



VEDANTA COACHING ACADEMY & LIBRARY

Two Editorials, Two Liberties

Preventive Detention & the Right to Liberty | Demography, Security & the State

CHAPTER 1 **Peace with Peace — On Preventive Detentions**

The Hindu, Editorial • 16 June 2026 — **GS-II Polity (Fundamental Rights, Judiciary) / Governance**

CHAPTER 2 **Politics over People — On the High-Level Committee on Demographic Change**

The Hindu, Editorial • 16 June 2026 — **GS-I Society / GS-II Governance / GS-III Internal Security**

Edition: 16 June 2026

CONTENTS

1	The Editorials, as Published	3
CHAPTER 1	Peace with Peace — On Preventive Detentions	
2	Context & Why in News	5
3	Decoding the Argument	5
4	Background & Static / Constitutional Linkages	5
5	Key Facts & Data	6
6	Critical Evaluation & Way Forward	6
7	Answer-Writing Toolkit	6
8	Practice Zone (3 Mains + 10 MCQs + Essay/Ethics)	7
CHAPTER 2	Politics over People — Demographic-Change Committee	
9	Context & Why in News	9
10	Decoding the Argument	9
11	Background & Static / Conceptual Linkages	9
12	Key Facts & Data	10
13	Critical Evaluation & Way Forward	10
14	Answer-Writing Toolkit	10
15	Practice Zone (3 Mains + 10 MCQs + Essay/Ethics)	10
16	The Common Thread — Synthesis	12

How to use this booklet. Each chapter follows one flow: the editorial *as published* → context → a point-by-point decode of the argument → background & static linkages → a key-facts/data table → a balanced critical evaluation with a way forward → an answer-writing toolkit (deployable lines + keyword bank) → a practice zone with 3 Mains, 10 solved Prelims MCQs and essay/ethics angles. **Today's connecting theme:** how the State balances *order* and *security* against the individual's *liberty, due process and dignity*.

1 | THE EDITORIALS, AS PUBLISHED**Peace with peace: On preventive detentions****Preventive detentions are misused by the state in the name of order**

June 16, 2026

In [Chander Pal Singh](#), a matter involving preventive proceedings, the Allahabad High Court has simultaneously addressed a part of the criminal justice system that often receives less attention than ordinary criminal proceedings and the more overbearing reality of mechanisms designed to avert disturbances having gradually become instruments to deprive people of liberty. The state has the power to intervene before a crime occurs if it is reasonably apprehensive that a person is a threat to public order. However, it has acquired a habit of exercising that power routinely, resulting in detentions without any substantive criminal charge. The High Court's order was based, the Bench said, on a "highly irresponsible" deprivation of personal liberties in Uttar Pradesh, where police officers and executive magistrates were using preventive powers to incarcerate individuals on the basis of arguably minor apprehensions. In *Chander Pal Singh* as well, the petitioner, a physically challenged Dalit advocate, had been arrested over a petty dispute with a neighbour. The Bench said that between May 2025 and April 2026, around 2,500 people were reportedly subjected to preventive detention proceedings in Ghaziabad, despite a 2021 State policy to guide the exercise of such powers.

The guidelines in response are commendable; if implemented appropriately, they could reduce the use of preventive incarceration in neighbourhood and property disputes; require executive magistrates to justify their decisions; encourage constitutional challenges to unlawful preventive detention; and generate appellate scrutiny of the compensation framework. They may also snap at the heels of magistrates who cite unspecified "communal tensions" to jail protesters and who impose prohibitively unaffordable bonds for release. Further, even if the ruling does not directly impinge on the detention of activist Sonam Wangchuk under the NSA, it critiques the idea of using the excuse of maintaining peace to silence dissent and reminds the state that it still has a responsibility to maintain peace with peace. The ruling may also apply to workers and activists recently detained in New Delhi if held under Sections 126 or 170 of the BNSS without valid grounds. That said, implementing the ruling will be difficult. The Bench said that compensation for unlawful detention can be recovered from the salary of the magistrate concerned and/or police officer following a disciplinary hearing. However, the executive has been historically reluctant to penalise its personnel. Second, executive magistrates are part of the State administration and their careers may depend on maintaining 'peace' as the State defines it. Addressing these barriers could reform preventive proceedings in India.

Editorial I, reproduced as uploaded. "Peace with peace: On preventive detentions", The Hindu, 16 June 2026.

