

Greater Common Good

What exactly is greater common good?

It means the land, livelihood and perhaps even lives and families of a smaller section of society has been sacrificed in the greater interest of the larger section of society.

But is this really a just sacrifice?

Is it really “greater common good” to take away a persons land and livelihood that they had for generations, to build expressways, access controlled ring roads and IT/BT/SEZ coolie parks owned by Global Investors/Wall Street/Dalal Street Pimps and Lalas?

This sort of “greater common good” for the private benefit of Global Investors/Wall Street/Dalal Street Pimps and Lalas is a complete fraud.

In fact it just an extension of the original devious selfish self-interested purpose introduced by FUKUS to steal, grab and take over the lands of the colonised.

It is now being used by the coconuts and Representative DFIs who inherited these fraud FUKUS systems to steal, grab and take over the lands of the poor and oppressed and hand them over to Global Investors/Wall Street/Dalal Street Pimps and Lalas.

The law of eminent domain for private profit is alien to the heritage of Bharat.

It is a part of FUKUS common law.

It was done successfully by FUKUS colonists in the USA to displace and destroy the land, livelihood and permanent well being of the Native Americans, which they had maintained for generations and unsuccessfully fought for to protect at the

cost of their own lives.

In fact with the introduction of slavery, FUKUS even considered a living sentient human being as just a piece of property, fit only to be abducted, molested, branded, mortgaged and sold off at the will of the purchaser, in complete disregard of the feelings of the actual owner of that body.

So the law of eminent domain is a very unjust law especially in these times where private profit and greed is being masked as a public purpose for greater common good.

Let' take a larger purpose: Water.

Is it right to submerge lands and entire villages under dams, to benefit another section of villages and people who probably were not even aware of the sacrifice made by the other for their well being?

Even if they were aware, would they be thankful and grateful for it?

Would they be willing to offer some sort of solace and compensation to those that sacrificed their lands, livelihoods and well being for the welfare of the beneficiaries?

What was the basis to judge whose need was more urgent and just:

The submergence of the villages which remained in existence for millennia?

Or letting already dry lands remain dry?

Any sacrifice is truly not worth it or even justified if the recipient does not:

- **Be aware of who sacrificed what and how much for their benefit.**

- Remains grateful for life towards those who sacrificed their well being for the well being of the beneficiaries.
- Made serious attempts to offer compensation and support and a permanent replacement of income to those displaced and for at least 5 generations of their families.

The original constitution of Bharat guaranteed the right to property under Articles 19 and 31.

Article 19 guaranteed all citizens the right to “Acquire, Hold and Dispose of property. “

Article 31 guaranteed all citizens that “No person shall be deprived of his property save by authority of law.”

Both these articles 19 and 31 were removed by the congenitally evil Indira Ghendy who just put a socialist spiel on the original intention of the socialist urine drinking Desai.

Desai wanted to remove articles 19 and 31 so that more votes could be gathered by acquiring land from a few rich landlords and giving them to the landless poor who had much more votes.

Not all rich landlords were idle and wicked and usurious and wasted their time gambling and drinking.

This is the version most often shown in the Bollywood movies even in classics like Mother India.

Many of the rich landlords I knew who were affected by these laws were really hard working and intelligent people.

They did not leave their land idle, they actually invested great time, money, hard work and effort in their land, not to mention extreme emotional attachment and love towards their land.

And they treated their labourers quite well.

Not all poor landless labourers were sincere, hard working and intelligent people.

Many of them indulged in the same vices of the rich landlords who they stole their lands from.

And many of them sold off the lands that they grabbed from these rich landlords.

It is a proven fact that small farming is better, more productive and more environmentally sustainable than large farming.

However it is unjust and unfair to steal and grab from many deserving hard working rich landlords to help many undeserving poor.

Again you will notice I did not generalise like the urine drinking Desai and the congenitally evil Indira Ghendy.

I said many, not all.

We should never have laws that discriminate people on a generalised basis and favour or punish them on a generalised law framed on a generalised basis.

Laws should always be used on a case to case basis.

I would not be surprised if almost 75% of the land that was grabbed by unjust and unfair the land ceiling acts in Bharat was actually given to the landless labourers.

The whole basis of the land ceiling acts itself was unjust.

It was just a socialist vote gathering exercise.

Even today there are restrictions on land ceiling for agriculture in Bharat.

But even in a communist state like Bengal, there are **absolutely no restrictions on land ceiling** for the activities

of the **Global Investors/Wall Street/Dalal Street Pimps and Lalas** like real estate speculation, IT/BT/SEZ coolie export parks and for black money recycling activities of the Representative DFIs like educational and healthcare institutions and many such black money recycling activities.