



सत्यमेव जयते

REPORT OF THE
LIBERHAN
AYODHYA
COMMISSION
OF INQUIRY

CHAPTER 6
MOBILISATION
OF KARSEVAKS

56. THE MOBILISATION OF KARSEVAKS

- 56.1. Religion competes for its interest within the political system for available sources. The differences between religions lead to dissonance.
- 56.2. The cleavage between Hindus and Muslims for centuries is well known. From time to time, efforts were made to eliminate the cleavage but power hungry politicians have always come in the way. The Hindu religion is the religion of the majority of Indians. Its tolerance and capacity to absorb new religions and cultures within it is well known. Historically it is proven that from time immemorial, people belonging to other cultures or religions have come to India. They were not only absorbed but also allowed to grow and develop their religion or culture. Right to participate in governance was freely granted to them. It is in this historical background that our constitution recognised secularism as the basic fundamental feature of its structure. Religious bigotry exaggerated the cleavage by fanning the differences between the two religions, with the object of keeping a hold on one religion or the other to capture power. In the process, these bigots used Muslim minority against Hindu majority or vice versa. Religious groups further divided into castes, which is rhetoric for political power.
- 56.3. What triggers a riot? Each individual has his own knowledge, experience, opinion and belief about himself and those around him. When such individuals fail or are prevented from achieving desired results and goals, it

consciously or unconsciously results in their acting irrationally which gives rise to riots or aggression.

56.4. There cannot be two opinions that in the ordinary course of action there is always a difference, in the words and philosophies of leaders, middle class leaders, pedestrian leaders, social climbers, workers or executors. This difference, whether called diplomacy or expediency, is in fact nothing more than a self-serving process.

56.5. Religious feelings give rise to emotive issues. Religious intolerance or vandalism is invariably influenced by the propaganda of the perceived infidels, which is perceived to be a religious problem. Their own religious susceptibilities provided justification for physical attacks on the disputed structure, while the other religious group was obsessed with their own religious ideas and believed that their own religion alone was valid. The issue was conceived to be a religious problem.

56.6. Caste and religion retain their negative effect on democracy as well as social revolution. They become the focus of political mobilization at all levels of society. This is used as the vehicle for pursuit of power and group interest. It opens the political process of individuals, scrambling upwards on society's ladder. It hampers democracy and retards social justice. All over the world, race and religion are relevant and people care for these over and above all other things. It provides an opportunity to the ones, who are neither expert in any field nor in possession of any thought, philosophy or experience in governance for climbing up the social ladder, at the cost of erosion of the

social system. Caste and religion ensure and facilitate upward mobility for self-seekers. It provides an opportunity for using the administrative machinery and the police to ride rough shod on their opponents, based on caste, communalism, religion and regionalism etc. Caste and religion or regions provide an opportunity in the numbers game of democracy to amass wealth with no answerability to anyone, as they themselves are the ones governing.

57. The cleavage between Hindus and Muslims

57.1. The cleavage between Hindus and Muslims had been exploited even leading up to the partition of the country. Pakistan became an Islamic state; India preferred to be a secular state despite some philosophies floated about Hindutva or cultural nationalism or *Hindu Rashtra* or *Akhand Bharat* as propagated by Veer Savarkar. From time to time for political expediencies or local needs, religious fanatics in the name of religion or caste etc. have wrecked the society. The era of religious fanaticism with religious conflicts is made prevalent by interested political personalities for self aggrandizement.

57.2. The dispute regarding the disputed structure remained subdued for a long time, i.e. until 1949 when idols were installed under the domes. The then District Magistrate, in one of his notings dubbed the installation of idols as an illegal act, which in his opinion had put the authorities and the Government in a false position. He however perceived that removal of idols would lead to Hindu reaction and tremendous loss of property all over the country. The Hindus had decided to attack Muslim habitations. His perception proved hearsay by events post installation idols. On historical analysis and assiduously examining the events post-installation of idols, unassailable conclusion emerged that the whole issue, civil litigation remained within the realm of religion and that too confined to Ayodhya alone. Emphasis was on religious emotions.

57.3. It is well known and acknowledged that the RSS is a tightly structured organization with BJP as its political wing. Being a disciplined organisation and a staunch believer in Hindu religion, RSS ideologues or philosophers introduced Hindu religion as Hindutva. In general parlance and by the common person, Hinduism is a religion. Although courts and philosophers or leaders according to times, attempted to explain that Hindu is no religion, rather it is a way of life. However, on the face of it appears to be too literal, or philosophical or theoretical or may be as explained on logistical analysis. It is against accepted nomenclature used by common person, who categorically accepts *Hindu* as *the religion* in contradistinction to *Muslim* and *Christian*. The globally accepted concept of geographical nationalism is attempted to be substituted by cultural nationalism. The RSS preached the creation of a *Hindu Rashtra* right from its very inception. This preaching of notions or the philosophy of the RSS was accepted by a large number of witnesses. It continues to be so today too.

57.4. *Hindu* as a religion is imbibed amongst all Swayamsevaks, i.e. member of the RSS. This army of Swayamsevaks is trained in martial art by the RSS. RSS Swayamsevaks and its leaders, despite their claim as a social organization have militant attitude. The Constitution of India envisaged secularism to be the basic feature of its structure, yet the RSS harangued right from its inception, *Hindu Rashtra*, *Hindutva* or cultural nationalism. Attempts made by our seers for centuries to uproot the evil of caste from our society and system have failed till date. This is the travesty of facts and circumstances; because of the

lust for power, religion with all its negative aspects is still alive in our democracy promoting national destructive prejudices.

58. Mobilisation of the masses

58.1. There is no dispute that until 1980s the dispute with respect to disputed structure remained confined to individuals of Ayodhya. Further, the issue remained confined as a religious issue. Only claim made or demand raised during this period was confined to removal of receiver, right to collect offerings or possession of land etc. These demands remained confined to civil courts. There was no demand by the public at large at any forum. There is not an iota of evidence to hold contrary to this. Prof Rajinder Singh, RSS leader, Dau Dayal Khanna, Guljari Lal Nanda, the die-hard Hindus, in connivance with people with similar thoughts, started conceiving and exploiting the local dispute at a national level, may be for their selfish political needs or for advancing their old theory of Hindu Rashtra.

58.2. There was no mobilization with respect to any dispute worth noticing until 1983, when the local dispute got merged with the ongoing dispute about Kashi and Mathura. Imperceptible mobilization was being carried out, about the latter disputes.

58.3. It was only on merging of the Ayodhya dispute with the Kashi and Mathura temple disputes, somewhere in September 1984 that various *Rath Yatras* were taken out for mobilizing the people for the *liberation* of the idols in the disputed structure³⁰⁶. No demand for construction of temple at disputed site arose during the course of above *Rath Yatra*. No political party of national or

³⁰⁶ See statement of Acharya Dharminder Dev Ji.

state level got involved in the dispute in any way. It can be said that to some extent some local leaders might have used the issue for securing local votes by hyping the hidden emotions, as pointed out by the fact of District Magistrate or his wife, having contested the election as Jan Sangh or Hindu Mahasabha candidates after the installation of idols and became legislators.

