

janata

Vol. 73 No. 19
June 3, 2018

Make in India to Kill in India

Sankara Narayanan

BJP's New Sand Mining Policy:

**Award Contracts to Party
Supporters**

Sandeep Pandey

**Archbishop's Letter: Storm in
a Tea Cup**

Irfan Engineer

**Strife Torn Kashmir: Longings
for Peace**

Ram Puniyani

**Guilty Men of Two-Nation
Theory:**

**A Hindutva Project Borrowed
by Jinnah in India**

Shamsul Islam

Editor : **G.G.Parikh**

Associate Editor : **Neeraj Jain**

Managing Editor : **Guddi**

Editorial Board :

**B. Vivekanandan, Qurban Ali
Anil Nauriya, Sonal Shah
Nandu Dhaneshwar,
Sandeep Pandey**

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Mumbai - 400 007.

Email : janataweekly@gmail.com
Website: www.janataweekly.org

After Raigad, Jaitapur (Maharashtra), Kalinganagar, Niyamgiri, Gandhamardhan, Dhinkia and Khandadhar (Odisha), Nandigram, Singur (West Bengal), Dandakaranya, Raipur (Chhatishgarh), Saranda (Jharkhand), Singrouli (MP), Kovvada, Sompeta (Andhra Pradesh) and Koodankulam and Neduvasal (Tamil Nadu), the recent unfortunate events at the copper smelter plant of Sterlite Industries at Tuticorin bring out the basic issue back to the table. Can the state agencies and the companies impose projects on the unwilling people?

Lawrence Summers, the World Bank's chief economist in a confidential memo in 1991 said, "Shouldn't the WB be encouraging more migration of the dirty industries to the LDCs (Less Developed Countries)? The measurement of the costs of the health impairing pollution depends on the foregone earnings from increased morbidity and mortality. From this point of view, a given amount of health-impairing pollution should be done in the country with the lowest cost, which will be the country of the lowest wages. I think the economic logic behind dumping a load of toxic

waste in the lowest-wage country is impeccable and we should face up to that." Sterlite Copper is a perfect example of WB's expectations.

The most serious issue with regards to the Sterlite Copper plant, like every other toxic industry, is the ecological damage inflicted on the surroundings. Right from its inception in 1993, the Sterlite plant has been facing resistance from the fishermen groups and the local people. According to residents, the area in the vicinity of the unit is unfit for human habitation. Sterlite is accused of discharging noxious gases, especially during night. Medicines have become the staple diet for the people living around the plant. Impotency and abortion rates are also common now. Eye irritation and disease and death of cattle are some of the other complaints.

Because of the polluted air and ground water, respiratory problems, skin rashes and related problems are rampant. Way back in 1998, the National Environment Engineering Research Institute (NEERI), on the instructions of the Madras High Court, checked out groundwater samples taken from a bore well adjacent to Sterlite's surge pond. It found the presence of heavy metals

way beyond permissible levels, including arsenic and aluminum.

With several litigations going on in various courts against the plant, the persistent opposition from the local people and now the latest police firing that killed 13 people, the plant's future appears to be very bleak, despite the covert assistance provided to the company from state agencies. The TNPCB has issued a closure notice to the company, and the power supply is disconnected. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has also announced his government's intention to close down the plant. (*As this article was going to the press came the news that the TN Government has ordered the permanent shut down of the plant – Editor.*)

How could a plant of such hazardous nature play havoc with the environment and the lives of people for over two decades? We have adequate laws to deal with poisonous industries. Even the health inspector of a municipality is vested with powers to shut down such toxic industries. Yet rarely these laws are enforced resulting in massive pollution of the air and water sources and destruction of health and livelihoods of people living around such plants.

The Supreme Court has delivered several pathbreaking judgments in the past three decades with regards to environmentally polluting industries (in cases relating to Kanpur tannery, Oleum gas leak, Udaipur chemical industry, Vellore tannery, Tirupur dyeing, etc). One of the vital guarantees in our Constitution is the protection of the Right to Life enshrined in Article 21. The apex court expanded the concept of the right to life to include the right to a wholesome environment.

Explaining this, the Supreme Court stated: "Article 21 protects the right to life as a fundamental right. Enjoyment of life . . . including [the right to live] with human dignity encompasses within its ambit, the protection and preservation of environment, ecological balance free from pollution of air and water, sanitation, without which life cannot be enjoyed."

Our Constitution evinces great concern for the environment. Article 48-A of the Directive Principles mandates that the State shall endeavour to protect and improve the environment. One of the fundamental duties prescribed in Article 51-A is to protect and improve the natural environment.

Despite these constitutional provisions, pollution continued unabated. The river Ganges was brazenly polluted by the discharge of effluents by some tanneries in Kanpur who, despite notices issued by the Supreme Court to take steps for the primary treatment of industrial effluent, had utterly failed to do so. Hence the court was constrained to issue directions for the closure of the tanneries. The court was conscious that closure of tanneries may bring unemployment and loss of revenue, but it significantly ruled that "life, health and ecology have greater importance to the people."

A five-judge bench, in the Oleum Gas Leak case, unanimously ruled that "an enterprise which is engaged in a hazardous or inherently dangerous industry which poses a potential threat to the health and safety of the persons working in the factory and residing in the surrounding areas *owes an absolute and non-delegable duty to the community* to ensure that no harm results to anyone on account of

hazardous or inherently dangerous nature of the activity which it has undertaken."

In 1996, in the *Udaipur Chemical Industry case*, the court pointed out that the rule of absolute liability is premised on the very nature of the activity carried on and that "the enterprise carrying on the hazardous or inherently dangerous activity *alone* has the resource to discover and guard against hazards or dangers and not the person affected."

The Supreme Court further introduced the Polluter Pays Principle, wherein it stated that the financial costs of preventing or remedying damage caused by pollution should lie with the undertakings that cause the pollution. Under this principle, it is not the role of the government to meet the costs involved in either prevention of such damage, or in carrying out remedial action, because the effect of this would be to shift the financial burden of the pollution incident on the taxpayer.

In its subsequent judgment in the *Vellore Tannery case*, the court held that "the Precautionary Principle and the Polluter Pays Principle are essential features of Sustainable Development." This is a milestone judgment in our environmental jurisprudence. The court reaffirmed the Polluter Pays Principle laid down in its previous judgments to mean that "the absolute liability for harm to the environment extends not only to compensate the victims of pollution but also the cost of restoring the environmental degradation. Remediation of the damaged environment is part of the process of Sustainable Development and as such the *polluter is liable to pay the cost to the individual sufferers as well as the cost of*

reversing the damaged ecology.”

Supreme Court judgements constitute the law of the land and are binding on all courts, authorities and persons. Yet Sterlite Copper has violated three important rulings of the apex court, namely: (1) Precautionary Principle; (2) Polluter Pays Principle; & (3) Sustainable Development. These violations by the Sterlite were allowed and blessed by the State agencies and unfortunately the judiciary also rendered a helping hand disregarding its own directives.

