

# ‘Modi—the Warlord’

I K Shukla

In his Mumbai speech Jan 21 Narendra Modi posed as a medieval warlord and excoriated "Delhi Sultanate". The speech is substantively much more than merely a reprobate demagogue's rant. It should send chills down the spine of not just the minorities but also the entire nation. He would drag India back to medieval times while chanting "development, development".

The ominous portent of his megalomania rings more sinister with Hindutva's Adolf Advani in Delhi raring to become PM and impatient in the interim as a pretend PM.

Oddly, he faulted Congress-UPA for the heinous sins of "minority appeasement, vote bank politics, and soft approach on terrorism". Ironically, he is wholly right, but without knowing in the least how or why. Yes, Congress has been persistently and preferentially appeasing not, the sizeable national minorities, whether they be Dalits, Christians, Tribals or Muslims, but the loud-mouthed Hindu fanatics, i.e., 'the saffronazis'. As to the vote bank politics, it is not a Congress specialty. Its initial forays in the field were halting and half-hearted. But the viciously virulent strain of exclusive vote bank politics invented and inducted in the body politic of India, poisoning its arteries, is the solely distinctive achievement of Hindu fascism (cunningly called Hindu nationalism in the Indian media, a privilege ceded to no other community).

Soft-pedaling terrorism? This charge is as monumental as it is monstrously mendacious, characteristic of the trained and congenital liars constituting the seasoned and marinated rank and file of Hindu fascists. Really, Congress-UPA is guilty as charged. But the terrorists whom cravenly and treasonably Congress has coddled all these years are all the Hindu Taliban, saffron-soiled, who drenched India in blood repeatedly and remained unpunished, enabled, thus to continue their crimes with impunity. It was a failure of grievous proportions not just of the Congress but also of the Indian state. India as a nation state proved irresponsible and delinquent, and for all practical purposes, collaborative with the historical enemies of the nation. India seemed to have rewarded the terrorists instead of pillorying and quartering them.

What Modi touted as the best development model (out of the four that he dismissed as failures), apparently mandated by 5.5 crore Gujaratis, boils down to one word, genocide- mass murder, mass rape, mass arson, and mass thugery perpetrated on Muslims. Besides "teaching them a lesson", the Chief minister of Gujarat had laid out for the world to see in gory detail the mold and milieu of would be Hindu Rashtra, Gujarat being only the prime abattoir, the lab of "final solution".

The vitriol that runs in his arteries impelled him to call criticism, of his crimes "mispropaganda". That is, he denied any wrong doing, any state-sponsored ethnocide and attendant horrors that he and his cohorts committed on the thousands of innocent Muslim men, women and children of Gujarat in 2002. Those murdered, and flayed alive are certainly out of his chimerical 5.5 crore Gujaratis whom he regards his collaborators in his brutal crimes, who crown him

as a designer warlord, and carry him in a chariot supposedly in vogue in the middle ages.

The throwback to medieval horrors is a potent and pernicious part of Hindutva project. It is the fundamentalist call to savagery, the belligerent negation of the modern state, an atavistic repudiation of the multi-cultural nation, and the declaration of open war on India and its republican Constitution. That he has made his intent known can be useful only if New Delhi acts promptly to punish him for treasonous sedition, for fomenting divisive turmoil and openly promising to cast the "Delhi Sultanate" in the bin.

He is, in fact, the real progeny of Babar who too had attacked Ibrahim Lodi of Delhi Sultanate. Babar was a "geographical" outsider, whereas Modi is a thorough outsider, a foreigner, in so far as India's cultural ethos and historical heritage are concerned. By no definition of Hinduism, or Indian, can Modi ever qualify as either.

In truth, he fought the 2002 election in Gujarat against Gen Pervez Musharraf. There was no meeting where he did not invoke him as his contender. And, his so-called 5.5 crore voters swallowed it. Similarly, he insinuated in his Mumbai speech that money was being paid to "foreigners". He forgot he had paid a huge amount to foreigners to do his PR work, an American firm specializing in image make-over, whose clients included Pinochet, Somoza, etc. Modi chose well on whom to shower Indian money.

As to his plea that the provenance of arms be investigated, use of government and banking channels by terrorist, funds be stopped, use of communal networks for subversive activities be probed who can disagree. But does he mean where daggers (trishuls) are manufactured, where saffronazi bomb-makers obtain explosive materials to make bombs (and get killed dutifully), who funds them via one of the numerous Hindutva fronts, how foreign and hawala money is helping communal fires rage incessantly across India? No, he preempts this inquiry against Hindu Taliban by deflecting it towards the victims of Hindu fascism, the minorities, mostly—the Muslims.

Modi must face trial for his innumerable crimes. Democratic legalism should not stand in the way of justice. He is guilty of crimes against humanity (Geneva Conventions), and crimes against the nation (Sedition, Terrorism). □□□