



THE TIMES OF INDIA

Date: 25-07-18

Patently Flawed

India must allow foreign universities to boost Indian research

TOI Editorials



In statistics that show Indian research in poor light, the number of patents filed by a single US firm in India in 2016-17 was more than double of all applications filed by top laboratories in the country, including 50 labs under DRDO, more than 40 labs in IISc, 23 IITs and six research facilities under Isro. All of these institutes together filed 781 patent applications while Qualcomm Inc filed 1,840 applications. Glaringly, a total of 45,444 patents were filed in 2016-17 in the country of which 71% were filed by foreigners. Even if one accounts for the fact

that a significant number of these was filed to prevent reproduction of foreign technology in India, the disparity is huge. This is the result of the lack of a patent culture in India, which in turn stems from poor quality of research in universities and technical institutes.

Higher academia in India is geared towards churning out degree holders, not fostering an ecosystem for meaningful research. The only way to rectify this situation is to allow reputed foreign universities and research institutions to set up shop in India, a country that abounds in talent. After all, Indians are behind path-breaking research and innovation abroad, as exemplified by their significant presence in America's Silicon Valley. However, at this point of time, Indian institutions aren't doing a great job of nurturing this talent. If India is to become a global knowledge hub, the need of the hour is to create a local ecosystem for cutting edge R&D. This can be enabled, and the haemorrhaging of talent from Indian shores prevented, by permitting foreign universities to set up their own campuses in India – which would allow students to acquire prestigious foreign degrees at a fraction of the cost. This is precisely the path that Malaysia has adopted. There's no reason for India to lag behind.

Date: 25-07-18

A Lynching Foretold

Supreme Court warned of districts like Alwar, yet vigilantes continued in defiance of court orders

TOI Editorials

The blame game between Alwar police and the local BJP MLA over the latest gau raksha related lynching reveals complicity at multiple levels. Both police and politics are under scrutiny just days after Supreme Court issued a series of directions to state governments and district police functionaries to curb mob violence. The alleged proximity of the vigilantes to the MLA could explain the impunity but the police themselves have much to answer for. Their conduct in first transporting victim Rakbar's cows to a gaushala and stopping for tea before taking him to a hospital signify dereliction of duty of the highest order. The Alwar episode has forced Union government to begin deliberations that could lead to a separate penal provision to tackle lynchings. But legislation in the Indian system often becomes a substitute for political will and administrative action.

For example, new legislations pushed through in recent years to address rising sexual offences against women and children, had little discernible impact. Outrage is growing at all this prevarication even as India's international image takes a beating. Union ministers are rushing to condemn government critics like Rahul Gandhi instead of focusing on justice and corrective steps. The high decibels at which those asking the government to change tack are being shouted down are in stark contrast to the low, sometimes inaudible pitch at which ministers condemn lynchings. Even political gains from gau raksha are doubtful. Alwar has been a hotspot of this violent movement, but in Lok Sabha bypolls earlier this year BJP faced a massive drubbing, losing to Congress by 1.96 lakh votes.

Yet the project to blame lynch victims and rationalise vigilantism proceeds in right earnest. A Union minister's claim that lynchings were a bid to arrest PM Modi's popularity was followed by a senior RSS leader who believes lynchings will end if people stop eating beef. Even BJP ally and fellow Hindutva traveller Uddhav Thackeray has questioned BJP's obsession with gau raksha at the expense of law and order. Government's failure to end impunity for gau rakshaks must prompt Supreme Court to view the Alwar incident as contempt of court. SC had laid emphasis on districts with a history of lynchings. It is indeed a sad irony of "new India" that SC's red flags about the susceptibility of districts like Alwar went unheeded.

Date: 25-07-18

India's Trade Policy Folly

Current turn to import substitution will take economy down from turnpike to dirt road

Arvind Panagariya, (The writer is Professor of Economics at Columbia University)

Trade openness today faces both external and internal challenges in India. Externally, tariff hikes on aluminium and steel imports by the United States invited retaliation by us, at least as a last resort. We also face challenges of secondary sanctions arising out of the US sanctions against Iran and Russia. Internally, bureaucratic forces have regrouped to return India to import substitution. This column is exclusively about the latter, internal challenge. Despite repeated assertions that 'Make in India' is about making for the world, in reality, it is the 'Make in India for India' view that is winning. The first significant tilt in this direction came with the extensive tariff hikes in the 2018-19 budget, which the revenue secretary later defended as necessary to promote import substitution.