- 58.4. Paramhans Ramchander Dass categorically admitted that attempts to take over possession or mobilizing the people with respect to the disputed structure met with no success until 1984. He and his associates opined that they would not succeed without the support of a party at the National level. Believers of Hinduism or Hindu organizations were requested to support the movement. It was in this context that the RSS and VHP's support was sought. KS Sudarshan stated that *Ram Janam Bhoomi Mukti Yajna Samiti* rightly sought the support of Hindu men in society, which resulted in an assurance from the RSS of its total support through a resolution³⁰⁷. He further opined that the *Rath Yatra* resulted in nationalization of the Ayodhya movement. Bringing of bricks for *Shila Pujan*, or bringing of Ganges's water were attempts on an all India basis to drum up the religious feelings. It corroborated the opinion of Paramhans Ramchander Dass. It would be reasonable to infer that the RSS and the VHP controlled by persons like Ashok Singhal, one time RSS Pracharak, kept the issue confined to a religious issue. It was in this context that the religious leadership controlled by the VHP under the name of *Dharam Sansad, Kendriya Marg Darshak Mandal* was not only involved in the movement for *liberation* of idols in 1984

³⁰⁷ CW18/14

but from time to time it was put in front of the movement. Ashok Singhal admitted that the VHP used to decide the agenda of the Dharam Sansad and the Kendriya Marg Darshak Mandal. It is VHP, which used to call their meeting. VHP used to implement and carry out their decisions.

58.5. Eschewing hazarding an opinion, on a historical analysis of events, it emerged that the RSS put the foot forward to mobilize people for the construction of temple on the disputed structure at Ayodhya. Leaders of the VHP, or BJP were associated with the RSS at one point of time or the other. I have dealt with this aspect in my report while dealing with the interlinks of Sangh Parivar. They mobilized people, by observing *Sankalp Divas* at the banks of the *Saryu* river, launching of the *Bajrang Dal*, holding of *Hindu Sammellans* at Lucknow, submitting of a memorandum to the Chief Minister for opening of locks, taking out *Ram Janki yatra* or other Yatras or launching of *Tala Kholo Movement*. Principally and prominently mobilization through *Rath Yatras* remained confined to the State of U.P.

58.6. L.K. Advani, who later became the icon of the temple construction movement, Murli Manohar Joshi and other leaders took out *Rath Yatras* to mobilize the people to construct the temple at the disputed site. L.K. Advani took out the *Ram Janaki Rath Yatra*. It was the leadership of the BJP, a national political party, which came forward for mobilizing the people on the Ayodhya Temple issue, along with Mathura and Kashi. It challenged the Constitutional Secularism by calling it Pseudo - Secularism. Various theories of Conceptual Secularism were floated. Then commenced the exploitation of

communal and religious feelings. It gave impetus to the division of the society already rising day in and day out, on caste and regional consideration.

58.7. Muslims gave a helping hand to the challenge of the *Sangh Parivar* for construction of temple by constituting the *Babri Masjid Action Committee*. They started asserting the counter theory of awakening of Hindu consciousness. Competitive mobilization by protagonists of the construction movement, countered by the religious leadership of Muslims commenced in real earnest. The Muslim leadership started attributing motives to the movement for construction of temple as a political issue. The mobilization and consolidation of Hindu society on the premise of religion in a caste ridden emotionally religious society started firmly holding ground, broadening the religious cleavage. By challenging the Muslims loyalty or patriotism or nationalism through political rhetoric the *Sangh Parivar*, stated building up a political movement in the wrap of a socio religious movement of a particular community.

58.8. Demand for “liberating” the idols and the movement for opening of locks of the disputed structure veered around to the demand for construction of the temple by 1989.

58.9. Political parties started perceiving and realising the political potential of the religious issue for acquiring power.

58.10. The BJP as a political party decided to participate in the movement for construction of the temple at Ayodhya. In June 1989, at Palampur the key resolution was passed to support the issue and make or support a demand for

the construction of temple. While passing the resolution, the BJP and other Sangh members felt disturbed by the legislative amendment brought out to undo the consequences of a judgment, popularly known as Shah Bano's case. It was observed in the resolution that important leaders of the BJP were already covertly or overtly supporting the movement for construction of the temple, while other parties were working against the interest of Hindus. The temple issue was incapable of judicial determination. A debate about redefining *Secularism* was initiated by the BJP.

58.11. The Ayodhya issue was put on the same pedestal as the Somnath Temple issue. The BJP started mobilizing people for Shila Pujan programmes of the VHP. Resolution or support for the construction movement was brought on the election manifesto of the BJP. The Janta Dal and the BJP contested election to Parliament jointly. It was at this stage that so called religious issue completely merged with the political issue. The BJP and its associates put it as a major issue during the course of elections. The issue emerged on the national political scenario and the people were mobilized for the same. It had set up the political agenda of the nation. The disputed structure was projected as the *National Shame*, and as an insignia of slavery, requiring removal.

58.12. Through political rhetoric and political might, the state authorities, *Sants* and religious leaders, whipped up religious sentiments to build the political movement in the name of a socio religious movement of a particular community. Initially it had a hidden agenda of acquiring political power, which was unveiled during the elections, the process of acquiring power. All

articulation, be it philosophical, religious, political, historical were directed to acquire political power irrespective of the objective of a casteless society envisaged by the Constitution and by our seers. Mobilisation resulted in aggravating the cleavage between Hindus and Muslims. It created an ambience of tension all over the nation.

58.13. In order to diffuse the communal situation, the Government of India through Buta Singh, the then Home Minister of India, entered into an agreement with Ashok Singhal and others representing the VHP which allowed them to carry out the mobilization for the *Shila Pujan* and *Shila Nyas*, which was peacefully carried out in 1989. The *Shila Nyas* at the *Singh Dwar* as per the model of the proposed temple was carried out. Construction of a Chabutra was also done for the proposed construction of the temple despite the agreement that the courts' orders would be implemented.

58.14. In spite of the agreement between the apparent authors of the movement and the Government, twenty-seven districts of U.P. were identified as communally hypersensitive along with a few villages and places in or around Ayodhya and Faizabad.

59. The intensification of the Ayodhya campaign

59.1. The construction movement got intensified in 1989. A decision to construct the temple was taken, and programmes like *Shila Pujan*, *Shila Nyas* etc. were decided to be continued. The model of the proposed Ram temple was unveiled. There was some difference in the statement of Ashok Singhal and that of Param Hans Ramchander Dass about the place from where construction of the temple should commence. Ashok Singhal wanted it to start from the stairs; Param Hans Ramchander Dass wanted it to begin from *Garb Grah*. There is no dispute that the disputed structure was a part of the plan for construction of the temple³⁰⁸.

59.2. Elections were held in 1989. The RSS constituted *Ram Janambhoomi Samities* to carry out mobilisation. Muslim leaders opposed this through provocative speeches. Mobilization for the movement by the RSS, VHP, Bajrang Dal, BJP and other protagonists systematically brought into existence a mass movement which carried on to an extent where it resulted in political dividends. In the meantime, the Janta Dal with the support of BJP formed the government at the centre.

59.3. There is no gainsaying that the movement did not make any headway until the political parties jumped into the fray. It is only on coming of the political parties on the scene that this conflict or issue acquired an access to people even in remote areas of the country. It gained in momentum. It was just

³⁰⁸ See CW 11/1.

manipulation of religion for power politics. It became obvious when Acharya Giri Raj Kishore stated that clearly their motive was that they wanted to install a favourable government in Delhi.

59.4. To succeed required political power and the Ayodhya “issue” became the greatest influencing factor on the Indian political scene. Ethnic slurs were blatantly used. Ideological causes took the back seat, to be replaced by sheer political rhetoric.

