

## The Promulgation of Hindutava Ideology under Secularism's Curtain in the Modi Era

▪ DOI: 10.31703/gsssr.2022(VII-I),07

▪ URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsssr.2022\(VII-I\).07](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsssr.2022(VII-I).07)

▪ Vol. VII, No. I (Winter 2022)

▪ Pages: 66 - 75

▪ p-ISSN: 2708-2121

▪ e-ISSN: 2708-3616

Hajra Nasir<sup>\*</sup>

Mariam Asif<sup>†</sup>

Saima Gul<sup>‡</sup>

**Abstract:** *The research article addresses the underline reason for opting for Secularism in India by Nehru. Nehru knew India was a home of people from different cultures, languages, religions, and ethnicities. So, choosing one religion, i.e., Hinduism, would create problems for the rest of the religions, and in the future other religions may ask for a separate country. An aggressive reaction was seen by other parties who wanted to protect Hinduism after the adoption of Secularism in India. Secularism welcomes all religions and allows people of its Nation to live freely by treating everyone equally. Gandhi also announced his view on Secularism and how he considered it a western concept and would not fit in easily. Gandhi believed that you could not separate religion from state policies. Nevertheless, Nehru was more than convinced, so he chose Secularism as an ideology for India.*

**Key Words:** Hindutva, Secularism, RSS, Modia Era, Gandhi

### Introduction

After August 15, 1947, India gained independence; the country was going through much turbulence regarding the form of governance. The contention was whether the country would be Hindu, as most people followed Hinduism or a secular state. Most Hindus live in India, with a large number of people from different cults living with them, like Muslims, Sikhs, and Parsi. Muslims, in large numbers, chose to fight for India even though they had gained religious freedom in Pakistan. Jawaharlal Nehru was well aware that it has a secular concept that preserved the 'Rule of law' in a democracy that was threatened by the 'rule of people.' Nehru admitted that it was challenging for him to model a secular state where Hinduism predominates. Nehru wisdom and agnosticism were sceptical about religious beliefs that interfered with the State's affairs and personal spiritual matters. On Religion, Nehru said: "Organized Religion, allying itself

to theology and often more concerned with its vested. Interests, then with things of the spirit, encourage. A temper opposite to science produces narrowness and intolerance, credulity and superstition, emotionalism, and irrationalism. It tends to close and limit the mind of man and, to produce a temper of dependent, unfree person" (Narivelil, Nehru and the Secular State of India, 1968)

### Universal Definition of Secularism

George Jacob Holyoake first coined the word Secularism in 1851, a newspaper editor, an English secularist, and a co-operator. Who defined Secularism as: "Secularism is that which seeks the development of the physical, moral, and intellectual nature of man to the highest possible point, as the immediate duty of life — which inculcates the practical sufficiency of natural morality apart from Atheism, Theism or the Bible — which selects as its methods of the procedure the promotion

<sup>\*</sup> Research Scholar, Department of International Relations, COMSATS, Islamabad, Pakistan.

<sup>†</sup> Lecturer, National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Email: [mariam.saqib1982@gmail.com](mailto:mariam.saqib1982@gmail.com) (Corresponding Author)

<sup>‡</sup> Lecturer, Department of International Relations, University of Peshawar, KP, Pakistan.

of human improvement by material means, and proposes these positive agreements as the common bond of union, to all who would regulate life by reason and ennoble it by service” (Cline, [2019](#)) Secularism’s basic conceptualization is the concern and requisite of humanity in this life without thinking about the vital needs required for any possible afterlife. In social sciences, Secularism means opposition to religion.

There are three fundamental principles of Secularism.

### 1. Separation

State affairs, the public sphere, and religion are altogether three different entities, so they should be reviewed separately. Religion has a say or can participate in public affairs but cannot subjugate. Religion has no say in State affairs. People can practice religion, but religion will play no part in policymaking.

### 2. Freedom

Means one can practice belief and faith openly and freely without thinking about threatening and changing others’ beliefs just because their conscience says so.

### 3. Equality

All religions in a state are equal. If the believer of one faction is in the majority, it does not mean they are privileged or have some advantage. Every camp (religion) should be treated equally. No religion should be given special status and privileges over other religions. (Taylor, [2010](#)).