True to his word, he went on to deliver additional tariffs subsequently. To top it all, we have now appointed a taskforce headed by the cabinet secretary aimed at cutting imports of items that India can produce at home. It may be recalled that the key elements of our 1991 reforms were end to import licensing on all products other than consumer goods, two back-to-back devaluations of the rupee, end to investment licensing and opening to foreign investment. During the subsequent two decades, the process of import liberalisation was deepened with complete dismantling of import licensing regime in 2001 and a decline in the average industrial tariff from 113% in 1990-91 to 12% in 2007-08. That liberalisation brought us handsome rewards. Between 2003-04 and 2011-12, India's GDP grew 8.2% annually leading to massive fall in poverty. Alongside, imports of goods and services expanded from \$85 billion in 2002 to \$642 billion in 2011-12.

The expansion of exports and remittances from \$92 billion to \$518 billion over the same period helped sustain these imports. What was the connection between rapid growth in the GDP and the expansion of imports and exports? As we liberalised trade, we produced and exported more and more of those products for which our production costs were lower than our trading partners and imported more and more of the products for which our production costs were higher. To use the economist's jargon, we specialised in and exported products in which we enjoyed comparative advantage and imported products in which we lacked comparative advantage. This same explanation also goes a long way (though it is not the whole story) towards explaining why our performance was so abysmal during the first three and a half decades after Independence.

During those decades, we kept tightening our import regime more and more and pushing the economy into producing goods in which we lacked comparative advantage. Sadly, our current turn to import substitution threatens to return us from the turnpike on which we have been travelling all these years on to the dirt road. To be sure, with imports and exports of goods and services at 21.6% and 19.6% of the GDP respectively in 2016-17, we are far more open today than in the 1950s when we first experimented with import substitution. For this reason and because response to any policy change takes time, we will not feel the impact of our mistake immediately. But if we stay the current course, we will eventually find ourselves on the dirt road. Then, no matter how powerful the engine of our vehicle, we will slow down.

There is no wisdom in producing at home products that we can buy abroad at lower cost using our export earnings. It is best to let a doctor do what he does the best and nuclear scientist do what she does the best. It is a trap to think that the doctor can also do what the nuclear scientist does and vice versa. The same principle applies to nations. Rather than appoint a taskforce to find ways to curb imports, our strategy should be to appoint a taskforce to devise strategies to expand exports and to do so on a war footing. That is precisely what President Park Chung-hee – who made South Korea what it is today – did. After he embarked upon an export-oriented strategy, he personally presided over many hundred meetings each year to ensure that bottlenecks facing exporters were promptly removed. In less than a decade, Korea's exports rose from just 3.5% of the GDP in 1963 to 21.3% in 1972. And Korea grew 9.5% annually during that same decade.

Mathematician and nuclear physicist Stanislaw Ulam once teased economics Nobel laureate Paul Samuelson, asking whether he could name "one proposition in all of the social sciences which is both true and non-trivial." Samuelson was dumbfounded at the time, but later wrote that his answer should have been the principle of comparative advantage. "That it is logically true need not be argued before a mathematician; that it is not trivial is attested by the thousands of important and intelligent men who have never been able to grasp the doctrine for themselves or to believe it after it was explained to them." No wonder, generation after generation of bureaucrats has tried to defy this immutable principle and time and again produced outcomes that only go to prove its truth.

THE ECONOMIC TIMES

Date: 25-07-18

A Desirable Route To Flexible Resolution

ET Editorials

The new inter-creditor agreement (ICA), signed by two dozen banks and financial institutions, to resolve bad loans is welcome. It gives lenders flexibility in taking a call on a viable resolution plan, instead of being herded into taking haircuts that can be substantial, in many cases. The ICA, hopefully, would keep the RBI away from mandating banks to file insolvency petitions using the bankruptcy code. The leeway to banks, subject to their complying with RBI's non-performing asset (NPA) recognition norms, makes sense. A rigid framework does not provide banks an upside. In projects that have inherent viability, banks should have the freedom to convert debt into equity and participate in the upside when the project does turn around.

This can happen regardless of whether the banks retain a controlling stake or not. The ICA envisages the setting up of an asset management company (AMC), with equity contribution from banks, to take over bad loans and an alternate investment fund to raise money from institutional investors. This is welcome. It provides more time for the assets underlying the bad loans to realise their valuable potential. However, it calls for lowering the cost of the project, that is transferred to the AMC, to realistic levels. The haircut that banks would need to take can be recouped if the project turns around.

Capital can also be returned to the government if the assets are sold at a premium. Sensibly, the lead lender can offer to buy out the share of loans held by those not in favour of the resolution plan. It also allows promoters to continue to be in charge in some cases. This makes sense. Many businesses are

stressed due to sudden changes in policy, rather than managerial deficiency. The main benefit of the ICA is the flexibility banks acquire to resolve individual bad loans taking into account their specificities, instead of being straitjacketed into resolution under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, and accepting huge haircuts. However, for the scheme to work, bankers need protection from arbitrary arrests and criminalisation of motives.