59.5. Various negotiations started. Prominent representatives of the VHP or people / leaders from the BJP or those associated with the movement participated in negotiations on behalf of the claimants. Muslims from all over the country participated. It is worth noticing that local Muslims or Muslim leaders from Ayodhya or Faizabad stayed away from the negotiations. *Sants* started wearing the political mask. They surreptitiously disguised the motive of politics through publicity of religion. A nationwide communal frenzy through the medium of mobilization, press etc. was built among the masses in the name of religion. Everything was subjected to the communal hatred campaign launched by fanatics in both the communities. Political motivation mobilized the *Karsevaks*. They responded to the religious sentiments and emotions and took it as a challenge to religion. Rightly or wrongly, there is a genuine belief in Hindu community that at the place where the disputed structure stands there was a temple of Ram, upon which mosque was built under orders of the invaders. In official notes, it was accepted or otherwise too, that VHP’s past strategy used to prolong negotiations until it was able to

mobilize the maximum support and ensure the physical presence of their cadre at strategic places.

59.6. During the course of negotiation, mobilization by the leaders of movement used to continue. Threat warning were issued by persons no less than L.K. Advani, the icon of this movement, that in case no solution was found through negotiation or any attempt was made to scuttle the VHP stand, the nation would have to face an unprecedented mass movement. It was held out that if any obstacles were created in mobilization, or in the construction of temple or the programmes made for construction of temple, the support to the then Janta Dal Government would be withdrawn.

59.7. In order to mobilize the *Karsevaks*, for construction of the temple L.K. Advani took out a *Rath Yatra* from Somnath. L.K. Advani stated that the *Rath Yatra* was launched on the birthday of Deen Dayal Upadhya i.e. on September 25th 1990 and which was declared on 12th of September 1990. He declared himself a follower of Pt. Deen Dayal and accepted his philosophy, which is said to be the philosophy of the BJP and the RSS. Mobilization continued with rhetorical tactics. It provided an opportunity to pedestrian leaders or the rumour mongers to build their own inferences, where by religion was allowed to spill. Slogans during the *Rath Yatra* played their own role, though leaders pleaded amnesia with respect to the slogans raised during mobilization. The Leaders used colloquial words and speeches to provoke the people, who were receptive to the hate propaganda because of the cleavage between the two communities. A general ambience was created that the wrongs done by the Muslim invaders in the past had to be set right.

59.8. LK Advani stated that there were no discussions with the BJP leadership on how to contribute to the movement. He stated that, "*my first idea was to do Pad yatra, but since I was to be travelling through four states (Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh), logistically I needed a Jeep, which on the suggestion of my colleagues was changed in to Rath as the movement was for Ram Temple.*" The promoters of *Rath Yatra* conceived and perceived the special significance of *Rath* to the Indian religious environment on the psyche of Hindus. It was accepted that the BJP developed this *Rath Yatra* as a mass contact, mass-mobilisation, mass movement and for mass education. It was further admitted by him that the message of nationalism through religious idioms is more effective and translates better with the audience. He admitted that the *Rath* was looked upon by public as having religious significance attached to the *Rath* of the epic era of Ram and Krishna. L.K. Advani said he realized the significance of Vivekananda saying, "*religion is the soul of India*" during the yatra when the people received and revered it as a religious symbol.

59.9. LK Advani said the objectives of taking out the 1990 *Rath Yatra* were i) Awakening the awareness about the dispute, ii) Spreading the view point of the BJP, iii) Awakening the people politically and iv) opening the debate on Secularism.

59.10. VP Singh asserted that the Mandal Commission was the catalyst for the *Rath Yatra*. The BJP denied this fact³⁰⁹. The symbolic *Rath* carried the image of Ram, proposed plan of temple and the lotus - the election symbol of the BJP

³⁰⁹ See BJP's White Paper.

and carried the inscription "*Raghupati Raghav, Raja Ram*". The *Rath* and L.K. Advani by this time had become an icon of temple construction movement. He stated that no power of the world could stop the *Ram Rath*. He said, "I feel whole nation is behind *Ram Rath*" and posed a question "*will the Government arrest the whole nation?*" He declared that if the *Rath Yatra* was stopped support to the Government would be withdrawn.

59.11. Parmod Mahajan said "*the Ram Rath is the foot of Angad and cannot be moved by anybody*" "*the storm arising from Somnath cannot be stopped*" "*the arrow of Ram cannot come back*" "*are you the children of Babar or Ram, Akbar or Rana Partap, Aurangzeb or Shiva Ji*". LK Advani later said that media had misquoted the speeches.

59.12. At Bhopal, the Chief Minister, and his cabinet colleagues received the *Rath Yatra*. During mobilization or *Karseva* every tool, be it psychological, emotional, religious, political, threat or hope etc. were used. Leaders delivered provocative speeches of any level with the exception of some icons like L.K. Advani, about whom almost all the witnesses including Mark Tully accepted that he had not delivered any provocative speeches.

59.13. The power of words was fully exploited for manipulation and achieving fame, power etc. From dissection of the evidence, it categorically emerged that the leaders had used intemperate language. The vilification campaign in an undignified language against one community by the overbearing strong leadership continued. Historical narrations set in motion the gigantic process of mass mobilization. It was said by leaders be they on any pedestal in the

hierarchy, religious leaders, protagonists of the movement, even the sympathizers of movement that one particular community was not patriotic.³¹⁰

59.14. The *Rath Yatra* of 1990 of LK Advani had the blessings of Bala Sahib Deoras President of RSS and Murari Bapu another icon of Hinduism. L.K. Advani, the BJP and the RSS leadership infused life into the issue. The Shiv Sena too contributed to it from their area of influence. Acts, gestures, and messages were enough to see or feel that the BJP or the Sangh Parivar had no restraints while whipping up the passions. Neither logic nor objectivity nor intellectual honesty nor any other thing stood or counted in the way of positive political result. In the whole process of mobilization, the fundamental interest of leaders and the organizations was to acquire power in the electoral process in the future. It had its own consequential direct or indirect effect upon Constitutional Governance, Constitution, multi-cultural or multi-linguistic or multi-regional or multi-religious society.

59.15. Secularism as provided by the Constitution and understood by the common man who is expected to follow it in day-to-day working, is the need of our society, accepted by one and all during the course of evidence before me. Religious neutrality was lost in the struggle for power. In fact, war for control and to govern the people was fought using religious culture. There is no gainsaying as the later event showed the reflection of trend of religion, caste influence in ideological movements on governance. It is too obvious, and even leaders of the stature of VP Singh, LK Advani etc. accepted that

³¹⁰ See file no 6.200 (76)-A/D/90)

caste had come to govern by numbers in our democracy. Secularism or a casteless society envisaged by the Constitution had started disintegrating.

59.16. They decided to mobilise the *Karsevaks* by lighting the *Ram Jyoti*, taking out *Vijay Yatras* and processions, Shila Pujan, bringing holy water from the Ganges, by showing of films of carvings being carried out at Ayodhya, and by raising provocative slogans against a particular community etc.

59.17. It is not expected to have religious matters put up in a political campaign. Religious issues or the ones having religious appeal or faith expectations or demands are not permissible. The Political nominee in the ordinary course of election campaign has to promise specified results. Here, the religious issue or even the dispute was a part of the election campaign or manifesto; be it for Parliament election or election to the state legislatures. Religious campaign mixed with political campaign or aspirations became a norm with a long-term effect. BJP, RSS, VHP, Bajrang Dal, and the Sangh Parivar managed to channel the frustration of illiterate or semiliterate persons in a destructive direction and increased their political impact through violence, intimidation, and strategically organised mass hysteria. The record of the police including that at Ayodhya on sixth of December 1992 or even the events in Bombay of massacre of a particular community or in preventing the vandalism at Ayodhya have shown a fairly dismal record, and the extent of communal-fascist thought among the police was exposed.

59.18. Members of the Sangh Parivar have been a major force in promoting regional sectarianism and communalism or cleavage amongst the two communities.