Politics over people: On India's High-Level Committee on Demographic Change

Pragmatism should guide India's demographic governance

June 16, 2026

In constituting a [panel to study demographic changes in India](#), the Centre was guided by a paranoid mindset that saw devious conspiracies everywhere. The move gave shape and substance to a thought expressed by Home Minister Amit Shah: "unnatural demographic change" is a "very significant challenge to the present and future of any nation". In his [Independence Day address in 2025](#), Prime Minister Narendra Modi announced the proposal, characterising illegal infiltration as a "premeditated conspiracy" to alter India's demography. The committee, chaired by retired Supreme Court judge Justice P.P. Naolekar, is to assess demographic changes, examine patterns of abnormal population shifts among religious and social communities, and recommend a time-bound solution. Mr. Shah linked demographic changes not only to sovereignty but also to national security, law and order, "profound changes in social structure and the preservation of tribal society". According to the government, demographic shifts have affected public service delivery, local governance, resource distribution and social cohesion, and Justice Naolekar has said that the panel will also formulate a system for the custody and deportation of infiltrators.

It is indeed true that the management of population dynamics is a key instrument of governance. On June 14, Switzerland held a referendum and rejected a proposal to cap the country's population at 10 million. Across the world, immigration has become contentious, with unregulated cross-border movement seen as a challenge to sovereignty. Population management, however, is not entirely about illegal infiltration, and securitising demographic trends at the cost of all adjacent factors could do more harm than good. As the recent experience with the SIR of electoral rolls shows, facts about people would be seen as valid only to the extent that these are established through documentation. If this exercise creates a large stateless population with no country willing to accept them, it could result in a demographic deadlock rather than a solution. The fear of communal profiling of Muslims is real, and the Centre should also seriously consider whether the human costs are worth it. India faces major demographic challenges. Rising life expectancy and falling birth rates are changing the composition of India's population. There are concerns of India losing its demographic dividend, as the quality of education and health, and the evolving dynamics of work, remain very challenging. Migration continues to shape India's trajectory. Partition created three sovereign countries out of a geographical and cultural continuum, and its legacy included voluntary and involuntary movement of people. Sensitivity and a long-term view should guide India's demographic governance.

Editorial II, reproduced as uploaded. "Politics over people: On India's High-Level Committee on Demographic Change", The Hindu, 16 June 2026.

CHAPTER 1 | PEACE WITH PEACE — ON PREVENTIVE DETENTIONS

2 Context & Why in News

The Allahabad High Court, in *Chander Pal Singh* — a matter involving preventive proceedings — has turned the spotlight on a part of the criminal justice system that usually escapes scrutiny: **preventive detention**, the State’s power to act **before** a crime, on a reasonable apprehension that a person threatens public order. The Court flagged a “highly irresponsible” deprivation of liberty in Uttar Pradesh, where police and executive magistrates were jailing individuals over **arguably minor apprehensions**. Here the petitioner was a **physically challenged Dalit advocate** arrested over a petty dispute with a neighbour.

The scale is striking: the Bench noted that between **May 2025 and April 2026 around 2,500 people** were reportedly subjected to preventive-detention proceedings in **Ghaziabad alone** — despite a **2021 State policy** meant to guide such powers — and issued **guidelines** to curb the routine misuse.

Punitive vs Preventive detention: Punitive detention *punishes* after a proven offence; preventive detention *restrains* a person **before** any crime, on mere apprehension, without trial or conviction. The latter is an exception to the presumption of liberty — which is precisely why it must be tightly controlled.

3 Decoding the Argument

A. From a safeguard to a routine instrument

The central charge: a mechanism **designed to avert disturbances** has become an **instrument to deprive people of liberty**. Meant to be exceptional, it is exercised **routinely**, producing detentions with **no substantive criminal charge** — neighbourhood and property disputes escalated into preventive incarceration.

B. What the High Court’s guidelines try to fix

The guidelines are **commendable**: they could reduce preventive incarceration in neighbourhood/property disputes; **require executive magistrates to justify** decisions; **encourage constitutional challenges** to unlawful detention; and generate **appellate scrutiny** of compensation. They also check magistrates who invoke vague “communal tensions” to jail protesters or set **prohibitively high bonds**.

C. ‘Peace with peace’ — the larger principle

Even where it does not directly touch high-profile NSA detentions (the editorial cites activist Sonam Wangchuk), the ruling critiques using the **excuse of maintaining peace to silence dissent**, and reminds the State to keep “**peace with peace**” — order through lawful, proportionate means. It may extend to those detained under **BNSS Sections 126 or 170** without valid grounds.