Secularism is a concept that places paramount value on the matter of this world. Secularism believes that observation and rational reasoning are the tools to make the world and human standards known and improved—the theory proposed was in response to religious belief. George Holyoake us the term Secularism for the first time in 1851. The term introduced was new, but the overall idea of free thought on which it was founded had breathed all over history—Secularism advocates keeping religion out of state affairs. State or organization and religion are different entities; both should work and manoeuvre separately from one another. In one way State is free from religious teaching and practices in

Secularism; it allows its citizens to choose for them, remain neutral in religious beliefs, and not bend to religions. It also highlights the fact that when an individual is making a political decision or carrying out political activities, it should rely on authentication and fact detached from religious instigation. Secularism was often regarded as a European concept, and a debate that’s come with it is that it is a movement toward religious modernization. Early secular ideas can trace back to the Averroism school of philosophy and Ibn Rushd. Holyoake designed the term Secularism to illustrate his beliefs that he promotes a social order that works separately from religion. Secularism is not against Christianity; it is independent of it. It teaches citizens how to conduct this life. (Subhan, [2016](#)).

Secularism has three popular beliefs: Religious communities do not dominate each other. Individuals belonging to the same religion do not try to dominate each other. Finally, the State gives their Citizen a free hand to choose and practice any religion they want, and no privilege should be given to a particular religion to the extent that it becomes a state religion. There are two types of Secularism soft and hard Secularism.

When a human believes in supernatural beings/deities, they follow everything they preach. He tries to make deities happy because he fears that he does not follow them or shows subordination, which would bring disaster for himself as a consequence. This way, men try to apprehend the infinite. He engages in endless endeavours and only does those acts that will please supernatural beings. From individuals practising religion, it becomes part of society. Religion is a permanent and universal institution; it plays a vital part in maintaining and regulating the social system. When a person tries to become more religious, then one group tries to dominate others. It is problematic as there are many religions in this world, and the only possible way for their peaceful coexistence is if individuals have religion, and the State does not have one. Secularism applied in a state will not force its Citizen to follow one particular religion or try to favour a particular religion over others—secularism outs God from the world’s matter (Rectenwald, [2011](#)).

Modern societies usually follow Secularism. Due to complete freedom in choosing the religion, a person can follow one religion, believe in other religions, or not follow any religion, with little legal or social sanction. For the secularist, it is a general postulation that religion does not dictate politics or the State. However, the moral values embedded in traditional religious customs remain politically important for Secularist countries.

### Protestation After Declaring India a Secularist Democracy

After declaring India as a secular Parliamentary democracy, the rift between Hindu Nationalism and Hindu Traditionalists started. Hindu traditionalists paid more attention to propagating cultural features and safeguarding Hindi's supremacy over Urdu. Hindu pluralists never care about their Hindu community's enlargement; it was okay to worship two or more deities simultaneously. They got full representation in the parliament and decided to opt for secular Democracy. Traditional Hindus' polytheistic nature helped them accept people of different Religions. (Marbaniang, [2005](#), [2009](#), [2011](#)) Hindu Nationalists believed that Hinduism should be the State's Religion instead of Secularism as it is a western concept and does not suit them.

Moreover, Hindus are the only sons of the soil as they fought for India and are in the majority. These Hindu fundamentalists were very aggressive and had confrontational views that Muslims are right fundamentalists, and their beliefs make them extremists. In addition, their companions started the independence debate, and at some point, they will do the same in the future. Hindu Nationalists considered Muslim outsiders even though they fought for India with them. So, the concept of Secularism will benefit them more, and they will be equal to Hindus. To protect India from further disintegration in the future by Muslims. A movement started by the religious militant group Bajrang Dal. Other organizations like Shiv Sena also share the ideology of Sangh Parivar. Sangh Parivar is promoting Hindutva policies and perceives Secularism as the enemy of India. Hindutva is described as a classical fascist ideology promoting cultural hegemony and a homogenized majority.

Hindutva Vadis believe in an extreme form of ethnic absolutism and conservatism.