दैनिक भास्कर

Date: 25-07-18

हिंसक भीड़ पर केंद्र सरकार के सख्त कदम के मायने

सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने केंद्र से कहा है कि वह भीड़ द्वारा की जा रही हत्या के विरुद्ध एक विशेष केंद्रीय कानून लाए

संपादकीय

यह अच्छी बात है कि अलवर में गोपालक किसान रकबर खान की भीड़ द्वारा पिटाई और उसे बचाने में पुलिस की लापरवाही पर चौतरफा प्रतिरोध के बाद केंद्र सरकार ने केंद्रीय गृह सचिव राजीव गौबा के नेतृत्व में समिति का गठन कर दिया है। उसी के साथ राजस्थान पुलिस का लापरवाही स्वीकार करना भी सही दिशा में उठाया गया कदम है। किसी भी बुराई के अंत की शुरुआत उसे स्वीकारने से होती है और उसे मिटाने के उपाय उसके बाद निकाले जाते हैं। उम्मीद है कि दोनों सरकारों की भंगिमा के पीछे न तो कोई राजनीतिक दिखावा है और न ही लीपापोती का इरादा।

हालांकि, राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ के नेता इंद्रेश कुमार कहते हैं कि भीड़ द्वारा हत्याओं का सिलसिला तब बंद होगा, जब गोमांस सेवन बंद हो जाएगा। देश के भीतर पनप रही यही सोच भारत में अल्पसंख्यकों और कमजोर लोगों पर अत्याचार का कारण है। इन स्थितियों को अगर दूर करना है और भारत को एक सहिष्णु लोकतंत्र बनाए रखना है तो उसकी प्रमुख संस्थाओं को संविधान की भावना से काम करने देना होगा। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने हाल में भीड़ द्वारा की जा रही हत्या से बेचैन होकर केंद्र और राज्य सरकारों को जो आदेश दिया है, उसका पूरा असर केंद्र पर दिख नहीं रहा है। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने केंद्र से कहा है कि वह भीड़ द्वारा की जा रही हत्या के विरुद्ध एक विशेष केंद्रीय कानून लाए और देश में कानून का राज कायम रहे।

इस बारे में राज्य और केंद्र दिशा-निर्देश तय करके काम करें। केंद्र सरकार सुप्रीम कोर्ट के इस आदेश का पालन यह कहकर नहीं कर रही है कि कानून और व्यवस्था राज्य का विषय है और उस पर कानून उसे ही बनाना चाहिए। इसके बावजूद गृह सचिव राजीव गौबा के नेतृत्व में गठित समिति में न्याय, कानून और सामाजिक न्याय मंत्रालय और सबलीकरण मंत्रालय के सचिव शामिल हैं। समिति चार हफ्ते में अपनी रिपोर्ट सौंपेगी और उस पर गृह मंत्री राजनाथ सिंह के नेतृत्व में कई मंत्रियों की समिति विचार करेगी। समिति के इस स्वरूप को देखकर यह अनुमान भी लगाया जा सकता है कि सरकार दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता में संशोधन पर विचार कर सकती है। अच्छा हो कि सरकार और सारे राजनीतिक दल

इस मामले पर चुनावी नजरिये से काम करने के बजाय लोकतंत्र और मानवता के लिहाज से काम करें। इसी में देश का भला है।

Date: 25-07-18



काले धन पर लगाम लगाना कठिन काम है, स्विस् बैंकों में जमा धन में कमी

संपादकीय



कार्यवाहक वित्त मंत्री पीयूष गोयल की ओर से यह जो दावा किया गया कि बीते चार-पांच सालों में स्विस् बैंकों में जमा धन में 80 प्रतिशत की कमी आई है वह एक माह पहले आई उस खबर का खंडन करता है जिसमें यह कहा गया था कि इन बैंकों में जमा भारतीयों की राशि में वृद्धि हुई है। वित्त मंत्री की मानें वह मनगढ़ंत खबर थी। अच्छा होगा कि अब वह इसकी तह तक भी जाएं कि ऐसी गलत और गुमराह करने वाली खबर कैसे इतनी महत्ता पा गई? हालांकि वित्त मंत्री पीयूष गोयल ने

अपने दावे के संदर्भ में स्विस् प्रशासन की ओर से दी गई जानकारी का उल्लेख किया, फिर भी विपक्ष और खासकर कांग्रेस एवं तृणमूल कांग्रेस के सांसद उसे मानने को तैयार नहीं। हैरानी नहीं कि वे स्विस् प्रशासन की ओर से दी गई जानकारी को फर्जी करार दें या फिर ऐसे तर्क लेकर आ जाएं कि मोदी सरकार ने मनमाफिक सूचना हासिल कर ली है।

