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While giving his unassailable, pointed, inspiring and historic replies in the both Houses of Parliament, Union Home Minister Amit Shah asked a number of questions which the Congress and the communist parties have never dared to ask in these seven decades of independent India. Where have the minorities of these three neighbouring countries – Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan – gone over the years? There has been a distinct depletion of their numbers in these countries, where have they gone, asked Amit Shah? If our brothers and sisters are afflicted, face persecution and attacks in these countries, should we just look the other way, where else will they go except come to India, should we drive them away then”, he asked.

On the definition of secularism, Home Minister Shri Shah asked how is that, “just because this Bill does not speak of Muslim, you dub it is as anti-secular, but you do not see that it includes all minorities in the countries mentioned, why don’t you see that it speaks of Christians, Sikhs, Jains, Parsis, Buddhists as well”. He also pointed out, how this Bill was meant to confer citizenship and not to take it away. He clearly stated a number of times on the floor of the House, that Muslims who are citizens of India had nothing to be apprehensive of and should not fall for false propaganda spread by a section of the opposition. The CAA, Shri Amit Shah, has time and again pointed out, does not take citizenship away, it is meant to “give citizenship to religiously persecuted refugees, it is not to take away citizenship of any Indian.” Both Prime Minister Shri Narendra Modi and Union Home Minister Shri Amit Shah, BJP working president Shri J.P. Nadda have repeatedly asserted, in various forums, programmes and rallies that the CAA is not meant to take away but to confer citizenship.

In its 2019 vision document, released during the campaign, the BJP, clearly stated its intent of bringing about the Citizenship Amendment Bill. Since its first national session in Kanpur in 1952 the Bharatiya Jana Sangh (BJS) and later the BJP have always advocated the need to provide citizenship to these beleaguered minorities of Pakistan, to protect them and to fulfill the promise India made to them at the time of partition. In its 2014 Vision Document, the BJP stated (p.40), “India shall remain a natural home for persecuted Hindus and they shall be welcome to seek refuge here.” In its 2019 Vision Document the BJP clearly states, (p.12), “We are committed to the enactment of the Citizenship Amendment Bill for the protection of individuals of religious minority communities from neighbouring countries escaping persecution. We will make all efforts to clarify the issues to the sections of population from the North-eastern states who have expressed...
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apprehension regarding the legislation. We reiterate our commitment to protect the linguistic, cultural and social identity of the people of the Northeast. Hindus, Jains, Buddhists, Sikhs and Christians escaping from India’s neighbouring countries will be given citizenship in India.” It was with this Vision Document that the BJP went into elections and won with a historic majority. It has adhered to each section of the promise it made in this paragraph on the CAB, why then this hue and cry by a section of the pseudo-intellectual class and the Urban Naxals?

While speaking on atrocities on minorities in Bangladesh, Shri Shah, also clearly stated in both Houses of Parliament that minorities in Bangladesh were best protected during Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib’s period and their condition deteriorated after that. It was bad during Pakistan’s rule as well, and degenerated after Mujib’s assassination. Shri Shah pointed out that the situation since the coming to power of the Sheikh Hasina led Awami League government has seen a vast improvement. Therefore, the current dispensation in Bangladesh need not pay heed to distorted versions of what Shri Shah said that is being dished out by a section of the communists and pseudo-secular political elements in India and worldwide, they should instead base their assessment and stand on Shri Shah’s statement made on the floor of the Indian Parliament. This said, the Bangladesh government ought to also accept the historical reality of discrimination and atrocities on minorities in East Pakistan, and in Bangladesh, especially during martial rule and later during the BNP rule of Khaleda Zia.

It also was unclear on what basis or what drove parties such as the BSP to oppose the passage of the Bill? Had the BSP leadership, which had supported the abrogation of Article 370 on the ground that it would provide for reservation to the marginalised sections in the region, read up the history of India’s partition in some detail, especially how partition had affected the Dalits of East Pakistan, it would have perhaps had a rethink. Most of the persecuted minorities of these countries are Dalits, the persecution of the Namasudras – the valiant Matuas in East Pakistan and later Bangladesh is one of the most disturbing episodes of our recent history. Most of those who had to therefore leave their homes in East Pakistan and Bangladesh were Dalits.

The present BSP is certainly not the one which late Kanshiram had founded. It is allowing itself to be held hostage to the politics of appeasement and vote-bank. A large number of Dalit Hindu refugees are loudly asking this question, how is it that the BSP leadership did not stand by them? How is it that a political entity like the BSP and other parties which have built up an entire political career professing to work for the empowerment of Dalits oppose the CAA?

A sample for those self-professed Dalit, communist and Congress leaders who have opposed CAA. In their seminal study, “Religion and Politics in Bangladesh and West Bengal: a study of Communal Relations” Sukumar Biswas and Hiroshi Sato, for example, document how in January 1950 (the period when the attacks on minorities in East Pakistan intensified) a pogrom was unleashed on tribals – Santals by East Pakistan police, “Village after village was indiscriminately burnt down, peasants were beaten and tortured mercilessly. They created a reign of terror by free looting, and raping of the Santal women went at will. 24 Santal peasants succumbed to death due to police torture…” Innumerable Santals were killed in Nawabganj and Rajshahi Jails… The pervasive and multi-directional torturing compelled several Santal peasants to emigrate to West Bengal…” These Santals were active participants in the historic Tebhaga movement led by communist party
leaders in East Pakistan! Yet, both Mayawati and Sitaram Yechury have opposed the CAA, they do not want ST and SCs, among others, who came away to India due to religious persecution, to be conferred with Indian citizenship!

Plenty of records and documentation exist on how people from these sections of society were driven away, along with others, from East Pakistan. Here are again a few more samples, the Amrita Bazar Patrika reported on March 6, 1950, for instance: “…After a month since the atrocities had been committed on the Santals, disturbances again started on February 28 last. Since then, hundreds, of Hindus of all classes began to cross the border into Maldah district in the Indian Union. During their journey these people have been subjected to all sorts of harassment; their womenfolk especially suffered great indignities…The Ansars are snatching away whatever these unfortunate people have with them…In Singhrill village one Rahim Bux occupied a house belonging to the leader of the Mahato community of the village. Thus people of the village became very much panicky. As a result of this widespread Hindu-baiting, Hindus of all classes began to leave those areas for India.”

The Amrita Bazar Patrika issue of 23 March, 1950, for example, reported how, the Pakistan armed forces and Ansars, on the point of rifles, “drove away 20 families [Santals] of village Hariharpur, adjacent to Balurghat, and broke open the roofs of the houses and took away huge quantities of C.I. sheets, paddy, rice, mustard seeds, jute and utensils…” It was a continuous situation of this magnitude which compelled the minorities of East Pakistan to flee to West Bengal.

The Nehru-Liaquat Pact of 1950 failed to protect the minorities in East Pakistan and this was compounded by Nehru’s peculiar and irrational refusal to effectuate a total exchange of population on the eastern front and to provide the refugees, flowing in from East Pakistan, only with relief and not rehabilitation under the logic that they will have to go back. Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee, speaking in Parliament on 7 August 1950, pointed out that the Pact had failed, it had failed to prevent atrocities and attacks on minorities in East Pakistan. These continuing attacks, desecrations, killings had shown, Dr Mookerjee told the House, that the “entire social and economic structure in which Hindus lived has collapsed and it is impossible for them to live there.”

Nehru refused to even consider their plight, when at the Jaipur session of the AICC in 1948, a delegation of Bengali Hindus refugees belonging to the Nikhil VangaBastuharaKaramParishad (NVBK) led by Gandhians and Congress leaders of East Bengal, among them the veteran Congressman and Gandhian, Amritlal Chatterjee, all of whom had to come away from East Pakistan and take shelter in West Bengal, called on Nehru to submit a deputation requesting the Central government to provide for rehabilitation for refugees who had come from East Pakistan to West Bengal, he told them, point blank that they were foreigner and that they must get in touch with the AICC’s foreign affairs bureau instead!

This was the attitude of the Congress leadership, it left a huge historic challenge unaddressed, and despite assuring these hapless people of protection and shelter it had the gumption of turning its back on them once partition was done and the pogrom against the minorities began. While Dr Ambedkar, in his seminal book Pakistan or the Partition of India, had advocated a complete exchange of population, “That the transfer of minorities is the only lasting remedy for communal peace is beyond doubt…”, Mahatma Gandhi is on record having said on 16 July 1947, after his customary post-prayer meeting address,
that “There is the problem of those Hindus who for fear imaginary or real, will have to leave their own homes in Pakistan. If hindrances are created in their daily work or movement or if they are treated as foreigners in their own land, then they will not be able to stay there. In that case the duty of the adjoining province on this side of the border will be to accept them with both arms and to extend to them all legitimate opportunities. They should be made to feel that they have not come to an alien land.”

The CAA aims to accept these people with both arms, to extent to them all legitimate opportunities and to make them feel that they have not come to an alien land. But ironically, the Congress then, and the Congress now continues to oppose this move. Nehru had also promised these people during partition that they would be protected and looked after if the need ever arose, he had said, “our duty to those who will be in peril in East Bengal, will be to protect them in their own country and to give them shelter in our own country if there is no other way and the situation so demands.”

But Nehru never made any serious move to fulfil or to stand by this promise, while his political heirs today have actively opposed the conferring of citizenship on minorities persecuted and evicted from these three countries. Nehru’s heirs have whipped up emotions, have attempted to generate a communal frenzy through a deliberate misinterpretation of the Act, have displayed a colossal ignorance of partition history and a stony and disdainful indifference to the plight of the refugees who, for seven decades, have been living a near invisible existence.

Historically West Bengal has been the first port of shelter for these persecuted minorities of East Pakistan, why then is the Trinamool Congress dispensation in the state and especially Chief Minister Ms Mamata Banerjee, spreading deliberate misinformation about CAA, actively perpetrating a state of communal tension and calling this Act passed by the Parliament and assented to by the President of India as unconstitutional? How can an elected Chief Minister refuse to pay heed to an act of the Indian Parliament and that too on a subject which clearly falls under the jurisdiction of the Union government?

The reality is that Ms Banerjee is determined to protect her infiltrator vote-bank and at the same time prevent the Bengali Hindus refugees from becoming citizens of India. So fierce is her hatred for these refugees that she allowed a section of lumpens to create unrest, vandalises public property and terrorise people. That an elected head of a state government can allow and encourage such public acts of violence is in itself deplorable, that she does it in the name of protecting the Constitution is doubly deplorable. It is ironical that in West Bengal, a state in which the Bengali Hindu refugees have waged the longest struggle for Indian citizenship rights, the ruling party is resolutely opposed to implementing the CAA because it is worried about the dilution of its infiltrator vote-bank!