Fascist movements typically thrive when political groups or willing to tolerate or appease them. The Sangh Parivar, BJP, VHP, RSS and Bajrang Dal did not condemn the violent activities of Shiv Sena but became its ally in political power. One can see the recent crowds in Ayodhya have certainly experienced a fair share of “tricks” both from politically active priests and politicians who exploit religion.

59.19. The effectiveness of deliberately manipulating the “crowd” particularly has contemporary relevance. Failure of the Indian government from time to time to expand mass education and have done much to make these groups vulnerable to militant obscurantism, that vulnerability has also been thoroughly exploited by the extremist Hindu political leaders though illiteracy is not the sole cause of Nationalist Hindu politics generally. In recruiting candidates in the Ayodhya movement widespread illiteracy has been exploited by skilful political leaders.

59.20. The mobilisation imbibed frenzy for construction of temple; a militant and belligerent nature with confrontational attitude amongst not only the participants of Karseva but also in the organisers of the movement, leaders, and political parties supporting the construction movement. Mobilisation hyped the emotions, amongst the Hindus, particularly those who prefer Hindu as their religion. It awakened the hatred towards the disputed structure. Mobilisation had not only challenged constitutional secularism but also created doubts about secularism, the need for which is affirmed even by those who were redefining the secularism by labelling Constitutional secularism Pseudo secularism.

59.21. Mobilisation not only brought out the subdued cleavage between the two religious communities to the forefront but also enhanced it with the aid of their own interpretation or articulation of history. In totality it not only created a suspicion about the security of the disputed structure but also created a suspicion between the communities about their living together peacefully. It challenged the well-accepted connotation of patriotism referable to the country with the geographical boundaries. Acceptance of the country with the geographical limits is an internationally accepted norm.

60. Mobilisation around 1990

60.1. *Karsevaks* were mobilised to reach Ayodhya in advance and stay in sensitive villages, which were sympathetic towards either Hindu religion or towards the movement for the construction of the temple at the disputed structure. The *Karsevaks* succeeded in positioning themselves in villages around Ayodhya in view of the stand taken by the Government not to allow construction of the temple or damage to the disputed structure. There was a famous quote by the then Chief Minister Mulayam Singh even a bird will not be allowed to flutter, which was prevalent at that time.

60.2. In the process, the Government decided not to allow any congregation of frenzied, belligerent crowd of fanatics in Ayodhya. The other States supported this decision of U.P. Government. There is no gainsaying that the immediate object of security then was to provide physical security to the disputed structure. In the process, the State Government requisitioned paramilitary forces and support from the Central Government. It was recorded in official notes that forces were deployed for security keeping in view the religious perspective of PAC personnel, being carried away by the motivated appeals of the fundamentalist leaders or by religious leaders to stand against the State administration.

60.3. The mobilisation and frenzy had reached such an extent, that despite the impregnable security arrangements and virtual ban on the *Karsevaks* congregating at the disputed structure, the *Karsevaks* stationed themselves

around Ayodhya and re-stationed *Karsevaks* stealthily sneaked into Ayodhya through un-defined routes. They succeeded in reaching the disputed structure. They caused some damage but having failed to succeed in their objective of Ram Janambhoomi construction or from congregating in large numbers in the complex, they declared that *Karseva* would be carried out on second of November 1990.

- 60.4. In the competitive process of mobilising for *Karseva* and Government's efforts not to allow congregation, some people lost their lives. L.K. Advani and other leaders declared it symbolic success of *Karseva*. There is no gainsaying that the mobilisation of the *Karsevaks* got further impetus because of the statements of Muslim leader or the clergy, like Syed Bukhari, who said, "*Muslim community will not accept any formula in which the suggestion to put idols in the disputed structure is proposed*"
- 60.5. The BJP withdrew the support to the Janta Government, therefore fresh elections were declared in March 1991. Religion was used for political objectives. The Ayodhya dispute was made a symbol for it. The BJP issued an election manifesto promising removal of all hurdles in construction of the temple.
- 60.6. In continuity of mobilisation for the movement, keeping in view the election declared in 1991, a meeting at the Boat Club was organised in April 1991 by RSS, VHP, and BJP under the name of *Vishwa Hindu Samelan*. However, Kalyan Singh has specifically stated, "*no state machinery was used or was involved*" in answer to the suggestion contrary to it. Placards carrying the

slogans like "*Jo Hindu hit Ki bat Karega, Wohi Desh par raaj Karega*" were displayed. Leaders and witnesses who appeared before the Commission pleaded amnesia about the slogans and those who admitted it, found nothing wrong in them. It may appear to be so to some. It cannot be denied these conveyed different shades of meaning to the persons addressed, depending upon the ambience under which they were addressed or the background from where they had come, the gesture of the person addressing, his tone and texture, capability and capacity to understand the hidden meaning or capacity to analyze etc. Ideologues, icons, important leaders used their articulation of words, properly wrapped in the language, still conveying the real meaning meant for the people or *Karsevaks*. Although icons of the movement, leadership veiled real intentions. The local leadership, pedestrian leadership, religious leadership would usually lift the veil while carrying out the mobilisation at the grassroots level. The totality of evidence is that the BJP organised the rally under the name of *Hindu Sammelan*. The RSS was the major force behind for movement for mobilising people for the same.

60.7. The RSS had the capacity to do so under the widespread network of able, capable, trained, and dedicated Swayamsevaks. They had the support of the State Governments where the BJP or the Shiv Sena was in power. They also had the benefit of guidance of officers, retired or otherwise, including DGP, army officers, engineers, retired judges, apart from the experienced political leaders.

60.8. The philosophy of Hindutva, Hindu Rashtra, and cultural and Hindu religion nationalism imbibed and believed had been preached for a long time,

even before the partition of the country. It may be made clear that I have not commented on the thoughts or philosophy etc. of the RSS or any other political party. It is clear that the same is not within the preview of the inquiry. At the cost of repetition it may be observed that till the BJP, the national political party, which can be said to be one of the alternative or a force at the National level, had jumped into the fray as a political party, there was no success or recognition of the dispute. In totality, and as proved by the later facts, LK Advani's Rath Yatra in 1990 gave an impetus and momentum to the Ayodhya movement. It brought the BJP and its allies to power in many States in 1991. And finally as later events showed, also at the centre. The various candidates in various elections from time to time carried out Mobilisation for construction of the temple in one form or the other during the election campaigns.

60.9. Mobilisation for construction of the temple did not end after the BJP success in some states and on increasing its number of seats in Parliament. Images are crucial to communicate with ordinary people. The BJP governments imbibed support for construction in the minds of the votaries. It was part of the election manifesto since 1989. The success at the hustings created hysteria among the people of the states where the protagonists of the movement had succeeded. They conveyed a message to the masses that the Government was of the Sadhus and Sants *Karsevaks*, by them, for them or the protagonists of the *Karseva* and not for the rest of the citizens or inhabitants of the country of other religions, castes or parties.

60.10. It is undisputed that Kalyan Singh, his Cabinet Minister along with Murli Manohar Joshi went to Ayodhya after the formation of the Government in July 1991. Slogans to the effect “*Ram Lalla hum aye hain, Mandir yabin Banayenga*” were raised in their presence. They have denied their participation in it, which cannot be believed on the ground that admittedly they have not even raised any objection to the slogans or their being raised at any point of time. It would be reasonable to infer that they overtly or covertly approved of them. The act of the Chief Minister and his Cabinet colleagues along with one of icons of the movement i.e. Murli Manohar Joshi added strength to the process of mobilisation and the participation of the Government or the State or the political executive for the mobilisation carried out continuously, at least since 1989.

