

The Future of Muslims under Indian Secularism in the Paradigms of Bhartiya Janta Party and Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh

Mr. Dildar Ali

Lecture Pakistan Studies (M.Phil), Department of Social Sciences, Sukkur IBA University, Sindh, Pakistan

Email: alidildar.kk@iba-suk.edu.pk

Syed Yaseen Ali Shah

M.Phil Scholar, Lecture Pakistan Studies, Department of Social Sciences, Sukkur IBA University, Sindh, Pakistan

Email: yaseen.shah@iba-suk.edu.pk

Abstract:

India, a secular and world's largest democratic state, terrorizing Muslim minorities in India as well as held-Kashmir. Muslim actors and actresses have married to their Hindu counterparts under the aegis of secularism and democracy. But the current spark of violence by Government and Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh RSS have shocked the Muslim brethren to leave India and Kashmir. World Politics bear witness to state-sponsored terrorism. RSS was fabricated and fashioned on communal grounds; but others did exist, for an instant, Arya Samaj prepared the ground for RSS at the helm of Swami Dayananda Sarasvati 1875. The anti-Islam and anti-Christianity Samaj coerced into religious disaffiliation. RSS fostered against minorities; Modi elevated to fame as an ideologue and a person of a dogmatic approach. He compelled Gujrati Muslims to embrace Hinduism or face the torch and kill. Bharatiya Janata Party contested for elections to revoke articles: 370, and 35A from the Indian Constitution. The tabled motion waved the flag of Hindu vendetta. The illegal occupation of Kashmir through illegitimate means is a violation of United Nations (UN) resolutions and internationally recognized dispute between India and Pakistan. This paper will examine the racist and fascist attitudes and policies of the Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) government, a course of Indian Secularism. The paper will also discuss the current wave of Modi's Muslim ignorance on Kashmir and India with suitable recommendations: UN must take responsibility, or Muslims should fight a war of independence.

Keywords: Hindutva, Ideology, Secular, Policy, Dogma, Dogmatic

1. Introduction

A flag of Islamophobia in the hands of BJP elevated as a force of religious decay; eroding secularism and religious freedom from the state. Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh fashioned into Bhartiya Janta Party—

interpreted as Indian Peoples' Party. Since then, BJP [control freak] has been exerting control over state institutes; ruled over Uttar Pradesh. In 2002, Narendra Modi's nine years oppressive regime over UP bore witness to the killing of more than one thousand people. In 2005, he was denied US visa on his dogmatic approach/anti-religious freedom scandals: US states department released a report on [his] abuse of religious freedom and tolerance; Indian Congress [political faction] leadership was also critical. Human Rights Watch (HRW, New York based) and Amnesty International's annual report, as matter of fact, revealed a mine of information on Modi's government—2017: “Religious minority groups, particularly Muslims, faced increasing demonization by hardline Hindu groups, pro-government media, and some state officials. Authorities were openly critical of human rights defenders and organizations, contributing to a climate of hostility against them. Mob violence intensified, including by vigilante cow protection groups. Press freedom and free speech in universities came under attack. India failed to respect its human rights commitments made before the UN Human Rights Council. The Supreme Court and High Courts delivered several progressive judgments, but some rulings undermined human rights. Impunity for human rights abuses persisted, the report.”¹ The dogmatic BJP assisted ideologues, who reiterates, Jinnah was right to demand separate state for Muslims—once the British left: it would be virtually impossible for minority to live with majority side by side. “In recent years, the rise of ‘Hindutva’ in India has helped Pakistan’s ideologues advance their case but even before that the fear of ‘the other’ served as an important element in composing Pakistan’s nationalism. Envisioning India as a ‘permanent enemy.’”² The government response to the abuse was irrational and irretrievable. “India does not take cognizance of internal reports of a foreign country.”³ India: ‘Religious

Freedom Issues.’ a report is mentioned in the endnote, provides a demographic profile of the state i.e., the Hindus 79.8%, Muslims 14.2%, Christians 2.3%, Sikh 1.7% and other constitute 2.0%. Thus, Indian Muslims credit to India as the world’s third-largest country with Muslim population after Indonesia and Pakistan.