With the prospect of Sterlite Copper closing its shop looking bright, Tuticorin is facing a hazardous future. The Supreme Court's ruling

mandates that it is not the role of the government to meet the costs involved in either prevention of ecological damage or in carrying out remedial measures. No part of the liability arising out of industrial pollution can be limited nor passed on to the government.

There can be two views about the advantages or disadvantages of foreign investment in India. But there can be only one view regarding environmental pollution: the health, well-being and protection of our people are paramount and must override revenue considerations. It would be against the cherished fundamental rights of the people of India, whose protection should be

the primary concern of any civilised democratic government. Foreign multinationals are not solicitors of the fundamental rights of our people. The Bhopal Gas case is a burning reminder.

It is very doubtful that the present governments at Chennai and Delhi will force Sterlite to implement remedial measures to bring the ecology back to its original state and compensate all the victims, both now and in the times to come. Let's hope the judiciary comes to the people's aid in this, it appears to be the only ray of hope for the people of Tuticorin.

Email: psn.1946@gmail.com

BJP's New Sand Mining Policy: Award Contracts to Party Supporters

Sandeep Pandey

When Bhartiya Janata Party government was formed in Uttar Pradesh under the leadership of Yogi Adityanath a number of educated middle class people thought that days of caste politics and corruption were over. They were expecting a clean government.

The Yogi Adityanath government cancelled all sand mining contracts alleging illegality and corruption in operations and announced that it will soon come up with a new sand mining policy. This seemed justified because the escapades of Gayatri Prasad Prajapati, the Mining Minister in the previous government, were fresh in public memory. Illegal sand mining is not just a menace in UP but is an all India phenomena

and officials have had to pay with their lives if they tried to take action against illegal operations. To recall a few incidents, the sand mafia killed deputy tehsildar R. Venkatesan in 2004 in Tamil Nadu, IPS officer Narendra Kumar was killed in Morena (MP) in 2012, forest guard Narendra Sharma was run over by a tractor trolley and crushed to death in Raira, Gwalior (MP) in 2016, and earlier this year, Boyini Sayulu, a Village Revenue Assistant, in Kamareddy, Telengana was mowed down by the sand mafia when he tried to stop a sand tractor which was illegally transporting sand.

Now, the UP Government has awarded three sand mining contracts to Suprayas Construction, Deoria,

Reliable Infrabuild, Gorakhpur and Globe India Infrastructure, Maharajganj in the bed of Narayani or Badi Gandak river in Kushinagar district. All these companies are connected to BJP Members of Parliament Guddu Pandey from Padrauna, Harish Dwivedi from Basti and Pankaj Chaudhary from Maharajganj, and were recommended by at least another ten BJP Members of Legislative Assembly. These contracts are expected to fetch Rs. 2,47,61,520, Rs. 2,65,21,530 and Rs. 2,32,45,410 respectively, as revenue for the government in the first year. This means that government will get a total of Rs. 7,45,28,460 from these contracts. A tractor trolley, which can fill upto 3 cubic metres

of sand, is sold for Rs 4,000 in the market. The cost that the contractor is required to pay to the government is only Rs 65 per cu.m. The margin is enormous.

No mining contract has been awarded ever before in this area. These contracts were awarded without the formation of a sub-divisional committee or a appraisal committee which is required for taking a decision on this matter. Instead, a junior officer, an Assistant Engineer, was made to sign the approval for these contracts.

Interestingly, a senior executive engineer of the Irrigation department, who is in-charge of floods, has written a letter to the District Magistrate, Kushinagar on 2 February 2018 that sand mining in this area will be a threat to the 17 km long Ahiraulidan–Pipraghat (AP) embankment on the UP–Bihar border. This provides protection to close to 50 villages having a total population of 1.5 lakh. The river is notorious for its vagarious behaviour, as it has dramatically changed its course and devoured a number of villages in the past. It is ironical that against an expected revenue of Rs 7.5 crore from the new sand mining contracts, the government spent Rs 22 crores in 2016–17 and another Rs 36 crores in 2017–18 for protection of the embankment from erosion by the river. Even if we attach no cost to the lives of the people who will be drowned if there is a breach in the embankment, even then no cost-benefit analysis can justify these contracts!

The leader of the Congress Legislature Party in UP, Ajay Kumar Lallu, who happens to be the MLA from Sewrahi, which is located at

one end of the AP embankment, is leading a sit-in at Virvat Konhwalia village on the embankment for the last more than hundred days, since 3 February, 2018, demanding cancellation of the above mentioned three contracts. Nineteen protestors were arrested by the district administration on false charges on 6 April 2018, of which 17 have been released on bail. Narad and Gautam Singh are still in jail facing charges of dacoity and attempt to murder, whereas the fact is that the protestors caught six trucks illegally carrying sand. Because of the continuous sit-in of the villagers, the mining activity in the river has come to a standstill.

In an unrelated incident and a major scandal, the Forest Department of the UP government has registered a First Information Report on 5 May 2018 against its own officials serving on deputation, the Managing Director, UP Forest Corporation, S.K. Sharma, Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests and General Manager Manoj Sinha and Divisional Manager, Eco-restoration, G.C. Sinha, for inviting online tenders for coarse sand mining under the euphemism of 'eco-restoration,' in violation of State and Central government norms and regulations. The proposed activities were to be carried out in Nazimabad, Urai, Hamirpur, Mirzapur and Sonebhadra on forest land, which was completely illegal. Could the three senior officers have undertaken the exercise in violation of Indian Forest Act and Supreme Court ban on sand mining in forest areas on their own, without any external political pressure acting on them? Did they not know that they would be liable to be punished? S.K. Sharma

has been forced to go on leave and the two Sinhas have been suspended. It needs to be investigated that on whose behest these three senior officers were acting ?

Far from checking corruption the BJP government seems to have opened new avenues for it, at higher rates. It has failed to demonstrate the political will to act against illegal sand mining business. Instead, it too has adopted the beaten path, where politicians become part of the bandwagon of corruption.

Email: ashaashram@yahoo.com

Janata
is available at
www.lohiatoday.com

Janata Subscription

Annual Rs. : 260/-
Three Years : 750/-

Demand Draft /
Cheque on
Mumbai Bank
in favour of

JANATA TRUST

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Grant Road (W),
Mumbai 400 007.

Archbishop's Letter: Storm in a Tea Cup

Irfan Engineer

The gross over reaction of the *Sangh Parivar* to the letter of Archbishop of Delhi, Anil Couto, dated 8 May 2018 and addressed to all parish priests and religious institutions in the Archdiocese of Delhi asking them to pray for 'our nation' seems to be well calculated. The letter begins with the observation: "We are witnessing a turbulent political atmosphere which poses a threat to the democratic principles enshrined in our Constitution and the secular fabric of our nation." The letter then requests the 138 parish priests and 5 religious institutions within Delhi to observe "a Day of Fast every Friday . . . offering our penance and all our sacrifices for our spiritual renewal and that of our nation." Assuming that the request is complied by all the 138 parish priests addressed in the letter, it is still a very tiny number.

