Twitter Thread by Anonymous poster

Anonymous poster
@handle_anonymus

It is ironic that I have to educate someone ,who was so confident that Hindu code follow Hindu religious laws, on basic history. Hindu code

> Illustrate which Hindu Personal law has been "amended" without taking religious considerations into light? Know facts before stating laws https://t.co/OZdeXASYrn
>
> — Smita\U0001f1ee\U0001f1f3 (@DikshitSmita) May 12, 2017

was not based on Hindu laws as it incorporated innovations based on secular western thought on marriage, property, and divorce, while

ignoring Hindu traditional/shastra laws .

This is an excerpt printed from “The Hindu national movement and Indian politics from 1925 to 1990’s by Christopher Jaffrelot” in Outlook

https://t.co/X0Si7896um

https://t.co/dfUtkwRTfD

Link: https://t.co/LOLfN08cBi

It clearly states that Hindu civil code was not based on Hindu personal laws, and included several reforms which were opposed by many people

on the grounds ranging from undue interference in Hindu personal laws to Hindus being singled out for interference.

Here are pics from book “India after Gandhi” of @Ram_Guha. Probably, he may be willing to defend his work,or not as it is antithetical to

.@Ram_Guha concept of Muslim male privilege.

This pic contain portion in which Swami Kriparti opposed Hindu code:

This pic contain portion in which foreign expert testify that Hindu civil code completely supplants shastras as source of Hindu law, and it

to be compared only to ‘code Napolean’ in boldness and innovation.

Here is its criticism of Hindu code of changing Hindu laws, while leaving Muslim laws untouched.

https://t.co/5rXbdPkzPj

If you have problem with quality of pics, here is a link for that chapter which you could read: https://t.co/yg9SHFzL8Q

It is not that I am salty about changed made to Hindu laws as most of them were progressive; What amazes me is that so called “liberals”

and “seculars” are not only willing to throw Muslim women under the bus for sake of protecting Muslim male privilege, but also provide such

lame arguments that any amendment in personal laws need to conform to religious beliefs, when there is an established precedence that there

is no need to conform to religious beliefs when drafting or amending personal laws, a precedence that has been strengthened every time any

of Hindu civil code has been amended.

To add: Here are views of P.V. Kane's(no one has researched & written more profusely on Hindu laws then PV Kane) opinion on Hindu code:

https://t.co/6omsGGvSq5

https://t.co/i6Fbt5oZlw

Source: The Cambridge Companion to Christian Ethics

I am not arguing that multiple marriages should be allowed for Hindus, but that, if a Muslim practice is antithetical to general morality,it

should be amended as practices that were considered immoral in contemporary world were banned;and Supreme court's logic that they would not

change any aspect of Muslim personal law, if it is part of their religion is morally obtuse as there is a clear precedence that personal

laws could be changed unilaterally without giving a damn about religious requirements.