2. Attitude and Policies of BJP

Let’s discuss, with an example, the attitude of the party to minority community. On May 16, 2019, British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) reported under title: *‘India’s Muslims fear for their future under Narendra Modi.’* Shaukat Ali, a resident of Assam had been selling beef to coreligionists: Government decreed its sell licit in Assam. Comrades could scratch the surface of tragedy; it had transpired during the first phase of elections—India. On the pretext of being an exotic—Bangladeshi, he was surrounded by a mob, coerced to bow down, and enquired about Indian Identity; beating up with sticks and booted shoes heavily on face. “Shaukat Ali wasn’t just injured physical – he was stripped of his dignity. The mob made the devout Muslim to eat pork, forcing him to chew it and then gulp it down,”⁴ reported the BBC news.

The government is posturing and provoking subjects into grudge. It must ponder over anti-dogmatic feelings, assaults on creed, religious violence, racial indiscriminatio, hatred, and violation of their fundamental rights were the causes of the separation of sub-continent into two states (1947), i.e., Pakistan and India. Asaduddin Owaisi, President All India Majlis-e-Ittehadul Muslimeen (AIMIM) an India Muslim politician replying to one of PM Pakistan’s tweet said: “Mr. Khan (P.M Imran Khan)! We like to tell you don’t ever remember, we have rejected the message, the wrong theory of Jinnah. We are proud Indian Muslims and till the day of Judgement, Insha’Allah we’ll remain as proud India Muslims. No power on earth can

get away my India nerves, no power on earth can get away my religious identity. Why because the constitution of India guarantees me that.⁵ Not dense but thin Muslim population opted for exodus from India to Pakistan; rest of them loved and desired to stay off. The patriotism and their nationality in the state has become confutative. The case of Mr Shaukat Ali is just for an instance; such ‘uninvestigated hate crimes’ resulting in the innovation of ‘climate of impunity’ for the adherent of RSS. “India witnessed more than 700 outbreaks of communal violence last year that killed 86 and injured 2,321 people. The actual number, however, could be higher as many as cases go unreported,” India Official Statistics. ^[5] It is worth to mention that not only Muslims are affective, but also other communities: Christians and Sikhs. The impunity is heightening day-to-day activities of Anti-Cow Society and Anti-Romeo: both are dogmatic association. “A 16-year-old Muslim boy was stabbed to death on a train last week by a mob that accused him and his three companions of carrying beef in their bags. They were travelling to their villages from Delhi after Eid-shopping. This week, a Muslim dairy farmer in the eastern state of Jharkhand was beaten up and his house set on fire after a dead cow was found outside it.”⁶ (Ibid) Government ban on cow-slaughter results in cultural and religious discrimination, i.e., Hindus, Muslims. A secular government needs to maintain parity between the two; should ensure the rights of both—the herbivore and omnivore. Besides, it should promote peace and security, but Modi was reluctant to condemn attacks; his mum left the minority insecure. The policies of the BJP government in its first tenure/regime (2014-19) were dogmatic and communal. Modi elevated Adityanath Yogi, further raised the Muslims’ heckles. Yogi, Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, an anti-Muslim and activist of RSS. RSS is the breeding ground for BJP: both promote the vision of Hindutva. The dogma of