Christians (including Protestants who are not addressed in the letter) are 0.87% of Delhi's population. The Hindu supremacists project the letter as a huge problem even when this very tiny section of the population which hardly counts politically was addressed! However, by responding to an otherwise innocuous letter, the BJP leaders have made it a national issue reaching out to a much wider audience.

The Hindu supremacists have problematised the timing of the letter—just one year before the General Elections, as well as the observation of the Archbishop about the "turbulent political atmosphere which poses threat to the democratic principles enshrined

in our Constitution and secular fabric of our nation." The two most important persons after the PM Narendra Modi in the BJP and in the NDA Government responded to the letter. Rajnath Singh, Minister of Home Affairs, said, "there was no discrimination against anyone". The letter made no claim to the contrary. Amit Shah's response was: "polarising people in the name of religion" was "not appropriate". The letter remotely doesn't seek to polarise in the name of religion. In fact it calls upon people to pray for principles enshrined in the Constitution and preserve the secular fabric of the nation. Both the leaders, and other Hindu supremacists, read something that is not there in the letter or want to deliberately draw conclusions to give it a political colour.

Elections are one year later and the letter will be forgotten by most people. Even if remembered, a very tiny section could hardly influence the outcome of the elections. Besides, elections are almost always round the corner in some state or the other and such a letter could always be problematised whenever written.

Turbulent political atmosphere

The surge in hate spouted by the Hindu supremacists against non-Hindus is visible to all. To the Hindutva followers, the test of nationalism is neither in following Constitutional values nor in respecting rule of law nor in respecting democratic institutions like the legislature or judiciary. Their test of nationalism asserts supremacy

of the privileged upper caste Hindu traditions and is proved only if one says *jai shri Ram*, *Bharat mata ki jai* and singing *Vande mataram* which, often, they themselves cannot sing. Variants of these like *jai Hind* which is the tradition in the security forces, or hoisting the national tricolour, would not do. Expressing nationalism through constitutionally acceptable methods and plural traditions but which are not in conformity with the desires of Hindu supremacists becomes ground for them to indulge in violence and hate crimes. Violence against Muslims, Christians, Dalits and women are on the rise. Social hostilities based on religion are on the rise, particularly as the Hindu supremacists find an enabling environment where politically influential leaders and even ministers spout hatred against Muslims and Christians. Muslims are often advised to take permanent residency in Pakistan, an enemy state according to Hindu supremacists. Pakistan is projected to be patron state of Muslims in India. The BJP President Amit Shah publicly asserted while campaigning during Bihar Assembly elections—'Pakistan will celebrate if BJP loses elections in some innocuous Indian state'. Beef eaters (read: Muslims and Christians) are advised to emigrate to Pakistan (Anil Vij, Minister in Haryana).

A Minister in the Central Government Sadhvi Niranjan Jyoti publicly stated that Hindus were *Ramzade* (progeny of Lord Ram) and the rest—Muslims, Christians, Jains, Sikhs, Buddhists, Parsis,

atheists who do not accept Lord Ram to be their God—are *haramzade* (bastards). The Sadvhi continues as minister and she was not even reprimanded. Maneka Gandhi, another Union Minister, said the profit from cow slaughter was financing terrorism. Sakshi Maharaj, BJP MP, asserted that Madrasas (religious schools run by Muslims) were terrorist training centres. The person who asserted that Hindus should forcibly marry 100 Muslim women (and convert them to Hinduism) for every Hindu woman who chooses to marry a Muslim man (and gets converted to Islam), has been made Chief Minister of UP.

Attacks on Churches and prayer meetings of Christians have dramatically increased. Instead of arresting the criminals, they are sought to be protected by categorising the attacker/s as mentally disturbed person/s. Mob lynching of Muslims and Dalits on accusations of consuming beef or slaughtering cows have grown manifold in the last four years.

Table 1: Incidents of Mob Lynching on Accusation of Cow Slaughter

Year	No. of incidents
2010	-
2011	-
2012	1
2013	1
2014	3
2015	13
2016	25
2017	35
Total	78

Source: www.indiaspend.com & www.news18.com

Mohd. Afrajul was hacked to death and then burnt alive in Rajsamand (Rajasthan) by Shambhulal Raigar, a follower of Hindu supremacist ideology. He videographed the incident and uploaded it for popularity. Junaid Khan and Mohammed Akhlaq were lynched to death. Recently a Dalit youth Mukesh Vaniya was beaten to death in Rajkot for refusing to clean up a factory premise belonging to an upper caste. Those who lynched Pehlu Khan to death in Rajasthan have been discharged and the accused freed. Survivors of mob lynchings have on the contrary been charged.

Communal conflicts have escalated. Communal violence has increased in Bihar since Nitish Kumar aligned with the BJP to form the state government. Massive Ram Navmi processions were taken out in March 2018 in several towns through new sensitive routes passing through minority areas in order to provoke and resulting in communal violence. In Kasganj, Muslims celebrating Republic Day were asked to halt their Indian flag hoisting to make way for a bike rally of Hindu supremacist and on requesting them to wait a little, they sparked off a communal riot. In West Bengal, there were riots during Muharram and Ram Navmi.

Table 2: Number of Communal Incidents in the Years 2014–2017

Year	No. of Incidents	Deaths	Injured
2014	561	90	1688
2015	650	84	1979
2016	703	86	2321
2017	822	111	2384

Source: Ministry of Home Affairs' reply in Parliament

Religious festivals are becoming tense moments for communities.

Crime against women are on increase. Rape in Kathua was motivated by religious hostility and the Hindu Ekta Manch organised massive demonstrations in defence of the accused. A BJP MLA in UP has been arrested for raping a child and later beating her father to death along with other accomplices. We could fill pages with sordid cases. If these are not turbulent times, what else could be? The PM of the country has by and large remained silent on all these issues.

