

Law Commission on Uniform Civil Code

Why in news?

\n\n

The Law Commission of India has said that a Uniform Civil Code (UCC) is “neither necessary nor desirable at this stage.”

\n\n

What are the observations made?

\n\n

\n

- **Uniformity** - Difference does not always imply discrimination in a robust democracy.

\n

- So a unified nation does not necessarily need to have “uniformity.”

\n

- Cultural diversity cannot be compromised to the extent of preserving uniformity.

\n

- As, uniformity itself cannot become a threat to the territorial integrity of the nation.

\n

- **Secularism** - Secularism could not contradict the plurality prevalent in the country.

\n

- The term ‘secularism’ has meaning only if it assures the expression of any form of difference.

\n

- This diversity, both religious and regional, should not get subsumed under the louder voice of the majority.

\n

- However, discriminatory practices within a religion should not hide behind that faith to gain legitimacy.

\n

\n\n

What does the commission call for?

\n\n

\n

- The commission stresses on efforts to reconcile the country's diversity with universal arguments on human rights.

\n

- **Codification** - The commission has called for the codification of all personal laws.

\n

- This would help in bringing to light the prejudices and stereotypes in all religion.

\n

- They can eventually be tested on the anvil of fundamental rights of the Constitution.

\n

- **Universal principles** - Codification of different personal laws could help arrive at certain universal principles.

\n

- These may facilitate prioritising equity rather than imposition of a Uniform Code.

\n

- A uniform code would only discourage many from using the law altogether.

\n

- This is especially given the fact that matters of marriage and divorce can be settled extra-judicially as well.

\n

- **Amendments** - The commission thus suggested certain measures in marriage and divorce.

\n

- These should be uniformly accepted in the personal laws of all religions.

\n

- These amendments in personal laws include

\n

\n\n

\n

- i. fixing the marriageable age for boys and girls at 18 years so that they marry as equals

\n

- ii. making adultery a ground for divorce for men and women

\n

- iii. simplifying divorce procedure

\n

\n\n

\n

- **Polygamy** - It suggested making polygamy a criminal offence and applying it to all communities.
\n
- This is not recommended owing to merely a moral position on bigamy, or to glorify monogamy.
\n
- It rather emanates from the fact that only a man is permitted multiple wives, which is unfair.
\n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: The Hindu

\n

