

AN EXPLORATION OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND ANTI- CONVERSION LEGISLATION IN INDIA

MOOL RAJ SINGH

Research Scholar

Dr Parag Garg

Guide name

Monad University Hapur up India

DECLARATION: I AS AN AUTHOR OF THIS PAPER /ARTICLE, HERE BY DECLARE THAT THE PAPER SUBMITTED BY ME FOR PUBLICATION IN THE JOURNAL IS COMPLETELY MY OWN GENUINE PAPER. IF ANY ISSUE REGARDING COPYRIGHT/PATENT/ OTHER REAL AUTHOR ARISES, THE PUBLISHER WILL NOT BE LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE. IF ANY OF SUCH MATTERS OCCUR PUBLISHER MAY REMOVE MY CONTENT FROM THE JOURNAL WEBSITE. FOR THE REASON OF CONTENT AMENDMENT /OR ANY TECHNICAL ISSUE WITH NO VISIBILITY ON WEBSITE /UPDATES, I HAVE RESUBMITTED THIS PAPER FOR THE PUBLICATION. FOR ANY PUBLICATION MATTERS OR ANY INFORMATION INTENTIONALLY HIDDEN BY ME OR OTHERWISE, I SHALL BE LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE. (COMPLETE DECLARATION OF THE AUTHOR AT THE LAST PAGE OF THIS PAPER /ARTICLE

Abstract

In spite of the fact that secular principles form the basis of India's constitution, the term "secularism" is not used anywhere in the document. Political and religious issues have been a source of contention in Indian politics in recent years, with five states passing legislation prohibiting religious conversions in the past seven years, adding to three that had previously existed, reflecting a rising unease. This study investigates the perplexing relationship between religious freedom and anti-conversion laws in India. It dives into the historical setting of conversion banter during the drafting of the Indian Constitution, featuring the consideration of the dubious right to "propagate" religion. Next, it examines the nature and limitations of religious freedom, drawing on international human rights documents and Indian legal precedents. Additionally, this study also critiques anti-conversion laws across several Indian states, arguing that their broad and ambiguous definitions of terms like "force," "allurement," and "fraudulent means" unduly restrict legitimate religious practices and missionary activities.

Keywords: *Religious Freedom, Anti-Conversion Laws, Legislation, Constitution, Legal Framework*

1. INTRODUCTION

Any discussion on the post-Independence India's claim to religious freedom is complicated by the problem of religious conversion. For at least two centuries, disagreements on religious truth and conversion have caused miscommunication between various groups in Indian culture. Limitations on unambiguous types of conversion have been upheld for in political and legal talk on numerous events throughout recent many years. A few Indian states ordered "Freedom of Religion Acts," which prohibited the utilization of pressure, duplicity, and instigation to change over somebody. As far as possible on conversion are acknowledged to jeopardize the right to freedom of soul and religion, which has prompted worries about religious intolerance and inclination against Christian and Muslim minority. On the other hand, some battle that the demonstration of changing over another person to one's own religion is an encroachment on their right to freedom of religion; they consider it to be a fierce invasion into a singular's religious life.

The fundamental right to freedom of religion is emphasized in Article 25(1) of the Indian Constitution, which was drafted by the Constituent Assembly between 1946 and 1949. The inclusion of the right to propagate religion in the constitution was the outcome of a key debate, winnowed by the more liberal-leaning members over Hindu conservatives who opposed conversion and the right to propagate religion. This constitutional provision affirms individuals' freedom to profess, practise and propagate

