

## **67. Ideology goes beyond election**

**By Gopal Krishna Agarwal,**

We agree with Congress president Sonia Gandhi when she says the fight with the BJP or RSS is not just electoral but also ideological. We want the debate to go to the ideological level. I firmly believe that no movement, person or organisation can claim preview to infallibility. If a fair debate proves an ideology to be false, it has to be rejected; if it is not, then it will die. Before we take on any debate we must define the terms clearly so that we do not interpret it differently, creating confusion.

Democracy has its weaknesses: A united minority can rule a divided majority. Secularism is uniform treatment of all religion without any differentiation on the basis of caste, creed or religion. But the Congress, communists or others in the name of secularism will simply appease the minorities. Can they tell what is communal in asking for a common civil code? Civil laws without any discrimination on the basis of religion will only enhance the secular character of the country. Similarly, Article 370 has only encouraged the fragmentation of the country. Even Nehru had said national integration will automatically erode Article 370

One must not undermine or denounce the contribution of some people just because one doesn't agree with their ideology. Mr Mani Shankar Aiyar's action against the honour of a great freedom fighter, Veer Savarkar, was a derogatory action. Everybody knows and respects the contribution of Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru towards the freedom struggle, but the present Congressmen are so short-sighted that they cannot look beyond them. Indian freedom struggle was a national movement. How can one party claim legacy to an entire movement?

Mr Aiyar is the person against whom it has been written that during the 1962 war with China, he collected funds at Oxford University for communist soldiers. People like him in with indulge in the worst form of communalism

under the garb of secularism. They flare up the fear psychosis inherent in any minority community and then try to become its messiah.

Mr Arjun Singh talks of saffronisation of education by the NDA Government and its subsequent detoxification by the UPA. Has he spent any time defining the terms 'saffronisation' and detoxification? By detoxification, does he want to undermine the contribution of Hindus or their culture to the history of India? I know he is not ignorant, but is out to play the worst form of communal politics. Let me remind him that saffron in our culture represents the rising sun, symbolising knowledge, hope and a new beginning. Does he want to remove the moral element from the education system or simply diminish the contribution of great leaders like Shivaji and the Sikh Gurus? If you are telling children that the Sikh Gurus were great, then you will have to tell about their struggle with particular foreign rulers who had enslaved us. Losing this freedom in a free country is a blot on the whole country. But how can a so-called self-styled secularist like Mr Arjun Singh accept and tell this truth?

Litterateur VS Naipaul, during his last visit to India, said, "History is always written by the winner and, therefore, it can be rewritten at a later date incorporating the portions ignored earlier. History has been rewritten in many parts of the world."

Macaulay, who implemented the present education system in India during British rule, said he had been successful in implementing a system of education in India which will produce people who will be Indian in appearance but British in thinking. People coming out of this education do not have any knowledge of our history or its contribution to the world. After Independence, our educational institutions came under the influence of people with communist ideology. They always looked to Russia, their fatherland. Russia has now denounced communism and China has ignored it. Communism has failed miserably, but the communists of our country are still clinging on to that ideology.

These are the core issues of the BJP and the RSS, and if anyone calls us communal for our stated stand then he will have to alter his definition of secularism. By defining secularism as appeasement of the minorities in place of equality of all religion, they are creating confusion in the minds of the people. Appeasement of minorities has

always prevented their integration into the mainstream. Minorities have been trying to maintain their separate status because of the inherent benefit derived in the process. An open discussion on these issues is needed. The country needs such discussion. Else, a united minority will rule and implement its ideology on a divided majority. to the status

All rhetoric of secularism by these people is based on deception of which all of us are well aware and yet it persists, being built on something apart from the ignorance of the individual.

**Appeasement of minorities has always prevented their integration into the mainstream. Minorities have been trying to maintain their separate status because of the inherent benefit derived in the process**

**Secularism must be debated or else a united minority will rule a divided and notional majority, says Gopal K Agarwal**