Hindutva is spreading rapidly; this dogmatic ideology was derived from “the writings of Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, an anti-British activist, who first introduced Hindutva in a 1923 pamphlet written from Ratnagiri Jail in Bombay.”⁷ Father of the propounded dogma preferred Hindu (patriotic) identity over the religious. Its advocates forcing minorities to absorb into their culture, instigate them consider themselves as second and inferior class. They promoted ideology/dogma similar to Jewish—claiming their right to Palestine. As Jews promoted Jewish settlement to Palestine so BJP put herself on the same footing. Zionist and Hindutva are alike dogmas with intent to boost religious brethren. Hindutva considers Muslims out of the frame from India, i.e., as outsiders and former conquerors. Savarkar, in his, ‘The Essentials of Hindutva’, wrote: “The Indians saw that the cherished ideals of their race—their thrones and their families and the very Gods they worshipped—were trampled underfoot the holy land of their love devastated and sacked by hordes of barbarians, so inferior to them in language, religion, philosophy, mercy and all the soft and human attributes of man and God—but superior to them in strength alone—strength that summed up its creed in two words, Fire and Sword.”⁸ He opined that Muslims sustained identity under ‘striking sword’, ‘defiling religious places’, and ‘desecrated Hindu religion’. He applied dogmatism on Muslims, his dogmas should also be extended to Aryans who promoted Hinduism among the native Indians. As Europeans invaded America; assaulted on natives, coerced them to embrace themselves as slaves. America is still dominated by European populace. Similarly, real Indians lost their identity and dove into Aryans in sub-continent; now it is difficult to segregate native and Aryan. Aryan sponsored castes system, i.e., Vaishnava, Shudders, Brahman, and Kshatriya and they declared the original inhabitants as outcaste Hindus. Bearing history in mind, the

demand and restoration of secularism is imperative. Further, He mentions: “We will, therefore, protect our religion and for that we would even lose our lives. We will acquire new kingdoms by our power and that bread we will eat.” Aryans inserted dogmatism and sponsored their dogmas in the form of caste system, bred irrationalism to secular approach. The Aryans promoted their culture and embraced Hindu nationality. Aryan converted to Indian pressurizing Muslims to adopt Hindu-Culture and identity. While the fact about the culture is what the first Indian Premier Jawaharlal Nehru, and Mohan Das Gandhi expressed. Nehru: “It is, therefore, entirely misleading to refer to Indian culture as Hindu culture.”⁹ and Gandhi: “Indian culture is neither Hindu, Islamic, nor any other, wholly. It is a fusion of all.”¹⁰ Although, the partition of sub-continent triggered the antagonist dogmas of Hindutva, yet the past has passed away; why their mentality is projecting Hindutva to present populace and nations living on both side of the corridor. Let mention dogmatic policies—have been faced by minority even with passage of time. Indian Muslims are not considered as a nation, i.e., Indians. They have to prove their loyalty with India particularly when India plays cricket match in Pakistan. Government of Premier Manmohan in 2006, got a report published entitled, “Social, Economic, and Educational Status of the Muslim Community of India.” The study revealed that Muslims are the prejudiced, targeted, suspicioned, and threatened to have association with Pakistan in jobs, society, academic, and non-academic institutions. “India would become a purely Hindu nation by 2024 and all Muslims will need to either convert to Hinduism or leave the country. He argued, “There are a very few Muslims who are patriotic. Once India becomes a Hindu Rashtriya [nation], Muslims who assimilate into our culture will stay in India. Those who will not are free to take asylum in any other country,”¹¹

