China can't rewrite the Dalai Lama story



July 6, 2026, marked the 91st birthday of the 14th Dalai Lama. More than 20,000 devotees gathered in Leh, Ladakh, to honour his message of peace, love and compassion. In his birthday message, he reaffirmed the importance of helping others: "When I look back on my life, I see that the core of my practice has been to be of benefit to others. That is the altruistic motivation with which I wake up every day." While his teachings continue to inspire countless devotees around the world, the Chinese Communist Party has consistently advanced a different historical interpretation of the Dalai Lama institution. Its response to the Dalai Lama's birthday celebrations reflects a broader effort to politicize that institution.

Continuation of the Dalai Lama Institution - On July 2, 2025, the Dalai Lama unequivocally reaffirmed that the institution of the Dalai Lama will continue. He further emphasised this position in his autobiography, stating that the purpose of reincarnation is to carry forward the work of the predecessor. For that reason, he wrote, the next Dalai Lama will be born in the free world so that the traditional mission of the Dalai Lama can continue: to serve as a voice for universal compassion, the spiritual leader of Tibetan Buddhism, and a symbol of Tibet embodying the aspirations of the Tibetan people and its nation. No Approval was required from China - Today, the Dalai Lama's influence extends far beyond the Tibetan community, reaching more than 500 million Buddhists worldwide who are directly or indirectly inspired by him. In January 2024, the 12th General Assembly of the Asian Buddhist Conference for Peace unanimously recognised him as the "Universal Supreme Leader of the Buddhist World", honouring his lifelong work to bring Buddhist communities closer together and strengthen a shared sense of humanity. To curb the Dalai Lama's global influence, the Chinese Communist Party has sought to undermine the current Dalai Lama while asserting authority over the selection of his successor. More recently, the spokesperson of the Chinese Embassy in India has repeatedly tried to shape the narrative around his institution by claiming that China's Central Government formally recognised the title "Dalai Lama" in 1578.

Historically, the title "Dalai Lama" was bestowed on Sonam Gyatso by the Mongol ruler Altan Khan in 1578. Altan Khan later played a crucial role in establishing Buddhism in Mongolia, where the Fourth Dalai Lama was subsequently born in Mongolia. According to Sino-Tibetan historical records, the Ming Dynasty was overthrown by the Qing Empire in 1644. Two years before the Qing conquest of the Ming Dynasty, the Fifth Dalai Lama had already assumed both the spiritual and temporal leadership of Tibet with the support of Gushri Khan of Mongolia. In 1649, the Manchu Emperor Shunzhi invited the Fifth Dalai Lama to the imperial capital. Historical accounts describe the extraordinary respect shown by the emperor to the Dalai Lama. The story reminds us how the emperor extended his respect to the fifth Dalai Lama: "In an unprecedented sign of respect, the Manchu emperor made a four-day journey outside his capital (Peking) to receive the Tibetan sovereign and foremost spiritual leader of Central Asian Buddhists."

American scholar W. W. Rockhill wrote of the Fifth Dalai Lama's visit to the imperial capital: "The Dalai Lama had been treated with all the ceremony which could have been accorded to any independent sovereign, and nothing can be found in Chinese works to indicate that he was looked upon in any other light; at this period of China's relations with Tibet, the temporal power of the Lama, backed by the arms of Gushir Khan and the devotion of all Mongolia, was not a thing for the Emperor of China to question." It is also stated that "the Fifth Dalai Lama and the Manchu emperor bestowed unprecedented high complimentary titles upon each other, and the cho-yon relationship was reaffirmed".

Based on the above records, the Fifth Dalai Lama was treated by Emperor Shunzhi as the sovereign head of an independent nation. Therefore, there was no question of the emperor conferring a "golden certificate and golden seal" as a prerequisite for formal recognition. Even in the case of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, the Tibetan government did not seek approval from China to formally recognise the two-year-old Lhamo Dhondup as the reincarnation of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama.

Golden Urn and politics of succession - A traditional method of recognising the Dalai Lamas stands in contrast to what the Chinese authorities describe as the "Golden Urn" system. In Hinduism, Chapter 2, Verse 22 of the Bhagavad Gita states: "Just as a person discards worn-out clothes and puts on new ones, the soul discards a worn-out body and enters a new one." Similarly, Tibetans believe in life after death. In Tibetan Buddhism, when a highly realised lama passes away, his or her consciousness is believed to be reborn in a new body in order to continue unfinished spiritual work. This process is known as reincarnation.

