimum compromises needed for convincing the neighboring government and send the food grains to the third nation.

Which of the two options is ethically superior? Justify your choice with the help of supporting arguments. (250 words)

20

Candidates
must not
write on
this margin

Candidates
must not
write on
this margin

Candidates
must not
write on
this margin

Candidates
must not
write on
this margin