

Welcome to **KEYSTONE IAS Academy**



Anna Nagar, Chennai - 40.

Current Affairs

For All Competitive Exams



Current Affairs (**NEWS**)



For All Competitive Exams

7305777541 / 641 www.keystoneiasacademy.com

AN ACADEMY RUN BY OFFICERS OF ALL INDIA CIVIL SERVICES & JUDICIAL SERVICES.



தினம் ஒரு குறள்

குறள் எண் 846

புல்லறிவாண்மை

அற்றம் மறைத்தலோ புல்லறிவு தம்வயின்
குற்றம் மறையா வழி.

தம்மிடத்தில் உள்ளக் குற்றத்தை அறிந்து நீக்காத போது , உடம்பில்
மறைப்பதற்குரிய பகுதியை மட்டும், ஆடையால் மறைத்தல்
புல்லறிவாகும். - மு. வரதராசன்



Challenges facing the upcoming income survey

The upcoming Household Income Survey promises to provide a detailed snapshot of India's households – their incomes, expenses, and changing dynamics. Yet, collecting accurate income data remains a challenge due to the sensitive nature of the questions, which many respondents may find intrusive or difficult to answer.

ECONOMIC NOTES

Vignesh Radhakrishnan

The upcoming Household Income Survey, 2026, which is going to be the first of its kind, could offer the clearest picture yet of India's households, revealing how they are coping, changing, and moving towards the future. However, the challenge with such an exercise lies in the sensitive nature of questions about individual income, which many respondents may be reluctant to answer. While the survey design is valuable from a policymaker's perspective, for respondents, such questions can feel intrusive and, in many cases, difficult to answer accurately from memory.

On past surveys

Indian policymakers lack actionable information about household income. While surveys like the Periodic Labour Force Survey attempt to capture earnings, it views wages and salaries through the lens of labour market dynamics, and falls short of offering detailed insights into household characteristics. The Household Consumption Expenditure Survey (HCES) relies on spending patterns to infer household income. While this survey is considered more reliable, using consumption data as a proxy for income involves a leap that may not always hold up in practice. Then there is the RBI's Consumer Confidence Survey which tracks how income levels rise or fall over time among urban and rural consumers. Put together, these survey tools have either captured broad trends in income changes, relied on proxies to gauge them, or examined income through specific analytical lenses.

The upcoming Household Income Survey, however, aims to collect income data to understand income itself and its interplay with other household characteristics. The new survey gathers



GETTY IMAGES

detailed information on social group, religion, and occupation – covering whether households are engaged in agriculture or other economic activities. It also records land ownership and use, property details such as the size and type of dwelling, and loans taken.

This survey, for the very first time, collects detailed information on regular salaries, including allowances such as overtime pay, performance-based bonuses, stock options, leave encashments, and severance payments. For casual workers, the survey will record the number of days worked, average daily wages earned, and even tips received. In the case of self-employed respondents, it will gather details on the type of crops sold, the quantity, and the value of those sales. For those engaged in non-agricultural work, the survey will note down the sector of business and the gross value of receipts earned.

By combining such information, the survey will make it easier to understand

class dynamics across different types of employment and whether certain jobs are concentrated within specific social groups. It may also shed light on what share of a household's total income goes toward loan repayments – an important metric in an economy driven by EMI-based spending, particularly among urban households. When it comes to agriculture, the detailed questions make this survey an excellent direct tool to test claims like "doubling farmers' income", and assess related government schemes.

Expenses recorded

While measuring income is important, considering spending patterns is equally essential. Therefore, this survey repeats some questions from the HCES. For instance, the survey asks farmers to report input costs for each item, including seeds, labour, and transport. For those engaged in self-employment in other sectors, it seeks details on raw material costs, rental payments, and repair and

maintenance expenses. By gathering both cost and income data from the same households, the survey enables accurate measurement of profit margins.

Additionally, it measures pension payments, family support transfers such as alimony or child support, and remittances. More importantly, for the first time, the survey collects data on funds received through State-specific schemes such as the *Kalaigam Magalir Urimai Thittam* in Tamil Nadu, along with several Union government schemes.

Testing troubles

In August this year, the proposed survey was pilot-tested by randomly selecting households across India to answer its questions. This exercise generated some concerning feedback. Close to 95% of the respondents considered the information to be sensitive and felt uncomfortable disclosing income from different sources. A majority of them refused to answer questions about income taxes paid. Most respondents thus are likely to feel cautious when answering these questions.