Pew Research Centre, an independent non-partisan polling and research organisation, has been publishing its annual *Global Restrictions on Religion Report* since 2009. In their research, India ranked fourth in the world in 2015—after Syria, Nigeria and Iraq—as having the highest social hostilities involving religion. India's ranking worsened sharply since 2014. The report comprises of two indices—the Government Restrictions Index and the Social Hostilities Index. While the former measures government restrictions on the free practice of religion, the latter looks at hostilities between groups around the issue of religion. The Social Hostilities Index looks at 13 indicators including crimes motivated by religious hatred, mob violence related to religion, communal violence, religion-related terrorist groups, using force to prevent religious groups from operating, the harassment of women for 'violating' religious dress codes and violence over conversion or proselytising. India ranked 'very high' on the index with an index value of 8.7 out of 10, 10 being the worst. Syria ranked at 9.2, Nigeria at 9.1 and Iraq at 8.9

Real reason

Hindu supremacist leaders problematise the Archbishop's letter as polarising and influencing voters. Such a conclusion would be a very remote possibility, and as pointed out above, would not influence the outcome. However, appeal by varied Hindu God men is far more direct and materially influences electoral outcomes. To give just a few examples, Haryana Chief Minister and several ministers visited controversial godman Gurmeet Ram Rahim Singh's Ashram and he is known to have appealed to his followers to vote for the BJP. The Ashram was a beneficiary of Haryana Government funds. Another controversial godman Asaram was visited by the then Gujarat Chief Minister Narendra Modi, BJP leader Atal Bihari Vajpayee and other leaders (for votes obviously) and his Ashram in turn has been a beneficiary of government largesse in the form of land and the State turning a blind eye to illegal activities going on within the Ashram.

Baba Ramdev's Patanjali empire rapidly expanded after the BJP came to power. Patanjali's Acharya Balkrishna has become the 8th richest person in the country with a 173% rise in his wealth to Rs 70,000 crore. Patanjali has secured the second place in Indian FMCG market share in under 5 years, according to Hurun India Rich List 2017 (BT Online 2017). The rapid growth is because Baba Ramdev is openly associated with the BJP and has been given government land at highly concessional rates in several states ruled by the BJP. The Haryana government invited the Digamber Jain monk Tarun Sagar to address the State Legislative Assembly for 40 minutes. In his address, he asserted

that relations between religion and politics should be like those between husband and wife. Just as the wife needs to serve the husband and the husband needs to protect his wife, politics should serve religion. In his words, "*Rajniti par dharam ka ankush zaroori hai. Dharam pati hai, rajneeti patni. Har pati ki yeh duty hoti hai apni patni ko sanrakshan de. Har patni ka dharam hota hai ki woh pati ke anushasan ko sweekar kare. Agar rajneeti par dharam ka ankush na ho toh woh magan-mast haathi ki tarah ho jaati hai.*" The Monk's assertion is against both the Constitutional principle of equality of genders and secularism.

When other parties approach Imam Bukhari for Muslim votes, then that becomes anti-secular and even anti-national (although election results do not bear out that Muslims vote according to the diktats of Imam Bukhari or for that matter any other Muslim religious leaders). In the 2014 General Elections, Rajnath Singh hobnobbed with Shia religious leaders. It is difficult to believe that during election time such a visit by the BJP leader was only a courtesy call without any electoral and political motive.

The BJP is not worried that the innocuous letter by the Archbishop will contribute in any way towards losing even a few votes. Its real objective in problematising the letter is that it wants to create a fear among the majority community about (non-existing) unity within the minority community. They scare the majority community that unity within minorities would lead to assertion of 'their' culture and dilution of the Hindu culture or 'Hinduness' of the nation. Minorities struggle for secularism and space for their culture, which is perfectly in

accordance with our Constitutional principles, but is against the political ideology of Hindutva. It is the secularism and loyalty of the minorities to the principles enshrined in the Constitution that worries the Hindu supremacists and the BJP. The BJP leaders have always ridiculed secularism as assickularism. The BJP has problematised Archbishop's letter mainly because being from the minority community he has dared to speak up for Constitutional principles and the secular fabric of our nation.

The revered ideologue of Hindutva—M.S. Golwalkar—wanted that minorities should dream of nothing but the glory of Hindu (read upper caste) nation and Hindu upper caste traditions and symbols. The objective of Hindu supremacists is to relegate the minorities to the status of second class citizens. Bharatkumar Raut, former Rajya Sabha member of Shiv Sena—a party that subscribes to Hindutva ideology—even wrote an article demanding that the Muslims be disenfranchised—a demand which is a punishable offence under section 153B of the IPC.

It is the idea of equality of all citizens that scares the BJP though it pays lip service to *sabka saath sabka vikaas* (with everyone and development of everyone). Even if this slogan is sincerely implemented, it would actually negate the democratic principles enshrined in our Constitution. It only asserts that if the infrastructure of an area is developed, all communities would benefit 'equally'. However, that is not true. If a road passes through a village, those people having vehicles would benefit more than others; and which village gets the road is itself a political decision and may be based

on which community or caste forms the majority in the village.

What kind of new India do we want to build? Do we want to build an India where lynch mobs undermine

the rule of law and have the freedom to do so because they belong to the majority religion, while those who stand up for democratic principles enshrined in our Constitution and

the secular fabric of our nation are questioned because they belong to minorities?

Email: irfanengi@gmail.com

Strife Torn Kashmir: Longings for Peace

Ram Puniyani

The Green of the valley has regularly witnessed the blood of militants, Kashmiris, personnel from armed forces and now even those of tourists. On May 2 this year, a school bus was stoned leading to a class 2 student suffering a head injury. This is the background in which Mehbooba Mufti, the Chief Minister of Kashmir, sitting on the heap of a coalition, which is ideologically spilt down the middle, requested for a unilateral ceasefire in Kashmir in the holy month of Ramadan. Kashmir lately has witnessed increased violence as the Central Government, which is calling the shots in Kashmir, has adopted an iron fist policy, in place of the earlier one wherein it was partly sensitive to the grievances of local population. It is during this period that the fake encounter of Burhan Wani unleashed a series of protests, and the disgruntled and alienated youth intensified their favorite method of protest, 'stone pelting'. Now the frustration levels of the protesters are so high that they are not scared of the consequences of the repressive steps of the State.

The earlier UPA era of 'dialogue with firm handling' has given way to the muscular, hyper nationalist, high handed attitude, which in turn has increased incidences of violence in the valley. So far in

2018, forty militants, twenty four soldiers and thirty seven civilians have lost their lives. While the PDP earlier was talking separatist language, it later tied up with the Hindu nationalist BJP, which has been asking for abolition of article 370 (the autonomy clause), for the sake of grabbing power. The BJP is wearing its anti minority stance on its sleeves and is out to undermine the Muslim majority of the state. Mehbooba Mufti is in a Catch-22 situation; neither can she implement policies which can sooth local sentiments nor is she able to counter the high handed Hindutva policies of its ally BJP. Mufti is forced to remain a mute witness to the Centre's high handed attitude in Kashmir, barring probably the lone example of Kathua rape and murder where she could assert herself and the BJP leaders had to bite the dust.

The present scenario, worsening by the day, may affect tourism, which is the prime source of revenue for the State. The plight of the average Kashmiri needs empathy as with BJP rule in the Centre, matters have taken an adverse direction. The simmering discontent, which came out in the form of stone pelting, is worsening by the day due to lack of mechanisms of democratic protests and the possibility of dialogue from the authorities. The Chief Minister

has been calling for a dialogue, but she has been overruled by the BJP, as the latter's interests are to maintain the intimidating dominating attitude for its electoral and divisive Hindu nationalist goals.