The CAA is a civilizational move, it is the fulfilment of a historic promise and the rectification of a historic wrong, it is a move that will further concretise the vision of a new India, it is announces the start of new phase, a phase in which those long suffering and ignored will at last find a place of dignity and contribute their energies to this vision of a New India. Those who oppose it today are the ones who have habitually sided with separatism, the forces of disintegration and elements who wish to see India’s march retarded and captive to the old narrative of fear and division. The real India, is rejecting them, and will gradually reject them entirely and comprehensively.
मेरे लिए सौभाग्य का विषय है कि आज इस महत्वपूर्ण अवसर का साही बनने का और इसमें शरीक होने का मुझे अंतर मिला है। ये सफ कह सकते हम कि कभी चरा चल रही थी संविधान निमंत्रिताओं के बीच में कि सदन एक हो या दो हों, लेकिन अनुभव कहता है कि संविधान निमंत्रिताओं ने जो लोकस्थली ही, जो कितनी उपयुक्त रही है और कितना बढ़िया contribution किया है।

अगर विचला सदन जमीन से जुड़ा हुआ है तो ऊपरी सदन दूर तक देख सकता है। और इस प्रकार से भारत की विकास यात्रा में विचल सदन से जुड़ी तत्कालीन चीजों का अगर प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त होता है तो यह वैह हुए महानुभावों से क्योंकि ऊपर है, ऊपर वाला जरा दूर का देख सकता है, तो दूर की वृद्धि का भी अनुभव, इन दोनों का combination इन हमारे दोनों सदनों से हमको देखने को मिलता है।

इस सदन ने कई ऐतिहासिक पत्त देखे हैं। इतिहास बनाया भी है और बनते हुए इतिहास को देखा भी है और जहरत पड़ने पर उस इतिहास को मोड़ने में भी इस सदन ने बहुत बड़ी सफलता पाई है।

उसी प्रकार से इस देश के गणमान्य दिग्गज महानुभावों ने इस सदन का नेतृत्व किया है, इस सदन में सहभागिता की है और इसके कारण हमारे देश की इस विकास यात्रा को और आजादी के बाद की बहुत सी चीजों गढ़नी थी। अब तो 50-60 साल के बाद बहुत सी चीजों ने शेष ले ली है, लेकिन जो शुरुआत काल में fear of unknown से हमें गुजरना पड़ता था। उस समय जिस maturity के साथ सबने नेतृत्व किया है, दिया है; ये अपने-आप में बहुत बड़ी बात है।

आदरणीय सभापति जी ये सदन की बड़ी विशेषता है और दो पहलू खास हैं- एक तो उसका स्थायित्व permanent कहें या eternal कहें, और दूसरा है विविधता diversity। स्थायित्व इसलिए है, eternal इसलिए है कि लोकसभा तो भंग होती है,
इसका जन्म हुआ न अब तक कभी भंग हुई है न भंग होना है, यानी ये eternal है।

» लोग आएं, जाएंगे लेकिन ये व्यक्ति eternal रहती है। ये अपनी उसकी एक विशेषता है और दुसरा है विविधता- क्योंकि यहाँ राज्यों का प्रतिनिधित्व प्राप्त है। एक प्रकार से भारत के फेडरल स्तर पर यह आत्मा यहाँ पर हर पल हमें प्रेरित करती है।

» भारत की विविधता, भारत के अनेकता में एकता के जो सूत्र है, उसकी सबसे बड़ी ताकत इस सदन में नजर आती है और वो समय-समय पर ये reflect भी होती रहती है।

» उसी प्रकार से उन विविधताओं के साथ हम जब आए बढ़ते हैं तब, इस सदन का एक और लाभ भी है कि हर किसी के लिए चुनौती भरपूर पर बाहर बढ़ने को नहीं होता है, लेकिन देश हित में उनकी उपयोगिता कम नहीं होती है।

» वैज्ञानिक हों, खेल जगत के लोग हों, कला जगत के लोग हों, कलम के धार्मिक हों, ऐसे अनेक महानायकों का लाभ जिनके लिए चुनौती भरपूर से निस्कर लेने के आमा बढ़ते मुश्किल होता है, लेकिन इस व्यक्ति के कारण हमारी इस बौद्धिक संपत्ति की भी एक richness हमें इससे प्राप्त हुई है।

» इन 250 सालों में और मैं मानता हूं इसका सबसे बड़ा उदय यह है कि इसका सबसे बड़ा उदय यह है जब यह कृपया इस सदन में हमें शासन का प्रभुत्व नहीं आने देता। शासन में बैठे हुए लोगों को महान दिशा में जाने के लिए प्रेरित करने के कठोर काम इस सदन में हुए हैं। ये एक याबून कितनी बड़ी सेवा हुई है, इसका हम गर्व कर सकते हैं और ये हम सबके लिए समर्पित है।

» आदरणीय सम्मानित जी, हमारे प्रथम उप-राष्ट्रपति जी डॉक्टर सर्वपल्ली राधाकृष्ण जी ने इस सदन के संबंध में जो बात कही थी, मैं उसको आपके सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहूँगा।

» डॉक्टर राधाकृष्ण जी ने कहा था, इसी चेहरे पर बैठकर उन्होंने कहा था और जो आज भी उत्तम है। और आप आदरणीय प्रभुत्व मुख्यालय की बात का उल्लेख करते हों तो सुवर्ण अपना दर्शक व्यक्त करते हों, ये सारी बातें उससे हैं और उस समय राधाकृष्ण जी ने कहा था- हमारे विचार, हमारा व्यवहार, और हमारी सोच ही दो सदनों वाली हमारी संसदीय प्रणाली के अधिकार को साफ़ करती। संविधान का हमसे भी इस विदेशी व्यक्ति की परीक्षा हमारे कामों से होगी।

» हम पहली बार अपनी संसदीय प्रणाली में दो सदनों की शुरूआत कर रहे हैं। हमारी कोशिश होनी चाहिए कि हम अपनी सोच, सामर्थ्य और समय से देश को इस व्यक्ति का अधिकार साफ़ करें।
मुख्य ब्रिक्स विज्ञान फोरम में शामिल होकर बहुत प्रसन्नता हूँ। 11वें ब्रिक्स समिट कार्यक्रम की शुरुआत इस फोरम से हुई है। Business का प्राथमिकता देने के लिए मैं प्रावीन के राष्ट्रपति, इस फोरम के ऑर्गाइजर्स और सभी participants को बधाई देता हूँ।

विश्व की आलोचनक वृद्धि में ब्रिक्स देशों का लहसुन 50% है। विश्व में मंदी के बावजूद, ब्रिक्स देशों ने आलोचनक विकास को गति दी, करोड़ों लोगों को गरीबी से निकाला और Technology तथा innovation में नई सफलताएं हासिल की। अब BRICS की स्थापना के दस साल बाद, भविष्य में हमारे प्रयासों की दिशा पर विचार करने के लिए यह फॉरम एक अच्छा मंच है।

इंट्रा-ब्रिक्स व्यापार और निवेश तक स्पष्ट बनाने से परस्पर व्यापार और निवेश बढ़ेगा। हम पांच देशों के बीच Tax और Customs प्रक्रियाएं सरल होती जा रही हैं। इंस्टेलेक्चुअल Property Rights पर, और Banks के बीच सहयोग से Business सहयोग आसान हो गया है। BRICS Business Forum से मेरा अनुमान है कि यह इस प्रकार उत्पन्न अवसरों का पूरा लाभ उठाने के लिए जल्दी विज्ञान पहलों का आधार बनेगा।

Intra-BRICS व्यापार और निवेश के targets और महत्वपूर्ण होने चाहिए। हमारे बीच व्यापार की लागत को और कम करने के लिए, आपके सुझाव उपयोगी होंगे।

में यह भी अनुमति देंगे कि अगले दस वर्षों के लिए हमारे बीच विज्ञान में प्राथमिकता के क्षेत्रों की पहचान की जाए और उनके आधार पर Intra-BRICS सहयोग का blue print बनाया जाए।

हमारा market size, विविधता और हमारी पूर्व तओं एक दूसरे के लिए बहुत फायदेमंद है। हमारे उद्देश्य के लिए, आप एक ब्रिक्स देश में तक स्थापना की है, तो दूसरे में उससे संबंधित में मेंटरिंग या मार्केटisation एनार्किकिंग विकास, Electric vehicles, digital technology, Fertilizer, कृषि उत्पाद, Food processing, आदि में ऐसे संभावित विशेष तौर पर हैं।

मैं आपके कहने का सहयोग कि Forum पांचों देशों में इस प्रकार की पूर्वरीतियों की mapping की है। मांग सुझाव भी देना चाहिए यह अगले ब्रिक्स समिट तक ऐसे कम-से-कम पांच क्षेत्रों की पहचान की जायें, जिनमें पूर्वता के आधार पर हमारे बीच Joint Ventures बन सकते हैं।

» ब्रिक्स विज्ञान फोरम में शामिल होकर बहुत प्रसन्नता हो रही है। 11वें ब्रिक्स समिट कार्यक्रम की शुरुआत इस फोरम से हुई है। Business को प्राथमिकता देने के लिए मैं प्रावीन के राष्ट्रपति, इस फोरम के ऑर्गाइजर्स और सभी participants को बधाई देता हूँ।

» विश्व की आलोचनक वृद्धि में ब्रिक्स देशों का लहसुन 50% है। विश्व में मंदी के बावजूद, ब्रिक्स देशों ने आलोचनक विकास को गति दी, करोड़ों लोगों को गरीबी से निकाला और Technology तथा innovation में नई सफलताएं हासिल की। अब BRICS की स्थापना के दस साल बाद, भविष्य में हमारे प्रयासों की दिशा पर विचार करने के लिए यह फॉरम एक अच्छा मंच है।

» Intra-BRICS व्यापार और निवेश के targets और महत्वपूर्ण होने चाहिए। हमारे बीच व्यापार की लागत को और कम करने के लिए, आपके सुझाव उपयोगी होंगे।

» में यह भी अनुमति देंगे कि अगले दस वर्षों के लिए हमारे बीच विज्ञान में प्राथमिकता के क्षेत्रों की पहचान की जाए और उनके आधार पर Intra-BRICS सहयोग का blue print बनाया जाए।

» हमारा market size, विविधता और हमारी पूर्व तओं एक दूसरे के लिए बहुत फायदेमंद है। हमारे उद्देश्य के लिए, आप एक ब्रिक्स देश में तक स्थापना की है, तो दूसरे में उससे संबंधित में मेंटरिंग या मार्केटisation एनार्किकिंग विकास, Electric vehicles, digital technology, Fertilizer, कृषि उत्पाद, Food processing, आदि में ऐसे संभावित विशेष तौर पर हैं।

» मैं आपके कहने का सहयोग कि Forum पांचों देशों में इस प्रकार की पूर्वरीतियों की mapping की है। मांग सुझाव भी देना चाहिए यह अगले ब्रिक्स समिट तक ऐसे कम-से-कम पांच क्षेत्रों की पहचान की जायें, जिनमें पूर्वता के आधार पर हमारे बीच Joint Ventures बन सकते हैं।

Salient Points of PM’s remarks at BRICS Business Forum on 14 November 2019
Salient Points of PM’s address to nation following SC verdict on Ayodhya on 09 November 2019

» Today, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has given its verdict on a very important issue, which has a history of several years.