RSS and named it as Sangh Parivar. It was solely created by the extremist faction, which means the family of RSS. It is an umbrella composed of Hindu supremacists, Hindu nationalists, and paramilitary volunteer right-wing organizations. It also incorporates the religious organization Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP), the political party Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the workers union Bharatiya Kishan Sangh (BKS), the student's union Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad (ABVP),

religious militant group Bajrang Dal. Other organizations like Shiv Sena also share the ideology of Sangh Parivar. Sangh Parivar is promoting Hindutva policies and perceives Secularism as the enemy of India. Hindutva is described as a classical fascist ideology promoting cultural hegemony and a homogenized majority. Hindutva Vadis believe in an extreme form of ethnic absolutism and conservatism. (Jaffrelot, [2019](#))

From the 1950s to the 1970s, this secular model worked in favour of India. The problem started in the 1980s when BJP was formed, promoting anti-secular sentiments among Hindus. Their preaching sessions were openly carried out to gather the attention of the majority of Hindus. BJP wanted Hindus to make themselves aware and become a strong faction so that after elections, policies have been made while respecting Hindu sentiments and changed accordingly. To prove that Secularism was not the right choice for Hindus and only their emotions are vital. BJP in the '80s started the campaign for the reconstruction of the Ram temple in place of Babri Masjid. It helped BJP to win the election of 1991 in Uttar Pradesh. In 1992 Babri Masjid was demolished. (Majid, [2015](#)).

After that, BJP won the election two times in 1998 and 1999. Both times it was the coalition government as they could not win the election by a majority. Because of the coalition government, the hands of BJP leaders back then were tied. BJP adopted a less aggressive and anti-secularist approach towards minorities to keep the bloc together. (Jaffrelot, [2019](#)). In 2002 Modi, Gujrat, as a Chief Minister, carried out a massacre against Muslims by killing more than 790 Muslims and burning down their whole towns. National Democratic

Alliance (NDA) resented the anti-Muslim massacre. It broke its coalition with BJP (Bonney, 2004). For the next terms, i.e., 2004 and 2009, the Congress-led coalition (UPA) United Progressive Alliance won both times. The hatred against minorities, especially Muslims and christens, was there, but the government controlled it until 2014 when Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) won the elections. After the 2014 turbulence of all kinds of weather related to Religion, Hindu related-discrimination based on caste, governance-related, and law-related is there in India.

Modi openly supported Hindutava ideology by initiated anti-secular policies, which later proved to be an injustice to minorities. Modi himself is a religious man who follows Hinduism and believes in Hindu Raj.

## Development of Indian Secularism into Political Paddling

### Nehru's take on Opting for Secularism for India

In 1946 Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the Interim Government's Prime Minister, so he played the leading role in the final settlement between Congress and Muslim League. After India's formation in 1947, Nehru was asked to form an interim government because he was the Congress president in 1946. Gandhi, who aided a lot in India's formation, did not want to be part of politics. So he handed over the Government to Nehru. He was referred to as a "Bhai" and his "Political heir" After independence, Gandhi disappeared, and all the burden shifted to Nehru's shoulders. Despite achieving independence, after many hurdles, freedom movements, and sacrifice, the next dilemma arose in the State's Constitution, as people from different religions were living in India (Zachariah, 2004).

Nehru believed that India would only progress on one condition if the State did not interfere in the religion; it is malice towards none, and not one religion preferred upon others. Although Hindus was making up two-thirds of India's population, Nehru thought of people from different cultures and religions. Religious practices and beliefs did not influence Nehru's overall perspective on life. Nehru regarded the practice of religion as disobliging wherever anyone practices it. It was confounding with his scientific and