Most of the times; all the blame for the discontent among the people is put on instigation from Pakistan. The fact is that Kashmiris are dissatisfied due to multiple factors, role of Pakistan being just one of these. The Al Qaeda clones are another and the attitude of the army is not helping the matters in any way. The army's basic duty is to protect the borders from the enemies. Here a civilian area is under army control for decades. The army's attitude was exemplified when Farooq Ahmad Dar, a weaver who had come to cast his vote, was used as a human shield. The army is trying to defend the action of the officer who subjected a civilian to such an ignominy. He was tied for over five hours and now he has to live with this humiliation all his life. Can such attitudes let the people live their lives in a normal way? The central hallmark of democracy is the process of dialogue, which is missing in the State. Many earlier leaders had attempted to bring peace; Vajpayee's famous doctrine aimed at peace, progress and prosperity in the Valley by bringing in the spirit of Insaniyat (Humanity), Jamhuriyat

(Democracy) and Kashmiriyat (Identity of the people of Kashmir). It also aimed at improving relations with Pakistan. Mehbooba Mufti is reminding the present rules of the Vajpayee doctrine, but her plea seems to be falling on deaf ears.

UPA II undertook a major step by appointing a team of interlocutors, Dileep Padgaonkar, M.M. Ansari and Radha Kumar. They undertook extensive interactions with diverse groups in the state and submitted their recommendations, which basically called for promoting autonomy of the State assembly, dialogue and improvement of relations with Pakistan. The report has been completely ignored. It is time that this report, the last major step at reconciliation on the issue, is revived to bring in peace in the Valley. The BJP's role in the alliance has been very negative and has marginalised the Muslim community in a Muslim majority state. The question we need to ask is, can Mehbooba Mufti assert herself to articulate the democratic aspirations of the people of Kashmir? The anger of people against Mufti has grown immensely. The ceasefire declared by the government is a welcome move and it needs to be backed up by humane policies to restore peace in the Valley.

Email: ram.puniyani@gmail.com

Spectre of Fascism

Contribution Rs. 20/-

Published by

Janata Trust & Lokayat

D-15, Ganesh Prasad,
Naushir Bharucha Marg,
Grant Road (W), Mumbai 400 007

Chavismo: Part II

Marco Teruggi

An Organisational Path

Go for a walk in any humble neighborhood of Venezuela—urban or rural—and you will always find some form of organisation. It never fails. It is no accident, it is a way to cultivate ongoing politics from point zero of the revolution. From the first speeches of Hugo Chavez to his last remarks, the call for organisation was constant. It was, along with the unravelling of the historic debt, the essential task. Moreover, it was through organisation that it was possible to respond to the avalanche of demands Chavismo faced during its first years and for which the institutional framework had no capacity to respond.

You can build a genealogy of the organisational forms: from social missions, public meal homes, public water aid, the Bolivarian circles, urban land committees, Zamorano communal haciendas, communal councils, communes, presidential councils of popular government, to the local supply and production committees. Each experience responded to the material and political needs of the moment; it was part of a learning and collective creation.

Arranging global affairs, being endangered like any order within a multitudinous and heterogeneous process, one could speak of three moments. The first, from 1999 to 2006, marked the constituent process for national refoundation, followed by the resolution of the historic debt in water, health, education, identification, food, with the

massive shift to sectoral/claiming organisational processes. Each need was developed into a participation process. It was the stage in which the revolution faced the coup-led assaults of the right-wingers, which came to paralyse the oil industry and almost the whole country.

Socialist Horizon

The second moment can be understood until 2012. A time of defeats and strategic ravings by the right, it was also a time for Chavez to consolidate his government and himself as leader. The economy grew and the socialist horizon appeared. It was no longer about boosting organisational experiences in terms of sectoral demands, but trying out forms of organisation that carry the power of the transition to socialism. They are centrally the communal councils and the communes, which must install community governments in their territories.

Finally, the current stage, from the death of Chavez in 2013 to the present. It is a period marked by a siege on all fronts. New trials of transition and co-government appeared, such as the presidential councils of popular government and a centralisation in local food distribution committees. This decision can be read in pragmatic terms in view of the need to respond to the economic crisis, as well as under the predominance of a political view that discovers communal possibilities.

The common thread between

the three periods lies in the call by the leadership / government to the organisation. In this permanent process, one of the central dimensions of Chavismo was formed, which is his experience of collective organisation. I speak of tens of thousands of communal or production committees councils, for example.

Political Revolution

It is an essential part of the political revolution, which was ahead of the economic one. Men and women who had never participated politically, nor had any previous experience. It was about the democratic eruption of the excluded, at the same time as the emergence of new forms of democracy, particularly in the communes: 'the expression of a new political culture.' Organisation, formation and mobilisation: the revolutionary triad, the meeting between a call and a need. With a weakness: the material dependency of the organisation on institutions,

which also resulted in political dependence, raised by Chavez himself. To what extent is this people's power actual power?

The unity between political identity and organisational processes gives Chavismo a radicalism to advance and resist this era. It is possible to investigate what has been left in the territories, what predominates in these adversities that seek to destroy this weave. Some experiences were integrated with others, in particular to communal councils and communes. Others have returned for the needs, such as the feeding houses, while the production committees took centrality in an accelerated way in the communities. It could not be otherwise: they are a partial food response when food is scarce or unaffordable. You could hardly have started on that scale without all the previous experience accumulated.

Chavez Formula

It is good to go further in the analysis and enter into debate

about the perspectives that carry different organisational forms. The local supply and production committees have been thought of as palliative mechanisms in an emergency situation, not as socialist forms of trial in a transitional perspective. That can and should be the communes, which are the territorialisation of socialism, the test of establishing it on communal governments with the capacity for self-management capacity, of being a new institutionality with the capacity to exercise a communal and national power. An articulated network of communes covering the country to come, beyond parties, movements, institutions. To put it another way: without communal development, where is the socialism of the 21st century? What is 21st century socialism? It is a question about the strategic project.

Without this organisation in constant growth, there is no possibility of founding the new.

It is the Chavez formula.

Guilty Men of Two-Nation Theory: A Hindutva Project Borrowed by Jinnah in India - II

Shamsul Islam

Moonje, Har Dayal, Savarkar and Golwalkar as Prophets of Two-Nation Theory

Dr. B.S. Moonje was another prominent Congress leader (who equally dabbled in organising the Hindu Mahasabha and later helped the RSS in its formation) who carried forward the flag of Hindu separatism long before the Muslim League's Pakistan resolution of March 1940.