The survey team is aware of this challenge and is addressing it by increasing public awareness, dispelling misconceptions, and planning outreach across various media. They also aim to deploy field staff familiar with local languages to build trust. The testing team observed that respondents in rural areas sought fewer clarifications, whereas those in affluent households asked for more. Due to this hesitation, unusually, the government is considering introducing a self-compilation system exclusively for affluent and gated communities. Under this system, respondents would receive a written request explaining the survey's objectives and the importance of providing accurate income data.

Moreover, during field visits, many households overstated their expenses or misunderstood their income levels. Respondents also found it difficult to recall details about their financial assets and were often unaware of the interest earned from savings or fixed deposits.

THE GIST

▼ This survey, for the very first time, collects detailed information on regular salaries, including allowances such as overtime pay, performance-based bonuses, stock options, leave encashments, and severance payments.

▼ In August this year, the proposed survey was pilot-tested by randomly selecting households across India to answer its questions. This exercise generated some concerning feedback.

▼ A majority of them refused to answer questions about income taxes paid.

Topic: Challenges Facing the Upcoming Household Income Survey

Source: The Hindu

Relevance: Understanding India's first Household Income Survey and its implications for data-driven policy, inequality measurement, and economic planning.

Linked Topics: NSSO | Household Consumption Expenditure Survey | Income Inequality | Economic Policy | Data Collection Challenges | Poverty Estimation

Context:

The Government plans to launch India's first-ever **Household Income Survey (2026)** to gather direct data on household incomes, expenses, and socio-economic details. The exercise aims to address long-standing data gaps in understanding income distribution but faces challenges due to the sensitive nature of income-related questions and respondents' reluctance to share accurate details.

Curiosity Question:

Can India's first Household Income Survey overcome issues of privacy, trust, and recall to deliver a reliable picture of real incomes and inequality across the nation?

Analytical Overview:

- India has long relied on **proxy data** from consumption or labour surveys to infer income levels.
- The new survey focuses directly on **income measurement** — including wages, self-employment earnings, farm and non-farm income, bonuses, and remittances.
- It includes **cross-sectional data** on caste, religion, occupation, property, loans, and assets.
- However, **sensitivity and hesitancy** in disclosing income — especially among affluent households — may distort accuracy.
- The government may introduce **self-compilation systems** for gated communities to improve participation.

- Combining **income and expenditure data** will allow estimation of **profitability, debt burdens, and class dynamics** across occupations.
- The survey could reshape understanding of **income inequality**, test claims like “*doubling farmers’ income*”, and refine welfare policy targeting.

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- Article 38: Directive for equitable distribution of material resources.
- NITI Aayog’s role in data-driven governance and poverty mapping.
- SDG Goal 10: Reduce inequalities within and among countries.

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- Conduct **public awareness campaigns** to reduce hesitation and ensure trust.
- Use **technology for confidentiality** and anonymization of responses.
- Integrate data with **labour force and consumption surveys** for triangulation.
- Train enumerators in **local languages and ethical data collection**.
- Institutionalize periodic income surveys for **policy consistency**.

Prelims Pointers:

- First national-level Household Income Survey: 2026 (under NSSO).
- Previous reliance: HCES, PLFS, and RBI’s Consumer Confidence Survey.
- Key issue: Respondent sensitivity and accuracy of income disclosure.

Mains Keywords: Income inequality | Data reliability | Survey design | Informal economy | Statistical transparency | Economic inclusion

Mains Practice Question:

“India’s Household Income Survey marks a paradigm shift from proxy-based measurement to direct income assessment. Discuss the methodological and ethical challenges it poses and its potential role in shaping equitable economic policies.”

Dimensions:

Data Sensitivity | Methodological Design | Policy Relevance | Socioeconomic Inclusion

One Line Takeaway:

India’s first Household Income Survey holds the promise of redefining income measurement — but its success hinges on trust, transparency, and public cooperation.

What constitutes as contempt of court in India?

How does the Constitution define courts of record? What are the two types of contempt?

C. B. P. Srivastava

The recent controversy over the alleged contemptuous and derogatory remarks against the Chief Justice of India and the Supreme Court has not only raised eyebrows, but can also be considered an act of diminishing the 'authority' of India's top court. Moreover, such remarks being spread through media and social media may also be seen as an act of interfering and obstructing the administration of justice, thereby directly damaging the edifice of constitutional morality. This has been the basis for the demand to initiate contempt proceedings.