D. Why implementation will be hard

Two structural barriers. First, though compensation can be recovered from the **salary of the magistrate/police officer** after a disciplinary hearing, the executive has been **historically reluctant to penalise its own**. Second, executive magistrates are **part of the State administration**; their careers may depend on maintaining ‘peace’ *as the State defines it* — a conflict of interest. Addressing these is the real route to reform.

4 Background & Static / Constitutional Linkages

Article 21	Right to life & personal liberty; deprivation only by fair, just & reasonable ‘procedure established by law’ (post <i>Maneka Gandhi</i> , 1978).
Article 22	Protection on arrest. (1)-(2): ordinary arrest rights. (3): these do not apply to enemy aliens & preventive detainees. (4)-(7): the preventive-detention code — Advisory Board, 3-month limit, communication of grounds.

PD laws	NSA, 1980; UAPA; State Goonda/Gangster Acts; externment. India is a rare democracy permitting peacetime preventive detention in its Constitution (colonial lineage).
BNSS, 2023	§§126 / 170 (successors to CrPC §§107-110, 151) — security for keeping the peace & good behaviour; executive-magistrate powers the editorial flags.
Key cases	<i>A.K. Gopalan</i> (1950) → <i>Maneka Gandhi</i> (1978) → <i>Rekha v. State of T.N.</i> (2011: detention is the exception, liberty the rule) → <i>D.K. Basu</i> (arrest safeguards).
Remedy / bodies	Habeas corpus under Arts. 32 & 226; NHRC/SHRCs; Advisory Boards; District/Executive Magistracy.

5 Key Facts & Data

Indicator	Detail
Ghaziabad PD proceedings	~2,500 persons, May 2025 – April 2026
Governing State policy	Uttar Pradesh 2021 policy to guide preventive powers
Max detention without Board	3 months (Art. 22(4))
Compensation route	Recoverable from magistrate / police salary after disciplinary hearing
Relevant BNSS sections	§126 (security for peace) §170 (security for good behaviour)

6 Critical Evaluation & Way Forward

Strengths of the ruling / argument	Concerns & limitations
Reasserts liberty as the rule, detention the exception — in line with <i>Rekha</i> and Art. 21.	Binds one High Court’s jurisdiction; without SC backing/statute, replication is uncertain.
Demands reasoned orders — accountability and a paper trail for appeal.	Executive reluctance to discipline its own blunts the salary-recovery deterrent.
Targets vague ‘communal tension’ pleas & unaffordable bonds — protects the poor & dissenters.	Structural conflict: magistrates answer to the same State whose ‘peace’ they define.
Links an invisible routine abuse (2,500 cases) to a constitutional principle.	State may genuinely need pre-emptive powers; over-correction could hamper legitimate prevention.

Way forward: Don’t abolish preventive powers — **proceduralise** them: mandatory reasoned orders, time-bound and independent review, real compensation enforced through NHRC/judicial oversight, training of executive magistrates, and data transparency on PD orders. Prevention must not quietly become punishment without trial.

7 Answer-Writing Toolkit

Deployable lines

- “Preventive detention is a **constitutional exception**, not an administrative convenience.”
- “When a safeguard becomes a routine, prevention quietly becomes **punishment without trial**.”
- “Order must be secured through **peace with peace** — lawful, proportionate means, not coercion of dissent.”

Keyword / fact bank: Arts. 21 & 22 • Advisory Board • ‘procedure established by law’ • NSA 1980 • BNSS §§126/170 • *Rekha v. State of T.N.* (2011) • *Maneka Gandhi* (1978) • *A.K. Gopalan* (1950) • habeas corpus (Arts. 32/226) • ~2,500 Ghaziabad cases • UP 2021 policy • ‘peace with peace’.

8**Practice Zone — Mains, Prelims MCQs & Essay/Ethics****Mains (GS)**

Q1. “Preventive detention, conceived as a safeguard for public order, has in practice become an instrument to curtail personal liberty.” Critically examine in light of recent judicial intervention. (GS-II, 250 words)

Q2. Discuss the constitutional safeguards available against preventive detention in India. Are they adequate? (GS-II, 150 words)

Q3. “The legitimacy of ‘peace’ depends on the means used to secure it.” Examine in the context of preventive proceedings and the right to dissent. (GS-II, 150 words)

Prelims MCQs (with answer key)

1. Consider the following on preventive detention under the Constitution:

1. Article 22 contains safeguards specific to preventive detention.
2. A preventive detainee has a constitutional right to be defended by a legal practitioner.
3. Detention beyond three months ordinarily requires the opinion of an Advisory Board.