“The foreign races in Hindustan must adopt the Hindu culture and language-- must learn to respect and hold in worship the Hindu religion, must entertain no ideas but those of glorification of the Hindu race and culture and may only stay in the country wholly subordinated to the Hindu nation claiming nothing, not even citizen’s rights.”¹² It has been all cleared about the fascist views of Hindutva to whom Muslims and other minorities must accept their culture, language, and religion. Forcing minorities to work and propagate their ideology to glorify Hindu race only. His words such as, “Hindu nation claiming nothing, not even citizen’s rights.” One should relinquish his nationality. To them, no single national identity is acceptable except Hindutva, and no religion is acceptable except Hindu. To them, Hindu (religion) and Hindutva (nation), both are replica of Indian (nation) and secularism (religion). Modi and BJP leaders are propagators of Hindutva. Thus, forcing every Muslim one or the other way, either to accept Hindu religion and repatriate to a state where their co-religionist exist. Nationalist lack in tolerance towards other faiths. Even they couldn’t accept Dalits, Outcaste Hindus as part of nation which resulted in the acceptance of Buddhism and Jainism by a majority of minute population of Outcaste and Dalits. Thus, threat to nationality emerged in the form of acceptance of another direction against the wishes of those who tried to mold them. Muslims hold very rigid and inflexible societal structure. Their foundation and firms believes are matchless to be diverted and converted into a new nation of Hindutva. As they couldn’t mold Muslims, resulted in the independence of Pakistan. The founding statesmen of India didn’t tried to molest diversified nature of the subject and preferred to opt secularism as state business. Secularism denies any part of any religion as part of business of state. BJP threatened the secularity of India. It dies any part of secularism as part of business of the state. Once you end secular approach from you

nations' mind, forget to control a heterogeneous subject. Homogeneity is impossible to be attained. When you don't recognize diversity and heterogeneity you expel, repatriate, and throw your secularity and world's largest democracy into the thrash. BJP needs to focus on economic survival and sustainability as "the most successful and influential political tool of BJP in 2002 and 2014 was economics which resulted in the declining violence as Mr. Modi's speech's during campaign avoided communal topics and adopted a moderate approach instead militant Hindutva."¹³ The worst example to end Muslims national issued in Assam on August 31, 2019 named National Register of Citizens. Another attempt to bare Muslims nationality. Aljazeera reported from India, that nearly 2 million Muslims' nationality was excluded from the said list. Assam residents had been complaining about outsider which use to manage jobs against local. It was a governments' deliberate attempt to exclude millions of Muslims even those who had been residents since birth. For example. "Mijanur Rahman, a 47-year-old farmer, found himself, his 21-year-old son, and two of his daughters aged 16 and 14 included in the list. However, his wife and his other three daughters - all under the age of 10 - were excluded."¹⁴

3. The Course of Indian Secularism

India Constitution although was naturally secular, but secular article incorporated into it in 1976. "The RSS and many of its members want to change that. The group's mission statement describes it as firmly rooted in genuine nationalism and decries an erosion of the nation's integrity in the name of secularism and endless appeasement of the Muslim population."¹⁵

The nature of Indian Secularism, RSS is blamed of fostering, hate, intolerance, and racial discrimination. To them secularism is not fostering

Indian Nationalism—Hindutva. Provide religious security to minorities, impeding the progress of Hindutva; they are “claiming that its proponents have endeavored to make the state hostile or indifferent to religion. That was certainly not the intention of the architects of modern India, whose enemy was not religion, but communalism.” The architects of secularism were fully aware of implications of communal-cultural conflicts within India, prior Independence of India, which resulted in the division into two parts. Pakistan was the result of non-secular attitude of Congress towards Muslim—demands. The communal dividend forced them to articulate secularism to appease and provide rights of minorities. The chain of secularism controls over diversification of India. Two decades from 1950-70 showed the height of secularism when Muslims along with Hindus were on high posts. In 1951 Indian Parliament passed on an act name as “Representation of the People Act”, its section 123 refrains politicians either Hindus or Muslims from propagating or playing religious card during their political/election campaigns. But BJP’s decade (2014 onward) has neglected this lofty principle of secularism. Mr. Nehru did this to end communalism from India. Nehru’s secularism didn’t separate religion from politics. His only purpose behind, was to ensure unity of India by putting all communities under one umbrella. “We talk about a secular state in India. It is perhaps not very easy even to find a good word in Hindi for ‘secular.’ Some people think it means something opposed to religion. That obviously is not correct. What it means is that it is a state which honors all faiths equally and gives them equal opportunities,”¹⁶