Understanding contempt

The phrase 'contempt of court' is used in Article 19(2) as one of the grounds for imposing reasonable restriction on fundamental freedoms yet the Constitution does not give guidelines on

how to initiate such proceedings. In India, the Supreme Court and High Court have been designated as courts of record under Article 129 and 215 respectively. A court of record is one whose decisions are kept in reserve for future references and inherently it also has the power to punish for its contempt. This implicit constitutional provision is explained in the Contempt of Court Act, 1971.

The Act classifies contempt into civil and criminal. Section 2(b) of the Act defines civil contempt as wilful disobedience to any judgment, decree, direction, order, writ or other process of a court or wilful breach of an undertaking given to a court. On the other hand, criminal contempt is defined in Section 2(c) of the Act, as the publication (whether by words spoken or written or by signs or by visible representations or otherwise) of any matter or the doing of any act which – (i) scandalises or lowers the authority of any court; or (ii)

prejudices or interferes or tends to interfere with, the due course of any judicial proceeding; or (iii) interferes or tends to interfere with the administration of justice in any other manner. This makes it clear that contempt is different from mere disrespect. It is beyond just covering disobedience and disruption in the working of the justice system. The Act further states that the High Court or Supreme Court may initiate contempt proceedings *suo moto*. It may also be initiated by a third party provided the petition has consent from the Attorney General or Advocate General for the Supreme Court and High Court respectively.

The mode of criticism

It is now a settled principle that fair criticism of a decided case is not contempt, but criticism that transgresses the limits of fair commentary may be considered contemptuous as held in

Ashwini Kumar Ghosh versus Arabinda Bose (1952). Further, in *Anil Ratan Sarkar versus Hirak Ghosh* (2002), it was held that the power to punish for contempt must be exercised with caution and shall only be exercised when there is a clear violation of an order. One of the landmark cases is of *M. V. Jayarajan versus High Court of Kerala* (2015) in which the top court upheld a contempt finding against an individual for using abusive language in a public speech while criticising a High Court order, establishing that such actions could be considered criminal contempt for undermining the judiciary's authority and disrupting the administration of justice. The top Court recently in *Shammugam @ Lakshminarayanan vs. High Court of Madras* (2025) has held that the very purpose to punish for contempt is to ensure administration of justice.

Criticising the Courts' action democratically is not wrong; however, one needs to consider that the judiciary is playing a crucial role by contributing to setting the priorities for the state so that the sanctity of administration of justice is maintained. Both the state and the citizens need to understand that any kind of misrepresentation would not only amount to contempt, it would also be detrimental to democratic principles, affecting the delivery of substantive justice (elimination of injustices).

The author is President, Centre for Applied Research in Governance, Delhi.

THE GIST

▼ The phrase 'contempt of court' is used in Article 19(2) as one of the grounds for imposing reasonable restriction on fundamental freedoms.

▼ In India, the Supreme Court and High Court have been designated as courts of record under Article 129 and 215 respectively.

▼ It is now a settled principle that fair criticism of a decided case is not contempt, but criticism that transgresses the limits of fair commentary may be considered as contemptuous.

Topic: What Constitutes as Contempt of Court in India

Source: The Hindu

Relevance: Constitutional provisions and judicial powers relating to contempt of court; balance between freedom of speech and judicial integrity.

Linked Topics:

Article 129 & 215 | Article 19(2) | Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 | Judicial Accountability | Freedom of Speech | Rule of Law | Separation of Powers

Context:

A recent controversy over alleged derogatory remarks against the Chief Justice of India and the Supreme Court reignited debate over what constitutes “*contempt of court*.” The issue highlights the tension between **free expression** and the need to **protect the authority and dignity of the judiciary**.

Curiosity Question:

Can India’s judiciary maintain its authority and public trust while allowing open criticism under the right to freedom of speech?

Analytical Overview:

• **Constitutional Basis:**

- *Article 129* – Supreme Court as a “Court of Record” with power to punish for contempt.
- *Article 215* – High Courts enjoy similar powers.
- *Article 19(2)* – Allows restriction on speech in the name of contempt of court.

