



DAILY NEWSPAPER ANALYSIS

THE HINDU

(9th March, 2019)

**Topic: GS2/GS1- Secularism and
Ayodhya Dispute**



THE HINDU
Daily News Paper

Strange turn: on SC's order regarding Ayodhya dispute

Context:-

- Recently Supreme Court appointed **3 member panel** (Justice F.M.I Kalifulla, Advocate Sriram Panchu, and Sri Sri Ravi Shankar) to mediate in Ayodhya Dispute.
- Mediation, especially when it is at the instance of a court, is a welcome option for those embroiled in **protracted** civil disputes. A compromise could indeed be preferable to an order that may leave one side aggrieved. However, it is questionable whether this principle can be applied to all disputes and in all situations.

Concerns with Mediation in Ayodhya Dispute:-

- **Previous Attempts of Mediation:** The Supreme Court's order to find a solution to the Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute by mediation is quite **strange and incongruous**, given that all such previous attempts have ended in failure.
- **No Consensus for Mediation among Parties:** Further, the case is ripe for final hearing, and not all parties favoured mediation.
- **Long Pending Issue since Independence:** The dispute over the site at Ayodhya, where a 16th century mosque stood, has remained intractable **since 1949**.

- **Against the spirit of landmark decision of 1994:** After the demolition of the Babri Masjid, the President referred to the Supreme Court the question whether there was a temple to Lord Ram before the mosque was built at the site. The court, in a landmark decision in 1994, declined to go into that question.
 - **Why Landmark Verdict:**
 - It **revived the title suits** and, thereby, **restored due process and the rule of law.**
 - It was that verdict that made possible the **2010 judgment of the Allahabad High Court**, which favoured a three-way split of the site among **Ram Lalla**, the **Sunni Wakf Board** and the **Nirmohi Akhara**, which is under appeal.
- **Concern on the Mediation Panel:** The inclusion of **Sri Sri Ravi Shankar** as one of the mediators is controversial. In the past, he has made remarks to the effect that Muslims ought to give up their claim and that the failure to find a negotiated settlement will result in “**civil war**”.

Positives of Resolution through Mediation in Ayodhya Dispute:-

- **Time Bound Manner And Does not Impact Final Hearing:** A welcome feature of the court-mandated mediation attempt is that it will not consume much time; the same eight weeks are needed for preparation for the final hearing.

- **Taking Care of the Sensitivity of the Case:** The confidentiality rule will be helpful as none would want the atmosphere to be vitiated by premature disclosures when the country is in election mode.

Conclusion:-

- It is true that the prolonged problem has had *an adverse impact on the body politic and some “healing”* is required. But the injury to the **country’s secular fabric** was caused by **fanatical Hindutva groups** that launched a revanchist campaign on the plea that some temples had been turned into mosques by invaders.
- The only way to heal this festering wound on the body politic is to **render complete justice** not only in the civil case, but also for the criminal act of the demolition.
- No one must be left with the impression that the exercise is aimed at privileging the faith-based argument that the mosque stood at the exact spot where Lord Ram was born over the legal question on who holds the title to the land.