Nehru. The architect were facing threats from nationalism and traditionalism. The traditionalist supported in favor of Hindutva while traditionalist supported Ayurveda, medicines, language supremacy of Hindu over Urdu. Secular nationalist won the debate over rest of two factions of

nationalist. Thus, country ebbed toward secularism. The constituent assembly under Brimao Ram (B.R) Ambedkar favored composite culture, and this type of ... they called it secularism. The upper class/wright-wing is working with an end in mind—"On August 27, 2018 Sanatan Sanstha, a Hindutva outfit in India, relatively unknown till a few years ago, held a press conference in Mumbai to demand removal of the word 'secular' from the Indian constitution."¹⁷ Because the section of the constitution keeps majority religion either in danger or at disadvantage. BJP raised to power in polity because of the same fear that they are being dominated by minority. The ideology worked; the minorities were seen persecuted during the rise of violence. The term secularism was incorporated into Preamble during 42th amendment in reign of Indra Gandhi, while Modi always distanced himself from preamble's part. BJP promoting minority disadvantage and advantage for majority. They are trying every single effort to accommodate majority by murdering secularity. Sanatan Sanstha is a faction of one the school of thought—Sanatan Dharma. This Dharma believes in idol's worship, while most of its followers are not members of Sanstha. Those who are member they execute terrorist activities. They were involved in the murders of "most prominently for the murders of rationalist thinker Narendra Dabholkar and journalist Gauri Lankesh."¹⁸ to them it is against the vary idea of India, because how can a nation keep her religion at disadvantage?—declaring secularity.

4. Modi's Ignorance on Kashmir

It was a long-desired policy of BJP, to revoke articles of the Indian constitution on Kashmir's special status. Various resolutions on Kashmir are clear signs—Kashmir is not an integral part of it. To scrape secular preamble, had been vary difficult for the party. Revocation was part of Modi's election manifesto. Finally on August 5, 2019 it took decision to

revoke. They deem—after some hue and cry over the adaptation, Kashmir would be given provincial status under Indian Constitution as other provinces possess. Doing it so would be easy to acquire land in Kashmir, and control its police, and other administrative offices. Presidential order divided the Kashmir into two Units, i.e., Jammu Kashmir, and Ladakh. The revocation is totally unfair, against the international norms, and UN resolution on Kashmir—refuse any special Indian claim on Kashmir. Indian policy as explained by Abkaruddin: “If there are issues, they will be discussed, they will be addressed by our courts; we don't need international busybodies to try and tell us how to run our lives. We are a billion-plus people.”¹⁹ India claim it internal matter, Kashmir as integral part, and had reiterated to solve it according to Simla agreement—1972. Two sections of this accord are essential to be mentioned, one—‘That the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations shall govern the relations between the two countries; and That the two countries are resolved to settle their differences by peaceful means through bilateral negotiations or by any other peaceful means mutually agreed upon between them. Pending the final settlement of any of the problems between the two countries, both sides shall unilaterally alter the situation and both shall prevent the organization, assistance or encouragement of any acts detrimental to the maintenance of peaceful and harmonious relations.’ Revocation of Kashmir is a unilateral decision by the Indian Government, Pakistan was not summoned to negotiate and show reservation if any. “Any engagement with Pakistan would require an end to cross border terrorism. The Simla Agreement and the Lahore Declaration provide the basis to resolve all issues between India and Pakistan bilaterally,”²⁰ Raveesh Kumar the Minister of External Affairs (MEA) spokesperson said. These are just mocking statements. If India had really wished to resolve under—1972 accord had not dared to take unilateral