Considering the significance attached to this discussion, we shall begin by posing the following queries: What sort of discussions did the Assembly have regarding the freedom to spread religion? Why was it decided by this body drafting the constitution to add the word "propagate" to this Article instead of the more widely used terms "profess" and "practise"? What were the various points of view and arguments that shaped the discussion, and how did they contribute to the adoption of Article 25 and the freedom to practise one's religion? The Constitution was drafted more than quite a long while by the Constituent Gathering. It is understandable that this board, whose mission was to lay out the fundamental standards by which the Indian nation ought to be governed, would take some consideration in planning and discussing the issues encompassing

religious freedom in India. In this manner, to realize the Gathering's individuals' opinion on religious freedom, conversion, and the spread of religion, we hope to its files.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- Analyse the reasons behind the inclusion of the right to freely preach religion in Article 25 of the Indian Constitution.
- Examine critically whether anti-conversion legislation in India are constitutional, paying particular attention to the meanings of important terminology.
- Examine how anti-conversion laws affect minority communities in India,

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Harish S. Wankhade (2009) this article examines the political environment in which religious conversion occurred in Orissa, focusing on the role that Hindu nationalism and violence against minority communities had in the process. Concerns are raised in this article on the politicization of conversion as well as the requirement for legislative protection for religious minorities.

Anzil Kommattu (2004) makes the case for the passage of laws to control religious conversion, arguing that such legislation is essential in order to safeguard vulnerable groups and prevent coercion. From this point of view, questions are raised over the possibility of constraints being placed on religious freedom, as well as the difficulty of defining "coercion" in a culture that is so diverse.

K.N. Chandrasekharan (2006) in this article, Pillai investigates the position taken by the Supreme Court of India regarding caste conversion and reservation policy. By shedding light on the legal complications surrounding conversion and the influence it has on social and economic rights, this essay provides some illumination.

Paul M. Taylor (2005) examines the criticisms that are levelled against proselytism and particular religious expressions, stating that these criticisms frequently originate from intolerance towards

religion and violate the individual's right to freedom of religion. The constraints that are placed on proselytism are challenged in this article, which stands as a powerful defence of religious freedom.

Carolyn Evans (2006) Examine the European Convention on Human Rights' (ECHR) approach to church-state relations, keeping in mind the need to strike a balance between the protection of other fundamental rights and the freedom of religion. This article provides a comparative viewpoint as well as helpful insights into the legal systems that govern religious concerns in Europe.

4. FREEDOM OF RELIGION: SCOPE AND AMBIT

In each and every one of the states that are viewed as enlightened, the freedom of religion and conviction is viewed as a fundamental human right. Article 18 of the General Statement of Human Rights incorporates an arrangement that ensures the right of each and every person to freedom of thought, soul, and religion. This right incorporates the capacity to transform one's religion and convictions. India, which is a majority rule republic, has likewise conceded all people a similar degree of freedom of heart, profession, practice, and advancement of religion. This is on the grounds that India puts an unbalanced measure of significance on its mainstream qualifications.

Inside the framework of each and every vote based constitution, the freedom of religion and heart is viewed as a fundamental part. The freedom that exists in nations that are viewed as socialized today reaches out past the simple ownership of explicit convictions to remember the shortfall of conviction for any religion.⁶ Any obstruction with the free activity of religion and thoughts would be viewed as a serious break of an innate human right. This is on the grounds that religion and believed are the most fundamental parts of the human nature. One of the main parts of human advancement is the capacity to hold convictions of one's own picking and to adjust those perspectives. The singular's mission for significance and the will to understand our identity as human creatures are at the core of this peculiarity.

Subsequently, the right to freedom of religion is associated with different international files, including the African Agreement, the Overall Declaration of Human Rights, the International Settlement on Normal and Political Rights, the Statement on Removal Considering Religion or

Conviction, the European Show for the Affirmation of Human Rights, and the American Demonstration of Human Rights. This is a huge feature raise since, as demonstrated by article 4(2) of the International Agreement on Normal and Political Rights (ICCPR) and article 27(2) of the American Show, the security of religious freedom is non-distributable, and that infers that it can't be encroached upon at whatever point, regardless of what the circumstances, including war.

There are a few rights that relate to freedom of religion that are conceded to "all people" in India by the Indian Constitution, specifically Article 25-28. Under Article 25(1), each individual is ensured the freedom of "still, small voice," the right to "profess," the right to "practice," and the right to "propagate" their confidence.