• **Legal Framework:**

- *Contempt of Courts Act, 1971* explains procedure and classification.
- **Civil Contempt (Sec 2b):** Wilful disobedience of a court’s order or undertaking.

- **Criminal Contempt (Sec 2c):** Publication or act that scandalises the court, prejudices judicial proceedings, or interferes with administration of justice.
- **Who Can Initiate:**
 - Courts *suo motu*, or third parties with consent of the *Attorney General* (for SC) or *Advocate General* (for HC).
- **Judicial Interpretation:**
 - *Ashwini Kumar Ghosh vs Arabinda Bose (1952)*: Fair criticism is not contempt.
 - *Anil Ratan Sarkar vs Hiralal Ghosh (2002)*: Power to punish must be used cautiously.
 - *M.V. Jayarajan vs High Court of Kerala (2015)*: Abusive language against courts amounts to criminal contempt.
 - *Shanmugam @ Lakshminarayanan vs High Court of Madras (2025)*: Contempt ensures administration of justice, not suppression of dissent.
- **Balance of Interests:**
 - Courts must protect judicial integrity but also respect citizens' democratic right to critique.
 - Reckless, defamatory, or misleading statements against judges can erode public confidence and obstruct justice.

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- *Article 19(1)(a) vs Article 19(2)*: Balancing freedom of expression with judicial dignity.
- *Judicial accountability and transparency* in a democracy.
- *Rule of Law and Constitutional Morality*.

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- Encourage **constructive judicial criticism** within constitutional limits.
- **Revise contempt law** to differentiate between legitimate dissent and deliberate defamation.
- Promote **public legal awareness** about boundaries of speech and respect for courts.
- Courts to exercise **restraint** and prefer corrective over punitive measures.

Prelims Pointers:

- *Articles 129 & 215* → Courts of Record.
- *Contempt of Courts Act, 1971* → Defines civil and criminal contempt.
- *Attorney General's consent* required for third-party petitions.

Mains Keywords: Judicial dignity | Freedom of speech | Constitutional morality | Rule of law | Civil vs Criminal contempt | Court of record

Mains Practice Question:

“Freedom of expression and respect for judicial authority must coexist in a democracy. Examine how India’s contempt of court laws seek to balance these principles.”

Dimensions: Constitutional Basis | Judicial Precedents | Free Speech Limits | Democratic Ethics

One Line Takeaway:

Contempt of court safeguards the judiciary’s dignity and authority — but must not become a tool to silence fair criticism in a democracy.

The malleable Code of Conduct

Ambekar famously remarked in the Constituent Assembly, “However good a Constitution may be, it is sure to turn out bad because those who are called to work it happen to be a bad lot”. Well, it applies equally to any law or code framed for functioning of the country and its various public processes.

The Model Code of Conduct (MCC) for guidance of political parties and candidates is a set of norms which has evolved with the consensus of political parties. They have consented to abide by the principles embodied in the said code. It binds them to respect and observe it in its letter and spirit. This code began to be implemented strictly in the 1990s and has been revised in 2013 by the Election Commission of India (EC).

The MCC is operational from the date on which the election schedule is announced until the date of announcement of result.

The MCC lays down code for general conduct during campaign process by political parties and contesting candidates. With respect to the party or parties in power, it stipulates that ministers and other authorities shall not announce any financial grants, promise any construction of roads or provision of drinking water, announce new projects, lay foundation stone for projects or schemes of any kind which may have the effect of influencing the voters in favour of the party or parties in power.

Violations galore

The MCC is a voluntary set of norms to be followed by political parties and candidates. It is by itself not legally enforceable. Violations of certain provisions of the MCC with respect to campaign process can be enforced through invoking corresponding provisions in criminal laws and the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (RP Act). However, it is the announcement of financial grants or of new projects by the ruling



Rangarajan R

is a former IAS officer and author of ‘Courseware on Polity Simplified’. He currently trains at Officers IAS Academy. Views expressed are personal.

Successive governments at both the Centre and various States, representing the entire spectrum of political parties in India, are breaking the spirit of MCC

government just before elections that can vitiate the level playing field thereby impairing free and fair elections. The code does not restrict grants or disbursements under ongoing programmes on the date of announcement of elections.

A famous quote from Hamlet goes, “more honoured in the breach than in the observance”. This is meant for customs and laws that are better off being ignored than being followed. In the Indian electoral context, however, it has become a norm to breach the codes and laws. Politicians find ingenious ways of circumventing the MCC when it comes to announcement of projects or distribution of grants.