rational apprenticeship, philosophies of religion, and tendencies to assent to superstitions, whether Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, or any other. He said, "I am not wedded to any dogma or religion, but I do believe, whether one calls it religion or not, in the innate spirituality of human beings. I do believe in the innate dignity of the individual" (Narivelil, Nehru and the Secular State of India, 1968) Nehru, on many occasions, openly accepted that dogmas do not appeal to him. For Nehru, Religion is egoistic and self-centred because it is intolerant and narrow about others' beliefs, affecting people's spiritual and moral growth in the long run. Nehru's leaning towards Secularism was the primary motive for opting for Secularism in India. This Political and social doctrine will embrace all communities and religions in India. To ensure that in such a social structure, where there is diversity, a person would not subjugate to some graded ranks in society on the pretext of one's religion and faith. Nehru saw the partition of Hindustan for many reasons, but religion was on top. After the partition in India, people from different religions lived together to avoid the previous pattern from repeating itself; Nehru opted for Secularism. he knew that only Secularism would save the interpersonal and inter-group relations, which are always affected by religion and religious consideration. (Narivelil, Nehru and the Secular State of India, 1968)

### Features of Secularism According to Nehru

Nehru's notion of Secularism has mainly four attributes. The firstly and most vital aspect of Secularism, according to Nehru, was "the granting of equal status to all religions in India" (Rajasekhariah, 1987) The right to perform and live according to religious beliefs should be compulsory given to all communities. He was sceptical about giving a person economic and political rights according to his faith. To him, it means parallel regard for all religions and impartial prospects for those who confide in a different religion. Nehru always stipulated in a multi-dogmatic India. For him, India is a typical shelter for everyone who lives here, despite belonging to a different religion. He said, "We are building a free Secular State, where every religion and belief has full freedom and equal

honour, whose every citizen has equal liberty and equal opportunity” (Rajasekhariah, 1987). Likewise, Nehru’s 1951 congress election manifestos avow that “As India is a secular state, every citizen has the same duties, rights, privileges, and obligations as any other. He has full freedom to profess and practice his religion” (Rajasekhariah, 1987).

The second aspect of Secularism was that a state should adhere to following a neutral rule in religious affairs. In October 1945, Nehru wrote a letter to Mr Ghanshyam saying, “I am convinced that future Government of free India must be secular, in the sense that Government will not associate itself directly with any religious faith” (Shroff, 2017). Nehru was apprehended in strict words regarding talking about the Muslim or Hindu Raj. The State should observe the policy of coexistence as far as people having different faiths are concerned. According to Nehru, if the State invites to violate religious freedom, this approach will lead the State into jeopardy and ruckus. Moreover, this whole Act and approach will be regarded as Anti-democratic. The third attribute regarding Secularism by Nehru was that various communities living in India have some mental responsibility on their part.

People belonging to diverse faith have a role, i.e., to adopt an attitude to work for amicability and brotherhood towards one another. Neither the religions have the liberty to cramp other religions nor try to affect the State’s fundamental conceptions. Nehru was very vocal from the start regarding the role of the majority community in Secularism and how it should work for the betterment of minorities, not curbing their rights. For minorities, their well-being and growth are like sacred trust. If the majority community is breaking that sacred trust, they are breaking the country and themselves at the same time. Nehru’s opinion was that it is okay to lose an election, and upset a few people but never compromise ideals. The final feature of Secularism Nehru was there should be secularization in all aspects of social life. Hinduism and Islam have laid down the complete structure of society. Both religions make a hole in society by making their religious punishment and authority different from the State. The set of different rules for different

communities in the same country will not solidify the concept of Secularism. To avoid conflict, Nehru tried to form a civil code for all Indian communities, irrespective of religion. He worked for the State that will guard all the faith and will not let the State favour one religion until it became the state religion. Nehru stressed the fact that people from diverse religions living in India had devoted followers for generations. In this case, the only way society will function smoothly is on a secular basis. (Zachariah, 2004)

India faced the unpleasant encounter of integrating the subcontinent, religious diversity, minorities protection, and many other conspicuous problems and conditions that led to Secularism. India was not officially a secular state until the 42<sup>nd</sup> amendment. Until then, to give the taste or touch of Secularism, articles 25 and 26 were implemented in India, which formed the core identity of religious freedom in India. Article 25 gives citizens the freedom to choose, practice, profess, and propagate religion subject to public health, order, and morality. Article 26 assures freedom in supervising religious affairs subject to public health, order, and morality.

