

Exposing Setara Hashem' Political ideology.

Dear Editor,

I was thinking of not replying to Setara Hashem's nonsense, however, looking at what he/she wants to champion as political ideology, i.e. Islamic fundamentalism is an invention of capitalism that never existed before, I feel strongly committed and obligated to expose her ideology which has no relation with Marxism and completely aligned with Islamists.

We are observing that a group of Islamists are trying to infiltrate into leftist wing of the intellectuals by branding America as common enemy and therefore Islam as the real friend of the Marxists because it is fighting against American capitalist!

Readers can note that Setara Hashem used

Moonsoon Hekmat, a veteran Marxist leader of 'Iran' in her/his defense

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/mukto-mona/message/27683>

against my allegation that socialists of Iran did their worst mistakes by shaking hands with Iranian Mullahs.

I am quoting from Hekmat:

"This political Islam does not necessarily have any given or defined Islamic jurisprudent and scholastic content."

"This is not ideological Islam, rather it is political Islam based on specific political equations"

"Iran is not an Islamic society; the government is Islamic. Islam is an imposed phenomenon in Iran, not only today but also during the monarchy, and has remained in power by oppression and murder. Iran is not an Islamic society. They have tried to make it Islamic by force for twenty years and failed. Calling the Iranian society Islamic is part of the reactionary crusade to make it Islamic. "

Anybody who is following the writing of Md Asghar, Dr Abul Kahsem, Dr Sayed Kamran Mirza knows it pretty well that Koran is the source of political Islam, and Hekmat is just another covert face of Islamism, which is trying to hide in Marxism like Setara Has hem.

Anyhow, I will not reply to her other nonsense like G.E LLen sky'modified' Morgan

(Both of them are from Marxist school of thought but Morgan had problem with Darwinism as a devout follower of Church. Not only that, both of them differ by a century and presented quite different model of religion though both the models are based on social evolution. That is the reason, I wrote Ms Has hem does not understand dialectic materialism in my earlier rebuttal when she termed 'G.E.Len sky's model as nonsense

thinking it is my own invention!! And look, what she is speaking now). Also, I exposed Gandhi's sexual habits in details in my article contrary to her claim that I have hidden Gandhi's sex habit!

<http://www.vinnomot.com/BiplabPal/MaoGandhi.htm>

As usual she never read it. (Also most of the links sent by her non-functional and if functional, irrelevant to the debate.)

"Gandhi's experiment of sleeping naked with naked young teens looks less scandalous before Mao's sex life as described by his physician.

*Gandhi yoke did sleep with young females--and what's more, both parties were often naked at the time. He was 77 when this odd practice came to light, and from what we know sleeping was all they did. However, when a renowned holy man of any age pulls a stunt like this, he takes the chance that it'll turn up in a book with a title like *The Sexual Teachings of the White Tigress*.*

Gandhi's sleeping arrangements attracted public attention during the winter of 1946-47, when he was trying to quell violence between Muslims and Hindus in the Noakhali district in what is now Bangladesh. It came out that Gandhi was bunking nightly with his 19-year-old grandniece, Manu. In part this was an effort to stay warm in the winter chill, but Gandhi soon acknowledged there was more to it: he was testing his vow of brahmacharya, or total chastity in thought and deed. If he could spend the night in a woman's embrace without feeling sexual stirrings, it would demonstrate that he had conquered his carnal impulses and become "God's eunuch." It turned out that Manu was not his first brahmacharya lab partner--he'd also recently gotten naked (partly, at least) with another young woman in his extended family, starting when she was 18.

There were quite a few raised eyebrows in India. One of the most vocal critics was Nirmal Kumar Bose, a university lecturer who served as Gandhi's interpreter in Noakhali. While conceding that no hanky-panky had taken place (Gandhi and his entourage typically all slept in the same room) Bose protested that the master was exploiting the women, each of whom felt she had a special place in his affections and became "hysterical" if slighted. (Here I follow the account by author Ved Mehta in his 1976 New Yorker series on Gandhi and his followers.) Gandhi, far from being abashed, vigorously defended himself in meetings, letters, and articles, arguing that making a woman "the instrument of my lust" would be far more exploitative than what he actually did.

*Remarkably, the critics eventually quieted down. Even Bose, who quit in protest and later discussed the issue in a book, *My Days With Gandhi*, remained an admirer. Gandhi continued to sleep with women until his assassination in 1948, and the matter is little remembered today. The esteem in which Gandhi was held no doubt partly accounts for the lack of repercussions, along with his advanced age. His notoriously eccentric views on sex may have been a factor too. Gandhi believed that sex for pleasure was sinful (for that matter, he felt eating chocolate was sinful), that sexual attraction between men and women was unnatural, and that husband and wife should live together as brother and sister, having sex only for purposes of procreation. (I take most of this from a memoir by journalist William Shirer, another admirer.) He swore off sex at age 36, required a similar vow of his disciples, and publicly freaked when he had a nocturnal emission in 1936 at age 67. Many hearing him rationalize his unusual blanket substitute probably figured, eh, that's the mahatma for you. (For what it's worth, the kinkier takes on the story--e.g., that Gandhi was regularly massaged by naked women--have no basis in fact that I can discover.) Whether or not you buy the notion that he didn't get off on contact with his very young bedmates (or feel that that would make it any less creepy), it says something about this profoundly strange guy that you can*

hear his claim that naked sleepovers were tests of purity for both participants."

I do not think, I need to comment further on her nonsense.

-Biplab