In the case of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama, the search party sought guidance through prophecies associated with the sacred lake Lhamo Latso and state oracles. After extensive investigations and examinations, they identified the present Dalai Lama as the reincarnation of his predecessor. One of the most significant prophecies was the vision of "Ah Ka Ma" seen at Lhamo Latso. "Ah" was interpreted as referring to Amdo, the region where the present Dalai Lama was born. "Ka" was understood to refer to Kumbum Monastery, which is located in Amdo. "Ma" was later interpreted as a reference to the name Lhamo Dhondup, the childhood name of the present Dalai Lama. Critics argue that the Chinese Communist Party, despite officially adhering to atheism, has disregarded this traditional process and instead insists on the use of the Golden Urn system in the selection of the next Dalai Lama. They also contend that the Golden Urn process was politicised during the selection of the Eleventh Panchen Lama.

In his book Surviving the Dragon, Arjia Rinpoche recounts an allegation involving Ye Xiaowen, then head of the Bureau of Religious Affairs (now the State Administration for Religious Affairs), regarding the handling of the Golden Urn process: "When we made our selection, we left nothing to chance. In the silk pouches of the ivory pieces, we put a bit of cotton at the bottom of one of them, so it would be a little higher than the others and the right candidate would be chosen." According to Arjia Rinpoche's account, this is how China has selected Gyaltsen Norbu as the Eleventh Panchen Lama, while Gedhun Choekyi Nyima recognised by the Dalai Lama subsequently disappeared from public view. The Chinese Communist Party's deliberate attempts to distort historical facts are directed at the institution of the next Dalai Lama. According to this view, the Party is less concerned with who the next Dalai Lama is than with controlling the office itself in order to exert influence in Tibet and other Buddhist nations. To achieve this objective, it continually seeks to dominate the narrative, reinterpret history, and promote its own version of events.

Bootlegger caught with pistol

Action taken against habitual criminal, search begins for mastermind behind illegal weapons supply

Junagadh

The police administration has become extremely vigilant to strengthen law and order in Junagadh district and prevent any unwanted criminal activities. The Junagadh Crime Branch team has done commendable work and dealt a strong blow to the criminal network before any major criminal incident was carried out in the city. Under the direct guidance of Crime Branch Police Inspector K. M. Patel, the police teams were continuously patrolling and conducting intensive checking. During this, the police team has achieved great success in arresting a habitual criminal with illegal weapons based on specific information. Based on the information, the accused was cordoned off. During the patrol, the Crime Branch team received information that a person named Munir Kalubhai Bloch, who is involved in numerous prohibition crimes and is known as a headstrong element, is standing on the new bridge leading to Pancheshwar with a deadly weapon with some serious criminal planning. Due to which the Crime Branch had cordoned off the entire area. After reaching the spot, the police cordoned off this person from all sides. Pistol, 1 live cartridge seized from accused

A country-made deadly pistol hidden in the pants of accused Munir Blochni and 1 live cartridge that could be loaded with it were found. The police officers present at the spot were also shocked to see these deadly weapons. In this case, the police took legal action and recovered 1 country-made pistol worth about ?20,000 and 1 live cartridge worth ?100, and seized deadly items worth 20,100. The accused had taken the weapon from his uncle. When the arrested accused Munir Bloch specifically questioned him about where the weapon came from, the accused gave this deadly weapon to his uncle Rafiq Bloch for safekeeping.

Printed and Published by MAYUR C. BHATT on behalf of KALYANI PUBLIATION PVT. LTD. and Printed at : Dharti Printers C-3, Shankar Chember, Nr. Fadia Chamber, Asharam Road, Ahmedabad-Published From KALYANI PUBLIATION PVT. LTD. 201,202,208 Nandan complex, opp mithakhali rly crossing, mithakhali, ahmedabad.
Editior : Mayur C. Bhatt