### The reaction of Other Parties opting Secularism

On November 15, 1948, a dialectic was going in the Indian Constitution regarding the Constitution’s nature. In the amid of the contestation, Prof K T Shah proposed the inclusion of the word Secular in clause 1 of article (1). So, the amendment article shall read as follows after the inclusion of “secular, federalist, socialist”; “India shall be a Secular, Federalist, Socialist, Union of State” Nevertheless, the cabinet member did not want to use the word Secular in the preamble. So they dropped it. Three decades later, Indra Gandhi led the Government to include the word Secularism in the document as part of the Constitution’s 42<sup>nd</sup> amendment. With the Constitution’s change, there was a change in the preamble description from “sovereign, democratic, republic” to a “sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic republic. (Roychowdhury, 2020) the decade followed; few people praised the word Secularism while the vast majority criticized it. This criticism is still going on. A more significant part of the people is of the

view that Secularism is a foreign concept and its applicability in the Indian context is difficult and problematic. The opposition believed that the politicians who are in favour of Secularism are pro-European. Their thoughts and practices are shaped by Europeans, too, as Secularism originated in late medieval Europe.

The constituent assembly member took a significant time to incorporate the word Secularism in the preamble. Shefali Jha, a political scientist, wrote in an article, "all the members agreed, of course, on the necessity of establishing a secular state, and most shared an understanding of history in which the movement for the separation of religion. The State was irrevocably a part of the project for the democratization of the late" (Roychowdhury, [2020](#)).

Nevertheless, the debate in the constituent assembly was going about the nature of its application and how much it will cover people's lives. Lokanath Misra's stance was that he believes in Secularism, but it is a slippery phrase. It is a state's responsibility to stay out of the Religion of the Citizen. Secularism will compartmentalize life, and according to him, life can not be compatibilized. Secularism will play a significant role in the annihilation of Hindu culture. In the debate on December 6, 1948, he said, "Do we really believe that religion can be divorced from life, or is it our belief that amid many religions, we cannot decide which one to accept? If religion is beyond the ken of our State, let us clearly say so and delete all reference to rights relating to religion" (Balakrishna, [2019](#)).

### **Creation of Extremist Organization to Protect Hinduism**

After the Secular Constitution came into effect, Hindus divided themselves into two groups. Hindu Nationalists and Hindu Traditionalists. Later are pro-Hindu. They called them the son of the soil as the majority of Hindus formed India. Their identity is rooted in Hinduism. Hindu nationalists believed that India was their holy land, while Muslim holy lands were Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. They considered Muslims fundamentalists, which makes them true believers. A new concept of religion-racial nationalism by radical Hindus, which stated

for Buddhists, Jains, and Sikhs, India is a holy land as the concept of the holy land (religion) and shared blood (race) was mixed. In contrast, the Traditionalist Hindu views were opposite from Hindu traditionalists. For them, cultural aspects of Hinduism were important, like the advancement of the Hindi language over Hinduism as Urdu was considered a foreign language and the preservation of holistic medicine (Ayurveda) (McDonald, [2003](#)). According to Hindu traditionalists, they did not get proper representation assembly, and the Constitution was drafted in their absence.

To protect Hinduism, organizations and political parties like Vishva Hindu Parishad, Bajrang Dal, Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad, Shiv Sena, and many more formed. All the parties did not agree with the concept of Secularism. They all believe in Hinduness. These pro-Hindu parties want to make India a Hindu country where there is a unified law for all the Hindus, the Disputed territory of Kashmir becomes their integral part, Muslims should leave their country, and a new constitution should be drafted which declares India a Hindu country. According to pro-Hindu, a person who is Hindu is loyal to India, and all other people from different religions have different agendas. Gradually, these extremist organizations started forming political parties to fulfil their agenda. Parties like *Bharatiya Janata Party*, Shiv Sena, and Hindu Yuva Vahini are extremist parties formed to fulfil Hindu nationalists' radical views.

