

TOLERANT INDIA INTOLERANT PEOPLE

By *Debajyoti Saha*¹⁴³ & *Sunayana Bhat*¹⁴⁴

Intolerance in India has been a debatable topic in the recent times. It is not a sudden issue but prevailed in our country since ages; here freedom of expression is an illusion. One or the other day people will react whether silently or violently but they will react, this is a situation where in their reaction was portrayed in a big manner. When we begin to discuss about intolerance we need to keep in mind who actually is empowered for instance if we take like certain people dislike one particular thing but they cannot do anything about it whereas there are people who are empowered and they have the capacity to do something about it.

The dictionary meaning of Intolerance is “unwillingness to accept views, beliefs, or behavior that differ from one's own”. In India, people are democratic. Everyone has the freedom of speech and expression guaranteed under Art.19 of the Constitution of India. This issue has been hyped by the media in such a way that no Indian citizen can accept views against their cultures, norms etc. If that would have been the situation, there were no critics in the Indian literature. The main contention of the people is that they are murdered because others are intolerant of them. This issue began from the case of Kalburgi where he was killed because of his intolerance nature towards the different cultures like idol worship etc. He led different delegations for the protest against the cultures. It is still unclear as to what is the reason behind his murder. But supporters of Kalburgi have assumed that the normal citizens cannot tolerate him. This case had a twofold view; because Kalburgi had the right to voice his opinion but he should have been careful enough not to hurt the feelings of others. It's important to note that as every citizen in this country is free enough to do what he wants yet there is a small restriction as to not infringe the right of another.

Second instance was the lynching of a Muslim man for stealing a cow from others' stall. The media has portrayed this event in such a way that just because he is a Muslim, he was lynched. In United States and United Kingdom, the practice of lynching the persons who stole cows and horses are prevalent from centuries. The whole world has taken a bad impression of India due to this event. People have the opinion that the target group is the Muslim Group. But we cannot

¹⁴³ 3rd year, BBA LLB, School of Law, Christ University

¹⁴⁴ 3rd year, BBA LLB, School of Law, Christ University

say that Muslims are not killed in any part of the world. For example in Saudi Arabia, Muslims groups (Sunnis and Shias) kill each other because of their difference in cultures. Then why India is being shown in a different manner? The manner in which it is portrayed is simple but the issue has spread like forest fire which has led to a single matter travel from mouth to mouth and the actual fact has been changed. This kind of miscommunication itself gives birth to what we call intolerance.

A famous actor has given his statement over intolerance that he has lived with his wife for so many years in India but currently he is feeling insecure because of the prevailing environment in India. He has said what he has felt right. He has expressed his concern over the national award winners returning their awards in view of the intolerance of the events expressed above. There is freedom of speech and expression but it is subjected to reasonable restrictions. Such big personalities have been given name and fame by the Indian citizens only. They are only making such statements to leave the country and settle somewhere else. There is duty on such people to change the mindset of the common man. For instance, when we look into any kind of advertisement we purchase that product based on the person advertising it, how influential he is so let's say for boost ad Sachin Tendulkar comes, similarly for polio drops we have Amitabh Bachchan. Here the actor who made the statement regarding intolerance he should have been careful enough because people will go by his words and that will change the thought in people's mind. When the rumors are already spreading like some disease. Now if a Hindu is killed for stealing something, the media will not publicize that.

The main target of the people, supporting the movement of "intolerance in India", is Modi Government. They have presumed that the Modi government will only promote Hindutva and not let other religions leave. But that is not true. Our Prime Minister, Mr. Narendra Modi is trying to unite people in one or the other way. There is no doubt that some BJP ministers have given statements against Muslim group but Modi government has taken strict action against them. The communal chaos being caused in this country is nothing new, it's been happening since many years.

The next instance is that people are protesting on the basis of bans that are being imposed on the people. The first one is the beef ban. The common man thought that the beef was banned because India is a Hindu dominated country. So the Indian citizens cannot tolerate beef which lead the people of other religion to suffer. The Bombay High Court has specifically stated about

the reasons of the beef ban. It suggested for the alternatives places for the non-productive milch animals. The slaughtering of the cows is not an integral act of the other religion. But the media has taken this judgment in such a way that now most of the Indians are against the beef ban. No one is trying to understand the rationale behind such a move. After the Bihar elections, the Chief Minister of Bihar has stated of “liquor ban” in Bihar from Apr, 2016. Now everyone is calling India as a “Country of Bans”. The liquor ban will be imposed for the welfare of the people. Nitish Kumar has promised the same during his campaign. He is ready to incur the excise loss due to this ban. But people are people. The ban is expected to work in the same way as it worked in Gujarat. They will listen to third party like media and interpret in their way.

There are many stray instances of intolerance as we have seen above, but to actually analyze if a certain situation or statement is to be considered intolerant we need to look at few criteria i.e. firstly keep a track on such incidences for the past 30 years in our country and factors as to the level of impact on the country. Secondly, there should be a check upon such a trend in the recent years at both state as well as central level. The problem here is that the media is not doing such an analysis, instead the media plans to gather a panel of people who are in a position to debate.

India is a country where there are huge number of cases pending on the violation of the right of Freedom of Speech and Expression. This is because the phrase “reasonable restrictions” has not been defined in any part of the Constitution. There is nothing like the Indian people are intolerant of the people who are opposing or keeping their views in front of the public. There are a number of critics like Javed Akhtar, Tasleema Nasrin etc. whom our countrymen have respected from age old. There is a very thin line of difference between expressing a reasonable opinion and a radical opinion. Humans have the nature to critically analyze each and every matter from their point of view. People will believe things that are shown to them. But it lies in the hands of the media to portray something after investigating the issues from all the angles. Law has provided every safeguard to the writers, authors, poets etc. The efficiency of law depends on its users in the way that how they are using it. The welfare of the people will always be kept in priority than other things. We are not asking for any revert back of the statements. But whatever is said in public should be told keeping in mind the sensitivity of the public.