While alluding to a man's emotional sensation of good and off-base, the expression "inner voice" is utilized. It is workable for an individual to have freedom of soul, and that implies that they are allowed to consider any conviction or hypothesis that they accept will be gainful to their profound prosperity. The ramifications of this is that the state isn't allowed to ask about or think about the religious or moral perspectives on a man. Being able to put stock in a specific religious teaching of one's picking is remembered for the idea of freedom of soul. It is critical to take note of that this freedom is fundamentally unique in relation to the freedom to do outside activities for the sake of that confidence.

At the point when we contrast article 25 with other international reports, we arrive at the understanding that albeit the right to freedom of religion is allowed to people, gatherings, and categories the same, this right isn't unlimited and is dependent upon specific imperatives.

Then again, with regards to the freedom of still, small voice, it is difficult to put any type of limitation on an individual's internal contemplations, moral cognizance, or have faith in God. This is because of the way that it isn't possible for a human being to do as such. It is basically impossible to pressure somebody into accepting or not accepting. Puzzlers encompass the human brain. It is challenging to peruse, and much more hard to understand. It is outside the realm of possibilities for any individual, not to mention a state, to force constraints or limitations on human cognizance, and any activity that endeavors to do so is a serious break of the regular freedom of people.

During its 48th gathering, the Human Rights Warning gathering was researching article 189 of the International Vow on Normal and Political Rights (ICCPR). In area 3, the board saw that article 18 isolates the freedom of thought, soul, religion, or conviction from the freedom to show religion or conviction. It takes into consideration no limitations at all to be put on the freedom of brain and soul, as well as the freedom to have or embrace a religion or conviction of one's picking. As stated in article 19(1), these freedoms are defended with next to no circumstances, and the right of each and every person to offer their viewpoints without obstruction is likewise secured. As per segments 18(2) and 17, nobody can be compelled to uncover his viewpoints or his commitment to a religion or conviction. This is on the grounds that everybody has the option to express their genuine thoughts. Then again, inside the domain of the outer appearance of thought, soul, religion, or conviction, sensible limitations can be forced.

Hence, as per article 18 of the International Agreement on Common and Political Rights (ICCPR), states that are involved with the contract have the position to force limitations on the indication that might be managed by regulation and are fundamental for the security of "public security," "request," "wellbeing," or "ethics," as well as the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

Essentially, the Indian Constitution, to be specific Article 25, likewise incorporates arrangements for certain restrictions. Ten The main condition of Article 25 is a restricting proviso that states that it is "dependent upon public request, ethical quality, and wellbeing as well as different arrangements of this Part." This recommends that the freedom of religion that is ensured by article 25 is definitely not an outright right; as a matter of fact, the constitutional assurance is the most un-solid as in it is vulnerable to the next fundamental rights that are all given by the Constitution.

The contention that freedom of still, small voice with no freedom to show considerations is a useless right that fills no need is introduced here. In any case, simultaneously, the contention that freedom of soul can be limited because of the way that the right to still, small voice incorporates the right to sign is an oversimplified support for the way that the right to accept (or doubt) is a flat out right, though the right to act can't be.

Considering various plans of article 25, which integrate the right to uninhibitedly "practice," "profess," and "propagate" religion, it implies a lot to observe that the right to "profess" religion is

indistinguishably associated with the freedom of heart. An individual can follow any religion of his picking in the event that they have the freedom of still, small voice, though the right to profess religion gives them the right to openly state their belief in the event that they so want. Freedom of still, small voice is something inside and is restricted to the person who is looking for it. Profession of religion, then again, includes openly confirming one's conviction and confidence through expressions of mouth or other conduct. An individual's freedom to follow any religion or accept is inseparably connected to their right to communicate their religious beliefs."12" The act of a particular religion or the need to keep on being an individual from a specific group can't be forced on an individual for any reason. If an individual so wishes, he is totally allowed to change his religion. If an inquiry emerges with respect to the religion that he professes, it will be recognized that he is an individual from the new confidence that he has decided to acknowledge.

