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ABSTRACT
India is experiencing rapid population growth, lack of sources with the proportion of population. India is more than 1 Arab 25 Crore in population. More than one third population of educated youth is unemployed. The Indian Govt has implemented extension in retirement age in the higher educational institutions/universities without any thought about reality of the country and situation of youth. One side the Govt of India has increased the age of retirement 62 years or more in the educational institutions/universities and on the other hand the entry to the Govt services is only 35 years. Is not this unjustified, funny and ridiculous? It is a death blow for the educated unemployed youth.
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I. INTRODUCTION
India is the largest democratic country and having second highest population in the world. The Indian Constitution was approved on 26th of November, 1949 and came into existence on 26th of January, 1950 [1]. In India the population is increasing day by day and, in proportion of population, the sources are limited. In order to afford opportunities to qualified and talented unemployed youth whose number was increasing enormously due to expansion of educational facilities; No initiatives have been taken in the expansion of sources by Govt of India. With the increasing of higher technical and medical educational institutions/Universities established by Govt and private bodies, educated youth are increasing day by day [2]. In the 25-29 age group, the unemployment rate was nearly 18 per cent. Even among those in the 30-34 age group, nearly 6 per cent were unemployed, numbering over 1.2 crore [3]. In India, the last time retirement age was increased in December 1962 when, following the Chinese aggression, Jawaharlal Nehru found there were not enough personnel to run the ordnance factories. He issued a three-line diktat raising the retirement age from 55 to 58 and recalled those who had gone on leave in preparation for retirement [4, 5]. This time round, the government was pitted against graying educationalists at premier institutes, not an invading army. Raising the retirement age may provide some relief to the labor shortage and longer lifespan; it is not necessarily a solution. But they may be employed to train unemployed graduates who, in turn, will be able to gain hands-on experience faster and better under the immediate guidance of a superior.

Young people are a major human resource for development, key agents for social change and driving force for economic development and technological innovation. But harnessing these resources is a major challenge. The youth challenge is considered as the most critical of the 21st century’s economic development challenge [6]. However, there is a ruckus from Parliament to the road to extend the age limit of retirement. The question is why it is necessary to extend the age limit. In India, everyone wants from a politician to a simple employee that the age of retirement is 60 years, and then it should be 65. Then tomorrow he/she will say that let’s do 65 to 70. It is clear that in our country, no one wants young people to get an opportunity. That is why India is not able to join the category of developed countries. A professor like me or any other government employee, should be given retirement at certain times. The new generation will come in my place, his/her thoughts will come, and then the new revolution will be born to him, but who does it? If the politician lives in a juga to protect the throne, then the job seeker also wants a lifetime government chair. We are still studying on the basis of books, but a lot has changed, now
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It is a fact that the educated youth in India face a 
much higher risk of unemployment than the low educated, 
whereas in Europe, and in particular in Germany it is the 
other way round. The unemployment rate of high-educated 
(“graduated & above”) young Indian men and women in 
urban areas is 16 and 23 percent respectively in contrast to 
only 2 percent of low-educated (“literate and up to primary level”) young women as observed by Schmid [9].
Age retirement of Govt employee and politicians in India

As per Indian constitution every worker either government employees or private organisation employees should retire at the age of 60. The reasons are after 60 their efficiency reduces and we always need to give chance to the next generations. In the view the average expectation of life is about 70 years is not a ground for increasing the age of retirement of Government employees. Why there is no retire age for the post of President, Prime Minister etc? All these president, ministers are also Government employees. Why they do not have retired age? How they remain efficient at the age of 85? Politics is a vocation. Government employment is paid service. Therefore, any paid service would have retirement age. A vocation such as politics or being a musician or artist cannot have a retirement age. But, in the view that they should have a retirement age fixed! Here are few ridiculous facts: The average age of ministers in the present cabinet is 66.90. The average age of prime ministers since 1947 is 65.2. The average age of famous politicians is 69.3. But, when the person, who has the authority to frame the rule, himself, is aged, will he/she frame such a rule? The voters are the ultimate authority so if they want to elect elderly PM, President, etc. then they can. Because that would interfere with the rights of the voters to choose the candidates that they wanted. All questions have been answered in first line itself i.e. as per Indian constitution. If the age limit of President or PM has to be changed amendment to constitution is required.

Therefore, the age retirement should be considered equally in all educational institutions/universities for growth of the country giving opportunities to the young educated generation.

III. CONCLUSIONS

Based on this study the following conclusions have been drawn

(i) Extension in age retirement must be stopped to give the opportunities to young educated generations.
(ii) Housing and health care policies for the aged may have to be fine-tuned. In particular the retired person should work as consultant rather than to hold a particular post to utilized the experience. Provided these seniors are still able to work, keeping them in the workforce might have to be considered as much a matter of social justification.
(iii) The retirement age criteria must be strictly up to 60 years in all educational institutions/universities to give the opportunities for coming young generations.
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