» The entire country desired that this matter be heard in the court daily. That is exactly what happened and the outcome of which is today’s verdict. The judicial process that has spanned decades has concluded today.

» Friends, It is globally known that India is the world’s largest democracy. Today, the world has also known how vibrant and strong our democracy is.

» After today’s verdict the manner in which every section of society, every community, every religion, the entire nation embraced the verdict with open arms. This is a manifestation of India’s age old ethos, culture, traditions as well as our inherent spirit of brotherhood.

» Brothers and sisters, The virtues for which India is known- Unity in Diversity; this spirit is clearly visible today. Even after thousands of years, if somebody wishes to understand India’s ethos of unity in diversity, today would be referred as a classic example.

» Friends, Today is a golden day even in the history of this India’s judiciary.

» During the course of the hearings (on Ayodhya), the Honorable Supreme Court heard everyone with much patience and it is after that that the Court gave a unanimous verdict.

» Today is a historic day. It is the beginning of a golden era for the Judiciary of the country. The judgement was unanimous and was courageous. Supreme Court has shown grit and determination in this verdict. Our Judiciary needs a special appreciation.

» Friends, Today is the 9th of November. It was on this date that the Berlin Wall collapsed.

» Two different streams of thought came together and took a new pledge.

» Today, on 9th November, the Kartarpur corridor has begun. India and Pakistan made a coordinated effort for this corridor.

» Today the 9th November the judgment of the SC is giving us a message of staying united and getting together and living together. There should not be any ill feeling in anybody.

» If there is even a trace of bitterness in anyone’s mind, it is time to bid farewell to such a spirit.

» In New India, there is no place for fear, bitterness and negativity.

» Friends, With today’s verdict, the Honourable Supreme Court has given a message that even the toughest issues can be resolved within the framework of the Constitution and in spirit of the laws.

» We should learn from this verdict that even if there is some delay, we should remain patient. This is in everyone’s interest.

» In every situation, our faith in India’s constitution, India’s judicial system must remain unwavering. This is very important.
India and the RCEP
A Principled Withdrawal

Sanjay Pulipaka

nation-states seek to leverage maximum economic benefit either by joining or moving away from international trading arrangements. While the objective of international trade is economic gain, it is often modulated by geopolitical as well as ideological considerations. For instance, during the Cold War, economic interactions between nation-states were modulated through ideological frameworks. The Capitalist Bloc preferred to trade among themselves, and the Communist Bloc also did the same. With the end of the ideological contestation, there was a spurt in economic interactions between various countries and the globalisation process picked up momentum. In the recent past, there are concerns among the western countries that they are losing out in the globalisation process and they are also concerns that the non-democratic countries can rig the international trading system to their advantage.

India, as a fast-growing economy is cognizant of the need to scale up its trading relations to meet the 5 trillion dollar target by 2024-2025. At the same time, India is keen to ensure that the trading relations should be based on principles of mutual benefit, transparency and equity. It appears that the Indian leadership felt that the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) in its current form is not beneficial for India. Prime Minister Modi, in November 2019, at the 35th summit of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in Bangkok declared that the RCEP in its current form “does not address satisfactorily India’s outstanding issues and concerns...therefore, neither the Talisman of Gandhiji nor my own conscience permits me to join RCEP.” Over the past few years, India worked hard to be part of the emerging regional framework. There was genuine commitment to be part of the framework as the RCEP seeks to create a free trade agreement in the Indo-Pacific involving the 10 countries of ASEAN and Australia, China, Japan, New Zealand, South Korea and India accounting for almost 50 trillion dollars of combined GDP. It should be noted that the RCEP framework has not closed doors on India, and there is scope for further negotiations. As the ASEAN and RCEP Joint Leaders’ Statement notes: “All RCEP Participating Countries will work together to resolve these outstanding issues in a mutually satisfactory way. India’s final decision will depend on the satisfactory resolution of these issues.”

Why is India reluctant to join RCEP in its current form? First, India has huge trade deficits with many of the RCEP countries. Its experience from various trade agreements such as India-ASEAN FTA was disappointing. There is a perception in India that these trade agreements have increased access for goods from Southeast Asian to easily flow into the Indian markets without reciprocal benefits. The current RCEP deal would have meant that India would have to abolish tariffs on 70-90 per cent of goods from
various countries. This would have resulted in even further enlargement of trade deficit. Further, India’s strength lay in the service sector and the RCEP countries are reluctant to liberalise the service sector, which would be beneficial for India.

Second, India, on an average, had over 50 billion dollars of trade deficit with China in the recent past. The RCEP was seen as a de facto free trade agreement with China, which would have opened up doors for Chinese goods even more. China, because of its trade war with US and economic slowdown, will look to export more to other countries and India needs to have appropriate safeguards from dumping activities. On the other hand, Indian goods were finding it very difficult to access Chinese markets due to Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs). For example, in 2017-2018, Indian pharma exports to the US amounted to over $ 4 billion. During the same reporting period, Indian pharma exports to China was a mere $ 40 million, which suggests that NTBs were at play. The Indian negotiating team was also concerned that the RCEP framework did not have appropriate redressal mechanisms for non-tariff barriers.

Third, related to the above, India suggested strict rules of origin to ensure that goods of one country are not exported through another country. Recently, Vietnamese authorities have unearthed fraudulent cases wherein Chinese goods were smuggled into the country which were then subsequently exported to the US after getting relabelled as “made in Vietnam”. Similar concerns were also expressed regarding some goods exported from Cambodia. While these are fraudulent cases, India insisted that there should strict rules of origin based on the highest value addition to prevent third-country goods misusing RCEP provision to enter Indian markets. Many of the ASEAN countries are part of complex supply chains and therefore, were hesitant to endorse the strict rules of origin.

Fourth, India suggested an auto-trigger-mechanism that would automatically increase in import duties, instead of lengthy procedures, in case of a flood of imports that threaten domestic industries. Sadly, this mechanism was also not endorsed. Given the unwillingness to accommodate Indian suggestions, there was very little possibility of India joining the RCEP process. The decision to opt-out was welcomed by many industry associations/bodies in India. For instance, FICCI leadership noted that the government took a “very pragmatic decision towards safeguarding the interest of the Indian industry.” Amul welcomed the decision as it supported the livelihoods in the milk and dairy sector.

Some of the RCEP participating countries are also very keen that India should be part of the regional trading framework. For instance, Japan recently reiterated its desire to see India in the RCEP framework. While joining the RCEP on favourable terms is important for New Delhi, the presence of India in the framework is also important for many Southeast Asian and Northeast Asian countries as well. India constitutes an important market for many countries. Further, with the United States withdrawing from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), India not being part of the RCEP would result in imbalanced regional economic interactions. Therefore, it is imperative for the countries in the region to proactively consider India’s concerns. Going forward, India’s participation in RCEP will be contingent on the response that it gets from the member countries on its concerns.

(The author is a Senior Fellow at the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi. The views expressed here are personal.)
Citizenship Amendment Bill – A historic commitment

Dr. Anirban Ganguly

While he tabled the Citizenship Amendment Bill 2019, in the Lok Sabha, Union Home Minister, Amit Shah asked a fundamental question, he was responding to the Congress party’s leader in the House, Adhir Ranjan Chowdhury, who, because he comes from an infiltrator dominated Murshidabad was repeatedly obstructing the placing of the Bill. Shah asked why is it that this Bill has to be tabled? It has to be, he answered, because in 1947, the Congress had partitioned this country on the basis of religion. This is the stark truth that needs to be told, that this Bill and this herculean effort that is going into remedying this historic wrong, is because the Congress party had capitulated before Jinnah’s communal blackmail.

The Bharatiya Jana Sangh and the Bharatiya Janata Party have never overlooked this dimension of our partition history. Right since their inceptions they have continuously advocated the cause of the Hindus of either parts of Pakistan and have demanded that the Indian leadership fulfill its promised duties towards these minorities in the neighbourhood. During historic campaign in 2014 and in 2019, PM Modi has repeatedly referred to this historic commitment and had promised to bring it into effect. The Jana Sangh, for instance, in its first all India session in December 1953 in Kanpur, referred to the “continuously deteriorating condition of the Hindus in East Bengal”, it pointed out how Pakistan’s policy was to “drive out all those who are of strong will and to force through atrocities the weaker to embrace Islam...” It reminded the then ruling party that “the Hindus of Pakistan had not asked for partition but it was thrust upon them against their wishes and at the time of partition leaders of India including Mahatma Gandhi, Sardar Patel and Shri Nehru had given them the clear promise that it would be the duty of the people and the Government of India to always consider protection of their interests...”

Ever since, the Congress party during Nehru’s era and later has been lukewarm to the plight of the Bengali Hindu refugees, to the Hindus being forced to come away from Pakistan and Bangladesh. Nehru refused to heed to Dr Syama Prasad Mookerjee’s repeated exhortation that there be a complete exchange of population on the eastern front as well and kept harping on his demand that the Bengali Hindu refugee must go back to East Bengal. The foundation of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact of April 1950 was meant to...
facilitate that pipe hope. While Muslims who had gone to East Pakistan returned to West Bengal, the Hindus who went back to East Pakistan could not survive, they were hounded and driven out to return to West Bengal and eke out an existence as refugees without elementary dignity and source of livelihood.

As Dr Mookerjee, asked, during his intervention in Parliament, on August 7, 1950, when the House discussed in detail the “Bengal Situation”, “what was the main purpose of the Pact” [Nehru-Liaqat Pact], he asked the House, “Was not the chief object of the pact that Hindus would be able to live in East Bengal with a sense of security and without fear; that there would be no exodus and those who had come away would gradually of their own accord feel emboldened to go back to their home? Was it not the purpose of the Pact that there would be a sense of security in the minds of the minorities [in East Pakistan/ Bengal] themselves so that they could decide on their own course of action without any fear or expectation of favour from any quarter? Judged from this standpoint the Pact has failed....” The main test of the pact, Dr Mookerjee had argued, “would be whether conditions of security are being created in East Bengal whereby Hindus can live there out of their own free will.”