Which are correct? (a) 1 and 2 (b) 1 and 3 (c) 2 and 3 (d) 1, 2 and 3

Ans. (b). Art. 22(3) denies preventive detainees the rights to counsel and to be produced before a magistrate — so 2 is wrong.

2. Sections 126 and 170 of the BNSS, 2023 primarily deal with: (a) anticipatory bail (b) security for keeping the peace and good behaviour (c) sedition (d) custodial interrogation.

Ans. (b). Successors to CrPC provisions on security for peace/good behaviour, exercised by executive magistrates.

3. The National Security Act was enacted in the year: (a) 1971 (b) 1980 (c) 1985 (d) 2002.

Ans. (b). The NSA was enacted in 1980.

4. In which case did the Supreme Court hold that in matters of preventive detention, liberty is the rule and detention the exception? (a) A.K. Gopalan (b) ADM Jabalpur (c) Rekha v. State of T.N. (d) Kharak Singh.

Ans. (c). Rekha v. State of Tamil Nadu (2011).

5. The writ most appropriate to challenge an unlawful detention is: (a) Mandamus (b) Certiorari (c) Habeas corpus (d) Quo warranto.

Ans. (c). Habeas corpus — ‘produce the body’.

6. Article 22(3) of the Constitution excludes the protections of clauses (1) and (2) for: 1. enemy aliens 2. preventive detainees 3. persons arrested for ordinary cognizable offences. Select: (a) 1 only (b) 1 and 2 (c) 2 and 3 (d) 1, 2 and 3.

Ans. (b). Both enemy aliens and preventive detainees are excluded; ordinary arrestees retain the protections.

7. The transformation of ‘procedure established by law’ into a due-process-like standard is chiefly associated with: (a) A.K. Gopalan (b) Maneka Gandhi (c) Minerva Mills (d) Golaknath.

Ans. (b). Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978).

8. Under Article 22, the maximum period of preventive detention without obtaining the opinion of an Advisory Board is ordinarily: (a) 1 month (b) 2 months (c) 3 months (d) 6 months.

Ans. (c). Three months.

9. The D.K. Basu judgment is primarily associated with: (a) guidelines on arrest and custodial safeguards (b) reservation in promotions (c) right to privacy (d) electoral reforms.

Ans. (a). Arrest and custody safeguards.

10. Which of the following is true of preventive detention? (a) It follows conviction by a court. (b) It is punitive in nature. (c) It is based on apprehension of future conduct. (d) It always requires a chargesheet.

Ans. (c). It rests on apprehension of future conduct, not on a proven past offence.

Essay / Ethics angle

- **Essay:** “Order without liberty is tyranny; liberty without order is anarchy.”



- **GS-IV (Ethics):** An executive magistrate is pressured by superiors to issue a preventive-detention order against a peaceful protester to 'maintain peace'. Identify the ethical dilemma, the values in conflict, and the course of action you would justify.

CHAPTER 2 | POLITICS OVER PEOPLE — ON THE DEMOGRAPHIC-CHANGE COMMITTEE

9 Context & Why in News

The Centre has constituted a **High-Level Committee on Demographic Change**, chaired by retired Supreme Court judge **Justice P.P. Naolekar**. The editorial argues the move sprang from a “**paranoid mindset**” that sees conspiracies everywhere. It gives shape to Home Minister **Amit Shah**’s framing of “unnatural demographic change” as a major national challenge, and to PM **Narendra Modi**’s 2025 Independence Day characterisation of illegal infiltration as a “**premeditated conspiracy**” to alter India’s demography.

The committee’s mandate: assess demographic changes, examine “**abnormal**” **population shifts** among religious and social communities, and recommend a **time-bound solution**. Mr. Shah linked demography to sovereignty, **national security, law and order, social structure and the preservation of tribal society**; Justice Naolekar has indicated the panel will also frame a system for the **custody and deportation of ‘infiltrators’**.