In the space of religion, the right to "practice" religion suggests the appearance and veritable explanation of a solitary's convictions. Religious practices, on the other hand, can't be totally protected from meddling.

The "freedom of propagation" of religion is the freedom that has been the centre of all criticism and debate in addition to being the freedom that is outlined in article 25. The act of transmitting or spreading one's religion through the presentation of its precepts is referred to as propagation."14" Every individual has been granted the right to proclaim his or her religious beliefs for the purpose of enlightening other people, as protected by the Constitution. After going over the arguments that took place at the Constituent Assembly, we have come to the conclusion that the word "propagation" was one of the most contentious and extensively disputed words that was ultimately incorporated into the constitution. The fact that the term "propagation" is closely related to the concept of "conversion" is the reason why it is subject to such a large amount of criticism.

Conversion is viewed as a fundamental result to the course of spread. From the beginning of the conversations, the rights that clearly associate with conversion were direct in the topic of religious freedom. Specifically, the right to transparently talk or profess any religion was at the actual front of the discussion. Considering the way that these rights were thought about simultaneously with the right to engendering, apparently individuals who drafted the Constitution knew about the

association that exists between articulation or profession and the possibility of conversions. Some of the individuals from the gathering voiced areas of strength for them to the consideration of "engendering" in the draft, while simultaneously there were other people who upheld the incorporation of the expression.

The commonplace pattern that can be found in social orders that are wanting a longing that more individuals ought to join the group of their convictions and that their individuals shouldn't generally leave the family can be followed back to the way of thinking that supports the idea of engendering.

When viewed from this angle, the policy of dissemination as a tool of conversion does not necessarily have to be founded on ill will. It is possible that some individuals who are members of a specific religious group do love for other people what they love for themselves. This is done with the best of intentions. It is possible that they desire everyone to join their faith and benefit from the advice that it provides because they believe that their religion is the way that leads to salvation and success. By and by, there is a fundamental issue with everything going on. These people can't appreciate the fundamental idea that, with regards to significant issues touching one's own life and passing, an individual must be allowed to pursue their own choice. The choice to have faith in a religion or to modify one's religion should be established on a person's own thoroughly examined judgment, despite the fact that tolerating fair help from outside sources is generally proper. Concerning the choice of one's religion, it involves rule that each individual ought to be liberated from all possible tensions and enticements that come from the rest of the world. In mark of truth, it is a result of this freedom that every individual is responsible for the convictions that they hold.

4.1. Religion change as a freedom of thought right

According to a proverb, "a person cannot choose if he does not know what choices are open to him"²⁰, and this adage accurately describes the situation when it comes to matters of religion as well. On the other hand, the choice of religion cannot be understood in the same way as the choice between political and other types of ideas. It is possible that the decision between heaven and hell is a literal one, taking into consideration the motives that individual converts have for embracing and exhibiting a particular belief. The freedom of conscience includes the right to choose as an

implicit component. As human beings, we are born free with a natural freedom to choose; nevertheless, due to a variety of factors, none of us are able to freely use this right. A person's appealing surroundings, a lack of knowledge about the similarities and differences between the doctrines of the various religious systems, or the absence of opportunities that are both free and fair could all be factors. Almost no one is fully informed on the methods by which they might exercise their rights in relation to the freedom to choose their faith.

It is overall understood that freedom of religious heart incorporates the freedom to pick, to keep, to change, or to abandon a particular religion. In addition, it encompasses the freedom to pick or to abandon religion or secularism by and large with close to no ominous results. This understanding relies upon article 18 of the Comprehensive Statement of Human Rights and article of the European Show on Human Rights. Not the kind of thing can be restricted in any way.