60.11. State of U. P. in order to support or further abet the mobilisation acquired land for constructing the temple. The acquisition was sought to be disguised by notifying the object of acquisition being ‘development of tourism’. It may be observed that from the evidence it seems that the land was acquired with the hidden object of defeating the civil courts orders at a subsequent Stage. It was leased for a paltry sum of rupee one annually to a *Ram Janambhoomi Trust* for the construction of the temple. Ashok Singhal, Mahant Avaidyanath, Acharya Giriraj Kishore, Champat Rai, Vinay Katiyar, Laloo Singh, Brahm Dutt Dewedi and Paramhans Ramchander Das carried out the demolition of buildings and temple adjoining the disputed structure. They carried out levelling through the State agencies like Department of Tourism and with the help of the police. The levelling was carried out despite of the

court's stay orders. It was as if there was no government or the executive to implement the Court's orders; or as if executive, political executive and the Administration were of the *Karsevaks* by the *Karsevaks* and for the *Karsevaks*.

60.12. The *Karsevaks* were a class by themselves. They were the people mobilized and motivated with the frenzy for construction. They used to congregate at Ayodhya on the dates fixed by the protagonists of *Karseva* or construction movement only on their persuasion or when exhorted to congregate for a particular object. The pilgrims might or might not have been a part of them. Pilgrims used to visit or congregate only on religious festivals or dates prefixed every year on their own with no motivation for the construction of the temple or the demolition of the structure or under the persuasion of anyone. There is no gainsaying that mobilisation used to emanate from the RSS followed by VHP, BJP and Bajrang Dal etc. for various objects like *Shila Pujan*, bringing of holy Ganges waters or Ram Jyoti etc.

60.13. The Nature of mobilisation and the extent of it used to vary from time to time through various means. Speeches, slogans, public meetings be they religious or political or election meetings, through publication of pamphlets, audio and video cassettes, through print media in various languages and the electronic media etc. were the means of mobilisation for setting the tempo of the *Karsevaks*.

60.14. It cannot be denied that speeches were only a small part of the means of expression. One draws on all arts, gimmicks, gestures, ambience, look of

speakers etc. depending on the audience. Gestures were there in abundance, whipping up the frenzy and motivation for the *Karseva*. The speaker's language used to be such that there could be no other meaning except religious feelings or frenzy. The speeches were addressed to herds of people associated with the Sangh Parivar or the ones outside its realm, but may be having soft feelings for construction of the temple or communal bias against a particular community. Various speeches of the leaders or the icons of the movement were followed by the speeches of local leaders. Neither was there any centralized control over their speeches nor was there for any discipline. It would be reasonable to infer that speeches made were on the information derived from media as it has emerged from the predominant evidence led before me and assiduously examined. It has been admitted even by Chief Minister Kalyan Singh that his knowledge about the issue was derived from the media who themselves were not well versed with the facts or history apart from being blinkered in their thought by virtue of birth in a particular religion or community.

- 60.15. Mobilisation initially was carried out by self-proclaimed social organizations. Political leaders of all levels in the hierarchy of the party or the State Governments ruled by the BJP, pedestrian local leaders, social and religious parties, protagonists of the construction movement or self-proclaimed leaders in the guise of protectors of Hindu religion joined to carry out the mobilisation. During the mobilisation provocative slogans were raised and speeches were made. For mobilizing karsevaks, *Rath Yatras* were undertaken; *Hindus Sammellans* were held with banners having hidden meanings,

depending upon the readers reading between the lines as per their background or their capability with to discern with attitudinal bias, to understand their meanings. Specific reference to slogans like “*Jo Hindu Hit Ke Bat Karega, Wohi Desh Par Raj Karega*”, “*Ram Lalla Hum Aye Hain Mandir Yahin Banayenga*” may be made for this. The icons of the movement, made attempts to explain away these slogans before the commission. Howsoever innocent or simple these slogans might appear at first look, they derive their meaning in the context and text or from the manner, or the tenor or when or where made, the ambience, the nature of the crowd receiving them, the character and the background of audience or the reputation of the maker, his body language etc. It did carry hidden or concealed meanings or at least had the potentiality or capacity or capability for the same, especially when these were made by the *Sadhus* and *Sants* who were never involved in any negotiation etc. or in the movement except that the VHP pretentiously used to attribute their decisions to the Dharam Sansad or the Kendriya Marg Darshak Mandal or Sants and Sadhus.

- 60.16. Leaders of the VHP or other organisations used to proclaim that the call for *Karseva* was given by the Dharam Sansad etc. The object of such declarations was to give rise to the false perception that the call had been given by the religious leaders with the object of involving the religiously faithful public and to mobilize more of them for the various programmes. In fact indirectly the RSS, VHP or BJP, used to give the call for the *Karseva*. For expediencies of their own, the RSS and the BJP wanted to maintain the illusion that the movement was being carried out by the Sadhus and Sants

and the VHP meaning thereby that the movement bears the character of a religious movement and that it was devoid of any political connotations. They were merely the executors and supporters of the will of the clergy and the VHP whose predominant object was to organise the Hindu religion and to unite the Hindus. The very fact of the Dharam Sansad having been floated by the VHP with no independent legal entity unveils the façade over the misleading attribution to the Sants and Sadhus. Call for the *Karseva* was attributed to various institutions and parties involved in the movement according to expediencies and needs of time.

60.17. Prior to 1989, no religious personality of repute took any active steps for mobilisation of the people for the construction of the temple. It was only the representatives of the VHP and the staunch supporters or members of RSS at some point of time or the other, or the representatives of the BJP, who used to participate in negotiations with other claimants and the governments. The meeting of leaders of the VHP, BJP, and RSS was held at RSS headquarters at Delhi to work out the logistics of the movement. Here too no *Sadhu* or *Sant* participated. HV Sheshadri, a staunch RSS leader, visited Ayodhya to assess the situation and the viability for the construction of temple.

60.18. A feeling or a belief was generated and people were made to believe by the leaders that the State Government in UP of the time after election of 1991 was the Government of the protagonists of the construction movement and the karsevaks. Members of the Sangh Parivar, leaders of movement, *Sadhhus* and *Sants*, institutions supporting the construction movement vocally proclaimed that the BJP Government was their own Government and

constituted by them. The Government was committed for the construction of the temple. Emphasis used to be laid in various proclamations that BJP would form the government at the centre. Reference can be made to the statements recorded in a booklet issued by VHP.

60.19. The feelings imbibed as observed above, got affirmation on 6th December 1992 when slogans like "*Badi Khushi Ki Baat Hai, Police Hamara Sath Hai*" and other slogans were raised. The police, organisers, icons, leaders, philosophers, preachers either denied raising of such slogans or pleaded amnesia about the same, though they are clearly audible in the videocassettes produced before the Commission. The feeling of the government being of the supporters of the movement for construction was affirmed when Uma Bharti stated that demands like removal of barriers, removal of hurdles, handing over the acquired land etc. were met by the Kalyan Singh government. The government responded to the demands from time to time like acquiring of land, giving it on lease to the trust of VHP for construction of temple, or removing barriers.

61. Later events, leading up to December 1992

61.1. Sawan Jhula festival annually in July when a large number of pilgrims visit Ayodhya. Paramhans Ramchander Das, the proclaimed author of the movement admitted that it was difficult to separate the movement from politics. In order to project the support a large number of people to the movement and to mobilise people for karseva from amongst the pilgrims, Ashok Singhal exhorted *Sadhus* and *Sants* to hold a *Sarv Dharma Yajna Anusthan* and *Karseva* in July 1992. The BJP and RSS having already decided to support any program of VHP leading to the construction of the temple were mobilizing the people for the karseva in 1992. They were deceitfully projecting VHP as the frontal promoter organisation. Eleven *Mandaps* were erected in the complex for the purpose. Quite a large number of *Sadhus*, *Sants* and karsevaks converged on Ayodhya and intermingled with the pilgrims.