Cash politics

The recent example is the launch of Mukhyamantri Mahila Rojgar Yojana (MMRY) in Bihar in August 2025. Under the scheme, women are eligible to receive ₹10,000 as grant for self-employment and livelihood opportunities. The disbursements started on September 26, 2025 with the Prime Minister transferring the grant to 75 lakh women. Subsequently weekly instalments are being transferred to beneficiaries since October with recent one being on October 31 and the next on November 7. One-time cash transfer to the underprivileged and needy women, despite its fiscal burden on the state, does provide some much-needed succour.

However, with the elections scheduled to be held in two phases on November 6 and November 11, it is a valid criticism that this is breaking the MCC in spirit and influencing voters in favour of the ruling party through direct cash transfers. Taking refuge under the guise of an ongoing scheme, which was anyway launched just a month before the announcement of elections, does not seem kosher.

It is not the first time that MCC has been broken in spirit when it comes to announcements of new

projects just before elections. Successive ruling governments at both the Centre and various States, representing the entire spectrum of political parties in India, are guilty of this breach. The MMRY scheme, nonetheless, does push the dubious envelope of such breach to a new low.

Stop the sham

In 2013, the Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice, recommended making the MCC legally binding. However, the EC is not in favour since the elections have to be completed within a relatively short period of around 45 days while judicial proceedings take longer.

There has been criticism directed at the EC for turning a blind eye to such blatant violations of the MCC, if not in letter but in spirit. However, considering the Machiavellian ability of our political leaders to invent new ways of working around election laws, even the sincerest attempts in curbing such practices would be a wild goose chase.

“It is much more important to kill bad laws than to pass good ones,” said the former U.S. President Calvin Coolidge. It may be apt to apply this to most parts of MCC that deal with government schemes and projects. Violation of code with respect to campaign process can be suitably dealt with by the EC under its existing powers.

However, the MCC guidelines that stipulate no fresh projects or financial grants after announcement of elections can be done away with as they are more breached in spirit than followed.

One of the arguments for conduct of simultaneous elections to Lok Sabha and State Assemblies is to minimise the impact of MCC that restricts new government programmes and schemes with multiple elections every year. Scrapping these provisions in MCC would at least result in one farcical reason being less for the arguments in favour of simultaneous polls.

Topic: The Model Code of Conduct — Spirit, Violations, and the Case for Reform

Source: *The Hindu*

Relevance:

Electoral reforms | Ethics in politics | Free and fair elections | Role of Election Commission | Governance and accountability

Linked Topics:

MCC | Election Commission of India | Representation of the People Act, 1951 | Electoral Ethics | Simultaneous Elections | Rule of Law

Context:

Recent controversies over pre-poll government cash transfers and project announcements — such as Bihar's *Mukhyamantri Mahila Rojgar Yojana (MMRY)* — have reignited debates on the **relevance, enforceability, and spirit** of the **Model Code of Conduct (MCC)**.

Curiosity Question:

If the Model Code of Conduct is not legally binding, can it still ensure free and fair elections in India?

Analytical Overview:

• **Nature and Evolution:**

- The MCC is a *set of consensual ethical guidelines* evolved through political party consensus, first implemented strictly in the 1990s, last revised in 2013.
- It becomes operational from the date of **election schedule announcement** until **result declaration**.

• **Purpose:**

- Ensures **level playing field** among political parties and prevents **misuse of official position** for electoral advantage.

- Bars ministers from announcing new grants, projects, or schemes during election period.
- **Legal Standing:**
 - MCC is *voluntary* and not legally enforceable.
 - Violations can only be addressed under related provisions of **criminal law** or the **Representation of the People Act (1951)**.
 - The EC can issue warnings, censure, or file cases, but cannot impose direct penalties under MCC alone.
- **Current Issue:**
 - Bihar's **MMRY scheme** disbursed ₹10,000 to 75 lakh women close to election dates, arguably violating the MCC's spirit.
 - Governments often exploit "*ongoing scheme*" loopholes to justify such acts.
- **Systemic Problem:**
 - All major political parties — across Centre and States — have, at some point, breached the MCC's spirit by making populist announcements just before polls.
 - Enforcement challenges persist due to short election duration (≈45 days) vs. lengthy judicial procedures.