10 Decoding the Argument

A. Demography is a legitimate concern — but not only about infiltration

The editorial concedes that managing **population dynamics is a key instrument of governance** and that immigration is contentious worldwide — citing **Switzerland’s 14 June referendum** that rejected capping its population at 10 million. Its caution: population management is **not entirely about illegal infiltration**, and **securitising demographic trends at the cost of all adjacent factors could do more harm than good**.

B. The documentation trap and the risk of statelessness

Drawing on the recent **SIR (Special Intensive Revision) of electoral rolls**, it warns that “facts about people” would be valid only insofar as they can be **proved through documentation**. If the exercise creates a **large stateless population** no country will accept, the result is a **demographic deadlock**, not a solution. The **fear of communal profiling of Muslims is real**, and the Centre should weigh whether the **human costs are worth it**.

C. India’s genuine demographic challenges lie elsewhere

The real challenges: **rising life expectancy and falling birth rates** reshaping the population; the risk of **losing the demographic dividend** if education, health and the nature of work are not addressed; and migration’s continuing role. It recalls that **Partition** created three sovereign countries from one cultural continuum, with a legacy of voluntary and involuntary movement. Its conclusion: “**sensitivity and a long-term view**” — pragmatism, not politics — should guide demographic governance.

11 Background & Static / Conceptual Linkages

Demographic dividend	Growth potential when working-age population (15-64) exceeds dependents; needs jobs, skilling, health — else a ‘demographic burden’.
Demographic transition	Shift from high to low birth & death rates; India’s TFR near replacement (~2.0), with rising ageing — the editorial’s real concern.
Citizenship / migration	Citizenship Act 1955 & CAA 2019; NRC; ‘infiltrator’ vs ‘refugee’; statelessness (UN Conventions 1954 & 1961 — India not a signatory).
SIR of electoral rolls	Documentation-led voter verification; the editorial’s caution that identity becomes contingent on paperwork.
Constitutional values	Secularism (Preamble; Arts. 14, 15, 25-28); equality before law regardless of religion; federal stakes (delimitation, devolution).

Data / bodies	Census (overdue), NFHS, Registrar General of India, NITI Aayog; HLC chaired by Justice P.P. Naolekar.
----------------------	---

12 Key Facts & Data

Indicator	Detail
Committee chair	Justice P.P. Naolekar (retd. SC judge)
Mandate	Assess demographic change; study 'abnormal' shifts; time-bound solution; custody/deportation system
Switzerland referendum	14 June 2026 — rejected capping population at 10 million
India TFR	~2.0 (near/below replacement level of 2.1)
Statelessness Conventions	UN 1954 & 1961 — India is NOT a signatory

13 Critical Evaluation & Way Forward

Case for studying demographic change	The editorial's cautions
Population dynamics shape services, resources, federal share and security — a valid policy object.	'Premeditated conspiracy' framing securitises a developmental subject and invites communal profiling.
Border management & verifiable citizenship are legitimate sovereign functions.	Documentation drives (cf. SIR/NRC) risk rendering the poor and undocumented stateless .
A judge-led panel can lend procedural credibility and evidence.	A mandate to study 'abnormal shifts among religious communities' pre-loads a communal lens.
Global anxiety (Switzerland referendum) shows the issue is real, not imagined.	Real challenges — ageing, falling TFR, jobs, the dividend — risk being crowded out.

Way forward: Conduct the overdue **Census** for hard data; treat demography as a **development-and-rights** question — invest in jobs, education, health, ageing-care; frame a **humane, rule-of-law migration policy**; safeguard against statelessness; and keep any verification exercise non-discriminatory and rights-respecting. **Pragmatism over politics; people over suspicion.**

14 Answer-Writing Toolkit

Deployable lines

- "Demography is a question of **development and rights**, not merely of security and suspicion."
- "When identity becomes contingent on paperwork, the State risks manufacturing **statelessness**."
- "India's real demographic test is the **dividend, ageing and jobs** — not a conspiracy to be policed."

Keyword / fact bank: HLC under Justice P.P. Naolekar • demographic dividend & transition • TFR ~2.0 (replacement 2.1) • SIR of electoral rolls • statelessness (UN 1954/1961) • CAA 2019 / NRC • Switzerland 14 June 2026 referendum • secularism (Arts. 14, 15, 25) • 'politics over people'.