### **Formation of BJP**

On, 5-6 April 1980 BJP (Bharatiya Janata Party), the predecessor of BJS, was the political wing of RSS. Later, Atal Bihari Vajpayee changed the party name and the agenda because Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh members in BJS killed Mahatma Gandhi in January 1948. RSS was banned till 1949 for its action. BJP came into existence with the support of RSS. RSS never wanted to become a political party, so it empowered the member to make one. Deen Dayal Upadhyay, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, and Lal Kishenchand Advani are prominent leaders of BJS. Atal Bihari Vajpayee mixed three more parties with BJS to form BJP. A coalition government was formed but lived a short life due to internal party politics. In the

beginning, Vajpayee told his party member to pledge their support to Secularism. BJP had theoretically five objectives: Secularism, nationalism, Democracy, value-based politics, and Gandhian economic policy. BJP couldn't perform well in 1984; after the defeat, BJP adopted the old tricks to win the election, that is, to fight the election on religious lines and make sure to advocate Hinduness's ideology that yearned to portray Indian culture in terms of Hindu values.

Keeping in mind the new agenda Vishwa Hindu Parishad took some aggressive steps to promote Hinduness. He favoured that Hindus should do their prayers in the Babri Masjid, as it is the birthplace of Lord Ram, and it should be named Ayodah Temple, a sacred place for Hindus. To avoid the backlash, the prominent leaders suggested carrying out a series of "rath yatras" "journey on the carriage" which the Hindu God Rama emblematic implore as the portrayal of a cultural renaissance. In 1999 BJP formed a coalition government with the National Democratic Alliance (NDA); this coalition could not work well because of the aggressive behaviour of the BJP's leader. As a result, BJP had to let go of its three core objectives' unified civil Law for all the people, demolition of Ayodah temple, and scrapping of article 370. Modi became famous in the BJP due to the Gujrat incident. A Train was set on fire due to a passenger's mistake on board. Nevertheless, the blame was put on the Muslims. As a result, nearby villages were burnt down. Muslims were set on fire, all on the instruction of Modi. A commission was formed, which later ruled out the involvement of Muslims in setting fire to the train. Later Supreme Court of India intervened and found 96 people guilty. Modi used his top lieutenant, Mayaben Kodnani, as a scapegoat. She was found guilty of arson and conspiracy against Muslims and was given 28 years of prison.

### **Modi In Power For the First Time**

The tactics and promises made by the Modi-lead BJP government before coming into Power and doing precisely the opposite while being in Power are the new normal for Muslim Indians. Minority, predominantly Muslim votes mattered the most to win the election, including other OBCs, Casts, and tribes. So, Modi played on the religious lines to win the

elections of 2014. The famous Modi slogan employed before the election says SABKA VIKAS, minorities, especially Muslims, are purposely excluded. Many Muslim communities, including other minorities like Christians, Sikhs, and Dalits, voted for Modi as he promised peaceful coexistence and development of all and is now promoting Hindutva policies.

Modi has undermined Secularism on several occasions by implementing and promoting Anti-secularist policies. Secularism is not famous in Pro-Hindus, and they considered it a threat and conspiracy against Hinduism. All Anti-secular initiatives show the mindset of Modi, who believe in Hindu Rashtra (Shams, 2014). Where only Hindus will live, and Secularism will have no place in it. Supreme Court, bureaucracy, Media almost every sector is controlled and regulated by Modi. They do not work freely rather than support Modi's Anti-secularist schemes. Moreover, Controversial governors have been appointed to apply Anti-Secular policies without asking a question. Chief Minister of Utter Pardesh Aditya Yoginath was the first to applaud and implement the Gau Raksha program. He turned a blind eye towards the member of the Gau Raksha organization who carried structured violence against Dalits and Muslims. Muslims perform a superficial sacrifice on Eid, and Dalits and Muslims deal in Dairy products, the export of cow skin was banned under Article 48 of the Indian Constitution. Utter Pradesh, Karnataka, Rajasthan, Uttar Khand, Punjab, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, and Maharashtra have implemented this Article. Whoever does not obey the Constitution faces jail time. However, the Gau Raksha Organization member beats and kill people who are slaughtering, buying dairy products, or dealing in the cow Business. The Police do not register complaints against Gau Raksha Members. The Ghar Wapisi campaign affiliated with VHP supported by RSS implemented in Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, and Asam favour the Ghar Wapisi Campaign. RSS CHIEF has a vision that until 2021, large numbers of Muslims will be converted into Hindus. It is estimated that 300 Muslims in Agra, 100 in Karala, and 300 Christians of Gujrat have been converted into Hindus. The governors of these states encouraged the chief Ministers to promote the