decision of revocation. India has not only violated 1972 accord in its true spirit, but also 47 (1948). Resolution of April 21, 1948 [S/726] it states, ‘Noting with satisfaction that both India and Pakistan desire that the question of the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan should be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite.’, and has also violated part two of 2 (C), which says, ‘that as small a number as possible should be retained in forward areas; and in another section—2 (a) requires from India ‘reducing them progressively to the minimum strength required for the support of the civil power in the maintenance of law and order.’, although, India has refused to share number of its troops in held Kashmir, while it is estimated more than 7 lacks. Organizing such a huge strength of forces in such an area which is 222,236 sq. km. is clear violation of UN resolution on Kashmir. The resolution above nullifies Akbaruddins’ stated state policy—Kashmir is not an international issues, but domestic one. BJP’s move have not only violated diplomatically persuaded accord with the Pakistani government, but also UN resolutions and off course UN security council’s reiteration off UN resolution resolutions is prof to the world community—India can’t claim Kashmir as integral, internal, and domestic one. One must not forget UN’s 18 resolutions on Kashmir passed from 1948-71. It also maintains a handful group of observers there to record violations per UN resolutions. The matter should be considered as violation of two countries, but of humanity, basic and fundamental rights. Why world is mum on this issue? Why are they repeating policy of appeasement again? World must ponder over their own attitude and response to humanity in Kashmir. World has been associating Modi with Hitler, one who had been occupying and annexing wester territories, Modi has been repeating the same. Let some light on response—indeed, may be counted as suggestion for the India with respect to

revocation of Kashmir. Malaysia: “it called on the two nuclear-armed neighbors to exercise “utmost restraint” over the latest developments in Indian-administered Kashmir to avert any action that could be detrimental to the peace, stability, and prosperity in the region.”²¹ Indian Public is so fanatic, thus, secularism doesn’t work in India. After Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA)-2019 and National Registration of Citizens-NCR—Muslims have become invincible and resistant force that can protect secularism. Secularism in India, indeed, a shield before religion and minority. A state can’t snatch religion or belief, but secularity, tolerance, sympathy with all faith, protection of minority rights, and it’s [secularism] marsh in which fanaticism, Islamophobia, forced conversion, religious base genocide, and discrimination can go down; will never emerge again. India public need to replace BJP with a secular parity—INC. Pandits [clerics] need to deliver sermons, on national harmony, and religious tolerance. Religion can’t be blamed for genocide, extortion, torture, and cleansing, but self-motivated, ill minded and inhuman psychopath can. There is still need to change approach of certain mind through reasonable questions and arguments, such as why are Muslims facing ill treatment? Why only Muslims were barred/excluded from citizenship? Why UN has failed to implement its resolutions unilaterally? Why world community is silence over Kashmir issue/lockdown? Who is responsible for Muslims genocide in India? Why religious clerics have failed to deliver harmony? And why Muslims and Sikh communities have been seeking separate state with India again? There can be a lot of questions put, and a lot of answer and reasons with solution can be given, but there are only three options left for Muslims to preserve their identity as community and nation in India.

1. War of independence can spring out inside and against India, India reverse it unilateral decisions.

2. Solution based bilateral agreement, execution, and implementation between India and Pakistan.
3. UN is sole responsible and its security council to resolve the issue, not on grounds Israel and Palestine crisis had been settled; leaving a Gaza Strip for future violence and strife.

5. Concluding Remarks

Diversification in Indian state is the need of the day. No state in global politics is free out of diversification. Countries are bound to enhance/develop relations even with rival states; in such relations the diversification must be the core. Justice, right to property, citizenship, and religious liberty are the fundamentals on which states can ensure its survival. Pakistan was resulted of these legitimate demands—India had never been ready to accede to Muslims. Today world can witness the demand of Pakistan was just and fair. India need laïcité form of secularism right now, to avoid any sort of religious and communal conflict within heterogeneous society and religious diversity of India. Zhang Jun: “refrain from taking any unilateral action which might further aggravate” what was an already “tense and very dangerous.”²² While the UN chief had also suggested both countries regarding “the tense situation in the region and urged India and Pakistan to exercise restraint.”²³ Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad: “Malaysia would like to encourage all stakeholders to abide by the relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir towards the maintenance of international peace and security.”²⁴