State of doubt

What finally proves that I belong to my own country? It would have been another thing if this was only a rhetorical question that philosophers and intellectuals were asking themselves. But this question has begun to haunt the Indian citizen with increasing frequency. The question has come to acquire a disturbing urgency after reports that a former editor of a leading English daily was denied the renewal of his passport because his name was struck off from the electoral rolls during the Special Intensive Revision. Combined with the explanation that a passport is not proof of citizenship, this episode reveals that the land beneath our feet has shifted. Similar characterisation of other documents has been forwarded over the years. Aadhaar, we are told, is merely proof of identity, not citizenship. A voter identity card is not conclusive proof of citizenship and a ration card proves little beyond eligibility for welfare. Birth certificates, domicile certificates and a range of other official documents each carry their own limitations in recent times as told through different sources and voices. Individually, each statement may have a legal explanation. However, seen cumulatively, they produce something far more unsettling. They leave the ordinary citizen asking a profoundly constitutional question — which document does the Republic ultimately trust as proof of citizenship? Or perhaps the more uncomfortable question is if the Republic trusts its citizens at all. Since its inception, democracy in India rested upon a simple moral assumption. Unless there is compelling evidence to the contrary, the citizen belongs. The burden of suspicion lies with the State, not with the individual. The edifice of constitutional democracies is built upon a presumption of citizenship, not a presumption of doubt. And certainly, the state of doubt cannot be perpetual in nature. This relationship of trust, in other words the social contract, appears to have been reversed recently. The Indian citizen today seems condemned to an endless pilgrimage through files, certificates, photocopies, biometric authentication and documentary verification.

Every few years, another process arrives demanding fresh proof of what was supposedly established long ago. Every document becomes provisional and every recognition appears temporary. This is a disastrous situation in the making where every certificate carries within itself the possibility of future invalidation. The Republic that once recognised its citizens has gradually become a Republic that repeatedly interrogates them. While the administrative bottlenecks and pitfalls have received attention, this transformation in the philosophical character of the Indian nation and the Indian State deserves far greater public attention than it has received. Our Constitution never imagined citizenship as a favour periodically bestowed by official discretion. Citizenship was conceived as the foundational relationship from which every democratic right flowed. The right to vote, the right to equality before law, freedom of speech, access to public institutions — all derive their legitimacy from this settled constitutional identity. B.R. Ambedkar repeatedly reminded us that constitutional morality is sustained not just by the creation or the existence of institutions but by the conventions, restraint, and democratic practices that make institutions work. He took pains to point out that this is not natural but learnt. Perhaps his hope was that we might also learn this morality to make its practice reliable and predictable. We may call these habits of governance. Among those habits is the obligation of the State to inspire confidence rather than cultivate anxiety and trepidation amongst its own people. Surely, an anxious citizen cannot become a confident democrat.

The irony of the State being unable to trust its citizens is difficult to ignore as independent India has perhaps never possessed more data about its citizens than it does today. Biometrics, digital identities, banking records, tax filings, educational certificates, passports, driving licences and countless government databases collectively hold unprecedented information about millions of Indians. Yet despite this extraordinary expansion of State capacity to 'know', citizens are repeatedly asked to prove themselves.

One is reminded of Franz Kafka's haunting worlds where individuals spend entire lifetimes attempting to satisfy institutions whose standards remain permanently elusive. Kafka's bureaucracies were terrifying precisely because no amount of compliance ever brought closure, and the process became the punishment. Our administrative culture increasingly risks producing the same uncertainty.

It is often argued that rigorous verification is necessary to preserve the integrity of public institutions. Certainly, electoral rolls must be accurate and citizenship records must be reliable. Public resources should reach legitimate beneficiaries and no reasonable democracy can function without proper documentation. But documentation serves democracy only when it generates certainty. When documentation itself becomes the source of permanent uncertainty, it ceases to strengthen democratic legitimacy.

The State's responsibility is not simply to collect documents but also to ensure that citizens are not trapped in endless cycles of proving what already stands established. Let us not miss that the deeper issue here is trust. Every official document issued by the Republic carries an implicit constitutional promise to citizens that it recognises them. When the same Republic subsequently states that none of these documents conclusively establishes that recognition, it not only weakens administrative coherence but it also corrodes institutional credibility itself. Trust, once diluted, cannot easily be legislated back into existence because these concerns extend well beyond any individual case or any single government. History teaches us a simple lesson that powers created to scrutinise today's opponents rarely remain confined to them. Administrative systems possess remarkable continuity across political regimes. Once bureaucratic habits of perpetual verification become normalised, they acquire a life independent of electoral cycles and, thus, this situation should concern every political formation equally.

