Chapter 5
In Conclusion:
Rethinking the Relationship between Religion and Nation-State as a Response to Violence

5.1 An Overview of the Study

This study was carried out in the realm of Indian political thought where an exploration of the religion-state relationship was done in the works of select thinkers from the canon. An analytical reading of the ways in which the thinkers, namely, Rammohan Roy, Jawaharlal Nehru, and M.K. Gandhi, proposed alternatives toward resolving the conflicting positions both religion and nation-state occupied, was done.

The popular perception since times immemorial on the nature of the religion-state relationship was largely dominated by secularist sentiments. It was one thing to be committed to attributes of secular nature, however, transforming them into institutionalized forms of living and thinking posed concerns that even loom large in contemporary times. The cost at which such narratives were carved and the institutions entrusted to ensure and steer them in society was the State which occupied a sovereign space just as religion in Indian societies. With multiple sovereign centres in society, it became one of the many potent issues which political theorists had to grapple with, in order to make sense of the nature of this ideal political order that could address and conceive the gravity of the problems multiple legitimate orders could pose in the society. One had to rethink the nature of the arrangements of these entities in society and the task that was undertaken here was to place such an analysis in the canonical thought of Indian tradition, with the intent to draw newer possibilities to help us understand societies and their complexities today.

> "The dominant interpretation of secularism in India did not entail the removal of religion from the political sphere, but rather the belief that religion and culture were elevated to an ostensibly apolitical level, above the profanities of the political. This institutionalized notion of culture and religion as apolitical, and the derived notion of selfless "social work" as ennobling and purifying by virtue of its elevation above politics and money, provided an unassailable moral high ground to a certain genre of

> "antipolitical activism," conspicuous among social and cultural organizations but also often invoked in agitations and in electoral politics in India…. It was from this discursive field of "antipolitics" and "religious activism" that the Hindu nationalist movement, with great ingenuity, built its campaigns and organizational networks for decades. Like other forms of cultural nationalism, the Hindu nationalist movement always entertained a complex ambivalence vis-à-vis democracy and apprehension toward the "political vocation." The evolution of the movement, its organization, and its political strategies must be understood in the context of constant negotiation and oscillation across the deep bifurcation in modern Indian political culture between a realm of "sublime" culture and a realm of "profane" competitive politics."[1]

As this passage suggests, the study was performed specifically with the specific purpose of focusing on the religion-state relationship, by employing the trope of violence. The chapterization carried out, was, in the following thematic manner.

The first chapter, Chapter 1, dealt with a detailed exploration of the grounds on which the entire study was based, which also formed the conceptual grid of the study, that of the politics-political interplay. Beginning with an elaborate account of the basic concerns of the research, a comprehensive understanding of the intricacies in the religion and nation-state relationship was covered, while also simultaneously introducing the research problem. In order to carry this out, the trope of violence was employed. Through the course of this rather long chapter, the fallacies that lie inherently in this obsession with spatialization of the political, get exposed. The intertwining and lack of mingling of many institutional structures and concepts are exposed through the chapter, which also provides one a glimpse of the challenges that the formations of the political have had to undergo in theorizing its place and nature in knowledge systems. This chapter also carved out the scope of the current study and explained its limitations and plausible contributions and intentions.

The subsequent chapters, Chapters 2, 3, and 4, dealt with the three selected thinkers from the canon of Indian political thought, Rammohan Roy, Jawaharlal Nehru, and M.K. Gandhi, as mentioned above. A detailed exploration of the intricacies of the moral-political was dealt with by referring to both select primary sources as well as the secondary readings produced on these thinkers. Possible conclusions, within the proposed conceptual grid, was carried to make sense of the alternatives one could find in the works of these thinkers on the contentious relationship

between religion and nation-state in particular, and that of politics and the political at large. This was followed by the concluding chapter, Chapter 5, which aims to conclude the study with possible observations, analyses, and intentions for future theorizations related to this area of study. The central concern that undercut the entire study was the necessity to explore and make sense of the nature of violence located in this relationship as well as pave the way for an opening up of the Indian political canonical thought for many more thematic conceptualizations.

5.2 The Imperative of the Theologico-Political: Towards an Alternative Thematic

Violence makes us calculate the risks on life in general, and lives in particular, thereby installing the necessity to grade and rethink on whose lives matter the most. It was when violence began to used to target the intimate, that the problem was recorded.[2] Else, violence was essentially used to protect and secure human lives. Violence has been justified for the sake of life, and its security and value as the reason behind the grotesque killings that happen on a battlefield. The space of the war field offers a picture different from this dictum, which substantiates the above statement of violence forcing one to grade the quality of lives and make a choice on which life is more valuable than the other. Such a conception associated with violence offers us scope to explore the nature and contents of the political, which has affected politics.[3]

This exploration of the political using the thematic of violence, was chosen in this study undertaken, to make sense of the activities and the processes of politics that have been happening and that have already contributed to the psychopolitical formations of different kinds, which has the potential to nurture an understanding of the future. The study was undertaken with the intent of understanding the relationship between religion and nation-state in the Indian context; using violence as the thematic. An all-encompassing theme that had the potential to define not only lives but also death, was violence.