Ghar Wapisi Campaign. By doing this population of Hindus will increase; it is best for the BJP vote bank. UP governors and many others interfered in the Muslim Personal Law by passing Triple Talaq Bill. Many Muslims considered it a categorical attack on their Muslim personal Law, and many believed this move successfully started a fight among Muslims in India (Gupta, 2019). At one point, all Pro-Hindus and BJP-lead State governments overtly want Muslims to leave India; on the other hand, they are saving women by passing Triple Talaq Bill. PM Modi stayed quiet on the systematic Attacks on Dalits, Muslims, and Christians while addressing the Nation and Lok Shaba. He said, do not kill the Dalits; kill me instead, while addressing the Lok Shab one time; it was mere words. Modi stayed quiet when Gau Raksha members killed Dalits for possessing Cows, destroying their income mode; High Cast Hindus raped Dalits women.

The lift of the BJP is not the outcome of Congress's failure but the coalition of the main cultural force of Indian society with political Power. 2014 is about the development of Hindus, and 2019 is about the exclusion of minorities, especially Muslims from India. In his first term before becoming the Prime Minister, Modi promised Hindus, Muslims, Christians, and Sikhs the development and inclusion of all. After coming into Power, Modi started endorsing Hindutva ideology in his early days (Taseer, 2020). Modi promised the people to avenge the Pulwama attack, so he carried out the surgical strike against Pakistan. Where he publicly claimed that Indian Airjet destroyed terrorist camps in Pakistan. After a few times when the media started to expose Modi's lies, the sedition act has been used to suppress the voices. Many journalists, reporters, column writers, and news anchors were imprisoned on the Sedation Act's grounds, destroying the future of many people in India. The Planned clap down of the NGOs working for the Dalits, Muslims, Christians, and Sikhs, stated that the funders and the NGOs have ulterior agendas, i.e., destabilizing India's domestic situation (Aiyar, 2020). While the NGOs affiliated with RSS, which promulgate hate and violence toward minorities, especially Muslims and Dalits, are flourishing. Their funds have been multiplied by the Government and are working without any

hurdles. Modi's promises to increase the quotas of jobs of OBCs and other Scs in the government sector were not fulfilled. Instead, quotes have decreased, and the privatization of the jobs created more problems for OBCs and SCs.

Modi appointed governors who were anti-Muslims and who could carry out his anti-secularist policies. The criteria for choosing governs; is the hatred towards minorities, especially Muslims, who have a controversial history, believe in Hindu Rashtra, and can follow controversial orders without asking questions. Modi never wanted Muslims to have proper representation in Lok Sabha. The total number of seats given to Muslims was seven, and Muslims elected for Lok Sabha zero. No concrete policies were introduced to uplift Muslims economically, politically, culturally, and socially (Anand & Lall, 2022). The finding of the Sachar Committee has not given due importance; in fact, it was disregarded and buried under the pile of papers. Modi failed to scrub the violence against different minorities; instead, he remained silent on the violence carried out by RSS members on various minorities and communities. Modi institutionalized the Hindutava ideology. He strategically kept Muslims, Christians, and communities like Dalits out of the Government Sector.

## Conclusion

This research paper addresses the underline reason for opting for Secularism in India by Nehru. Nehru knew India was a home of people from different cultures, languages, religions, and ethnicities. So choosing one religion, i.e., Hinduism, would create problems for the rest of the religions, and in the future other religions may ask for a separate country. So, Nehru chooses Secularism instead of Hinduism. An aggressive reaction was seen by other parties who wanted to protect Hinduism. As a result, many parties were formed to protect Hinduism, and BJS was one of them. BJS, later on, changed into BJP. By changing the party name, objectives, members, and agenda also changed with it. It also chatters about the change of the Modi position in BJP from CM to PM. Also, the ways that ensured Modi, a high position in the party, i.e., the Gujrat Riots, in which many Muslims were slaughtered under Modi's instruction by Pro Hindus. No concrete