61.2. Under the garb of this congregation, *Karseva* by way of demolition of various structures around the disputed structure, levelling, construction of Chabutra etc. was carried out despite the stay order passed by the court directing maintaining *status quo* and restraining construction of a permanent nature. Paramhans Ramchander Dass, Ashok Singhal, Vinay Katiyar, Acharya Giriraj Kishore, Champat Rai, Dwivedi and the karsevaks present categorically refused to obey the court's order. UP state and its executive officers made a farce of complying with the court's orders through persuasion which did not carry any fear of the state, for the *Karsevaks*.

- 61.3. It was the thinly hidden agenda of the State Government of BJP to show and convey a message that no force would be used, as had been done in 1990. The Chief Minister Kalyan Singh categorically directed the DGP on innumerable occasions, not to use any force against the karsevaks or those supporting the construction of the temple. This further sent a message that the government of the time was implementing the election manifesto wherein construction of the temple was promised to the voters by removing all hurdles. The state acted irresponsibly to the extent that the UP Government disowned responsibility to implement the courts orders and asked the Central Government to do so³¹¹.
- 61.4. In 1992 the Sangh Parivar viewed and opined that they could seize the political initiative and reduce the Congress merely to a reacting agent. A view that losing the Government was preferable over a compromise on the construction of temple, was prevalent. The above facts as published in The Telegraph³¹². LK Advani and even KS Sudarshan admitted it in their statements.
- 61.5. A mad race designed to embarrass the Congress government was set in motion by BJP and other members of Sangh Parivar. People, specially believers of Hinduism as religion, through rumours or acts of pedestrian leaders were mobilized by conveying or building psychosis that the majority community is being deprived and the minority is taking the cake; that the majority community figure is coming down in the number game of

³¹¹ See the statement of Godbole (CW13)

³¹² CW18/12

democracy while that of the minority i.e. Muslims is increasing. It was further made known that Muslims were united in the name of religion and Hindus were a divided lot. Quite a number of Hindus had started taking a particular line, i.e. either against, or in favour of the disputed structure. It might have been because of fancy or real reasons or because of their beliefs, imagination, built, or knowledge acquired from media. These beliefs were embodied in the psyche of the common man by repeated and persistent speeches for mobilisation from time to time by most of the leaders of the VHP, *Sadhus* and *Sants*, or from persons like Sadhivi Ritambra, or Acharya Dharminder Dev, Mahant Avidya Nath, Giri Raj Kishore and other respectable leaders etc.

61.6. Mobilisation of the people continued to be carried out. Pledges were made for construction of the temple. People were asked to swear for making sacrifices for construction of the temple through raising of provocative slogans, by delivering speeches as admitted by Mahant Avidya Nath and others who held out that *Hindu Rashtra* had come into being the day *Pakistan* was formed. The threat of demolishing of Jama Masjid in Delhi etc. was held out and added further to the cleavage between Hindus and Muslims.

61.7. The political party in governance had the election manifesto for construction of the temple. The government U.P not only pursued it fervently but took it to other states governed by the BJP. It was difficult for the executive to provide any administrative hurdles or interfere administratively in the mobilisation or the *Karseva* to be carried out in July 1992 or thereafter. It is

obvious even from the latter's conduct i.e. when the executive as a whole made no attempt to enforce the court's orders except by keeping a facade that court's order are being implemented through persuasion. The State had full knowledge about exhorting of *Sadhus* and *Sants* for *Karseva* for construction of temple and the decision for *Anusthan Yagya* made at Ujjain. The State Government as well as the executive neither took sufficient steps of the security of disputed structure, nor took any action to regulate the *Karsevaks* or their leaders. It permitted *Sadhus*, *Sants*, and *Karsevaks* to congregate in July and December 1992, in Ayodhya. *Sadhus* and *Sants*, *Karsevaks* and other organisations knew that the state, government, or administration is for them, by them and of them. The public at large too intuitively knew this. Constitutional secularism was projected to be pseudo-secularism practiced by the opponents. There is no gainsaying that the religious issues had already translated into a political issue by this time.

- 61.8. Mobilization continued unabated. The Chief Minister held a meeting of legislators of their party on 24th of November on Ayodhya issue. He exhorted the Ministers not to take active part in the *Karseva*. He asked them to support it in their constituencies and to send at least 10 volunteers to Ayodhya from each of 75,000 gram Sabhas, resulting in a congregation of lakhs of *Karsevaks* in Ayodhya which was widely publicized³¹³. The fact was reported in the Telegraph dated 3.11.1992, it was categorically admitted and it was stated, "*Top level meeting of VHP, RSS and BJP decided that time has come to reset the political agenda of the nation and discuss various options on the*

³¹³ See File No. 16.200 (52) /D/92

Ayodhya issue". Ashok Singhal briefed about the decision of Dharam Sansad and the decision was ratified. The final phase of the Karseva was to start.

61.9. The BJP and RSS asked its frontal organisations to participate in the *Karseva* for the proposed construction of the temple, logistical details of the *Karseva* were finalized. The important leaders who participated in the meeting were LK Advani, MM Joshi, Kalyan Singh, VH Dalmia, Ashok Singhal, KS Sudarshan, Badri Prasad Toshniwal, Sunder Singh Bhandari, Lalji Tondon, Rajendra Gupta, Khusabhau Thackeray etc. The other participants were not identified. State Governments governed by BJP and their associate parties mobilised Karsevaks. The mobilization of Karsevaks for Karseva in fact was carried out by means of giving a send off befitting the group of the state going for *Karseva* and on their return receiving them as heroes by the VIP leaders, including Chief Minister and the Cabinet Ministers etc. of the state. In fact a feeling of going for a heroic act was imbibed in them.

61.10. In order to effectively implement the orders banning the organisations which were participants in the Karseva, it was the basic fact providing the premise for imposing President's Rule in the States governed by the BJP. The Supreme Court in the SR Bommai case accepted the fact of mobilization for Karseva by the states governed by the BJP. Participation of states governed by the BJP in mobilising the *Karsevaks* emerged clearly, when the Governor of Rajasthan reported about a royal send off on departure of the *Karsevaks* and grand welcome by the State Government and the BJP leaders on their return. He further stated that the BJP had control over the RSS, VHP and Bajrang Dal. Almost all other states governed by BJP conducted themselves in a

similar manner. It categorically emerged from the evidence on record that the State Government participated in mobilizing the karsevaks for karseva. The imposition of ban on provocative speeches and promoting the frenzy among the *Karsevaks* by the VHP etc. was justified approved in the Bahri Commission Report. The findings in the report were relied upon by the Counsel for Union of India during the course of arguments and the cross-examination of witnesses. Similarly Vinay Katiyar also relied on it.

61.11. During the course of mobilisation, it used to be said that the election in 1991 were a referendum on the temple construction movement and the opponents were preventing the BJP from fulfilling its electoral promise. Similar was the stand of Kalyan Singh the then Chief Minister before and after the demolition. Mobilization of *Karsevaks* by the state is further affirmed when the UP Government provided all amenities to the Karsevaks like food, stay, sanitation, medical facilities and construction material etc³¹⁴. Arrangements for food, free electricity, providing transport through buses withdrawn from the local routes to Ayodhya, providing water, camping, public convenience etc. was made by the UP Government. The Home Secretary affirmed the oral instructions from the Principal Secretary of the Chief Minister to provide the above-referred facilities.

61.12. A crude attempt was made to show that the arrangements were provided under the orders of the Supreme Court. MM Joshi, LK Advani decided on mobilizing the *Karsevaks* by taking out a Karseva yatra and it left to Sikander

³¹⁴ See file No, 16.200 (52) /D/92.