15 Practice Zone — Mains, Prelims MCQs & Essay/Ethics

Mains (GS)

Q1. "India's demographic challenges are essentially developmental, not securitarian." Critically analyse with reference to the High-Level Committee on Demographic Change. (*GS-I/GS-II, 250 words*)

Q2. Examine how documentation-led exercises of citizenship verification can create the risk of statelessness, and suggest safeguards. (GS-II, 150 words)

Q3. “A realised demographic dividend depends less on the size of the working-age population than on the quality of human capital.” Discuss. (GS-I/GS-III, 250 words)

Prelims MCQs (with answer key)

1. The term ‘demographic dividend’ refers to: (a) revenue from a growing population (b) growth potential from a rising share of working-age population (c) the fall in death rates during transition (d) subsidies to high-population states.

Ans. (b). Growth potential when the 15-64 group exceeds dependents — realised only with jobs, skills, health.

2. The replacement-level Total Fertility Rate (TFR) is generally taken as: (a) 1.5 (b) 2.1 (c) 3.0 (d) 4.0.

Ans. (b). About 2.1 children per woman.

3. With reference to statelessness, consider: 1. India is a signatory to the 1954 and 1961 UN Conventions on statelessness. 2. Statelessness can arise from gaps in citizenship documentation. Which is/are correct? (a) 1 only (b) 2 only (c) Both (d) Neither.

Ans. (b). India is NOT a signatory to those Conventions; statement 2 is correct.

4. The National Family Health Survey (NFHS) is conducted under the aegis of the: (a) Ministry of Home Affairs (b) Ministry of Health & Family Welfare (c) NITI Aayog (d) Election Commission.

Ans. (b). Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.

5. The Census in India is conducted under the authority of the: (a) Census Act, 1948 (b) RPA, 1951 (c) Citizenship Act, 1955 (d) Statistics Act, 2008.

Ans. (a). The Census Act, 1948 (Registrar General of India).

6. The ‘demographic transition’ describes the shift from: (a) rural to urban living (b) high to low birth and death rates (c) agriculture to industry (d) informal to formal work.

Ans. (b). High to low birth and death rates over the course of development.

7. The Special Intensive Revision (SIR) referred to in the news relates to: (a) tax assessments (b) revision of electoral rolls (c) census enumeration (d) caste survey.

Ans. (b). Revision of electoral rolls, conducted by the Election Commission.

8. The Citizenship (Amendment) Act, 2019 provides an accelerated path to citizenship for specified non-Muslim minorities from: (a) Pakistan, Bangladesh and Afghanistan (b) Nepal and Bhutan (c) Sri Lanka and Myanmar (d) China and Bangladesh.

Ans. (a). Pakistan, Bangladesh and Afghanistan.

9. The ‘dependency ratio’ measures: (a) export reliance on a single market (b) the ratio of dependents (young + old) to the working-age population (c) fiscal transfers to states (d) urban-to-rural migration.

Ans. (b). Dependents relative to the working-age population.

10. Which constitutional provisions are most directly invoked against religion-based profiling? 1. Article 14 2. Article 15 3. Article 25. Select: (a) 1 and 2 (b) 2 and 3 (c) 1 and 3 (d) 1, 2 and 3.

Ans. (d). Equality (14), non-discrimination (15) and freedom of religion (25) together.

Essay / Ethics angle

- **Essay:** “A nation is measured not by how it counts its people, but by how it treats them.”
- **GS-IV (Ethics):** A public official must implement a documentation drive that may render some long-resident poor families stateless. Discuss the conflict between rule-following and compassion, and how administrative discretion should be exercised.

16 The Common Thread — Synthesis

Both editorials are, at heart, about the **State's power versus the individual's rights**. Editorial I shows the State over-using **preventive** power to detain individuals on flimsy apprehensions; Editorial II shows the State framing a **demographic** question through a security-and-suspicion lens that could strip people of citizenship. The recurring UPSC theme is identical: **liberty, due process and dignity must constrain the pursuit of 'order' and 'security'**. Each reminds the State that legitimacy lies in the **means** — lawful, proportionate, humane — not merely the ends: 'peace with peace', and people over politics.

Cross-cutting Mains prompt

Q. "In a constitutional democracy, the State's pursuit of order and security is legitimate only to the extent that it respects liberty and due process." Critically examine with reference to recent debates on preventive detention and demographic governance. (*GS-II, 250 words*)

Prepared by Vedanta Coaching Academy & Library • Editorial Analysis Series • 16 June 2026. Editorial images are reproduced from The Hindu as uploaded, for classroom study; the analysis, linkages and practice questions are original.