Notes and References

¹ Amnesty International, Amnesty International Report 2017/18: The State of the World's Human Rights, February 22, 2018,p. 189

² Haqqani, Hussian, Reimagining Pakistan; Transforming a dysfunctional nuclear state, Uttar Pradesh, India, HarperCollins, 2018,p.107-8

³ Kronstadt K. Alan, India: Religious Freedom Issues, Congressional Research Service (CRS Report), August 30, 2018,p. 4

⁴ Pakistan Today, India's Muslims fear for their future under Narendra Modi, May 17,2019,p.10

⁵ [Nilanjana Bhowick \(Jun 29, 2017\), Modi's Party stokes anti-Muslim violence in India, The Week in Asia](#)

⁶ Ibid

⁷ Harrison Akins, Indian Muslims in the Crosshairs: The BJP and Its Anti-Beef Crusade. Published by Howard H. Baker Jr. Center for Public Policy University of Tennessee, Sept.2018,p.3

⁸ Vinayak Domadar Savarkar, The Essentials of Hindutva, Fifth Edition (Bombay: S.S. Savarkar, 1969.p.21

⁹ Jawaharlal Nehru, The Discovery of India: The Centenary Edition, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989,p. 75, 76

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 363

¹¹ Surendra Sing, UP member of BJP in January, 2018. (By 2024, Muslims who assimilate into Hindu culture can stay in India: BJP MLA," Hindustan Times, January 14, 2018

¹² Golwalkar, M. S, We or Our Nationhood Defined. Bharat Publications, 1939

¹³ Zubaida Zafar, S. A, Origin of "Hindutva" and Its Reflections in Modi's. Journal of Indian Studies, 2018,4(2), 228.

¹⁴ <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/08/nrc-list-19-million-excluded-india-citizens-list-190831044040215.html>

¹⁵ Furkan Latif Khan, The Powerful Group Shaping The Rise Of Hindu Nationalism In India, March 3, 2019, <https://www.npr.org/2019/05/03/706808616/the-powerful-group-shaping-the-rise-of-hindu-nationalism-in-india>

¹⁶ JAFFRELOT, C, The Fate of Secularism in India. Retrieved from The Companion, . 2019, April 4: <https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/04/04/fate-of-secularism-in-india-pub-78689>

¹⁷ Abrol, P, Retrieved from The Diplomat, 2018, August 31:

<https://thediplomat.com/2018/08/in-india-constitutional-secularism-comes-under-threat/>

¹⁸ Ibid

Deutsche. (2020). Kashmir: Is the UN Security Council reluctant to get involved? | ¹⁹ DW | 17.08.2019. Retrieved 11 January 2020, from <https://www.dw.com/en/kashmir-is-the-un-security-council-reluctant-to-get-involved/a-50061172>

Sharma, M, *Article 370 revoked: US says it's India's 'internal matter' in a blow to* ²⁰ *Pakistan*, 8 August 2019, Retrieved from Business Today: <https://www.businesstoday.in/current/economy-politics/article-370-revoked-us-india-internal-matter-blow-pakistan/story/370888.html>

²¹ Khaliq, R. u, *Abide by UNSC resolutions on Kashmir: Malaysia*. Retrieved from Asia Pacific 8 August 2019: <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/asia-pacific/abide-by-uns-c-resolutions-on-kashmir-malaysia/1552998>

²² <https://news.un.org/en/story/2019/08/1044401>

²³ <https://www.indiatoday.in/world/story/kashmir-article-370-united-nations-chief-india-violate-uns-c-resolution-1578152-2019-08-07>

²⁴ Khaliq, R.U, *Abide by UNSC resolutions on Kashmir: Malaysia*. Retrieved from Anadolu Ajansi, 8 August 2019. <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/asia-pacific/abide-by-uns-c-resolutions-on-kashmir-malaysia/1552998>



© 2017 by the author, Licensee University of Chitral, Journal of Religious Studies. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).