Key Debates:

- **For Legal Backing:** Standing Committee (2013) suggested making MCC legally binding to deter violations.
- **Against Legal Backing:** Election Commission fears delays in elections due to protracted litigation.
- **Moral Paradox:** The MCC is "more honoured in the breach than in the observance," exposing limits of moral persuasion in electoral ethics.

- **Reform Viewpoint:** Some argue to *scrap or simplify MCC clauses* on government schemes and instead strengthen EC's punitive powers for campaign-related misconduct.

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- **Article 324:** Powers of Election Commission.
- **Representation of the People Act, 1951:** Election conduct framework.
- **Good Governance & Ethical Politics:** Core democratic ideals under Preamble and DPSPs.

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- **Strengthen EC's enforcement powers** through statutory clarity.
- **Codify MCC provisions** selectively within the RP Act for consistency.
- Promote **ethical political culture** through voter awareness and party accountability.
- Consider **simultaneous elections** to reduce the frequency of MCC-related disruptions.
- Review and rationalize **MCC provisions on ongoing schemes** to prevent misuse.

Prelims Pointers:

- *Article 324* – EC powers.
- *Representation of the People Act, 1951* – Legal basis for election conduct.
- *MCC enforcement* – Based on consensus, not statute.
- *MCC duration* – From election announcement to results.

Mains Keywords: Model Code of Conduct | Election Commission | Electoral Ethics | Level Playing Field | Free and Fair Elections | Governance Accountability | Political Consensus

Mains Practice Question:

“The Model Code of Conduct has moral authority but lacks legal enforceability. Critically examine its effectiveness in ensuring free and fair elections in India.”

Dimensions: Constitutional Powers | Legal vs. Moral Authority | Political Behaviour | Reforms & Recommendations

One Line Takeaway:

India’s Model Code of Conduct reflects electoral ethics — yet without legal teeth, its spirit is too often sacrificed for political gain.

In Brazil, COP30 and the moment of truth

Today, in the Brazilian Amazon, the Belém Summit opens ahead of the 30th United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP30). World leaders convened here in the days leading up to the COP so that we can all commit to acting with the urgency that the climate crisis demands.

If we fail to move beyond speeches into real action, our societies will lose faith not only in the COPs but also in multilateralism and international politics more broadly. That is why I have summoned leaders to the Amazon: to make this the COP of Truth; the moment we demonstrate the seriousness of our shared commitment to the planet.

Humanity has shown its ability to overcome great challenges when it acts together and guided by science. We protected the ozone layer. The global response to the COVID-19 pandemic proved that the world can act decisively when there is courage and political will.

Back to Brazil

Brazil hosted the Earth Summit in 1992. We approved the Conventions on Climate Change, Biological Diversity and Combating Desertification, and adopted principles that defined a new paradigm for preserving our planet and our humanity. Over the past 33 years, these gatherings have produced important agreements and targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions – from ending deforestation by 2030 to tripling renewable energy use.

More than three decades later, the world has returned to Brazil to confront climate change. It is no coincidence that COP30 takes place in the heart of the Amazon rainforest. This is an opportunity for politicians, diplomats, scientists, activists and journalists to witness the reality of the Amazon.

We want the world to see the true state of the forests, the planet's largest river basin, and the millions of people who live in the region. COPs cannot be mere showcases of good ideas or



Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva

is the President of Brazil

The setting of the Belém Summit — in the Amazon — will help lead the way in effective action to tackle climate change

annual gatherings for negotiators. They must be moments of contact with reality and of effective action to tackle climate change.

To confront this crisis together, we need resources. And we must recognise that the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities remains the non-negotiable foundation of any climate pact.

That is why the Global South demands greater access to resources – not out of charity, but justice. Rich countries have benefited the most from the carbon-based economy. They must now rise to their responsibilities, not only by making commitments but also by honouring their debts.

Brazil is doing its part. In just two years, we have already halved deforestation in the Amazon, showing that concrete climate action is possible.

A move to preserve forests, other measures

In Belém, we will launch an innovative initiative to preserve forests: the Tropical Forests Forever Facility (TFFF). It is innovative because it operates as an investment fund, not a donation mechanism.

The TFFF will reward those who keep their forests standing and those who invest in the fund; a genuine win-win approach to tackling climate change. Leading by example, Brazil has announced a \$1 billion investment in the TFFF, and we expect equally ambitious announcements from other countries.