Without the freedom to change one's religion or certainty, the right to change one's religion or certainty would take a chance with staying an impasse. "The freedom of religious heart, as understood above, wraps the right to persuade others through teaching, for example through evangelist development," This honor isn't to be practiced exclusively in a common setting, like out in the open or among a gathering of different devotees; rather, it is to be practiced secretly and on a singular premise as well. There is a limitation put on the right to propagate one's religion or confidence because of the preclusion of proselytism, and specifically the shortfall of a definition for the term.

5. ANTI-CONVERSION LAWS

It is well known that every statute must be examined through the lens of the Constitution, and it is also known that "secularism" is an essential component of our Constitution. The constitutionality of statutes that regulate conversions is called into question as a result of this particular circumstance. Prior to delving into the validity of these seven legislation, which are referred to in a euphemistic manner as "Freedom of Religion laws," we will initially provide a concise overview of the historical context. For accommodation, I will allude to these Goes about as anti-conversion laws. In any case, it is essential to take note of that the normal discernment that these laws disallow conversions all by themselves is really a misinterpretation. These laws are pointed toward

managing conversions, and they don't disallow conversions rigorously based on religious convictions.

Anti-conversion laws were in effect in a number of princely kingdoms before to the country's independence, although British India did not have any laws protecting against conversion. It is likely that the reason for this distinction lay in the fact that the British themselves proclaimed a religion that promoted proselytising, while the princely governments that were predominantly Hindu shown hostility to conversion to a foreign religion like Christianity. Conversions that were obtained through fraudulent means, deceit, coercion, intimidation, undue influence, or other similar means now have the potential to be subject to a penalty. It was not possible to convert minors because offspring of converts were not instantly deemed to be guided by the new faith of their parents. This fact made it impossible to convert minors.

In the Constituent Gathering, the issue of conversion was one of the topics that got the most time and consideration from conversation. It was unequivocally felt that the Constitution shouldn't make express arrangements for all such possible things that could in all likelihood be managed by standard legislation. This was regardless of the way that there was no conflict of assessment on the benefits of the case, which stated that effective conversion ought not be perceived by regulation or can't be perceived by regulation.

After the nation acquired its freedom, various endeavors were made to carry out a focal legislation to oversee religious conversions; be that as it may, these endeavors were at last ineffective. Then again, there were a couple of separated instances of endeavors completed at the state level to have such legislations passed. In 1967, the state of Madhya Pradesh passed a regulation called the Madhya Pradesh Dharma Swatantraya Adhiniyam, which depended on the ideas made by the Bhawani Sankar Niyogi board. The State of Orissa had previously passed a piece of regulation that was very like the Madhya Pradesh Act, which was named the Orissa Freedom of Religion Act, 1967, when the Madhya Pradesh Act was passed.

5.1. Constitutionality of Anti Conversion Laws: An Analysis

Without a doubt, there is no basis that may legitimise conversions that are brought about via the use of violence or any other form of force that is not acceptable. In addition, there is no justification for the practice of converting to a different religion with the intention of evading the sanctions of the law or cheating the judicial system.

Converting someone against their will is a violation of the principle of freedom of conscience and is considered to be one of the most serious violations of human rights. Taking this assumption into consideration, it is possible to assert that the state is justified in enacting laws for the goal of preventing conversions that are brought about through illegal means and for the purpose of safeguarding the right to personal freedom of conscience. However, upon closer inspection of the statutes that are now in place regarding this matter, we come to the realisation that they are improper. The wording that is used by these laws goes a lot of past the security of this right, and as a matter of fact, it doesn't have all the earmarks of being driven by the craving to protect the freedom of soul in any manner.³⁸ - The verbiage that these bits of legislation utilizes changes over them from their obvious job as watchmen of constitutional rights into really violators of the specific ensures that they should safeguard.