जो यह मानने को तैयार नहीं कि काले धन पर कोई अंकुश लगा है वे किसी दावे पर भरोसा नहीं करने वाले, लेकिन तथ्य यह है कि काले धन पर लगाम लगाने के लिए मोदी सरकार ने बीते चार सालों में जैसे कदम उठाए हैं वैसे उसके पहले किसी सरकार ने नहीं उठाए। मोदी सरकार ने काले धन के कारोबार को नियंत्रित करने के लिए न केवल तमाम नियम-कानून बनाए, बल्कि अंतरराष्ट्रीय मंचों पर यह आवाज भी उठाई कि विश्व समुदाय को काले धन के खिलाफ कुछ कदम उठाने की जरूरत है। इतना ही नहीं उसने काले धन का ठिकाना बने देशों से ऐसे समझौते किए कि वे भारतीयों के खातों की जानकारी दें। इसी क्रम में स्विट्जरलैंड से दोहरे कराधान पर किए गए नए समझौते से यह जानकारी मिलना तय हुआ कि वहां के बैंकों में भारतीयों ने कितनी रकम जमा की? चूंकि यह जानकारी जनवरी 2019 के बाद मिलनी शुरू होगी इसलिए तब तक विपक्ष अपुष्ट स्रोतों से मिली कथित सूचनाओं को ही सही मानने पर जोर दे तो हैरत नहीं।

ध्यान रहे कि एक माह पहले सनसनीखेज तरीके से आई खबर में भी यह कहा गया था कि यह जरूरी नहीं कि स्विस् बैंकों में जमा सारा धन काला धन ही हो, फिर भी विपक्ष ने यही प्रचारित किया कि मोदी सरकार काले धन पर लगाम

लगाने में नाकाम रही। यह मानने का कोई कारण नहीं कि सरकार संसद में तथ्यों के विपरीत जानकारी देगी, लेकिन अब तो वह इससे अवगत हो ही गई होगी कि काले धन पर लगाम लगाना एक कठिन काम है। यह साफ है कि भाजपा सत्ता में आने के बाद ही काले धन पर अंकुश लगाने में आने वाली कठिनाई से परिचित हो पाई, लेकिन यह हास्यास्पद है कि इस कठिनाई से परिचित रही और काले धन के खिलाफ कड़े कदम उठाने से कतराती रही कांग्रेस भी यह चाह रही है कि प्रधानमंत्री हर एक खाते में 15-15 लाख रुपये डालने के अपने कथित वादे को पूरा करें। हर खाते में 15-15 लाख रुपये जमा कराने की मांग यही बताती है कि बचकानी राजनीति का कोई ओर-छोर नहीं।

Date: 25-07-18

बिज़नेस स्टैंडर्ड

वैज्ञानिक सोच और राजनीतिक बहस

समाज में वैज्ञानिक सोच-समझ पैदा करना अत्यंत आवश्यक है। तभी हम अपना मनचाहा भविष्य निर्मित कर पाएंगे

नितिन देसाई

हजारों वैज्ञानिकों, शिक्षाविदों और छात्रों ने अगस्त 2017 और अप्रैल 2018 में देश भर में विज्ञान मार्च का आयोजन किया। एक वैश्विक आंदोलन से प्रभावित ये प्रदर्शन हमारी राजनीतिक बहस में विज्ञान की घटती प्रतिष्ठा के विरोध का जरिया भी थे। इस वर्ष प्रदर्शन का आयोजन 14 अप्रैल को किया गया। उस दिन बाबा साहब भीमराव आंबेडकर की जयंती भी होती है। ये कदम उचित हैं क्योंकि वैज्ञानिक चेतना के प्रसार से समाज में हिंसा और दमन का कारण बनने वाले गलत विश्वासों का प्रतिरोध करने में मदद मिलेगी। राजनीतिक वर्ग के लोगों द्वारा गलत बातों को स्वर देने के कई उदाहरण हमारे आसपास मौजूद हैं। हम एक डिजिटल क्रांति के लक्ष्य के साथ आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। फिर भी हमारे एक नेता का कहना है कि महाभारत काल में भी इंटरनेट और उपग्रह आधारित संचार मौजूद था।