We also set an example by becoming the second country to present a new Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). Brazil has committed to reducing its emissions by 59% to 67%, covering all greenhouse gases and all sectors of the economy.

In this spirit, we call on all countries to present equally ambitious NDCs and to implement them effectively.

The energy transition is fundamental to meeting Brazil's NDC. Our energy matrix is among the cleanest in the world, with 88% of our electricity coming from renewable sources. We

lead in biofuels and are advancing in wind, solar and green hydrogen energy.

Redirecting revenues from oil production to finance a just, orderly and equitable energy transition will be essential. Over time, oil companies worldwide, including Brazil's Petrobras, will transform into energy companies, because a growth model based on fossil fuels cannot last.

People must be at the centre of political decisions about climate and the energy transition. We must recognise that the most vulnerable sectors of our society are the most affected by the impacts of climate change, which is why just transition and adaptation plans must aim to combat inequality.

We cannot forget that two billion people lack access to clean technologies and fuels for cooking, and 673 million still live with hunger. In response, we will launch in Belém, a 'Declaration on Hunger, Poverty and Climate'. Our commitment to fight global warming must be directly linked to the fight against hunger.

The need for a climate change council

It is also fundamental that we advance the reform of global governance. Today, multilateralism suffers from the paralysis of the United Nations Security Council. Created to preserve peace, it has failed to prevent wars. It is our duty, therefore, to fight for the reform of this institution.

At COP30, we will advocate the creation of a UN Climate Change Council linked to the General Assembly. It would be a new governance structure with the force and the legitimacy to ensure that countries deliver on their promises, and an effective step toward reversing the current paralysis of the multilateral system.

At every Climate Conference, we hear many promises but see too few real commitments. The era of declarations of good intentions has ended: the time for action plans has arrived. That is why, today, we begin the COP of Truth.

Topic: COP30 in Brazil – The “COP of Truth” and Global Climate Action

Source: The Hindu (Opinion)

Relevance:

Environment, Climate Change, Global Governance, International Relations

Linked Topics:

Paris Agreement, CBDR Principle, Energy Transition, Multilateralism Reform, Global South, Amazon Rainforest

Context:

Brazil's President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva writes ahead of COP30, hosted in the Amazon city of Belém, calling for urgent and genuine climate action. He urges global leaders to move beyond rhetoric, reaffirm climate justice, and ensure that COP30 becomes a “moment of truth” for collective planetary responsibility.

Curiosity Question:

Will COP30 in the Amazon mark a real turning point where global leaders shift from pledges to decisive, equitable climate action for the planet's future?

Analytical Overview:

- Lula emphasizes that the credibility of COPs and multilateralism depends on concrete outcomes, not repeated promises.
- He highlights Brazil's leadership in halving deforestation and launching the *Tropical Forests Forever Facility (TFFF)* — an investment-based model rewarding forest conservation.
- Calls for climate finance justice: developed countries must meet their historic obligations and support developing nations through equitable resource access.
- Advocates creation of a *UN Climate Change Council* under the General Assembly to ensure accountability.

- Links climate action to social justice — arguing that combating global warming must go hand in hand with eradicating hunger and inequality.

Constitutional / Policy Linkages:

- Article 48A – Protection and improvement of environment
- National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC)
- India's NDC commitments under the Paris Agreement
- Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 7, 13, and 15)

Way Forward / Recommendations:

- Strengthen multilateral climate institutions with enforcement powers.
- Ensure climate finance commitments are transparent and measurable.
- Integrate poverty eradication and climate resilience in national plans.
- Encourage Global South collaboration on clean energy and forest preservation.

Prelims Pointers:

- COP30 will be held in Belém, Brazil (2025).
- Tropical Forests Forever Facility (TFFF) – investment fund to reward forest preservation.
- Brazil's NDC: Reduce emissions by 59–67%.
- 88% of Brazil's electricity comes from renewable sources.

Mains Keywords: Climate Justice, COP30, Global South, CBDR, Energy Transition, Forest Conservation, Climate Governance

Mains Practice Question:

“The success of COP30 in Brazil will depend not on speeches but on accountability and equitable climate action.” Discuss in light of the need to reform global climate governance and ensure justice for developing nations.

One Line Takeaway:

COP30 aims to be the “COP of Truth,” demanding that the world replace promises with real, equitable climate action and global governance reform.