As the philosopher, Hannah Arendt, observed, citizenship ultimately guarantees what she called "the right to have rights". Remove certainty about citizenship, and every other right begins to rest upon unstable and fragile foundations. Debates around documentation have never been merely technical questions. They pose a deep moral question as to whether the citizen approaches the State as a rights-bearing constitutional equal or as a permanent applicant seeking official approval. India's freedom movement was not fought so that independent citizens would perpetually stand before administrative counters proving their existence. It was fought to replace the colonial culture of suspicion with a democratic culture of dignity. As a republic, we definitely deserve better. A mature State verifies where necessary, but it does not organise governance around the assumption that every citizen is always suspect. Yes, institutions do require records but we must refuse to normalise a culture where the latest bureaucratic exercise can jeopardise belonging for the people of such a vast nation repeatedly.

Canada's Nijjar miscalculation: When narrative outran evidence



In September 2023, Justin Trudeau, the then Canadian prime minister, stood in the House of Commons and turned a murder investigation into a diplomatic rupture. He did not announce charges. He did not present evidence that Canadians could examine.

He did not point to a completed prosecution. He said Canada was pursuing 'credible allegations' linking Indian government agents to the killing of Hardeep Singh Nijjar outside a gurdwara in Surrey, British Columbia.

Within hours, an unresolved criminal case became an international crisis. India was accused. Diplomats were expelled. Relations collapsed. Communities hardened. Some Khalistani activists claimed vindication. Critics of Khalistani extremism were smeared as anti-Sikh. A murder investigation became a political narrative before it became a public case.

Now, the latest public record raises the question Ottawa should have asked earlier: did Canada miscalculate?

US authorities have alleged that Lawrence Bishnoi, an imprisoned Indian gangster, and Satinderjeet Singh, known as Goldy Brar, directed Nijjar's killing. The case is part of a wider crackdown on transnational organised crime networks accused of murder, extortion, intimidation, narcotics offences, firearms offences and targeted violence. The latest public indictment does not allege that the Indian government ordered, approved or knew of the killing. No US official, while announcing the charges, publicly alleged that the Indian state directed the assassination. An indictment is not a conviction. The accused remain presumed innocent. Canada's investigation and the prosecution of four men charged in British Columbia still matter. But the clearest public criminal allegations now point to a gangster network, not to a named Indian official or the Indian state. For nearly three years, the Nijjar file sat at the centre of a political drama in which India was treated as the implied villain, while Canadians were asked to trust an accusation they could not test. If Canada had evidence strong enough to justify naming a foreign government in Parliament, Canadians deserved a clearer standard. If it did not, Parliament should not have been used in a way that looked less like justice and more like political theatre. Countries have diplomatic channels for sensitive disputes. They do not casually turn unresolved intelligence claims into parliamentary spectacle. Canada has long had a problem with how it handles Khalistani extremism. For more than 40 years, the loudest voices have too often been mistaken for the whole diaspora. Critics within Sikh and Hindu communities have been left exposed to intimidation. Referendums run by groups banned in India are treated as community politics. Posters glorifying Talwinder Singh Parmar, identified as the mastermind of the Air India Flight 182 bombing, are too often dismissed as free expression. Parmar was not a martyr. He was the central figure associated with Canada's deadliest terrorist attack, a bombing that killed 329 people, including 82 children, most of them Canadian citizens. That was the climate into which Trudeau made his statement. His words elevated a polarising frame, gave political oxygen to groups that had already weaponised victimhood, and helped transform Nijjar, a man India had accused of terrorism and links to the banned Khalistan Tiger Force, into 'Shaheed Bhai Hardeep Singh Nijjar' in activist messaging.

Truhome FINANCE

TRUHOME FINANCE LIMITED (Formerly Shriram Housing Finance Ltd.)
Head Office: Level -3, Wockhardt Towers, East Wing C-2, G Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai 400 051;
Tel: 1800 102 4345 ; **Website:** http://www. truhomefinance.in
Reg.Off.: Srinivasa Tower, 1st Floor, Door No.5, Old No.11, 2nd Lane, Cenatoph Road, Alwarpet, Teynampet, Chennai-600018

APPENDIX-IV-A [SEE PROVISION TO RULE 8(6)] SALE NOTICE FOR SALE OF IMMOVABLE PROPERTIES

E-Auction Sale Notice for Sale of Immovable Assets under the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 read with provision to Rule 8(6)] of the Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002.