उनके मुताबिक अगर ऐसा नहीं होता तो संजय कैसे धृतराष्ट्र को कुरुक्षेत्र का पूरा ब्योरा दे पाते? यानी इंटरनेट भी था और उपग्रह तकनीक भी मौजूद थी। हमें चिकित्सा शोध की अत्यंत आवश्यकता है लेकिन सत्ताधारी दल के कुछ नेताओं का मानना है कि गाय का गोबर और गोमूत्र कैंसर तक ठीक कर सकते हैं। कोई कहता है कि गाय ऑक्सीजन छोड़ती है तो एक और नेता कहता है कि कर्ण का जन्म मां के गर्भ से नहीं हुआ, यानी उस वक्त भी जीन विज्ञान मौजूद था। एक बयान यह भी है कि हम भगवान गणेश की पूजा करते हैं। जरूर उस वक्त भी कोई प्लास्टिक सर्जन होगा जिसने मनुष्य के शरीर पर हाथी का सर लगाकर प्लास्टिक सर्जरी की शुरुआत की होगी। हमारा देश एक महत्वाकांक्षी परमाणु कार्यक्रम के साथ आगे बढ़ रहा है और एक राजनेता हमें बताते हैं कि महर्षि कणाद ने प्राचीन काल में ही परमाणु

परीक्षण किया था। उनके अनुसार हजारों वर्ष पुराने एक ऋषि की मान्यता थी कि परमाणु को नष्ट नहीं किया जा सकता। विज्ञान के मूलभूत सिद्धांतों के बारे में भी हमारे नेताओं के विचार ऐसे ही दिलचस्प हैं।

मिसाल के तौर पर, 'डार्विन का सिद्धांत गलत था क्योंकि किसी ने बंदर को मनुष्य में बदलते नहीं देखा। यह भी सुनने को मिला कि ज्योतिषशास्त्र सबसे बड़ा विज्ञान है, बल्कि वह विज्ञान से भी ऊंचा है।' ऐसा भी नहीं है कि ऐसे बयान यदाकदा दिए जाते हों। वैज्ञानिकों ने प्रधानमंत्री को जो ज्ञापन भेजा है उसमें आरोप लगाया गया है कि बिना किसी परीक्षण के अवैज्ञानिक विचारों को स्कूली किताबों और पाठ्यक्रम में शामिल किया जा रहा है। ऐसा एक उदाहरण एक स्कूली किताब में देखने को मिलता है जिसमें कहा गया है, 'भारतीय ऋषि अपनी योग विद्या का इस्तेमाल करके दिव्यदृष्टि प्राप्त करते थे। इसमें दो राय नहीं है कि टेलीविजन का आविष्कार इसी से जुड़ा हुआ है।' यहां तक कि विज्ञान से जुड़ी बैठकों में भी समस्याएं सामने आईं। सन 2015 की भारतीय विज्ञान कांग्रेस में प्रस्तुत एक पर्चे में दलील दी गई कि वैदिक काल में वैमानिकी के बारे में आधुनिक वैज्ञानिकों से अधिक ज्ञान था और उस वक्त भी विमान बनाए जाते थे जिनका इस्तेमाल अंतरग्रहीय यात्राओं में होता था। उनका आकार बहुत बड़ा था और उन्हें दाएं, बाएं और यहां तक कि पीछे भी उड़ाया जा सकता था जबकि आधुनिक विमान केवल आगे की ओर उड़ते हैं।

अतीत गौरव बुरी बात नहीं है। अतीत में हम कई क्षेत्रों में उल्लेखनीय उपलब्धियां हासिल कर चुके हैं। आर्यभट्ट, ब्रह्मांगुप्ता और भास्कर, सुश्रुत और चरक इसके उदाहरण हैं। मिस्र, मेसोपोटेमिया और ग्रीस के साथ प्राचीन संपर्क तथा मध्य काल में अरब विद्वानों के साथ जुड़ाव ने हमें और उन्हें दोनों को समृद्ध किया। परंतु मौजूदा राजनीतिक बहस इन उपलब्धियों पर बात करने के बजाय ऐसे दावों पर बात करती है जो संभवतः मिथक हैं। यहां भ्रम की स्थिति बनती है। अगस्त 2017 में कई वैज्ञानिकों ने अपनी अपील में कहा था, 'हम प्राचीन भारत में विज्ञान एवं प्रौद्योगिकी की महान उपलब्धियों से प्रेरित हो सकते हैं लेकिन हम देख रहे हैं कि उच्च पदस्थ लोगों द्वारा अप्रमाणित और अवैज्ञानिक विचारों को प्रश्रय दिया जा रहा है जो विवादों को जन्म दे रहा है।'