While addressing the third session of the Oudh Hindu Mahasabha in 1923, he declared:

Just as England belongs to the English, France to the French, and Germany to the Germans, India belongs to the Hindus. If Hindus get organised, they can humble the English and their stooges, the Muslims . . . The Hindus henceforth create

*their own world which will prosper through shuddhi and sangathan.*¹⁴

It was sheer semi-illiteracy of Moonje that he presented England, France and Germany as justification for India for Hindus. The English, the French and the German identities had nothing to do with religions, these were secular identities of the people living in those countries.

Lala Har Dayal (1884–1938), a well-known name in the Ghadar Party circles, too, long before the Muslim League's demand for a separate homeland for Muslims, not only demanded the formation of a Hindu nation in India but also urged the conquest and Hinduisation of Afghanistan. In a significant political statement in 1925, which was published in the Pratap of Kanpur, he stated:

I declare that the future of the Hindu race, of Hindustan and of the Punjab, rests on these four pillars: (1) Hindu Sangathan, (2) Hindu Raj, (3) Shuddhi of Muslims, and (4) Conquest and Shuddhi of Afghanistan and the Frontiers. So long as the Hindu Nation does not accomplish these four things, the safety of our children and great grandchildren will be ever in danger, and the safety of Hindu race will be impossible. The Hindu race has but one history, and its institutions are homogenous. But the Mussalman and Christians are far removed from the confines of Hindustan, for their religions are alien and they love Persian, Arab, and European institutions. Thus, just as one removes foreign matter from the eye, Shuddhi must be made of these two religions. Afghanistan and the hilly regions of the frontier were formerly part of India, but are at present under the domination of Islam . . . Just as there is Hindu religion in Nepal, so there must be Hindu institutions in Afghanistan and the frontier territory; otherwise it is useless to win Swaraj.¹⁵

All such ideas of declaring India as a Hindu nation and excluding Muslims and Christians

from it were further crystallised by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar in his controversial book *Hindutva* as early as 1923. Interestingly, he was allowed to write this polarising book despite being in the British jail. According to his definition of the Hindu nation, Muslims and Christians remained out of this nationhood because they did not assimilate into Hindu cultural heritage or adopt Hindu religion. Savarkar decreed:

Christians and Mohamedan [sic] communities, who were but very recently Hindus and in majority of cases had been at least in their first generation most willing denizens of their new fold, claim though they might a common fatherland, and an almost pure Hindu blood and parentage with us cannot be recognised as Hindus; as since their adoption of the new cult they had ceased to own Hindu Sanskriti [culture] as a whole. They belong, or feel that they belong, to a cultural unit altogether different from the Hindu one. Their heroes and their hero-worship their fairs and their festivals, their ideals and their outlook on-life, have now ceased to be common with ours.¹⁶

Savarkar, the originator of the politics of *Hindutva*, later developed the most elaborate two-nation theory. The fact should not be missed that Muslim League passed its Pakistan resolution only in 1940, but Savarkar, the great philosopher and guide of RSS, propagated the two-nation theory long before it. While delivering the presidential address to the 19th session of the Hindu Mahasabha at Ahmedabad in 1937, Savarkar declared unequivocally,

As it is, there are two

antagonistic nations living side by side in India. Several infantile politicians commit the serious mistake in supposing that India is already welded into a harmonious nation, or that it could be welded thus for the mere wish to do so. These our well-meaning but unthinking friends take their dreams for realities. That is why they are impatient of communal tangles and attribute them to communal organisations. But the solid fact is that the so-called communal questions are but a legacy handed down to us by centuries of cultural, religious and national antagonism between the Hindus and Moslems. When time is ripe you can solve them; but you cannot suppress them by merely refusing recognition of them. It is safer to diagnose and treat deep-seated disease than to ignore it. Let us bravely face unpleasant facts as they are. India cannot be assumed today to be a Unitarian and homogenous nation, but on the contrary there are two nations in the main: the Hindus and the Moslems, in India.¹⁷

The RSS, following in the footsteps of Savarkar, outright rejected the idea that Hindus and Muslims together constituted a nation. The English organ of the RSS, *Organiser*, on the very eve of independence (August 14, 1947), editorially chalked out its concept of nation in the following words:

Let us no longer allow ourselves to be influenced by false notions of nationhood. Much of the mental confusion and the present and future troubles can be removed by the ready recognition of the simple fact that in Hindusthan

only the Hindus form the nation and the national structure must be built on that safe and sound foundation . . . the nation itself must be built up of Hindus, on Hindu traditions, culture, ideas and aspirations.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, a keen researcher of communal politics in pre-independence India, while underlying the affinity and camaraderie between Hindu Mahasabha and Muslim League on the issue of the two-nation theory, wrote:

Strange it may appear, Mr. Savarkar and Mr. Jinnah instead of being opposed to each other on the one nation versus two nations issue are in complete agreement about it. Both agree, not only agree but insist that there are two nations in India—one the Muslim nation and the other Hindu nation.¹⁸

Ambedkar warned that Savarkar's rhetoric that "Hindu nation will be enabled to occupy a predominant position that is due to it and the Muslim nation made to live in the position of subordinate co-operation with the Hindu nation" was "creating a most dangerous situation for safety and security of India".¹⁹

Hindu Mahasabha Formed Coalition Governments with Muslim League

The children of Hindu nationalist Savarkar who are presently ruling India are oblivious of the shocking fact that the Hindu Mahasabha led by Savarkar entered into alliances with the Muslim League in order to break the united freedom struggle, especially the 1942 Quit India Movement against the British rulers. While delivering the Presidential

address at the 24th session of the Hindu Mahasabha at Cawnpore (Kanpur) in 1942, he defended hobnobbing with the Muslim League in the following words,

In practical politics also the Mahasabha knows that we must advance through reasonable compromises. Witness the fact that only recently in Sind, the Sind Hindu Sabha on invitation had taken the responsibility of joining hands with the League itself in running coalition government. The case of Bengal is well known. Wild Leaguers whom even the Congress with all its submissiveness could not placate grew quite reasonably compromising and sociable as soon as they came in contact with the Hindu Mahasabha and the Coalition government, under the premiership of Mr. Fazlul Huq and the able lead of our esteemed Mahasabha leader Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerji, functioned successfully for a year or so to the benefit of both the communities. Moreover further events also proved demonstratively that the Hindu Mahasabhaites endeavoured to capture the centres of political power only in the public interest and not for the loaves and fishes of the office.²⁰

Hindu Mahasabha and Muslim League formed a coalition government in NWFP also.

Muslims Against Partition

One of the greatest lies concerning partition of India continuously spread by the Hindutva gang is that all Muslims of India in unison demanded Pakistan and they got the country divided. This lie, believed as truth by the Hindutva cadres, has

become the most important cause of persecution of Muslims in India. It is true that India was partitioned in 1947 due to Muslim League's demand for a separate homeland for Muslims. And there is no denying the fact that the Muslim League was able to mobilise a large number of Muslims in favour of its demand. But it is also true that very large sections of Indian Muslims and their organisations stood against the demand for Pakistan. A galaxy of leading Muslim intellectuals like Dr. Mukhtar Ahmed Ansari (who was in the forefront of struggle against the communal politics of the Muslim League and died in 1936), Shaukatullah Ansari, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Syed Abdullah Brelvi, Shaikh Mohammed Abdullah, A.M. Khwaja and Maulana Azad were associated with this movement against Pakistan. Several Muslim organisations produced large number of booklets in Urdu against the two-nation theory and in support of co-existence of Hindus and Muslims in India.