The three thinkers chosen to study here, have contributed in their respective significant ways to the relationship between religion and nation-state/state which has remained a conundrum since times immemorial, especially in complex and composite societies as India. Thus, there is an inherent paradox that lies in the usage of this term. Faisal Devji clearly seems to expose this dilemma inherent in the scholarship on violence, as he writes the following: “Shifting

uncomfortably between the particularity of pain and the generality of an intellectual category, violence has until recently been ill served by scholarship."[4] On one hand, while it has been employed for any instance of conflict and used widely, on the other hand it is also used to point out only at certain visceral kinds of conflict initiated by and characteristic of only some sections of the society. Here, the concept gets employed in order to fixate it in some people, some institutions, some actions, and some beliefs. Further, with this association comes the gradation, where each activity or a potential activity of violence gets graded against other activities and gets bracketed or branded as epitomizing the more cruel forms of violence, only explaining the activities of a certain kind.

The theme that is used here is violence, since it sits well with other important conceptual frameworks such as the concerns associated with legitimacy, liberty, equality, justice and the like. There is also something curiously theological about the violence that it allows for introspection and critical reflections, both reflective or reflexive/responsive to some or the other actions and events that happen in the external. Violence, perhaps, is the only concept that theorizes its own subject while carrying out the process of engaging with it, which makes it quite capacious and enigmatic.[5] It, therefore, constructs its own existence based on the kind of inquiry and based on what is enquired upon. Violence, however undefinable, has been ubiquitous and hence, a matter of concern for a researcher. This ubiquity of violence is not based on a preconceived fixated conception of what signifies/ causes life in general, but as mentioned above, it exposes itself in a society in various proportions when the entities interact and engage with each other in myriad ways. The enormity of violence, its proportion, and, at times, its gargantuan presence find immense possibilities in the following sites, religious bodies and state-led institutions. These and other possible sites shall provide literature on violence which keeps shifting the limits of its scope, within the space of the political. Hence, it becomes imperative to conceptualize of a space that is beyond the conception of the political, through an emphasis on the activity of politics in a context.

I intend to claim with a certain emphasis that perhaps, the only concept that allows one to contemplate on the life and death issues, which the thinkers from the Indian political tradition have contemplated, in their understandings of the colonial contexts and histories and memories that defined the Indian imaginations, is violence. Violence remains as not just the instrument here that traps one in the question of life and death, but also a thing that suspends the ideal of secure 'peaceful' life, eventually ending in death, however, with varying dignities. This

suspended anticipation allows for violence to also become legitimate as an intrinsic component of any life, and has the ability to govern how we think, behave and conduct ourself. It remains the underlying principle of life for the army on the battlefield, for the manual scavenger who continues to perform the profession despite the law deeming it illegal. The 'reckless courage' that one gets here is rooted in the lack of respect and dignity an average human life has, which may be achieved through death.[6]

5.2.1 Religion as/and/sans the Political: Locating Violence in Indian Thought

The aforementioned paradoxicity in the ambivalent attitudes toward and of violence, was first raised by M.K. Gandhi.[7] By associating intimacy with the enemy, Ashis Nandy perhaps was trying to provide a reason as to why such associations that casually use violence as a justification to vanquish the enemy, are neither disconnected from one's own self. The intimacy also perhaps vanquishes you after the enemy is vanquished.[8] Violence, then, doesn't culminate in the enemy's death, but allows itself to proliferate unless we rethink on who's life matters the most. Here is where states as the legitimate epitome of rationality team up with science and infuse politics with political realism of the *Machiavellian* kind, which the States are 'compelled' to practice in order to survive. The survival of the self of the State allows for violence to sustain or rather thrive on the sustenance of violence, which involves the subsequent erosion of the meaning of life; suffocating and playing into the narratives of the larger-than-life nation-state.

Violence offers the space to question politics on its crisis at the local and global levels, be it in the burgeoning presence of the nation or in the realm of international spaces. Specifically, now and here, Gandhi's perceptive analysis of violence, thus produces sufficient requirement of nonviolence to address the question of life and death. Faisal Devji's exposition of this inherent paradoxicality of violence is brought to life, in his reading of Gandhi amidst the growing crisis in public space initiated, sanctioned, and legitimized by the State on one hand and the collective identities of the cultural commune, on the other.[9] Violence gets moulded and tamed only when death becomes as significant as life. When the lives of soldiers and the army that are laid down for the nation's security and national interest during wars get celebrated in death, the security of the lives of some (the state and its civilians) get more respect than theirs.