In order to get started, let us first investigate the definition of "conversion" that is provided in the legislation. As indicated by the Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, and Himachal Pradesh Act, the expression "conversion" alludes to the demonstration of renouncing one confidence and tolerating another. Utilizing an alternate expressiveness, the Gujrat Act gives a meaning of the expression "convert" as "the demonstration of making an individual deny one religion and take on another religion."⁴¹ One of the distinctive qualities of the Rajasthan, Arunachal Pradesh, and Chhattisgarh Act is that it explicitly kills the expression "reconversion" from its meaning of "conversion." The Arunachal Act characterizes "conversion" as the demonstration of renouncing one's native confidence and tolerating another confidence or religion. This definition might be found in Area 2(b). A further meaning of "native" is given in Segment 2(c) of the Demonstration. This definition incorporates "such religions, convictions, and works on including rituals, ceremonies, celebrations, observances, exhibitions, forbearance, and customs as have been viewed as endorsed, supported, and performed by the native networks of Arunachal Pradesh from the time

these networks have been known." Moreover, a rundown of people who are considered native is given.

In the Rajasthan Act, the expression "conversion" is solely used to allude to the demonstration of renouncing one's own confidence and joining another. A clarification of "own religion" is that the religion one's ancestors rehearsed. Likewise, the Chhattisgarh Act, which has been refreshed, does exclude the idea of "getting back to one's ancestors' religion or his unique religion" in the meaning of conversion.

Among the Demonstrations, the differentiation among "conversion" and "reconversion" stands out as the main inconsistency. This qualification clearly separates among religions and disregards article 14 of the constitution. At the point when prompted reconversion isn't viewed as a wrongdoing, it is hard to understand the reason why instigated conversion is viewed as a wrongdoing in any case.

The justification behind these regulative measures is to refuse "viable" conversions, as stated in the going with terms: "No singular will change over or attempt to change over, either directly and so on, any singular beginning with one religion then onto the following by the usage of force or by allurement or by any underhanded means, nor will any individual abet such conversion." In the Demonstrations of Orissa, Arunachal Pradesh, and Himachal Pradesh, the expression "allurement" is supplanted by "affectation." The limitation to the disavowal stipulation of the Himachal Act continues to announce that "any person who has been exchanged beginning with one religion once again totally then onto the following, in nullification of the plans of this part, will be thought of as not to have been changed over." This game plan is associated with the Himachal Act.

As to meaning of the expression "compel," it is important that every one of the legislations stick to a uniform definition, which states that "force will incorporate the showcase of power or the danger of injury or the danger of heavenly dismay or social banishment."

This specific meaning of power is the main one in the regular world since it isn't known the way that this definition would work in genuine circumstances. For instance, assuming that a religion instructs that there is plausible of heavenly disappointment for the people who don't stick to its

lessons (which is the situation with all Abrahamic religions), then the demonstration of giving this statement of belief might be viewed as a demonstration of impulse as per anticonversion legislation. The right to modify one's religion is harmed subsequently by virtue of this.^{43.1} An unreasonably wide idea of power ridiculously obstructs communications between the people who are keen on changing over expected converts and other people who are endeavoring to urge them to change over. The last option are delivered unequipped for educating the previous regarding what their religion educates about nonadherents, which confines the data that might be made accessible to the possible proselyte and, accordingly, impedes the significant activity of the expected proselyte's right to change faith.⁴⁴ likewise, the expression "divine dismay" is used in the Indian criminal Code⁴⁵, which has been in presence for over 150 years as of now since its commencement. As per the Indian Punitive Code, any individual or gathering that utilizes the danger of heavenly dismay to constrain one more individual or gathering into playing out any demonstration can be arraigned for their activities. There is an unobtrusive qualification in the functional extent of the expression in every one of these conditions, to be specific when it is utilized in the Indian Corrective Code and when it is utilized in the anti-conversion rules. In its ability as an overall reformatory rule, the Indian Punitive Code (IPC) is the rule that everyone must follow that accommodates numerous classifications of offenses. Anti-conversion laws are established with the express aim of achieving a specific objective.

The extent of the Indian Punitive Code is very expansive, though the extent of anti-conversion laws is more restricted as far as territorial limits yet greater with regards to its scope and effect. There is dependably space for transparently expansive understanding or error when the term is utilized in a particularly exact way as in the anti-conversion laws. This could, in specific conditions, lead to limitations being put on the freedom to unreservedly propagate one's religion.