Bakht and AB Vajpayee to go to State capitals and mobilize the *Karsevaks*³¹⁵. Madhav Godbole, Union Home Secretary corroborated that the *Karsevaks* were mostly mobilized by the State Governments of Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and UP by whom facilities like transportation etc. were provided. Acharya Dharmendra Dev stated that the task of mobilization was given to LK Advani and MM Joshi. It was a distribution of the party work. This was as admitted by them also. LK Advani stated that the work allotted was keeping in view who could be more effective in Parliament and outside. Restraining or containing any section too was not taken into consideration apart from various other considerations. The plain denial of discussion is incomprehensible, as to how the BJP could contribute to this movement as asserted by LK Advani, when concededly a meeting was held at RSS headquarters in Delhi in November 1992, where logistics were worked out. The matter was reported in the Telegraph dated 3rd November 1992.

61.13. LK Advani and Murli Manohar Joshi restarted their *Rath Yatra* for mobilising *Karsevaks* to congregate at Ayodhya on 6th December 1992 from Kashi and Mathura respectively. KS Sudarshan stated, which was corroborated by NC Pandhi, that originally the plan for Karseva envisaged, calling Karsevaks in the batches of 25,000 to 50,000 everyday. It was on the 24th of November 1992, in view of the apprehension of dismissal of the BJP Government, that the VHP decided to make the contingency plan operative, which required all the *Karsevaks* to reach Ayodhya and instructions were accordingly issued. Prior to that, Ashok Singhal issued a warning, that they

³¹⁵ See CGW-32/M, CGW 50/1 and the statement of CGW 50 Harish Dubey

will call all the Karsevaks simultaneously in case of dismissal of the UP Government.³¹⁶ NC Pandhi³¹⁷ corroborated it. Reference to the statements of CGW 32 NC Pandhi and CGW 10 Peeyush Srivastava be made. It was well known and recorded that the State did not stop Karsevaks Rather they had mobilized the Karsevaks for the congregation. The BJP, VHP, RSS, Shiv Sena and Bajrang Dal did not want the campaign to run out of steam. NC Pandhi affirms the note that by 20th of November 1992 about 4,70,000 *Karsevaks* from all over the country were mobilised and persuaded by the VHP and others to participate in the karseva. The VHP started sending *Karsevaks* to Ayodhya from 25th of November³¹⁸. The state did not adopt any strategy either earlier or during the campaign for construction of the temple at the disputed site for preventing communal clashes³¹⁹. Ashok Singhal challenged the undertaking given by Kalyan Singh, Chief Minister to the Supreme Court for a symbolic karseva, “who is Mr. Kalyan Singh?” and thereafter stated that the undertaking by Chinmayanand for symbolic karseva to Supreme Court was given with an object to avoid confrontation. On the spot even Chinmayanand stated that the pretentious undertaking was only on paper, they were bound by the orders of *Sadhus* and *Sants*, over the orders of the Supreme Court. Video CD stating so is on the record. Majority of the leadership objected to the undertaking given to the Supreme Court. Some of the leaders had said the acquisition and undertaking had thrown the tempo of

³¹⁶ Recorded in file No 5.1355/D/91.

³¹⁷ CGW32

³¹⁸ See noting in file No. 15.200(51)/D/92.

³¹⁹ Recorded in file number 9.200(5)/D/90

“*Karseva*” backwards. The mobilization of the *Karsevaks* by the BJP and RSS was corroborated from the facts not seriously disputed.

61.14. The *Karsevaks* were provided introductory letters from their place of origin. They were issued identity cards on reaching Ayodhya when they used to report in the VHP office, by the organisers. The arrangements for their stay, food etc. was also made after they reported in the VHP office at Ayodhya. The statements of Sakshiji Maharaj³²⁰, Madhav Godbole³²¹, Sanjay Kaw³²² and DW 13/2 supported the facts.

61.15. Mobilization was in a disciplined way for which the RSS was known. This gives credence to the statement of Sanjay Kaw who stated that youth wing of the BJP was giving forms for going for karseva from their Delhi office and thereafter the cards were given by the RSS³²³. He was not even cross-examined on this; and not even a suggestion was made that this was incorrect.

61.16. The slogans to the effect, “*Jis Hindu ka khoon naa khola, woh khoon Nahin woh Paani hai*” were raised and accepted by Paramhans Ramchander Dass and Nriya Gopal Das. The air was filled with the rumours that if the leaders did not do *Karseva* they would have to face *mar-sewa* (thrashing). Paramhans Ramchander Dass and Vam Devji accepted the situation not to be normal after the decision of the Supreme Court for symbolic karseva. The militancy

³²⁰ DW8

³²¹ DW13

³²² CW20

³²³ See CW 20/2

was writ large on the faces of those attending the public meeting held within the boundary wall of Ram Janambhoomi complex³²⁴. Even Ashok Singhal has not denied or refuted that he used to assert that karseva will not merely be bhajan and kirtan, they would do the Karseva as planned, despite the court orders³²⁵. Nobody has stated that mobilisation prior to 6th Of December was for symbolic *Karseva*. Rather it was clear that actual construction would be carried out despite the stay order passed by Hon'ble Supreme court which further required it to be published through media etc. The state took no action when on the morning of 1.12.1992 karsevaks damaged graves and *Mazars*, except recording a formal FIR³²⁶. Doors of the mosque were removed. The beating of a German journalist on 5th December was reported to the authorities. The decision for symbolic karseva on 5th of December was taken as per Sakshiji Maharaj because BJP was in power. This statement appears to have credibility in view of the background that the Chief Minister throughout the movement had been emphasizing and asserting on the rights of the state to govern itself and the nature of the federal structure of the Constitution. He continuously objected to even the stationing of para-military forces much less deploying them. About the apprehensions and violation of the court's orders, he himself was well informed. Having failed to implement the same he asked the Prime Minister in July to get the orders of the Supreme Court implemented. All acts of Chief Minister Kalyan Singh or his other associates give an impression symbolic *Karseva* was only

³²⁴ See CGW 24/2.

³²⁵ See CW-24/2

³²⁶ FIR 193/92

therapeutic. It sent signals for the mobilising or the mobilized *Karsevaks* to reach Ayodhya. It was categorically conveyed in no uncertain terms that no force would be used against the Karsevaks.

61.17. The concept of the scheme or the conspiracy, and the desire etc. in the mind of the man having been ignited on the prospect of demolishing the disputed structure, excited and touched more persons with faith in the religion or belief of Ram through various means. Since the construction of the temple was the object, demolition of the existing structure was quintessential to achieve the objective. Local persons like Paramhans Ramchander Dass had always insisted on starting construction from Garb Grah.

61.18. Vinay Katiyar, Champat Rai, Acharya Giriraj Kishore, Mahant Avaidyanath and DB Roy etc. had begun plotting for demolishing the disputed structure though secretly right from the beginning. The methodology adopted for the demolition was sudden attack on the disputed structure, sudden simultaneous attack on journalists, proceeding with technical logistics like putting of ropes in the holes and then pulling the wall under the domes.

61.19. The state by its conduct, ensured non-use of force, and even eliminated the chances for the same by resisting the deployment of the central forces, and restraining the use of force against *Karsevaks* and the leaders of the movement. Failure to prepare any contingency plan to meet various eventualities not only sent a signal that the police, executive and state was supporting the mobilisation but also that they would ignore any plot hatched. Participation of the Government in levelling of the structures around the

disputed structure, construction of the Chabutra in violation of the court's orders, issuance of specific orders not only not to fire, but also not to use force against *Karsevaks* emerged from the prognosis of evidence. Security arrangements with no coercive force to use at the disputed structure against *Karsevaks* were made. Mobilization was being carried out before the fateful day of sixth of December for going to Ayodhya for the karseva for construction of the temple despite the directions of the Supreme Court given on the undertaking of the State Government, for symbolic karseva duly publicized in mass media.