This casualness of the necessity to practice or engage with violence and turn violent does not sit well with the maxim of 'security of life' amongst these practitioners of violence. Their lives garner respect that is anticipated and awaited in their death. This respect is also not made available to the lives of a human, who is forced to perform a certain kind of physical labor to earn a living, which gets rooted in caste-professional associations. The humiliation and disrespect of and for the lives of such sections of society are not unknown. As a matter of fact, it is made to remain visible as a testimony to the reminder of life and death as being superior for some sections and not as much for others; the reasons of which are laid and rooted in religion and its practices. However, what distinguishes the former kind of disrespect from the latter example, is the sheer disrespect for the latter's death as much as for the life. Any degree of both kinds of fraternal building in society, the former rooted in nationalism and the latter in a skewed sense of public order through an establishment and sustenance of caste hierarchies; would not suffice if even death doesn't unite one through these differences and discriminations.

Thus, to contrast with the language of violence, Gandhi's conception of *Ahimsa*, loosely translated as non-violence was introduced, which again became the site of analysis offering possibilities to understand its implications today. In this context, Akeel Bilgrami wrote,

> "Violence has many sides. It can be spontaneous or planned, it can be individual or institutional, it can be physical or psychological, it can be delinquent or adult, it can be revolutionary or authoritarian. A great deal has been written on violence: on its psychology, on its possible philosophical justifications under certain circumstances, and of course on its long career in military history. Non-violence has no sides at all. Being negatively defined, it is indivisible. It began to be a subject of study much more recently and there is much less written on it, not merely because it is defined in negative terms but because until it became a self-conscious instrument in politics in this century, it was really constituted as or in something else. It was studied under different names, first usually as part of religious or contemplative ways of life remote from the public affairs of men and state, and later with the coming of romantic thought in Europe, under the rubric of critiques of industrial civilization."[10]

In response to this conception of nonviolence by Akeel Bilgrami, Ania Loomba had stated the following: "Non-violence makes it extremely simplistic and a negation of the term violence, with the former sort of not having the agency, autonomy or the freedom to possess tools and

mechanisms to function, except as an antithet of the term violence." However literal Bilgrami's response appears, one must comprehend, the possibilities of thinking Bilgrami opens up, through his proposition of nonviolence as being a negation of violence and therefore, indivisible.

The incommensurability of violence and its potential reliance upon the crisis of the political and the inability of politics which pushes society towards dealing with extreme forms of violence,[11] operates in many forms that seemingly never appeared as being violent. Such as, right from the practice of religious rituals that fixes and cages one's sensibilities to adherence to open and 'free' thinking,[12] or through the practice of civility that became the epitome of moral-political forces in the society which drew heavily from religion and pitched against science and 'all secular appearances of the modern state', or through overt physical torture and violence on people, entities, bodies, institutions, ideas or concepts that occupied edges of the morally designed spaces in the society. However, perhaps Bilgrami offers a possibility of putting nonviolence and its practice within the above set of spaces where violence thrives. It problematizes the spaces that violence previously occupied or was aimed against. Through a study and practice of nonviolence, perhaps the scope of violence just expands and offers a possibility towards filling up the knots in time that threatened the existence of the political and therefore, of experiencing life well aware of the presence of violence. The reason why Bilgrami calls it indivisible could be rooted in the above possibilities, one that suggests of the opening up of the space of the political for one to make sense of the politics of religion. Thus, it is in the indivisibility of nonviolence that the understanding of violence assumes the highest potential. This exemplifies ***Religion as the Political.***

Perhaps Gandhi's reckless courage which emphasizes more on death and despises life might be misconstrued as allowing one to justify violence in a way as is visible on the battlefield. However, what is unique to Gandhi here in dealing with violence is the necessity to learn from the travails of battles and bloodshed and the activity of killing, the need to channelize the courage towards a more discerning application of violence in figuring out and accepting death as the ultimate truth. The act of dying for the neighbour gets prominent through Gandhi.[13] In conjunction with this, the use of religion in order to establish this anti-violence narrative gains semblance through this, which also forms as one of the major sites of active politics for Gandhi, which allowed him to debunk the legitimacy of modern civilization and expose its atrocities.[14] The agonistic[15] use of religion proffers this understanding of politics and the political in

Gandhi, where theorizing contexts and acting out processes, provided the cure to existing conflicts in society.