Obviously the pact had failed. In his historic statement in Parliament on his resignation, Dr Mookerjee, he reminded those who had questioned then the need for India to fulfil its promise, he had said, “Let us not forget that the Hindus of East Bengal are entitled to the protection of India, not on humanitarian considerations alone, but by virtue of their sufferings and sacrifices, made cheerfully for generations, not for advancing their own parochial interests, but for laying the foundations of India's political freedom and intellectual progress. It is the united voices of leaders that are dead and of the youth that smilingly walked up to the gallows for India's cause that calls for justice and fair-play at the hands of Free India of today...”

It was this failure of the first pact that added to the woe of the Bengali Hindu refugees
Dr Mookerjee said, “Let us not forget that the Hindus of East Bengal are entitled to the protection of India, not on humanitarian considerations alone, but by virtue of their sufferings and sacrifices, made cheerfully for generations, not for advancing their own parochial interests, but for laying the foundations of India’s political freedom and intellectual progress. It is the united voices of leaders that are dead and of the youth that smilingly walked up to the gallows for India’s cause that calls for justice and fair-play at the hands of Free India of today...”

who became rootless and felt abandoned. Dr Mookerjee’s intervention during this debate on free India’s provisional parliament, is also deeply disturbing, disturbing both because, having extensively travelled across the area where the refugees had come to seek shelter, having interacted with them, he gave an authentic and heart rending description of their status and the challenges and persecutions that compelled them to leave their home and hearth.

Speaking of the failure of the Nehru-Liaqat Pact, Dr Mookerjee, pointed out, after giving an exhaustive list of attacks on Hindus in East Bengal between April 1950, when the pact was signed and June 1950, that in everyone of these cases of attack, it is the “minority i.e., the Hindu is the victim and the oppressor is a member of the majority community. The entire social and economic structure in which Hindus lived has collapsed and it is impossible for them to live there.” It was therefore impossible for the Hindus, to continue to survive in East Bengal, he argued, because the “loot mentality has been roused. The blood lust is there. The lust to abduct women is there. You cannot escape from the telling and terrible facts...” he told the House.

Especially the Bengali Hindu refugees have been the worst sufferer. Blinded by the exigencies of vote-bank politics, the Congress, the Communist parties and the later splinters like Trinamool Congress have always ignored or obfuscated the present state and future of the Bengali Hindu refugees. The communists have a record of massacring the Bengali Hindu refugees, especially the Dalit refugees who had come from East Bengal and wanted to settle down in West Bengal, in the Sunderban estuary region of Marichjhapi. These parties have always stood in the way of granting citizenship to the Bengali Hindus who have been compelled, forced and terrorised to leave their homes and to come away to India. Not to grant them Citizenship today, to oppose their right to a life of dignity as citizens of India, will be to renege on a historic commitment, it will be ignoring their historic contribution to the making of a free India, one cannot ignore the decades of suffering that these people underwent in their land of birth and also the miserable lives that they had been forced to lead as refugees in West Bengal and in other parts of India. These people do not seek mercy, they do not seek favours, they aspire to a life of respect and opportunity, India is their natural home and they are entitled to seek a new life of possibilities here.

Syama Prasad’s word’s in Parliament, describing the plight of the refugees and their will to survive, still rings, “They are facing the spectre of death, not for any fault of their own. They cannot get shelter and they cannot get work. They do not want to live as idlers and it is amazing how even today they raise their feeble voice and shout BandeMataram which they have not forgotten yet and shed tears.

(The author is Director, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee Research Foundation)
In a historic moment, the Parliament passed the Citizenship Amendment Bill (2019) after a passionate debate. The bill was given the President's assent on 12/12/2019 and became an Act and come into effect with its publication in the official gazette of India. It provides a narrow window of a clear path to Indian citizenship to the non-Muslims from Afghanistan, Pakistan and Bangladesh who arrived in India before December 31, 2014. The Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, Buddhist, Jains and Parsis from these three officially Islamic countries fleeing religious persecution will no longer be deported back and will be eligible for the citizenship even if they lack valid documents to prove their identity.

With this, a long-standing demand, ever since the failure of the Liaquat-Nehru pact, of protecting religious minorities in the neighbouring countries has been fulfilled. It is important to note that this demand was older than the political mobilisation for the Ram Mandir, older than the demand for abrogating Art 370 or demand for a Uniform Civil Code. It was in opposition to the Liaquat-Nehru pact that Syama Prasad Mukherjee resigned from the cabinet of the Nehru in 1950. He argued that this pact has left the non-Muslims in Pakistan at the mercy of the Pakistan who is unlikely to honour its commitment of the safety of the religious minorities and that state-controlled exchange of population was the only way out.

Ever since the Jan Sangh and BJP have been demanding the right of refuge and citizenship to the minorities fleeing religious persecution from Pakistan and later Bangladesh as well. The promise to grant them citizenship also figured prominently in the election manifesto of the BJP in both 2014 and 2019. And by passing the bill in the face of hostile opposition, BJP has fulfilled yet another of its election time promise.

This bill is an important act of humanitarianism as it provides a chance at a better life to a de-facto stateless people by restoring their human dignity. It is also important because it emancipates the forgotten religious minorities esp the Hindus who were left to suffer without any voice being raised in their support. For too long they were treated like the orphans of the world and left to wither away due to inhumane discrimination and exclusion, forced conversions and repeated episodes of ethnic cleansing.

It is important to note that most of the Hindu refugees are from Dalit and other weaker castes who were unable to flee during the partition or were simply not allowed to migrate to India to ensure a captive workforce for the menial jobs in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. But now they have a ray of hope by becoming the citizens of the Republic of India. And it was the iron will of the Prime minister Shri Narendra Modi and commitment of Home minister Shri Amit Shadani that made this bill possible.
Shah that made it possible.

The new act has also drawn criticism basically on two grounds; that it discriminates against the Muslims and it threatens the demographics of the north-eastern states of India. The allegation of discrimination against Muslims comes from the same opposition parties who not so long ago had branded even the Indo-US nuclear deal as anti-Muslim. Their main argument is that the amendment violates the Art 14 of the constitution by discriminating against the Muslims from Pakistan, Bangladesh and Afghanistan. But the Art 14 doesn't mean treating everyone similar irrespective of the context but that equals would be treated equally, whilst un-equals would have to be treated unequally.

It seems that the opposition has forgotten that such maximalist reading of the Art 14 will render several other constitutional provisions void like Art 26-30 which provide for the autonomy of the minority institutions including non-compliance of the reservations for SC and STs. Also, the act doesn't stop any foreigner Muslim including from these three countries from becoming the citizen of India. The only difference is that he/she would have to follow the standard procedures for the same. Therefore, the argument of discrimination and violation of the secular fabric of the country doesn't hold at all.

The act is simply focused on the religious minorities from the three officially Islamic countries. Even Hindus from other parts of the world will have to follow the same standard procedures as Muslims.

The act is simply focused on the religious minorities from the three officially Islamic countries. Even Hindus from other parts of the world will have to follow the same standard procedures as Muslims.

The only real concern of the legitimate protests by the people of the north-east who are anxious that local demographics might change. It is to address these concerns Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland and Mizoram are kept out of the preview of the act and Manipur are protected via the Inner Line Permit. The 6th schedule areas in Assam, Meghalaya and Tripura are also kept out of the ambit of the preview of the bill. It will be a good step to distribute the new citizens across India like that was done with the Tibetans and refugees during the partition. This will reduce the demographic burden on the border states of the north-east who are the major recipient of immigrants from Bangladesh.

The new act is a pivotal point in India’s political history as it is for the first time the Indian state has stood up for the Hindu rights at the international stage without any apology. It has also reaffirmed its civilisational tradition of providing safe heaven to the persecuted religious minorities from across the world.

(The author is an Assistant Professor at the University of Delhi)
The Final Verdict: Major Findings of the Supreme Court in the Ram Janmbhoomi Case

Shubhendu Anand

In the 40-day marathon argument that took place in the Supreme Court after which the historic judgment in the Ram Janmbhoomi case was delivered on 9th November, 2019, the court heard all the parties on almost all the legal issues concerning the Ram Janmbhoomi case and decided in favour of the Hindu parties on the basis of documentary evidence, report of the Archaeological Survey of India, faith (whether validly held or not), law of adverse possession and status of an idol as a juristic person.

The Court while vindicating the stand taken by Hindus held that the Hindu belief in the sanctity of the disputed site is established by evidence. The travelogues of Joseph Tieffenthaler (18th century) and Robert Montgomery Martin (early 19th century) record the prevalence of Hindu worship at the disputed site.

The Court held that Bhagwan Sri Ram Lalla has been the object of worship for several hundred years and the underlying purpose of continued worship is apparent even absent any express dedication or trust. The Supreme Court has also recognized the appointment of Next Friend good in law to represent the interest of the deity.

Suit No.5 is also held within the limitation because it looks toward the future to construct a temple dedicated to Lord Ram on the site of Ram Janambhoomi, as the suit contains a plea that because of its interest were not being protected, therefore, suit was filed. [Para 429 Page 480]

On ASI Report, the Supreme Court has held that the interest of the Muslim parties was also taken care of in the composition of the ASI Team and an allegation of malafide by Muslim parties on ASI has been rejected.

The Court concluded ASI report at Para 788 of the judgment and then given its inferences as follows-

i. The foundation of the mosque is based on the walls of a large pre-existing structure;

ii. The pre-existing structure dates back to the twelfth century; and

iii. The underlying structure which provided the foundations of the mosque together with its architectural features and recoveries are suggestive of a Hindu religious origin comparable to temple excavations in the region and pertaining to the era.