These 'Muslims against Partition' challenged the Muslim League theoretically and confronted the latter on the streets. Such Muslims fought heroically, many times paying with their lives. The lie of culpability of all Indian Muslims for the partition of India continues to be spread not only due to the nasty anti-Muslim politics of Hindutva but also due to the fact that Indian Muslims are not aware of the great heritage of their ancestors who challenged the politics of the Muslim League politically, religiously and physically.

Within weeks of the Pakistan resolution of the Muslim League at Lahore, Indian Muslims organised the 'Muslim Azad Conference'

in Delhi (Queen's Park, Chandni Chowk) between April 27–30, 1940 (it was to conclude on April 29 but was extended by one day due to tremendous participation) with 1,400 delegates from almost all parts of India attending it. The leading light of this conference was the former Premier of Sind, Allah Bakhsh, who presided over the conference.

The major Muslim organisations represented in this conference were All India Jamiat-ul-Ulema, All India Momin Conference, All India Majlis-e-Ahrar, All-India Shia Political Conference, Khudai Khidmatgars, Bengal Krishak Proja Party, All-India Muslim Parliamentary Board, the Anjuman-e-Watan of Baluchistan, All India Muslim Majlis and Jamiat Ahl-e-Hadis. The Conference was attended by duly elected delegates from all major Provinces, including United Provinces, Bihar, Central Provinces, Punjab, Sind, NWF Province, Madras, Orissa, Bengal, Baluchistan, Delhi, Assam, Ajmer–Mewar, Delhi and Bombay, as well as several native states, thus covering the whole of India.²¹ There was no doubt that these delegates represented the “majority of India’s Muslims.”²²

Allah Bakhsh in his presidential address declared the Pakistan resolution as suicidal for Muslims as well as for India. Stressing the inclusive nature of Indian society and polity, he said:

As Indian nationals, Muslim and Hindus and others inhabit the land and share every inch of the motherland and all its material and cultural treasures alike according to the measure of their just and fair rights and requirements as the proud sons of the soil. Even in the realm of

literature one finds common classics like Heer Ranjha and Sassi Pannu, written by Muslim poets, equally and proudly shared by Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs in the Punjab and in Sind; to quote but only one example. It is a vicious fallacy for Hindu, Muslim and other inhabitants of India to arrogate to themselves an exclusively proprietary right over either the whole or any particular part of India. The country as an indivisible whole and as one federated and composite unit belongs to all the inhabitants of the country alike and is as much the inalienable and imprescriptible heritage of the Indian Muslim as of other Indians. No segregated or insolated regions, but the whole of India is the Homeland of all the Indian Muslim and no Hindu or Muslim or any other has the right to deprive them of one inch of this Homeland.

Muslim League Terror

How many of us know that long before M.K. Gandhi’s murder by Hindu nationalists, Allah Bakhsh was murdered on May 14, 1943 by professional assassins hired by Muslim nationalists (Muslim League leaders) at Shikarpur town in Sind. He needed to be liquidated as he had become a symbol of unity amongst Muslims against the Muslim League and its demand for Pakistan, just as Gandhi had to be killed as he had become the biggest stumbling block in the Hindutva project of converting India into a Hindu Rashtra.

But not just Allah Bakhsh, all leading leaders of the anti-Pakistan movement were physically attacked, their houses looted, their family members attacked and mosques where they stayed or addressed Muslims damaged. Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani, famously

known as Sheikh-ul-Islam, was a victim of violent attacks in UP and Bihar. Maulana Azad, the respected Ahrar leader Maulana Habibur Rahman, Maulana Ishaq Sambhali, Hafiz Ibrahim, Maulana Mohd. Qasim Shajahanpuri and many other leading ulama faced murderous attacks. At several places, ulama were attacked with daggers causing severance of body parts, they were shot and office of the Jamiat at Delhi was set on fire. Momin Conference meetings were special targets of attack and many of its cadres were killed, forcing the Conference to warn the Muslim League of war.

According to a contemporary document,

It is painful to describe how respected nationalist ulama (scholars) and leaders throughout the country were treated by ML. It was despicable, heartbreaking and inhuman. In villages, towns and cities meetings of nationalist were showered with stones and attacked regularly in the most criminal manner. MNG, the volunteer force of ML, indulged in unspeakable violence against nationalist Muslims. It was difficult for nationalist Muslims to travel as they were attacked ferociously while undertaking journeys. All those opposing Muslim League were scared and if any dared to challenge them had to bear terrible consequences.²³

Hindu Nationalists Who Believed in the Two-Nation Theory Paraded as Indian Nationalists

Despite all these facts, only Muslims are branded as the guilty men of partition and originators and perpetrators of the two-nation theory. The leading Hindu nationalist leaders like Bal Gangadhar Tilak,

Lajpat Rai, Madan Mohan Malviya, M.S. Aney, B.S. Moonje, M.R. Jayakar, N.C. Kelkar and Swami Shradhanand (some of whom were also Congress leaders) did not subscribe to an all-inclusive India but were committed to the building of an exclusive Hindu nation. They believed that India was primordial a Hindu nation and should be nurtured as one. Nevertheless, they went around as great Indian 'Nationalist' leaders, and many of them are considered so even today.

The majority community has had the advantage of disguising its communalism under the cloak of nationalism. Take one glaring example, Madan Mohan Malviya. He was President of the Indian National Congress which stood for a composite India in 1909, 1918 and 1933; but he also presided over the sessions of Hindu Mahasabha in the years 1923, 1924 and 1936. He was the originator of the most divisive slogan 'Hindi-Hindu-Hindusthan'.²⁴ Despite his history of spreading communal hatred, he continues to be known as a great Indian nationalist leader.

If Muslim leaders can be distinguished on the basis of whether they believed in a multi-religious India or in the creation of Pakistan as a homeland for Muslims, then the same distinction should apply to Hindu leaders. When we study Indian nationalism we are generally told that all Hindus were nationalists, whereas there were few patriotic Muslims and the rest were with the anti-national Muslim League. In order to clear the air we need to define what nationalism meant during the Indian freedom struggle. If Indian nationalism during those days meant creating a multi-religious

secular nation state, only those who shared this commitment should be called nationalist or patriotic. But this is rarely the case when we discuss communal Hindus or Hindu nationalist leaders. Despite their being decidedly against a multi-cultural India, they are still held up as nationalist icons. The truth is that the Hindu nationalist leaders were decidedly anti-patriotic or anti-national, in precisely the same way as the Muslim League was.