अतीत को यूँ अश्लील तरीके से प्रस्तुत करना न केवल विज्ञान को क्षति है बल्कि हमारे इतिहास पर भी हमला है। उससे भी बुरी बात यह है कि भीड़ के मन में पूर्वग्रह भरने और हत्याओं को वैधता प्रदान करता है। यह हमारे वेदों और समृद्ध विरासत को भी खराब कर रहा है। प्राचीन और मध्यकालीन भारतीय समाज दर्शन, धर्म आदि को लेकर अत्यंत सहिष्णु था। चार्वाक की भौतिकवादी परंपरा इसका हिस्सा रही है। उसे लोकायत के नाम से भी जाना जाता है और वह जनमानस में काफी लोकप्रिय रही है। 14वीं सदी में माधवाचार्य ने सर्व दर्शन संग्रह की रचना की। यह रचना स्पष्ट बताती है कि वह तार्किकता और अनुभवजन्य रुख के साथ आधुनिक विज्ञान के कितनी करीब है।

ज्ञान का अग्रिम मोर्चा भविष्य के हाथों में है जो अज्ञात है, न कि अतीत में। हमें भविष्य के उसी मोर्चे पर पहुंचना है। परंतु हमारी इस तलाश को विश्वसनीय बनाने के लिए राजनेताओं को विज्ञान के बारे में गलत बातें करना बंद करना होगा। उससे भी अहम बात यह है कि हमें कुछ बातों की पहचान करनी होगी:

ज्ञान आधारित समाज में वैज्ञानिक सोच और तार्किक मूल्य का होना जरूरी है। उसे विज्ञान पर विश्वास होना चाहिए और हर विश्वास का एक ठोस प्रमाण होना चाहिए। अंधविश्वास और नीम हकीमी हो सकते हैं लेकिन उसे लोगों का विचलित व्यवहार ही माना जाना चाहिए।

- ज्ञान आधारित समाज को निःशुल्क जांच को बढ़ावा देना चाहिए और असहमति को लेकर सहिष्णु होना चाहिए। दुनिया को देखने का उसका नजरिया शंकालु होना चाहिए। उसे बौद्धिकों को लेकर खासतौर पर सहिष्णु होना चाहिए। वे अगर गलत भी हों तो भी वे हमारे ज्ञान को बढ़ाने में मददगार साबित होते हैं।
- ज्ञान आधारित समाज में दुनिया को लेकर जिज्ञासा होनी चाहिए। सहिष्णुता केवल इस बात पर केंद्रित नहीं होनी चाहिए कि सच हमारे अलावा कहीं और भी हो सकता है बल्कि इसका संबंध विचारों और आस्थाओं के अनछुए पहलुओं से भी होना चाहिए।
- ज्ञान आधारित समाज में इस बात के लिए समय और संसाधन होने चाहिए कि ताकि नए विचारों का पीछा किया जा सके।
- ज्ञान आधारित समाज को ज्ञान की साझेदारी में यकीन करना चाहिए जहां अन्य लोग भी उसी राह पर आगे बढ़ रहे हों।

समाज में इस वैज्ञानिक सोच की स्थापना जरूरी है। उसी के आधार पर हम ऐसा भविष्य बना पाएंगे जैसा हम चाहते हैं। उसी के दम पर हम व्यापक प्रसार कर चुकी सामाजिक हिंसा का भी मुकाबला कर सकेंगे।



Date: 24-07-18

A Law For Children

Parliament must pass Trafficking Bill, Criminal Law Amendment for safety of minors.

Kailash Satyarthi, (The writer, a child rights activist, won the Nobel Peace Prize 2014)

Change is knocking on the door of Parliament. Millions are oppressed every day in brothels, homes, factories and hell-holes of endless violence against children. After rescuing tens of thousands of children, I can vouch that our children cannot wait any longer. I have heard rescued young girls talking about how they had been sold for a price much less than that of a buffalo. Recently, some children who were freed from a jeans factory in Delhi could barely open their eyes because they had not seen the sun for the last three years. Sitting and working for long hours without proper food had left them crippled. These are not isolated stories and should be looked against the overarching backdrop of a national emergency where eight children go missing every hour; four are sexually abused and two raped.

One ray of hope is a strong legal mechanism against trafficking and India is very close to coming up with a legislation that will break the backbone of trafficking. The Trafficking of Persons (Prevention, Protection and Rehabilitation) Bill, 2018 has been introduced in the Lok Sabha. The Bill is a moral victory for the 12 lakh Indians who marched with me in the 12,000-km Bharat Yatra last year declaring a war on child trafficking and the sexual abuse of children. An organised crime like trafficking needs a legislation that systematically dismantles the complicated modus-operandi of the traffickers. The proposed bill deals a solid blow to the very economics of trafficking as an illicit trade that fuels black money and corruption.

Trafficking is the largest illicit trade in the world which is pegged at \$150 billion. Every penny earned out of human trafficking is black money.