The communist propaganda report of four Historians which has been submitted by Muslim parties was also rejected by the Supreme Court because they did not consider B. Lal’s reports and subsequent excavations of ASI and its report hence cannot be taken into account. [Para 598 Page 705-706]

The Court has held that Hindus worshiped both in the outside courtyard and the inner...
court yard while the inside courtyard was contested and Hindu worship went across the entire site, the railing was to maintain peace and order by the Colonial authority post the communal incidents of 1856-57 and even though the railing was put, Hindus did not stop worshipping within courtyard. [Para 720 Page 836-837]

The Most significant aspect of the judgment is that the Court accepted for Hindus entire complex as a whole was of religious significance. The demarcation of the property by the British did not obliterate their belief that in the GarbhGrih there is birth place of Lord Ram. This is evident from the complaint of Moazzin of Baburi Mosque against the Nihang Singh Faquir on 30.11.1858. The Hindus had multiple points and form of worship within the disputed premises including Ram Chabutra and Sita Rasoi and Parikrama of disputed premise. The preponderance of probabilities suggests that there was continuum faith and belief of the Hindus in the Garb Grih as the birth place of Lord Ram. [Para 773 Page 884-885]

Ten Major Findings by the Supreme Court
i. The disputed site is one composite whole. The railing set up in 1856-57 did not either bring about a sub-division of the land or any determination of title;
ii. The Sunni Central Waqf Board has not established its case of a dedication by user;
iii. The alternate plea of adverse possession has not been established by the Sunni Central Waqf Board as it failed to meet the requirements of adverse possession;
iv. The Hindus have been in exclusive and unimpeded possession of the outer courtyard where they have continued worship;
v. The inner courtyard has been a contested site with conflicting claims of the Hindus and Muslims;
vii. The Muslims could not disprove any Hindu worship prior to 1856. Even though they accepted their worship was being obstructed to. [Para 787 Page 904]

The Muslims could not disprove any Hindu worship prior to 1856. Even though they accepted their worship was being obstructed to. [Para 787 Page 904]

vii. The evidence indicates that inspite of the Mosque, Hindu worship at the place was not restricted. Even though there was an Islamic structure, it did not shake Hindu faith on that site. The Muslims on the other hand have stated that the evidence of offering namaz was only apparent from 1856-57. [Para 788 (V) Page 909]

viii. The Muslims could not show that their possession in inner courtyard was exclusive [Para 788 (VI) Page 910]
ix. Muslims have also acknowledged that the presence Hindu symbol of Hindus significance both outside and inside of the mosque. [Para 788 (XI) Page 911]

x. The approach taken by the HC to trifurcate the land was erroneous. When the Suit was not of Partition and upon barring the suit by limitation, granting the relief through trifurcation was held not sustainable. Para 789 to 794 (starting from Pg. No. 915)

Despite all odds all brutal attacks on the places of Hindu worship, the Hindus survived. This judgment is just a manifestation of the same and in fact an acknowledgment of the historical wrongs committed upon Hindus.

(The author is an Advocate in the Supreme Court of India. He is also Research Fellow, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee Research Foundation.)
Not The Ayodhya Judgment, But The Mindset of Certain People Requires a Review

Ayush Anand

On 2nd of December 2019, M. Syed Ashhad Rashidi, the legal heir of M. Siddiq, the original litigant of the Ayodhya land dispute, has filed a review petition challenging the correctness of the Supreme Court Judgment pronounced in the Ayodhya case on 14 grounds. The Petitioner has not sought a review of the entire judgment but only of those issues which have been decided against them. Interestingly, they are in parts happy with the certain findings but unhappy with the others. It clearly indicates who is more interested in keeping this issue alive, as there are several findings which are against the interest of other parties as well but even then they are more interested in giving quietus to the dispute.

It is very unfortunate that there are certain groups who are creating this situation in the country whereby the interpretation of this landmark judgment is being peddled in a very wrong manner. Certain interested groups are deliberately avoiding the findings and reasoning arrived upon by the Court which indicates in a very clear terms that the Muslim Parties have lost their case because of their failure to adduce evidence to substantiate their case. At the same time the case has been decided in favor of the Deity as per the well settled principle of appreciation of the evidence in civil cases like this, i.e. ‘preponderance of probabilities’.

It is very apparent that the Petitioner seeks review of only adverse finding against them and a bare perusal of the Review Petition filed reflects that it nowhere satisfies the criteria fixed by the Hon’ble SC for reviewing its own judgment. However, on contrary it suggests that the groups which are behind this frivolous Review Petition requires a review of their mindset in a socio-political context and up-gradation of their knowledge in law with respect to the valid grounds for filing such review Petition. It is not the judgment which requires a review but the vicious and toxic mindset of certain people, who have misguided innocent Muslim community of the country for decades during the case including the Marxist historians and now after the settlement of this dispute, again crying that the Judgment is wrong. It is against the secularism. It is a kind of mandamus to destroy our ‘Babari Mosque’. The Court has rewarded the illegal acts. The Court was wrong in extending what was earlier a prescriptive right only into a possessory title over the land to the Hindus. The Court has relied upon the travelers account and inadmissible evidences adduced by the Hindu parties while giving land to the Deity. The Court is wrong by not holding the structure as a waqf property and so on…. But hang on; these were the issues which have been already decided by the Court, Right? Then is it possible through a review petition to reexamine the same issue on the basis of same set of evidence?
Let us in brief examine the grounds for review of a SC Judgment. Where the two interpretations/findings is possible and the Court has taken one, on the basis of evidences on record, then it can never be a ground for seeking a review by asking the Court to adopt the second one, which it has refused after thorough deliberation, upon the same issue in same set of facts. Adopting that would amount to violation of not only a principle of the Res-Judicate, but also damage the sanctity of the earlier Court proceedings. Such review is only permissible in rare of the rarest cases where while arriving to its conclusion Court has committed a human error. The scope of review is hence very narrow. It can never reopen the entire issue on the basis of same set of old evidences which has already dealt upon and the decision has been taken thereof or unless the judgment has been passed without appreciating any law or misreading of the law and which should be clear on the face of record like typo mistakes.

Review, i.e., a judicial re-examination stems from Article 137 of the Constitution of India and Order XLVII of the Supreme Court Rules, 2013. A review under the said statute lies only when:

i. There is a discovery of afresh and important matter of evidence, whereby the claimant is bound to prove that, after exercising due diligence, it was not within their knowledge or was not in a position to be produced at the time when the order or judgment was passed. (Aribam’s Case, AIR 1979 SC 1047)

ii. There is an error or mistake apparent on the face of the record and not from an erroneous decision or any other ground. An error apparent on the face of record is one that strikes at the mere looking of the record and does not need detailed scrutiny. It must be self-evident and should not have to be established. (Meera Bhanja’s Case, (1995) 1 SCC 170)
iii. Any other sufficient reason, after proving such sufficient reasoning.

Considering these limited scopes of review and while going through the grounds averred in the Review Petition, one can easily understand that the future of such Petition is bleak. The Review Petition has been filed in a manner to reopen the entire issue which is against the settled law hence it is bound to fail.

The Court has given a unanimous judgment on the findings that –

1. The alternate plea of adverse possession was not established by the Sunni Central Waqf Board, as it failed to meet the requirements of adverse possession [Paragraph 788(XVIII)(iii)]

2. The Archeological Survey of India's report has suggested that the foundation of the mosque is based on the walls of a large pre-existing structure, which was not of an Islamic origin and was suggestive of a Hindu religious origin comparable to temple excavations. [Paragraph 788]

3. The evidence in respect of the possessory claim of the Hindus to the composite whole of the disputed property stood on a better footing than evidences so adduced by the Muslims. [Paragraph 800]

4. The Hindus have been in unimpeded and exclusive possession of the property’s outer courtyard, where they continued worship over the periods of time, and other grounds.

The Court was therefore of a view that the Hindus have rightfully established a clear case over the possessory title of the disputed property by virtue of the long, unimpeded and continued worship at the Ramchabutra and other such objects of religious significance. Whereas, the Court has also observed that the Muslim Parties have failed to produce any document or evidence (be it admissible or inadmissible) prior to 1856 with respect to their right over the land. They have even failed to prove their exclusive adverse possession after 1856. What remains after that to claim over the property on behalf of Muslim Parties? In short, they have failed to prove their case and cannot take advantage of weak evidence of other Parties.

Illegal acts can only be punished through criminal courts; it has no bearing at all on a civil case while deciding the title of a land. A Court while adjudicating a civil dispute cannot decide upon criminality of certain acts committed in past and punish the offenders by way of not awarding title of the land to its legitimate owner. A Court cannot exercise its jurisdiction simultaneously both in the capacity of criminal and civil court.

Illegal acts can only be punished through criminal courts; it has no bearing at all on a civil case while deciding the title of a land. A Court while adjudicating a civil dispute cannot decide upon criminality of certain acts committed in past and punish the offenders by way of not awarding title of the land to its legitimate owner. A Court cannot exercise its jurisdiction simultaneously both in the capacity of criminal and civil court.

The judgment has been a result of the higher principle being that of equality before the law and has not sided with majoritarianism, as criticised by critics. The Court has considered law and reason over faith, has explained each point of law before making any observation and has only then come to the conclusion of allocating the disputed land to the Hindus.
Considering the strong reasons given by the Court in each issue upon scrutiny of evidences, it is imperative to state that the ends of law and justice have been met with, and that, there is no scope of injustice within the judgment, leave alone the presence of an unjust finding on the face of the judgment. Amongst other reasoning as to why the said review petition shall not stand, few of the most apparent reasons fall to be –

a. The judgment does not include a cloud of uncertainty as it has provided sufficient reasoning with proofs and evidences (oral and documentary) of all its findings. The Court has also acted in the interest of all the parties and has therefore given directions of alternative allotment of land to Muslims, an interest to the Nirmohi Akhara in the Trust so made to look after the building of the Ram Mandir and other such directions.

b. The party seeking the review, as also held by the Hon’ble Court, has not been successful in establishing their case, and that, the evidences as provided by the Hindus has been held to stand on a better footing than that of the evidences provided by the Muslims. In the Review Petition also they have not adduced any such permissible fresh evidence.

c. The review petition so filed raises questions over the powers of the Supreme Court to pass orders by which the Babri Masjid be demolished. The interpretations so made by the claimant are not as to the allocation of land to the other party, but emphasizes on the fact that the judgment of the Court virtually amounts to a mandamus to destroy the Babri Masjid. Hence, such controversial interpretations cannot pave way towards the admission of the petition, as it still does not clear the grounds of review under the required Article and Order.

d. The Petition further questioned whether the Court has ignored the wrongs committed by the Hindu parties in 1934, 1949 and 1992, as to which the Court has already given orders stating the same were wrongful and illegal and has duly acknowledged the acts before passing the said judgment.

e. Similarly the Petition sought clarification over the evidentiary value of the ASI reports and the gazettes, which have also been duly answered in the judgment itself, and stands no reasonable ground for the said review.

It is for these reasons that the filing of review petition is not the best of the decisions and with all reasonable factors does not stand valid in the eyes of law.

Before filing such mischievous Review in such a sensitive matter, the Petitioner has to think that the land has not been given to any person or individual, it has been given to the Deity. Deity has never committed any illegal act upon anybody. In fact illegality has been committed upon the Deity for centuries by the invaders. Then what is this argument that Court has awarded certain illegal acts. Is it even sane to say that giving land to the Deity is an award to the criminals? This Petition is clearly filed with intent to disrupt the harmony and peace in our society. The Socio-Political message which this Petition tries to convey is dangerous and the Society needs to remain wary of such groups.