punishment was given to guilty Hindus. After coming into Power, he and his appointed governors, propagated by all the Initiatives, proved he is a hard-core Hindu. Unchi zaat Hindus welcomed all the policies and assisted him in implementing the Inhumane strategies to suppress minorities. The Dalits are marginalized and not even considered human most of the time. Sikh considers themselves different from Hindus but Hindus think the opposite of it. The OBCs, Schedule Casts, and Tribes face different challenges, even being Hindu. Christians almost have zero representation in parliament. Modi is introducing policies that help the Saffron make

India a Hindu Rashtra. Modi is known for his aggression, so he appoints aggressive and harsh Governors who can fulfil his wishes without any question. Most of the time, the Chief Ministers are seen promoting hatred towards Minorities, especially Muslims. The Increasing intolerance against minorities proves the point that India is not Safe for marginalized communities and religions. Modi, a religious person, wants to see Hinduism flourish at other religions' expense. His initiatives are often criticized globally. However, he does not care about the outer world.

## References

- Aiyar, S. S. (2020, November 24). *Despite Modi, India Has Not Yet Become a Hindu Authoritarian State*. CATO Institute.
- Anand, K., & Lall, M. (2022). The debate between secularism and Hindu nationalism – how India's textbooks have become the government's medium for political communication. *India Review*, 21(1), 77–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14736489.2021.2018203>
- Balakrishna, S. (2019, september 24). Sri Lokanath Misra: A Forgotten Hero Who Fought Against Nehruvian Secularism. *The Dharma Dispatch*. <https://www.dharmadispatch.in/history/sri-lokanath-misra-a-forgotten-hero-who-fought-against-nehruvian-secularism>
- Bonney, R. J. (2004). *Harvest of Hatred. The Concerned Citizens' Tribunal Report on Gujarat, 2002*. Research Gate.
- Cline, A. (2019, June 25). *Defining Secularists: George Jacob Holyoake Coined the Term Secularism*. <https://www.learnreligions.com/george-jacob-holyoake-coined-the-term-secularism-250853>
- Gupta, S. (2019, December 19). *Desecularization in India: The resurgence of religion under Modi*. London School of Economics <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/southasia/2019/12/19/desecularization-in-india-the-resurgence-of-religion-under-modi/>
- Jaffrelot, C. (2019). *The Fate of Secularism in India*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Majid, A. (2015, December 31). The Babri Mosque and Hindu Extremists Movements. *Journal of Political Studies* 22(2), 659-677.
- Marbaniang, D. (2005, 2009, 2011). *Perspectives on Indian Secularism*. Research Gate.
- McDonald, I. (2003). *Hindu Nationalism, Cultural Spaces, and Bodily Practices in India*. Research Gate.
- Narivelil, V. Z. (1968). *Nehru and the Secular State of India*. Washington DC: Loyola University Chicago.
- Rajasekhariah, A. M. (1987). Jawaharlal nehru's contribution to secularism in india-an estimated. jstor. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 48(2), 212-224. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41855300>
- Rectenwald, M. (2011). *Secularism*. Research Gate.
- Roychowdhury, A. (2020, June 4). Secularism: Why Nehru dropped and Indira inserted the S-word in the Constitution. *Indian Express*.
- Shams, S. (2014, June 10). A Clear and Present Danger to India's Secularism. *The Diplomat*. <https://thediplomat.com/2014/06/a-clear-and-present-danger-to-indias-secularism/>
- Shroff, B. (2017). Role of Jawaharlal Nehru in Nation Building. *Jetir*, 4(8), 359-373.
- Subhan, J. (2016). *Concept of Secularism*. SSRN. 1-16.
- Taseer, A. (2020, May). India Is No Longer India Exile in the time of Modi. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2020/05/exile-in-the-age-of-modi/609073/>
- Taylor, C. (2010). The meaning of secularism. <https://go.gale.com/ps/anonymous?id=G ALE%7CA242844924&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=15279677&p=AONE&sw=w>
- Zachariah, B. (2004). *NEHRU*. Routledge: London.