The Bill proposes time-bound completion of trials against perpetrators with strong economic deterrents like attachment and forfeiture of property and also the proceeds of crime. Further, rigorous imprisonment and massive fines will cripple this organised crime. The anti-trafficking bill also provides a comprehensive framework for rehabilitation in a time-bound manner, irrespective of conviction. The Bill calls for the creation of a central and state-level rehabilitation funds for the survivors of trafficking for the first time ever. Recently, an 11-year old girl was raped over several weeks in an apartment complex in Chennai, allegedly by 17 men. A 14- month-old girl was raped in Madhya Pradesh by a close relative. Such incidents are going up in the absence of a deterrent legal framework.

To counter this disturbing and growing phenomenon, the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill, 2018 stipulates extremely stringent punishment for perpetrators of rape on minor girls. It is appalling to note that the current pendency for disposing of rape cases in some states is as high as 50 to 100 years. Most important is the fact that the Bill will pave the way for time-bound disposal of trials ensuring expeditious justice delivery by setting up special fast-track courts in all districts and forensic laboratories in every state. This Bill, replacing the ordinance promulgated in April, will also be tabled in the ongoing monsoon session of Parliament along with the Anti-Trafficking Bill.

Over the last 10 years, India has made phenomenal progress in promulgating and amending several pieces of legislation that will go a long way in upholding the rights of its children — for example, the Right to Education Act (2009), POCSO Act (2012), Juvenile Justice Act (2015), the new child labour law of 2016. In addition, on several occasions during the last decade, the judiciary has delivered landmark judgments related to missing children, the establishment of anti-human trafficking units, recovery of back wages and ensuring compensation for survivors of modern slavery, among others. In the absence of a robust anti-trafficking law, the state is failing to fulfil its duties under these laws and judgments.

It is abundantly clear that to be able to deliver justice to the most vulnerable survivors of trafficking, lawmakers must ensure the speedy and unhindered passage of the Trafficking of Persons (Prevention, Protection and Rehabilitation) Bill, 2018 and the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill. Let me underline that laws and institutions cannot be perfect instruments of justice in one go. There is always room for improvement in any law, and that is how they evolve. But we cannot keep arguing, hoping for a utopic legislation. Laws are the only tools at our disposal for a just and equitable society. Eventually, all stakeholders have to collectively use their hearts, heads and hands to attain justice. The collective conscience of all my fellow citizens is the only way to protect our children and while these laws are the first step they are only the first step. Society must rise collectively to provide protection to our children.

Date: 24-07-18



Changing the order of battle

Traditional diplomacy appears to be giving place to big power summitry as the way to get things done

M.K. Narayanan, (M.K. Narayanan is a former National Security Adviser and a former Governor of West Bengal)

Increasingly, leaders in both democracies and authoritarian regimes are beginning to take a direct role in matters such as foreign policy, even as they preside over the destiny of their nations. Notable among those engaged in summit diplomacy are President Xi Jinping of China, President Vladimir Putin of Russia, and President Donald Trump of the U.S.

A recent phenomenon

Diplomacy is one of the world's oldest professions. Summit diplomacy is, however, a comparatively recent phenomenon. In previous centuries, world leaders met occasionally, and it was the advent of World War II that gave a fillip to summit diplomacy. The U.K., for instance, was aghast when Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain personally undertook a trip to meet Adolf Hitler in 1938, as war clouds enveloped Europe. Summit diplomacy, thereafter, picked up pace as the war progressed, and one of the most vivid pictures of the time (of the Yalta Conference) featured U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin. In the immediate post-war years, however, traditional diplomacy seemed to make a comeback — but more recently, given the inability of traditional diplomacy to sort out intractable problems, summit diplomacy has come into its own.

Summit styles are personal to each leader. One common feature, however, is that Foreign Office mandarins and ministers in charge of foreign affairs are being pushed into the background. Nuanced negotiating stances are no longer the flavour of diplomatic intercourse. Summit diplomacy again tends to disdain diplomatic rigmarole.

Personal leadership tends to be highly contextual. At times what appears inappropriate could become the norm. Attitudes also change given different situations. While leadership styles may differ, what is apparent is that leaders engaged in summit diplomacy are not unduly constrained by the need to adhere to the Westphalian order.

Strong leaders

Strong leadership and summit diplomacy do not necessarily translate into appropriate responses. Mr. Trump, hardly constrained by diplomatic etiquette, firmly believes in the aphorism, 'what starts with him changes the world'. He hardly ever debates the question, 'what will the world look like after you change it?' He is clearly an advocate of the thesis that 'a crisis by definition poses problems, but it also presents

opportunities'. Most of this is, no doubt, anathema to traditional diplomats, but the U.S. President seems to be following in the wake of former French President Charles de Gaulle, 'moving in the direction of history'.