(The author is an Advocate in the Supreme Court of India. He is also Research Fellow, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee Research Foundation.)
‘HRIDAY’ is need of hour for returning Ayodhya its past glory

By Dr. Ajit Jha & Dr. Arvind Pandey

Construction of an impressive Ram temple will, in all likelihood, start in a year after being paved by a historical judgment on the Ayodhya dispute by the Supreme Court. It will take place after nearly 500 years of struggle. Although the first recorded legal fight between proponents of temple and backers of mosque in Ayodhya dates back to November 30, 1858 when one Mohammad Salim lodged an FIR against a group of Nihang Sikhs who had written 'Ram' inside the Babri mosque.

Leaving the chequered past of Ayodhya behind, the apex court through its landmark judgment has given a fresh lease of life to the city which, as per eminent historian Meenakshi Jain's book 'Rama and Ayodhya', was founded in 'Satya Yuga' by Manu, the progenitor of mankind. In coming years, on account of its religious and spiritual importance, the city is expected to get huge attraction from millions of Hindu devotees settled across the world. Then one should not forget about Ayodhya's historical connection with South Korea and Nepal.

However, before the construction of temple will start, the city needs to be included in the Ministry of Urban Development's HRIDAY (National Heritage City Development and Augmentation Yojna). In 2015, HRIDAY was launched with a focus on holistic development of heritage cities. Of the total 12 cities where this scheme is being implemented, Ayodhya is not among them.

According to the 2011 Census, Ayodhya is a part of Faizabad urban agglomeration and before 1981 it was a part of Faizabad-cum-Ayodhya Municipal Board. Thirty years ago, Faizabad-cum-Ayodhya Municipal Board was bifurcated into Faizabad Municipal Board and Ayodhya Municipal Board. Currently, Ayodhya is a Nagar Palika Parishad divided into 25 wards. The total area of this city is 10.24 sq. km. The total urban population of Ayodhya city was 49,417 in 2001, which increased to 55,890 in 2011 with an annual growth rate of 1.23 per cent between 2001 and 2011.

The sex ratio of city is 763 females per 1000 males against the state average of 912. The literacy rate (78.15 per cent) is, however, slightly higher than the state average of 67.68 per cent. The workforce participation rate in the city was 31.35 per cent. A total of 48.57 per cent males and only 8.76 per cent females were in workforce in 2011.

Ayodhya Nagar Palika Parishad has total administration over 10,026 households to which it supplies basic amenities like water and sewerage. Yet basic amenities available to the city dwellers are not very satisfactory. According to the 2011 Census, a total of 23 per cent households in Ayodhya practiced open defecation. Only 69 per cent households enjoyed toilet facility within premises, of which only 71 per cent had flush/pour toilet facility with septic tanks.
Hand pump was the main source of drinking water in Ayodhya city as a total of 60 per cent household used it in 2011. Only 37 per cent households had access to tap water. Similarly, only 78 per cent households used electricity as main source of lightening. Kerosene was the second important source of lightening as a total of 19 per cent households used it in 2011.

In 2014, an international airport was proposed in the Ayodhya. To this regard, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by the Uttar Pradesh government with the Airports Authority of India (AAI). Years have passed since signing of MoU, the airport is yet to take a shape. Services available at railway and bus stations are not up to any standard. The nearest international airport is around 134 km away in Lucknow. Existing hotels and restaurants in Ayodhya fail to match even local standards, forget about meeting any international parameters on infrastructure and amenities.

These glaring lacking in basic amenities have to be addressed while setting the goal for developing the city as the key tourist place in the world. To this effect, investment has to be made for the development of the city’s infrastructure as well as road, rail and air connectivity has to be strengthened. Then on the pattern of Sabarmati river front, Saruyu river front can be developed to make the city more attractive and grand. Listing of Ayodhya under HRIDAY, will provide the city a chance to get its past glory back.

Under this scheme, the development of core heritage infrastructure such as water supply, sanitation, drainage, waste management, approach roads, footpaths, street lights and other urban centric conveniences can be improved and developed. The city has also a Faizabad-Ayodhya Master Plan which was approved by the Uttar Pradesh government in 2001 for the development of the city. Thereby at a time when the state government is planning to build a tallest statue of Lord Ram, there is also a need to implement the Master Plan for the city which, as per the book ‘Rama and Ayodhya,’ was handed over by Manu in ‘Satya Yuga’ to Ikshvaku whose clan Lord Ram belongs to.

*(Dr. Ajit Jha is a Assistant Professor, Institute for the Studies in Industrial Development, Delhi & Dr. Arbind Pandey is a Post-doctoral Fellow, National Institute of Urban Affairs)*
गररकता संशोधन विधेयक के देश के दोनों सदनों से मंजूर हो गया और इसी के साथ भारत के प्रदेश 3 देशों- पाकिस्तान, बांग्लादेश और अफगानिस्तान में धार्मिक आधार पर प्रताडित अल्पसंख्यकों को भारत की नागरिकता प्राप्त करने का अधिकार मिल गया है।

विविध ने इस बात पर हल्ला-हंगामा किया जिसका फलन वाला विषयक है, जबकि सरकार ने बार-बार यह किया कि भारत से पाकिस्तान के बाहर के हजारों की संख्या में लहलौटे अल्पसंख्यकों को पाकिस्तान में धार्मिक प्रताडित झेलनी पड़ी थी और अल्पसंख्यक भारत से भारत से लेकर बांग्लादेश में धार्मिक प्रताडित झेलना बढ़ रहा है।

नागरिकता संशोधन विधेयक के इस फैसले के साथ, कभी हां, कभी ना का रिस्टा रखकर शिवसेना ने भारतीय जनता पार्टी को मुक्तिलेक डालने की कोशिश जरूर की, लेकिन शिवसेना नेता संजय राजनीति पर धार्मिक राजस्थान में बोला प्रायोगिक शिवसेना की ही राजनीति पर भारी पड़ता दिख रहा है। शिवसेना नेतालेखन राजनीति को राजस्थान में 3 मिनट का समय आकर्षित था और उससे हैरान नेता बार-बार यह दिखाने के बावजूद संजय राजा ठूलों के आत्मवेदना सारी बात करते रहे। संजय राजा डायलॉग मारकर हरु हुए कुछ को खुद करते दिखे। संजय राजनीति ने राजस्थान में कहा कि आज जिस स्थल पर दोनों हों, वहां के हम हेडमास्टर हैं। डायलॉग मारकर संजय राजनीति शिवसेना के तीनों सांसद सदन से बाहर निकल गए, लेकिन जब नागरिकता संशोधन विधेयक पर मतदान हुआ तो समझ में आया कि संजय ने राजनीति पर मजबूत हो गए हैं।

नागरिकता संशोधन विधेयक के इस फैसले के साथ, कभी हां, कभी ना का रिस्टा रखकर शिवसेना ने भारतीय जनता पार्टी को मुक्तिलेक डालने की कोशिश किया। लेकिन शिवसेना नेता संजय राजनीति का राजस्थान में बोला डायलॉग शिवसेना की ही राजनीति पर भारी पड़ता दिख रहा है।

भारतीय जनता पार्टी पर हमेशा यह आरोप लगता रहा है कि पार्टी इसे सिफर लटकाया रखना चाहती है। अब लगतार नरेंद्र मोदी की सरकार फैसले लेकर इस आरोप को पूरी तरह से ध्वस्त करने में कामयाब रही है।

नागरिकता संशोधन विधेयक के इस फैसले के साथ, कभी हां, कभी ना का रिस्टा रखकर शिवसेना ने भारतीय जनता पार्टी को मुक्तिलेक डालने की कोशिश किया, लेकिन शिवसेना नेता संजय राजनीति का राजस्थान में बोला डायलॉग शिवसेना की ही राजनीति पर भारी पड़ता दिख रहा है।
पार्टी के साथ खड़े होना भारतीय राजनीति के एक और महत्वपूर्ण परिवर्तन के तीर पर याद किया जाएगा।

अमित शाह ने राजनीति में एक बात और पुलता तरीके से स्थापित करने की सफल कोशिश की। कांग्रेस सहित विपक्षी दल इसमें मुसलमानों के शामिल न होने की बात को देख, संविधान और मुसलमान विरोधी बताने की कोशिश कर रहे थे, लेकिन अमित शाह ने जवाब मे साफ कहा कि जिस समय का समाधान करते हैं, उसी पर पूरा ध्यान लगाते हैं और इसीलिए पड़ोसी मुसलमान देशों में धार्मिक प्रताड़ना के आधार पर हर अत्याचार को भारत का नागरिक बनाने वाला विधेयक पेश किया। अमित शाह ने लगे हाथों कांग्रेस सहित विपक्षी दलों की इस बात को भी रखा, कि उन्होंने संफल मुसलमानों को चिंतित किया। महात्मा गांधी के हवाले से गृह मंत्री ने पूरा ध्यान दिया और इसलिए पड़ोस मुसलमान देशों में धार्मिक प्रताड़ना के आधार पर हर अत्याचार को भारत का नागरिक बनाने वाला विधेयक पेश किया।

शिवसेना नेता संजय राउत को राजनीति में 3 मिनट का समय आवंटित था और उसमें पढ़ाई बढ़ाने के बार-बार याद दिलाने के साथ संजय राउत डायलॉग मारकर ही खुद को खुश करते दिखे। संजय राउत ने राजनीति में कहा कि हमेशा आपके स्कूल में पढ़ाई करते हैं, भरोसे से हमेशा खुशी देते हैं। संजय राउत ने कहा कि यह बात है कि हमेशा स्कूल में पढ़ाई करते हैं, भरोसे से हमेशा खुशी देते हैं।

शिवसेना नेता संजय राउत को राजनीति में 3 मिनट का समय आवंटित था और उसमें पढ़ाई बढ़ाने के बार-बार याद दिलाने के साथ संजय राउत डायलॉग मारकर ही खुद को खुश करते दिखे। 