Notice is hereby given to the public in general and in particular to the Borrower/s and Guarantor/s that the below described immovable properties mortgaged/ charged to Truhome Finance Limited (formerly Shriram Housing Finance Limited), the Physical Possession of which have been taken by the Authorized Officer of Truhome Finance Limited, will be sold on "As is where is", "As is what is" and "Whatever there is" basis for recovery of the balance due to Truhome Finance Limited from the Borrowers And Guarantors, as mentioned in the table.
Details of Borrowers and Guarantors, amount due, Short Description of the immovable property, reserve price and earnest money deposit and date of Inspection are also given as:

Name of Borrowers/ Co-Borrowers/ Guarantors/Mortgagers	Amount of Recovery and date of Demand Notice	Reserve Price (Rs.) & Bid Increment	Date & Time of Auction	Contact Person Details – (AO and Disposal team)
MR.SUMANTA BIPADBHANJAN HALDER , SARMISTHA DEY **Present Address:-ST NO 2 NANDUBAG, SANTKABIR ROAD,RAJKOT,Gujarat-360003** **Occupation Address:-Murlidhar Enterprise, Embasy tower Shop No.103/104, Opp. Jubelee garden,Jawahar Road, Rajkot - 360001** **Property Address:-Samanvay Heights, Flat No. I-202,Bhagvatipara,Rajkot** **Permanent Address:-G-103, Vinayak Flat, Bhagvati para, Opp. Badripark – Rajkot** **Permanent Address:-SARMISTHA DEY** **Sumanta Haldar, Bara Meigachhi Katwa, Singi, Purba Bardhaman, West Bengal – 713514** **Loan Account No. SHLHRAJK0001328** **Date of Possession & Type** **06.03.2026 and Physical Possession** **Encumbranches known** **Not Known**	13(2) Notice date 04.10.2025 ---------- -- Rs. 1680130/-(Rupees Sixteen Lakh Eighty Thousand one hundred thirty only) as on dated. 09/09/2025 under reference of Loan Account No. SHLHRAJK0001328	Rs.12,30,000/- (Rupees Twelve Lakh Thirty Thousand only) **Bid Increment:** Rs.. 10,000/- and in such multiples. **Earnest Money Deposit (EMD)(Rs.)** Rs.1,23,000/- (Rs.One lakh twenty three thousand only) **Last date for submission of EMD : 10 August 2026, Time 10.00 a.m. to 05.00 p.m.**	**11-AUG-2026 & Auction Time: 11.00 A.m. to 12.00 p.m.**	**Mehul Parmar 84909 64364** **Debjyoti roy 98747 02021** **Property inspection Date. 10 August 2026, Time.11 AM to 1 PM**

Description of Property

All that piece and Parcel Of Immovable Property of Immoveable Property Comprising of Residential Flat No.202 Having a Built Up area admeasuring 43-40 Sq.Mtrs (I.E.Carpet area 39-02 Sq.Mtrs.) on 2nd Floor, "WING-I", of "GOLD-B-TOWER" Building named "SMANVAY HEIGHTS" Constructed on NA Land Collectively Admeasuring area 4953-54 Sq.Mtrs. of Plot No.1 to 18, area Known as "MOTI SAGAR". lying and Situated at Rajkot Revenue Survey No.8/3 Paiki 1. City Survey Ward No.13/2. Sheet No.561. City Survey No.3938/1/3. TPS No.31(Draft) (Rajkot). IP No.6 4 of Rajkot City Sub Dist & Regis Dist-Rajkot of Gujarat State.
BOUNDARIES:- NORTH : Common Passage and Stair , SOUTH: Open to Sky, EAST -Wing-1. Flat No.204. WEST Wing-H. Flat No.204,

1) **For detailed terms and conditions of the sale, please refer the website of Truhome Finance Limited (Formerly Shriram Housing Finance Limited) website.**
2) **The intending bidders have to submit their EMD amount to be deposited by way of RTGS/NEFT to the account details mentioned herein below: BANK NAME: AXIS BANK LIMITED BRANCH: BANDRA KURLA COMPLEX, MUMBAI BANK ACCOUNT NO. Current Account No. 911020045677633 IFSC CODE: UTIB0000230.**
3) **The mortgagors/borrowers are given a last chance to pay the total dues with further interest before auction, failing which secured assets will be sold as per above schedule.**
Please note that the secured creditor is going to issue the sale notice to all the Borrowers/ Guarantors/ Mortgagors by speed/ registered post. In case the same is not received by any of the parties, then this publication of sale notice may be treated as a substituted mode of service

Place : Rajkot
Date: 20/07/2026

Sd/- Authorised Officer- Truhome Finance Limited
(Formerly Shriram Housing Finance Limited)