Mr. Putin is less mercurial than Mr. Trump. He is, nevertheless, unflinching in his belief that he has the answers to Russia's problems, and how to take Russia from the low point of the Yelstin years to future glory. Having established an entente with China, he is now intent on raising Russia's stakes in Europe by confronting the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), and also hopes to establish itself as a key player in Eurasia. Relations between Russia and the West are possibly at their nadir today, but Mr. Putin believes that he can do business with Mr. Trump, even though there are few others in the U.S. today willing to deal with him or Russia.

At the opposite end is Mr. Xi of China, who is in the process of establishing a new political orthodoxy? Mr. Xi's 'thought' is being portrayed as the culmination of a century's historical process and philosophical refinement, produced through an ongoing dialectic of theory and practice, and encapsulating 'traditions' of the Qing dynasty, Maoist socialism and Deng's policies of reform. The chasm between the thought processes of Mr. Trump and Mr. Xi, hence, could not be wider. It would be interesting to see how Mr. Trump, who does not flinch from pursuing a zero-sum policy, ensures that there is no open confrontation with the ideologically oriented Mr. Xi.

What the world is surprisingly discovering is that with many more countries sporting 'maximum leaders' at the helm, summitry can help cut through the Gordian knot of many existing and past shibboleths. It is uncertain at this time whether this is more make-believe than real. The meeting between Mr. Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, in Singapore in mid-June, is a classic example of 'daredevilry' at the highest level which could only be attempted by leaders cocooned in their own personal beliefs ignoring past history and current problems. The meeting, which the two principals claim to be a success, has certainly lowered the temperature in Northeast Asia, irrespective of what professional diplomats and others believe.

It has kindled some hope that North Korea may desist, at least for now, from persisting with its nuclear shenanigans. Doomsday prophets claim that this is only a mirage, but in the topsy-turvy world that we live in, most people are willing to clutch at any straw that might provide a pathway to peace. The Trump-Putin meeting held in Helsinki last week, in July, has evoked a similarly negative response from the majority of western countries, especially among the diplomatic and policy-making fraternity. Much of the anger seems directed at the sheer gall of Mr. Trump in rejecting conventional wisdom in the West that Russia is Enemy No.1, and in challenging their beliefs by effecting a meeting with the Russian President. Aggravating their angst further, Mr. Trump has implicitly claimed that the Helsinki meeting was not only a success but in the long run could also prove to be of still greater real value than the association with NATO allies.

The Indian way ?

Indian Prime Ministers have also experimented on occasion with variants of summit diplomacy. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who was in effect his own Minister for External Affairs, conducted policy discussions with a whole range of world leaders, achieving a mixed bag of results. He was successful as the architect of the Non-Aligned Movement, but met with setbacks in his China policy. In 1988, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi ended a 25-year India-China stalemate by personally taking the initiative to reopen talks with Deng Xiaoping and the Chinese leadership. Prime Minister A.B. Vajpayee achieved a temporary

respite from cross-border attacks from Pakistan by engaging with General, later President, Pervez Musharraf.

Likewise, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh established a fairly successful 'back-channel' with Pakistan, thanks to his brand of summit diplomacy with President Musharraf. In the case of Indian Prime Ministers, what is different is that they did not seek to 'buck the trend', but while going with the flow use their personal credibility to achieve results. Prime Minister Narendra Modi is, to all intents and purposes, a firm believer in summit diplomacy. In the past four years, he has circumambulated the globe on quite a few occasions, meeting and discussing foreign policy issues with leaders of several countries, sometimes on more than one occasion.

Unlike Mr. Trump, Mr. Putin or Mr. Xi, he has, however, made no attempt to effect any systematic change in foreign policy, nor talked of establishing a qualitatively new order in the realm of foreign affairs so as to add gloss to Indian foreign policy. Also, unlike Mr. Vajpayee, who set up a National Security Council and established the post of National Security Adviser, he has not created any new institution to give impetus to his foreign policy imperatives. Yet, the informal summits held recently with Mr. Xi (in Wuhan) and Mr. Putin (in Sochi) have contributed to improving the 'fraying' relations with China and Russia.

The issue discussed here is not whether claims of success are true or not, but that summit diplomacy is taking leaders into hitherto uncharted waters, and producing results that traditional diplomacy has struggled for years to achieve — whether they be long-lasting or short-lived. If diplomacy is generally viewed as 'war by other means', then summit diplomacy is changing the 'Order of Battle' in a bid to succeed where all else has failed. This may have been unthinkable before the turn of the century. The 21st century is, however, demonstrating in many fields that this is the Age of Disruption. There is no reason why disruption in the area of foreign affairs should not alter staid diplomatic practices that were more relevant to the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries.