शिवसेना नेता संजय राउत को राजनीति में 3 मिनट का समय आवंटित था और उसमें पढ़ाई बढ़ाने के बार-बार याद दिलाने के साथ संजय राउत डायलॉग मारकर ही खुद को खुश करते दिखे।
टे लदशा में रिाज़ात की महत्वपूर्ण रही। जहां िे लरिक्स सममेिन में शालमि हुए। इसके संक्षेप में रिाज़ात नरेंद्र मोदषी की हषी प्रसतािों को महत्वपूर्ण रहे। जो ऊर्जा संधाभषों में संहली हुए। रिाज़ात, रूस, भारत, चीन और दक्षिण अफ्रीका के साथ लरिक्स सदस्य देशों के साथ लरिक्स संबंध बनाए। लरिक्स की संगठन तथा शासन भवन के साथ सहमलत हुई। रिाज़ात, रूस, भारत, चीन और दक्षिण अफ्रीका के नेताओं के साथ लरिक्स सीमा के साथ सहमलत हुए। लरिक्स की सममेिन 2009 में हुई थी। अगले वर्ष दक्षिण अफ्रीका के साथ सहमलत हुई। लरिक्स की राजधानी जापान में रिाज़ात के लिए आमंत्रण जाएगा।

लरिक्स सममेिन से इतर नरेंद्र मोदषी ने चीन के राष्ट्रपति जिनपिंग और चीन के राष्ट्रपति पुलिन से भी मुलाकात की। इसमें द्रिपश्चिमी रणनीतिक साझेदारी मजबूत करने पर सहमलत व्यक्त की गई। पुलिन ने रिाज़ात मोदषी को अगले वर्ष मई में रूस में होने वाले व्यक्ति दिनसमारोह के लिए आमंत्रित किया, जिसे प्रधानमंत्री मोदषी ने स्वीकार कर लिया।

लरिक्स सममेिन से इतर नरेंद्र मोदषी ने चीन के राष्ट्रपति जिनपिंग और चीन के राष्ट्रपति पुलिन से भी मुलाकात की। इसमें द्रिपश्चिमी रणनीतिक साझेदारी मजबूत करने पर सहमलत व्यक्त की गई। पुलिन ने रिाज़ात मोदषी को अगले वर्ष मई में रूस में होने वाले व्यक्ति दिनसमारोह के लिए आमंत्रित किया, जिसे प्रधानमंत्री मोदषी ने स्वीकार कर लिया।
EcoAgri Policy Diary
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Doubling farmer’s income and agricultural exports will have long terms of impact on the Indian economy. In order to achieve this agricultural industry needs to be flourished by all mean. In this new section of EcoAgri Policy Diary pain points of the Indian agricultural industry have been analyzed and proposed possible policy intervention on it.

Pain points and solutions of Indian Agriculture industry:

1. Small and fragmented land-holdings: According to the Agriculture Census, average landholding in India is 1.15 hectares per farmer. In India, 85% of farmers are in marginal and small farm categories of less than 2 hectares. Agriculture is not viable in small and fragmented landholdings. Further average landholding in India is decreasing. The problem of small and fragmented holdings is more serious because it directly impacts on productivity and profitability of agriculture. Irrigation becomes difficult in such small and fragmented fields. Further, a lot of fertile agricultural land is wasted in providing boundaries. Under such circumstances, the farmer cannot concentrate on improvement. However small and fragmented land holding problems can be addressed by the consolidation of holdings (reallocation of holdings which are fragmented), cooperative farming (farmers can pool their resources and share the profit), a product-based cluster where farmers can share land and resources and community farming.

2. Good agricultural practices: The majority of Indian farmers are not implementing good agricultural practices that seriously impact on quality and quantity of productions. Good agricultural practices include (Use of good seeds, Manures, Fertilizers and Biocides, soil testing, judicious use of pesticides, pre and post-harvest, use of mechanizations, etc.). This problem can be addressed by creating awareness in farmers, promoting good agricultural practices, incentives good agricultural practices and connect the field to the laboratory.

3. Irrigations: Agricultural productivity and production largely depend on water, irrigation is basic input for agriculture. Indian agriculture is very sensitive to the climate. Only one-third of the cropped area is under irrigation. This problem can be addressed by promoting a watershed development programme, incentives drip irrigation and bringing small farmers in an irrigation bracket.

4. Productivity Profitability Statement of Agricultural Exports Economy of India: Productivity levels in Indian agriculture is very low as compared to the productivity levels of other countries. Productivity levels of India in major agricultural export crops are very disappointing. India is one the
largest producers of most of the crops (both food grains and no-food grain) but ranks are very low in terms of productivity. The following are the productivity profitability analysis of important agricultural export commodities of India. However, possible remedies to increase productivity are land reforms, awareness, land-water resources, micro-credit and marketing facilities, better irrigation, a supply of quality seeds, intercrop farming, scientific cultivation, good agriculture practices, investment flow, strengthening basic infrastructure and involvement of professional experts in the supply chain. According to productivity and profitability statements, there is huge potential for India to increase the production of the Indian Agriculture sector.

5. Access to Small farmers in the international market: The involvement of small and marginal farmers in the export basket is a highly challenging task because they have limited resources. However, without the involvement of 85 million small and marginal farmers in the export business, India’s agriculture export policy will not be successful. Agriculture export significantly influences farmers’ incomes because if there is export it does have an impact on the price of the same product in the domestic market too. A single marginal farmer may not able to export, but with combined resources of a number of farmers, exports can happen. Therefore, it is very important to have an active export
cluster at the district level in order to tap the export potential of small and marginal farmers; through this, they can have the benefits of export business.

6. **Transport and Marketing issues of Agri Products in India**: Cost competitiveness is a very essential factor in the international market. In Indian agriculture internal as well as external transportation cost is high which directly impact on agriculture export. It has also impact on the profit margin of the farmers and affordability to consumers. As compared to the other major agricultural exporting countries, India's transportation and marketing costs are comparatively high. This problem can be addressed by financially supporting farmers in transportation and marketing agricultural goods. The separate scheme may be formed which may include domestic and international transport and marketing issues of agricultural products.

7. **Ease of doing agribusiness index**: In India, a new era of agribusiness has just began where agriculture is being seen through the spectacles of business. Agri-business has the potential to change the game and it plays an important role in the eradication of poverty, balancing economic inequality and providing for better rural livelihoods. However some more parameters are required calculating the ease of doing business such as training to farmers and young entrepreneurs, awareness creation of micro-financial management, etc. Entrepreneur skills development among farmers fosters agribusinesses in the respective States. Agribusinesses are micro-businesses which include vegetables and fruits shop, poultry, goat rearing, small processing plants, etc.

8. **Price competitiveness**: In international market price competitiveness is the issue for Indian agriculture products. Efforts have made to increase price competitiveness such as increasing productivity, branding, less cost of production, etc.

9. **Lack of market information**: Market intelligence in agriculture plays a very important role because it gives adequate market information on a basis in which farmers, processors, and exports can take the right decisions. Hence it is available that there must be market intelligence cell at every district level.

10. **Lack of processing units**: There is a big market for good quality agricultural processed foods however there is a lack of processing units. More processing units can be developed by promoting entrepreneurship in the agricultural sector.

11. **Flow of investment**: Considering agro-climatic conditions India has tremendous potential for value-added agricultural products exports. However, need more investment in this sector. Separate provisions are needed for agricultural value-added products in new foreign trade policy.

Agricultural and aligned industry is the real backbone of Indian economy. Higher economic growth can’t be achieved by not enhancing the contribution of the agricultural industry. Therefore strategic inputs are required to strengthen the agricultural industry. Doing well by the agricultural industry is in the interest of nation.

*(The author is a APEDA, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India)*
भ्रष्टाचार रोकने में सफल साबित हो रही मोदी सरकार

दी सरकार की भ्रष्टाचार रोकने की मुहिम सफल होती दिख रही है, इस बात का खुलासा हाल में आई कुछ रिपोर्टों से हुआ है। वित्त वर्ष 2019 में देश के 20 राज्यों में भ्रष्टाचार 10 प्रतिशत कम हुआ है। इंडिया करपशन सिके की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार, सरकार कामकाज में राजस्वतखोरी पर चिंतायों में गिराम गिरायी है।

भ्रष्टाचार संबंधी 248 जिलों के 1,90,000 लोगों से भ्रष्टाचार और राजस्वतखोरी से संबंधित सवाल पूछे गये थे। इस संबंधी 51 प्रतिशत लोगों ने कहा कि उन्हें पिछले 12 महीनों में एक बार राजस्वतख ही है। यह सवाल ट्रांसपेरेंसी इंटरनेशनल इंडिया ने किया था, जो एक गैर राजनीतिक, स्वतंत्र और गैर सरकारी भ्रष्टाचाररोधी संगठन है।

ग्लोबल वाचडॉग ट्रांसपेरेंसी इंटरनेशनल के वार्षिक सूचकांक के अनुसार भारत 41 अंकों के साथ 78िें स्थान पर है। भारत ने मामले में तीन अंकों का सुधार किया है। राष्ट्रपति शी जिनपिंग के जबरदस्त भ्रष्टाचार विरोधी अभियान के बावजूद चीन भ्रष्टाचार की रेंकिंग में ऊपर है। जानकारों के मुताबिक भारत ने भ्रष्टाचार की रोकथाम के मामले में पड़ोसी देशों से बेहतर प्रदर्शन किया है।

भ्रष्टाचार विकास की राह में सबसे बड़ा रोड़ा है। बढ़ते वैश्विक, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार, वित्तीय लेनदेन के दौर में भ्रष्टाचार की गूँज साफ तौर पर सुनाई देती है। आज कोई भी ऐसा देश नहीं है, जो अपने यहाँ इसकी उपवसथवत से मना सके। देखा जाता है, तो लेनदेन की लागत में इजाफा, निवेश में कमी या बढ़ोतरी या संसाधनों के दुरुपयोग में भ्रष्टाचार की सक्रियता बढ़ जाती है।

भ्रष्टाचार विकास की राह में सबसे बड़ा रोड़ा है। बढ़ते वैश्विक, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार, वित्तीय लेनदेन के दौर में भ्रष्टाचार की गूँज साफ तौर पर सुनाई देती है। आज कोई भी ऐसा देश नहीं है, जो अपने यहाँ इसकी उपवसथवत से मना सके। देखा जाता है, तो लेनदेन की लागत में इजाफा, निवेश में कमी या बढ़ोतरी या संसाधनों के दुरुपयोग में भ्रष्टाचार की सक्रियता बढ़ जाती है।

“भ्रष्टाचार विकास की राह में सबसे बड़ा रोड़ा है। बढ़ते वैश्विक, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार, वित्तीय लेनदेन के दौर में भ्रष्टाचार की गूँज साफ तौर पर सुनाई देती है। आज कोई भी ऐसा देश नहीं है, जो अपने यहाँ इसकी उपवसथवत से मना सके। देखा जाता है, तो लेनदेन की लागत में इजाफा, निवेश में कमी या बढ़ोतरी या संसाधनों के दुरुपयोग में भ्रष्टाचार की सक्रियता बढ़ जाती है।”