The expressions "allurement" and "prompting" require further basic examination to be completely understood.⁽⁴⁶⁾ It is essential to take note of that the Orissa High Court tended to the trouble with the use of the expression "actuation" on account of *Yulitha Hyde v. State of Orissa*⁴⁷. All things considered, the court decided that the word's very uncertain person and wide importance caused it to encroach upon various legal approaches to converting. Regardless of the way that this choice

was in the long run upset by the High Court on account of *Stainislaus v. Madhya Pradesh*⁴⁸, in which the Court kept up with the legality of the Orissa Act, the issue of the immense degree of both of these terms keeps on being an issue.

It is worried that altruistic deeds are essential to specific religions, and any wide translation given to these two expressions might obstruct the freedom of its followers to genuinely rehearse their religion or religious convictions. This is the explanation of worry in this present circumstance. The stockpile of instructive offices or clinical consideration by religious categories could be seen as "allurement" fully intent on making somebody convert to their confidence. This is plausible that can be thought of. Subsequently, these definitions offer a lot of space for understanding in regards to the activities that keep on being allowed and those that are not allowed.

The meaning of the expression "false signifies" is one more illustration of a vague definition. It is stated in the Rajasthan and Gujrat Act that "deceitful means and incorporates deception or some other fake creation." It is Himachal Pradesh, Orissa. Misrepresentation will incorporate misdirection or some other deceitful inventions, as indicated by the Demonstrations of Madhya Pradesh, Arunachal Pradesh, and Chhattisgarh. Obviously this definition isn't exact. For example, assuming that an individual was educated that changing over would carry them nearer to God, however it worked out that the changed over individual didn't encounter the ideal degree of otherworldliness in the wake of changing over, then the individual could contend that they were distorted.

At the point when policing are confronted with the undertaking of recognizing genuine and unlawful conversions, these wording will be a wellspring of disappointment for them. The implementation specialists are thus offered more room to involve their carefulness as a result of this. Because of the way that anti-conversion laws loan themselves to manhandle, they are viewed as a unique type of discrimination against minority gatherings. The worries against abuse and the feelings of dread of provocations make a component of doubt in the personalities of minorities, which is certainly not a decent sign for a mainstream a majority rule government. This is in spite of the way that it is unassumingly conceded here that the dubiousness of terms utilized in a

resolution and the anxiety toward abuse can preferably not be the justification for proclaiming a rule to be unconstitutional.

6. CONCLUSION

The manner in which individuals act in their everyday lives is affected by their religious thoughts and contemplations. A vital part of human development is the right to freedom of heart, freedom of training and profession, and freedom to propagate one's religious convictions. It is introduced in this paper that the topic of religious conversion in India is as yet a disagreeable one, with anti-conversion legislation producing worries about their capability to disregard the fundamental right to freedom of religion, specifically the capacity to spread and change one's confidence. In any case, the expansive and equivocal meanings of terms, for example, "force," "affectation," and "fake signifies" in these laws make vulnerabilities and the potential for abuse, which lopsidedly influences religious minorities. Despite the fact that it is unquestionable that powerful conversions abuse individual rights and warrant legal intervention, the laws being referred to are not adequately explicit to resolve the issue. The issue is additionally convoluted by the shortfall of a differentiation among genuine and unlawful methods of conversion, which leaves unanswered inquiries in regards to the reasonable extent of religious articulation and exercises connected with preacher work.

