

Shadab Ali Khan

Riyasat Ali mentorship

IAS Mentorship

With Riyasat Ali Sir

PARAMETERS FOR GS COPY EVALUATION

		VERY GOOD	GOOD	AVERAGE	SUBSTANDARD
1.	Conceptual Clarity on The Topic		✓		
2.	Context of Introduction & Relevance			✓	
3.	Understanding on the demand of Q			✓	
4.	Body Part:				
	Content Relevance		✓		
	Content Enrichment			✓	
	Presentation & Organisation			✓	
	Logical Structure & Coherence			✓	
5.	Language Competence		✓		
6.	Context of Conclusion & Relevance			✓	
7.					
8.					

IAS
MENTORSHIP
Riyasat Ali

5.0
Q

Normative ethics involves determining what is morally right or wrong. Compare and contrast deontological & consequentialist approaches in the context of environmental policy-making. Which approach do you believe is more effective in addressing climate change & why?

Candidate must not write on this margin

Introduction is relevant but too short

Normative ethics is based on evaluation of ethical theories from the point of rightfulness or wrongfulness.

mention about decision making process + Deontological Ethics + Consequential Ethics

Normative ethics are in determining moral behaviour

- ① Evaluation of Ethical Principles [eg] Administration - Divya Mittal IAS
- ② Choosing between Ends & means [eg] Peace as an End but war as a mean. → Israel Hannibal declaration
- ③ Utilitarianism [eg] Anti-environmental drive for maximum good.
- ④ Welfarism, duty boundness etc [eg] Free ration distribution under PDS

Relevant aspects

Precise this and focus on demand part of Qn.

Deontological vs Consequentialist ; To tackle environmental policy

Appropriate you heading & justification

Aspect	Deontology	Consequentialist
Aim	① Duty boundness of State to deal with environmental issues [eg] article 48-A	① Policies framed to keeping 'end' in mind [eg] FCA, 2023 Amendment.

Good relevant points

maximizing overall goods + outcome based

@ Rights & Justice

Candidate must not write on this margin

Aspect	Deontology	Consequentialism
Role	<p>② "Universal good" in environmental Policy [eg] EIA</p>	<p>② Utilitarianism & welfarism [eg] FRA-2009</p>
Scope	<p>③ Treating Nature as mean not just as end @ low justice</p>	<p>③ Treating Nature as an end. Cost-benefit analysis</p>
Limitations	<p>④ Accessive duty boundedness can lead to bureaucratic attitude in env policy making [eg] FRA-Implementation</p>	<p>④ Means can be unethical for ethical end [eg] Burning fodge for forest regeneration</p>

Free relevant points can add more

Morality depends on consequences

Many practical ignore outcomes

Can harmful actions justify if they result in positive

Which approach to choose

Address both approaches first w.r.t given elements
Better to go with consequential ethics

- ① Both approaches have their merits & demerits but deontology can be more effective as,
 - ② Treating Environment & humans as mean & not just end.
 - ② Focusing on both mean & ends as ethical.
 - ③ "Universally" accepted ethical env policies.

This part is lacking focus

Take your stand and address accordingly

④ Duty of the State to ensure environmental policy advocacy.
With rising global temperature Biblical ethics of Stewardship plays key role in dealing with climate change.

Need balanced conclusion to ensure ethical safeguards