भ्रष्टाचार विकास की राह में सबसे बड़ा रोड़ा है। बढ़ते वैश्विक, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार, वित्तीय लेनदेन के दौर में भ्रष्टाचार की गूँज साफ तौर पर सुनाई देती है। आज कोई भी ऐसा देश नहीं है, जो अपने यहाँ इसकी उपवसथवत से मना सके। देखा जाता है, तो लेनदेन की लागत में इजाफा, निवेश में कमी या बढ़ोतरी या संसाधनों के दुरुपयोग में भ्रष्टाचार की सक्रियता बढ़ जाती है।
वर्ष 2016 में कुल शिकायतों में से बाहरी शिकायत केवल 0.17% ही प्राप्त हुए थे, जो इस बात का संकेत है कि पहले की तुलना में प्रशासन ज्यादा साफ-सुथरे हुए हैं। इसी वजह से बाहरी शिकायतों में कम आ रही है। ई-लिविंग, ई-खरीद, रिचर्स नीलामी आदि नवीन प्रौद्योगिकी के जरिए होने से शासन एवं उसके कार्यविधियों में ट्रांसपेरेंसी आई है।

भ्रष्टाचार की धारणा सूचकांक

पारंपरिक इंटरनेशनल द्वारा प्रकाशित भ्रष्टाचार की धारणा सूचकांक में वर्ष 2011 से वर्ष 2016 के दौरान भारत, ब्रिटेन, जर्मनी और इटली जैसे देश समग्र रूप से उनन्यन करने में सफल रहे हैं। भारत वर्ष 2011 के 95वें स्थान पर आ गई थी, जबकि सिंगापुर, हांगकांग, मोरिशस, तुर्की और दक्षिण कोरिया जैसे देश भ्रष्टाचार के स्तर को कम करने में सफल नहीं रहे और उनकी समग्र श्रेणी और विकास दरों में गिरावट दर्ज की गई।

निष्कर्ष

भ्रष्टाचार विकास की राह में सबसे बड़ा रोडा है। बहुतें वैश्विककरण, अंतरराष्ट्रीय व्यापार, वित्तीय लेनदेन के दौर में भ्रष्टाचार की गूंज साफ तौर पर सुनाई देती है। अब कोई भी ऐसा देश नहीं है, जो अपने यहाँ इसकी उपस्थिति से मना कर सके। देखा जा सके तो लेनदेन की लागत में इजाफा, निवेश में कमी या व्याप्ती या संसाधनों के दुरुपयोग में भ्रष्टाचार की सक्रियता बढ़ जाती है।

भ्रष्टाचार का प्रतिकूल प्रभाव निर्णय लेने की शक्ति और प्राथमिकताओं के चयन पर भी पड़ता है। ऐसे में यदि भारत में भ्रष्टाचार में कमी आ रही है तो वह संतोष की बात है, लेकिन अभी सरकार को इस दिशा में और बहुल काम करने की जरूरत है जिससे इस व्यापार का समूल अंत किया जा सके।

(लेखक भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के कॉरपोरेट केंद्र मुंबई के आधिकृत अनुसंधान विभाग में कार्यरत हैं। ये उनके निजी विचार हैं।)
रत के वाम-उदारवादी बौद्धिक वर्ग और उन की तरफ से खड़ी की गई संस्थागत पाखंड के प्रतिक थे। वे वामपंथी मीडिया के माध्यम से खुद को ‘उच्च नैतिक आधार’ पर खड़ा हुआ दिखाते हैं। ऐसे दिखाते हैं, जानकारी भरी सत्यता जानते हैं और भारत में वर्तमान संस्थाएं पाखंड के प्रति ध्यान देते हैं। वे अपने प्रतिक गठन और उन की तरफ से खड़ी की संस्थागत पाखंड के प्रति ध्यान देते हैं। यह ध्यान देते हैं, कि उन का बातचीत स्पष्ट है, जिनके उधारणों के साथ भागते हैं और स्पष्ट निर्देश देते हैं।

राम मंदिर मुद्दे पर इलाहाबाद वामपंथी इतिहासकारों ने इन सभी वामपंथी इतिहासकारों को गवाही के लिए दुखाया। वे ने उन वातों के पक्ष में कहा कि सामग्री का उपयोग करके दुखाया। उन्होंने लिखा है कि उन्हें वामपंथी इतिहासकारों की उन सभी धारणाओं को खारिज करने के लिए आधार दिया है। इस दिशा में उन्होंने इतिहासकारों को उनके अनुभवों के आधार पर नष्ट करके मजबूत आक्रोश उतार दिया है।

राम मंदिर मुद्दे पर इलाहाबाद वामपंथी इतिहासकारों ने इन सभी वामपंथी इतिहासकारों को गवाही के लिए दुखाया। वे इन वातों के पक्ष में कहा कि सामग्री का उपयोग करके दुखाया। उन्होंने लिखा है कि उन्हें वामपंथी इतिहासकारों की उन सभी धारणाओं को खारिज करने के लिए आधार दिया है। इस दिशा में उन्होंने इतिहासकारों को उनके अनुभवों के आधार पर नष्ट करके मजबूत आक्रोश उतार दिया है।

राम मंदिर मुद्दे पर इलाहाबाद वामपंथी इतिहासकारों ने इन सभी वामपंथी इतिहासकारों को गवाही के लिए दुखाया। वे इन वातों के पक्ष में कहा कि सामग्री का उपयोग करके दुखाया। उन्होंने लिखा है कि उन्हें वामपंथी इतिहासकारों की उन सभी धारणाओं को खारिज करने के लिए आधार दिया है।
जिस खुदाई पर आधारित पुरातत्त्व विभाग की रिपोर्ट में जिस मुल्लीम ने अपने फैसले में बार-बार कहा कि इलाहाबाद हाईकोट को नाम कराया, उन्होंने लिखा है कि "हमने सभी लिखत और पुरातत्त्व शास्त्रों की जांच के और इस निर्देश पर पहुंचे कि कोई हीं मंदिर नहीं था।"

इससे पहले यहाँ बात होती थी, उन्होंने इलाहाबाद हाईकोट के फैसले को राजनीतिक कार्य देखा था क्योंकि का काम कोई राष्ट्र कबीला बहुत पहले हो जा चुका था, रोमिना थार पी. विनियंत्त और एस. गोपाल ने मुल्लीम परस्परता लगों बोड़ों का यह कर कर फ़ाक्या कि 19वीं सदी से पहले मंदिर तोड़े जाने का क्यों किसका निष्ठावाद और अर्थधारा बोड़ों और वैद्यों का क्रेट रहा हूँ। इन नीतियों के इरादन हवन, आर एस शमा, डी.एन ज्ञ, और अस्त अती जैसे धार्मिक निष्ठावाद कराए।

बार-बार फैसले को बागड़ते होने के मौके पर 12 मास 2003 को कहा था उसे इलाहाबाद हाईकोट के खड़े होते हैं। इससे 3.5 फीट की ऊँचाई पर 4.75 गुना 4.75 फीट की ऊँचाई बना था। इससे एक संप्रभु अधिकारी इसका निर्माण करने के अन्य इलाहाबाद समस्याओं के साथ होता था, जहाँ उन्होंने कहा कि बाबर विश्वास बहुत पहले हो जाता, रोलमिक थापर, लबलपन चन्द्र और एस. गोपाल ने मुल्लीम बुलधिज्ञों को लझागभ्रलमत नहीं कर ले तो इलाहाबाद हाईकोट के पहले मंदिर तोड़ने का कहीं कोई जुक माना जा सकता है।

इस मामले में सुप्रिया वर्मा का उदाहरण लिया गया, वह जेएन्यू में प्रोफेसर हैं और खुदाई के दीर्घ मुल्लीम बोड़ की ओर से पर्यायवाची थी। उन्होंने मायक्ले में अन्तरराष्ट्रीय साक्ष्यों में दाखिला किया कि "कोई पुरातत्त्व शास्त्र नहीं है कि बाबर मंदिर के नीचे एक मंदिर था।" हाफिजन और सगाई के साथ 2018 में एक साक्ष्य में, उन्होंने कहा कि "बाबर मंदिर के नीचे, पुराने मंदिर को भी हो सकता है।" अभी के जरूर रोलमिक थापर, लबलपन चन्द्र और एस. गोपाल ने मुल्लीम पस्नियों को बोलते हैं जब चित्तरा इलाहाबाद के बाद भी फैसला बाबर को भी जरूर लिखाए जाएगा।
रेणु मोदी सरकार के दूसरे कार्यकाल में संसद किसी एक व्यक्ति पर केन्द्रित रहती है, तो यह यह यह मंत्री अमित शाह है. उन्होंने देश का आध्यात्म भी किया कि मुस्लिमों को इससे बचने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है. इन सब के बावजूद विश्व इस विचारक को मस्तिम और बैंग्लादेश में भाषा देने का काम कर रहा है. विभिन्न दलों के नेताओं के बीच उनके वक्तव्यों से इन निर्णय पर पहुँचने में मदद करते हैं जिसमें यह जाने में सहायता भी करता है.

आदर्श तिवारी
नरेंद्र मोदी सरकार के दूसरे कार्यकाल में पार्टी जनसंघ के ज्ञानी से जो प्रतिबद्धता और वायदे करती आई है, उन वायदों को ऐतिहासिक दार्शनिकी से पूरा कर रही है। तीन तलाक, अनुच्छेद 370,रामपरवर्धी और अब नागरिकता संस्थापन विधेयक के माध्यम से लंबे समय से लंबित एक और युद्ध को संस्थाई में पारित करना सरकार की लहर इतराहारी को दिखाई है।

जनसंघ के ज्ञानी से ज्ञानी जो ज्ञानी प्रति भोजी को नरेंद्र मोदी ने पूरा किया
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Discussion on “Citizenship Amendment Bill & Future Roadmap for West Bengal” at West Bengal on 15 December 2019
Discussion on “Jammu & Kashmir New Vision - New Narrative” at Delhi on 30 November 2019
SPMRF Round Table Series: Discussion on “Understanding the Modi Govt’s Decision on RCEP” by Prof. Biswajit Dhar (Professor, Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, School of Social Sciences, JNU) on 21 November 2019
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“Let us not forget that the Hindus of East Bengal are entitled to the protection of India, not on humanitarian consideration alone, but by virtue of their sufferings and sacrifices, made cheerfully for generations, not for advancing their own parochial interests, but for laying the foundations of India’s political freedom and intellectual progress. It is the united voice of the leaders that are dead and of the youth that smilingly walked up to the gallows for India’s cause that calls for justice and fairplay at the hands of Free India of today.”

-Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee
in Parliament on his resignation as Minister of Industry and Supply,
19th April, 1950