REFERENCES

1. Anzil Kommattu, "Religious Conversion: Need for Legislation", 19 Lawyers Collective 24 (2004).
2. Badkul, S., & Yadav, U. (2015). A Socio-Legal Analysis of Religion, Secularism and the Anti Conversion Laws. *Nirma ULJ*, 5, 35.
3. Bhat, M. M. A. (2021). Religious freedom in contest: Enforcing religion through anti-conversion laws in India. *Journal of law, religion and state*, 9(2-3), 178-211.
4. Carolyn Evans* and Christopher A. Thomas, "Church-State Relations in the European Court of Human Rights" 699 *Brigham Young University Law Review* 699-720 (2006).
5. Fischer, M. G. (2018). *Anti-Conversion Laws and the International Response*. *Penn St. JL & Int'l Aff.*, 6, 1.

6. Harish S. Wankhade, “The Political Context of Religious Conversion in Orissa”, 44(15) *EPW* 33-38 (2009)
7. Hertzberg, M. I. (2016). *The Anti-Conversion Bill: Political Buddhism, ‘Unethical Conversions’ and Religious Freedom in Sri Lanka*.
8. Huff, J. A. (2008). *Religious freedom in India and analysis of the constitutionality of anti-conversion laws*. *Rutgers JL & Religion*, 10, 1.
9. K.N. Chandrasekharan Pillai, “Supreme Court on caste conversion and reservation” 47 (4) *JILI* 540-43 (2005).
10. Kumar, M., & Yadav, G. (2022). *Anxieties of the Dominant: Legal, Social, and Religious in the Politics of Religious Conversion in India*. *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion*, *rwac008*.
11. Nazish, S. (2008). *Freedom Of Religion In India: A Study Of Religious Conversion (Doctoral Dissertation, Aligarh Muslim University Aligarh (India))*.
12. Osuri, G. (2012). *Religious freedom in India: Sovereignty and (anti) conversion*. Routledge.
13. P., Mallows Priscilla. (2021). *Restrictions on Freedom to Propagate Religion vis-a-vis Anti-Conversion Laws in India*. *Issue 5 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, 4, 187.
14. Paul M. Taylor, “The Questionable Grounds of Objections to Proselytism and Certain Other Forms of Religious Expression” 699 *Brigham Young University Law Review* 811-36 (2006).
15. Saiya, N., & Manchanda, S. (2020). *Anti-conversion laws and violent Christian persecution in the states of India: A quantitative analysis*. *Ethnicities*, 20(3), 587-607.

Author's Declaration

I as an author of the above research paper/article, hereby, declare that the content of this paper is prepared by me and if any person having copyright issue or patent or anything otherwise related to the content, I shall always be legally responsible for any issue. For the reason of invisibility of my research paper on the website/amendments/updates, I have resubmitted my paper for publication on the same date. If any data or information given by me is not correct, I shall always be legally responsible. With my whole responsibility legally and formally have intimated the publisher (Publisher) that my paper has been checked by my guide (if any) or expert to make it sure that paper is technically right and there is no unaccepted plagiarism and hentriconantane is genuinely mine. If any issue arises related to Plagiarism/ Guide Name/ Educational Qualification/ Designation/ Address of my university/ college/institution/ Structure or Formatting/ Resubmission /Submission /Copyright /Patent/Submission for any higher degree or Job/Primary Data/Secondary Data Issues. I will be solely/entirely responsible for any legal issues. I have been informed that the most of the data from the website is invisible or shuffled or vanished from the database due to some technical fault or hacking and therefore the process of resubmission is there for the scholars/students who finds trouble in getting their paper on the website. At the time of resubmission of my paper I take all the legal and formal responsibilities, If I hide or do not submit the copy of my original documents (Andhra/Driving License/Any Identity Proof and Photo) in spite of demand from the publisher then my paper maybe rejected or removed from the website anytime and may not be consider for verification. I accept the fact that As the content of this paper and the resubmission legal responsibilities and reasons are only mine then the Publisher (Airo International Journal/Airo National Research Journal) is never responsible. I also declare that if publisher finds Any complication or error or anything hidden or implemented otherwise, my paper maybe removed from the website or the watermark of remark/actuality maybe mentioned on my paper. Even if anything is found illegal publisher may also take legal action against me

MOOL RAJ SINGH

Dr Parag Garg