61.20. No decision on symbolic Karseva was taken until 5th of December 1992 and thus added impetus to the mobilization of Karsevaks for the construction of temple, creating a surcharged atmosphere amongst the people committed to the construction. In totality, the conduct of the Government and speeches of the Ministers and the Chief Minister created an impression that the protagonists of karseva and the Chief Minister were one. The Chief Minister of UP claimed that he would not hesitate to sacrifice his Government for the construction of Ram temple. States supported the mobilization of *Karsevaks*. The congregation as also the Sangh Parivar did not want the campaign to run out of steam³²⁷.

61.21. It is discernable from the scheme of things, from the statements of Paramhans Ramchander Dass, LK Advani, Murli Manohar Joshi, Vishnu Hari Dalmia, Ashok Singhal, Vinay Katiyar, Uma Bharti, DB Roy, R.N. Srivastava, Parkash Singh, BP Sinha, Commissioner Faizabad, Deen Dayal

³²⁷ See noting in File No. 16.200/51/D/92.

etc, that mobilisation of *Karsevaks* and the *Karseva* itself was carried out as planned and thought out by RSS through its frontal organisations like the BJP, VHP, Bajrang Dal or the associations of religious leaders. It may be observed that it was either the RSS leadership or the fanatics who were the real actors behind the scene with powerful political interest pulling the strings not only for mobilizing *Karsevaks* for *Karseva* but also the movement. The real object of mobilizing the *Karsevaks* for *Karseva*, as is evident from the totality of statements on record, was to acquire political power.

61.22. All members of the Sangh Parivar attempted to take credit for mobilisation boosting the egos of their leaders. None of the counsel, including the Commission's Counsel addressed the commission, making even an attempt to attribute mobilisation to any particular organisation, or person for reasons best known to them.

61.23. In reality, it cannot be denied that it was the BJP, VHP, Bajrang Dal and RSS and its leadership including LK Advani and KS Sudershan who later became an icon of the movement, who had carried the burden of mobilisation of people generally. On BJP's commencing mobilisation for political reasons it gained unprecedented impetus and gave momentum to the movement. This was shared by other leaders like Murli Manohar Joshi etc. By focusing on alleged victimization of Hindu community, they had set in motion the process of mass-mobilisation, thereby setting up a national agenda for the future.

61.24. The crowd that had gathered to hear the national leaders became eager listeners to the emotive speeches of religious leaders and pedestrian leaders for setting up a frenzied ambience. Admittedly speeches and slogans were uncontrolled by any centralised agency of the Sangh Parivar. It gave a fiefdom to local leaders to build leadership. Injudicious words were used with motivated formulation to hype up emotions. The central leadership of the BJP was ill-equipped to monitor, let alone rein them.

61.25. The mobilization activities which were carried out covertly or overtly, according to the context and encouraged by the authorities resulted in raising the temper of hopes, giving and affirming the currency to Hinduism as religion. The entire campaign and even the statements of persons like Vinay Katiyar, Avaidyanath, BK Roy were nothing but vituperative and were repeated before the commission. The local leaders, local *Sants* had no qualms about the safety of the disputed structure. They mobilised their sense of frenzy for construction of temple. Neither the icons of the movement, nor national leaders, nor any other authority, be it state, executive, administration or police, had any control or will to wield any discipline over either the leaders or the Karsevaks. On the fateful day some of the leaders like Sadhivi Ritambhara, Uma Bharti etc. apart from going along with the *Karsevaks* on demolition, themselves became belligerent and militant. They went into ecstasy.

61.26. Allergy to the thought of symbolic *Karseva* was not a hidden fact. Sentimental slogans, even some of them being like war cries for waging a war, were raised further mobilising the *Karsevaks* for 6th of December 1992.

People at large, much less the *Karsevaks* gathered there, media, executive, administration and political parties knew about the therapeutic, or false declaration of state or the Chief Minister Kalyan Singh with respect to the security of the disputed structure during the *Karseva*. The state created favourable circumstances for mobilisation and congregation of *Karsevaks* with a clear-cut thought as was stated by Joseph Nye of Harvard Kennedy School that, "*life is still defined by family and village, in other words by social network that are both local and immediate.*"

61.27. The political party mobilizing the people for the *Karseva* was the governing political party. It was participating in mobilizing *Karsevaks* for the construction of the temple in place of the disputed structure while declaring that it would protect the disputed structure. The State through its various acts declared it a step towards construction of the temple by leasing out the acquired land measuring 2.77 acres to the *Ram Janambhoomi Nyas* for construction of the temple. *Ram Dewar* was constructed by the government as a boundary wall of the temple under the veil of the security wall of the structure. It helped in the mobilisation of *karsevaks* for construction of the temple.

61.28. In order to imbibe the impression with government departments about the contribution for mobilisation by the states, the state authorities undertook levelling, demolition of structures in and around Ram Janambhoomi complex, with the declaration of the chief Minister that irrespective of the fact whether the government stays or goes, the Mandir must be constructed. Other mosques were demolished, and the state still took no action. The state

allowed the construction, allowed the *Sants* and *Sadhu* to congregate at Ayodhya. Ashok Singhal exhorted them and others for *Anusthan* and *Karseva* for construction of the temple in July 1992, in spite of the stay order granted by high court. A *Chabutra* was constructed for the construction of the temple. Mahant Avaidya Nath categorically admitted that it was because of the BJP government being there that the momentum of mobilisation was built. VHP by itself would not have succeeded on their own in building the construction movement.

- 61.29. On the rumours or dysfunctional information about the imposition of President's rule, all political leaders went into hysteria, left their plans, if any was there, and started exhorting the *Karsevaks* to converge to Ayodhya to forestall the imposition of President's rule. Hysteria was built up to demolish the disputed structure.
- 61.30. The preparation was accomplished with phenomenal secrecy, was technically flawless with consistency and assured results. With complete insensitivity, what had been tried to be achieved for centuries, was accomplished in a few hours.
- 61.31. The theme was power. It attracted clusters of young men to support the hidden agenda. Leaders cannot extricate themselves politically from the results of desirable deceptive or gullible statements in which they have landed themselves. They know how passions are aroused and how to prevent the same; they however always see what would be beneficial to them rather than what would be good for the nation. This is what happened in Ayodhya.

- 61.32. The mobilisation and in fact the entire movement for the construction of the Ram temple at the disputed structure was carried out by the RSS, initially keeping the VHP, local *Sants* and *Sadhus* as the front body for raising the dispute. Later the BJP, Bajrang Dal, *Sadhus* and *Sants*, or other organisations like the Shiv Sena and other individuals joined as well. Some individual leaders of the BJP were associated and were supporting the movement from its initial stages. Throughout the movement, the reins of the movement remained with the RSS who used to work out logistics and programmes.
- 61.33. Without the mobilisation by the BJP and taking out of *Rath Yatra* by the icons of the movement like LK Advani etc. no substantial mobilisation would have taken place nor would any frenzy of hate towards the disputed structure have been built.
- 61.34. Regulation of religion has to be done for peaceful existence and not only as the means of effecting social or moral regulation. Refusal to enforce limits or religious feelings amounts to abandoning constitutional governance, which would result in civil wars. There should not be any element of religion behind a political decision or endorsement of religious activity, which in this case happened. Ram, the incarnation of God was exploited by a handful of men for their political power games.