In the same way that not all Hindu leaders were patriotic by this standard, not all Muslims were anti-patriotic. A large number of Muslim individuals and mass-based Muslim organisations opposed the two-nation theory and the creation of Pakistan with all their strength and resources, often laying down their lives. The saddest part is that the children of the Hindu nationalists, inheritors of the politics of the two-nation theory, are today ruling India. This ruling elite, whose political ancestors like Moonje, Savarkar and Golwalkar played no role in the freedom struggle, who cooperated with the Muslim League and the British rulers, are today questioning the patriotism of Indian Muslims.

Task Before Indian Muslims

Indian Muslims, instead of getting defensive against this onslaught by the anti-national Hindu nationalists, must aggressively challenge the propaganda against Muslims. History is with them. Indian Muslims are children of those fearless Muslims who waged a glorious fight against the Muslim League and its demand for Pakistan. They did not agree to Pakistan, but unfortunately were helpless victims of a deal amongst the British rulers, the Muslim League and the Congress

for partitioning India. The following statement of Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, renowned as the Frontier Gandhi, to M.K. Gandhi in June 1947, after Congress had agreed to the partition of India, symbolised the pervasive sense of betrayal of anti-Pakistan Muslims. He wrote:

*We Pakhtuns stood by you and had undergone great sacrifices for attaining freedom. But you have now deserted us and thrown us to the wolves . . .*²⁵

Whereas the children of Savarkar and Golwalkar, who rule India today, hail from a heritage which propounded the two-nation theory and allied with Jinnah, the Muslims who stood firmly against the partition of India resolutely opposed Jinnah and the division of the country on the basis of religion. This becomes clear from the anti-Pakistan poem titled Pakistan chahne walon se (To those who want Pakistan) penned by the renowned poet, Shamim Karhani, which became Indian Muslims' anthem against the Muslim League. It is a poem every Indian Muslim should be proud of:

*Humko batlao tau kiya matlab hae
Pakistan kaa
Jis jagah iss waqt Muslim haen,
najis hae kiya who ja*

(Tell me, what does Pakistan mean?
Is this land, where we Muslims are,
an unholy land?)

*Nesh-e-tohmat se tere, Chishti kaa
seena chaak hae
Jald batlla kiya zameen Ajmer kee
na-paak hae*

(Your slur has wounded Chishti's
breast
Quick, tell me, is Ajmer impure?)

*Kufr kee vaadi maen imaan kaa
nageena kho gaya
Hai kiya khak-e-najis maen shah-e-
meena kho gaya*

(Can you say the precious jewel of
Islam ‘Shah Meena’
has been lost in the unholy valley of
infidelity?)

*Deen kaa makhdoom jo Kaliyer kee
abaadi maen hae
Aah! Uskaa aastana kiya najis vaadi
mae hae*

(The place of high dignity at Kaliyar
where the Master of religion is
resting
Is it an unholy valley?)

*Haen imamon ke jo roze Lucknow
kee khaaq per
Ban gaye kiya tauba-tauba khitta-
e-napak per*

(The shrines of Imams at Lucknow
Are they built on impure land?)

*Baat yeh kaisee kahee tuney kee dil
ne aah kee
Kiya zameen tahir naheen dargah-
e-Noorullah kee*

(A deep sigh came out over your
statement
Can you say the Shrine of Noor-ul-
lah (at Agra) is not pious?)

*Aah! Iss pakeezah Ganga ko najis
kehta hae tu
Jis key paani see kiya Muslim
shahidon ne wazoo*

(Alas! You call the holy Ganga water
impure
which was used by martyrs for the
ablution)

Nam-e-Pakistan na le gar tujhko

*pas-e-deen hae
Yeh guzishta nasl-e-Muslim kee badi
tauheen hae*

(Don’t take the name of Pakistan if
you have least respect for your faith
because demanding Pakistan is
immense disrespect to our Muslim
predecessors)

*Tukre-tukre ker nahin sakte watan
ko ahl-e-dil
Kis tarah taraj dekhien gey chaman
ko ahl-e-dil*

(Those who have a sensible heart
cannot split the country
how will they dare to see a ruined
and plundered motherland?)

*Kiya yeh matlab hae ke hum
mahroom-e-azadi rahen
Munqasim ho ker Arab kee tarah
faryadi rahaen*

(Do you want us to remain devoid
of freedom
and lament like divided Arabs?)

*Tukre-tukre ho kay Muslim khasta-
dil ho jayegaa
Nakhl-e-jamiat sarasar muzmahil
ho jayegaa.*

(By division Muslims will split and
the tree of community will wilt.)²⁶

Email: notoinjustice@gmail.com

References

14. Cited in J.S. Dhanki, Lala Lajpat Rai and Indian Nationalism, S Publications, Jullundur, 1990, p. 378.
15. Cited in B.R. Ambedkar, Pakistan or the Partition of India, op. cit., p. 129.

16. V.D. Savarkar, Hindutva, published by V.V. Kelkar, Nagpur, 1923, p. 88.

17. Samagra Savarkar Wangmaya (Collected Works of Savarkar), Hindu Mahasabha, Poona, 1963, p.296.

18. B.R. Ambedkar, Pakistan or the Partition of India, op. cit., p. 142.

19. Ibid., 143.

20. Ibid., pp. 479–480.

21. According to records available with the reception committee of the Conference the number of delegates from major Provinces was as follows: United Provinces 357, Punjab 155, Bihar 125, Bengal 105, N.W.F. Province 35, Sind 82, Baluchistan 45, Bombay 60, C. P. 12, Madras 5, Orissa 5, Ajmer–Mewar 12, Assam 25, Delhi 112, Indian States 12. Cited in The Hindustan Times, April 28, 1940.

22. Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Modern Islam in India: A Social Analysis, Victor G. Ltd, London, 1946, p. 231.

23. Cited in Aseer Adardi, Tehreek-e-Azadi aur Musalman, Darul Maualefeen, Deoband, 2000 (6th edition), p. 341.

24. K.K. Gangadharan, Indian National Consciousness: Growth & Development, Kalamkar, Delhi, 1972, p. 97.

25. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Words of Freedom: Ideas of a Nation, Penguin, Delhi, 2010, pp. 41–42.

26. Shamin Karhani, ‘Pakistan chahne walon se’ in Jaan Nisar Akhtar (ed.), Hindostan Hamara, Vol. 2, Hindustani Book Trust, Mumbai, 1973, pp. 305–306.



GANNON DUNKERLEY & CO., LTD.

An infrastructure company established since 1924

REGD. OFFICE

New Excelsior Building, (3rd Floor),

A.K. Nayak Marg, Fort, Mumbai 400001.

Tel. : 022 2205 1231

Fax : 022-2205 1232

Office :

Ahmedabad, Hyderabad, Kolkata, Mumbai & New Delhi