Whereas, for Rammohan Roy, he did not delve as much into the political nexus that religions created with the entire civilizing mission of the colonial rule; he did delve into the theological aspects of the practice of religion which, when rethought, formed formidable grounds for a response that was devoid of a sense of an identity that we popularly associate with a nation or a nation-state. A contrasting trend of religious social movements against colonial intervention due to the Christian imposition of the colonial state through its interventional activities exposed the looming absence of the political nature of the relationship that Roy idealized for a 'good' society. According to him, the roots of regression were located in the absence of the realization that religion had to be filtered through reason. This exposes the violence in Roy's apologetic stance viz a viz colonial rule, which contrasts with the position of the self that he occupied in society, being a privileged individual. What appears contrasting here may just be the manifestation of the way the self functions contra the colonial rule, especially in Roy's acts of resistance to the rule for the freedom of the press and against the colonial rule's oppressive policies in Britain, India, and other colonies.[16] Even though this manifests a political relationship, the *politicality* is lost in the imitation and admiration for modular forms of thinking that translate into becoming the legitimate source of truth and authenticity for Roy. Even his interpretation of religions is rooted in this conception of the written word that must guide society towards getting placed on the wheels of progressive evolving history. The emphasis, in Roy, is thus on life, the quality of life, and its substantially sub-standard positioning viz a viz the western European culture.[17] This exemplifies ***Religion and/sans the Political.***

Taking cues from this liberal reformer that Roy was for the then Bengali societies seeped in corrupt social evils, Nehru's attitude towards society and religion in particular went in accordance with that of Roy, on the evils it could perpetrate. The social spaces were deeply unequal, religious, and divided, which proffered little to no vision for a 'good' future in Nehruvian modernist politics. His politics looked at the Gandhian ideal of 'giving up the wish to live' as being "obscurantist, impractical and far-fetched".[18] To add to it, giving up the wish to live and immersing courage to die for other fellows, while being rooted in values guided and nurtured by religion, was equivalent to it turning communal and more divisive for Nehru. This is evident in the following statements by Nehru:

> "Our Constitution lays down that we are a secular state, but it must be admitted that this is not wholly reflected in our mass living and thinking. In a country like England, the state is . . . allied to one particular religion . . . Nevertheless, the state and the people there function in a largely secular way. Society, therefore, in England is more advanced in this respect than in India, even though our constitution may be in this matter more advanced".[19]

This signified the 'Moment of Arrival' in Nehru, which according to the insightful analysis by Partha Chatterjee, talked about the State that was separated from its pasts and rooted in the vision of the new, that stood above the narrow interests of groups and classes, which harboured a historically mistaken and flawed view of the state as being the paragon of human reason and the responsible agent of change, all for the sake of a good life situated in the present and the future.[20] This exemplifies, ***Religion sans the Political.***

The following table encapsulates the ideas discussed above on the nature and location of religion in the ambit of the political and how the former has been dealt with within/ without political discourses, to which the three thinkers contributed, in their contexts. This table offers a conceptual and a re-contextual reading of the location of violence in the relationship and in turn, allows us to explore the possibilities their thought offered for us to understand our times today.

Selected Thinkers from the Study	Religion v/s Political	Nature of Secularity/ Religiosity[21]			Locating Violence
		Moral	Political	Legal	
Rammohan Roy	Religion and/sans the Political	Legal and Moral (Interference, state-guided)			The state (colonial) continues as the Self, which the society shall never be able to live up to. The idea of a near-perfect vision of the peoples rooted in liberal ideals is steered by the State. The legal (state) leads the moral that is worked out in society.
Jawaharlal Nehru	Religion sans the political	Political, Legal, Moral (Separation, state-guided)			State continues as the Self which will create the new political, and lead the legal and the moral. The gap is rather clear and somewhat fixed.
M.K. Gandhi	Religion as the Political	Moral and Political (Dialogical Interconnectedness, society-guided)			The state cannot be allowed to overpower the mind of people. Society develops its own language of the moral which shall work in conjunction with the political. The gap between the two is the least here, as the context determines their configurations, and this is suggestive of a movement toward the theologico-political, which always existed and was not new in praxis.[22]

5.2.2: 'Imperfect' Political Theories: The way ahead

Knowledge systems have imparted ways and means of crystallizing our understandings and findings in conclusive alternatives, that appear to resolve political concerns, which are then disciplined into systemic norms of knowing. Even though such alternatives are necessary for resolving conflicts and making sense of the same, it at times, creates a semblance of this constant need to perfect the 'lack' or feel perfect despite many unresolved concerns. The current thesis focused on choosing thinkers from the Indian canonical political tradition, in the light of the ways in which they dealt with these imperfections. What is common to Roy, Nehru, and Gandhi is that they all acknowledged the presence of imperfections. Through the implementation of violence as a trope, in reading them, I have made a modest attempt at emphasizing on the imperative to rethink the ways in which knowledge is processed, arranged, and disseminated, especially with respect to the need to perfect it.

The perfection that we look for in knowledge is absent in real praxis. The latter dwells in imperfections which we conveniently seem to bracket and package into categories of knowledge that make the promise of a perfect alternative. Of the three thinkers, it was only Gandhi who comes closest to acknowledging and accepting the absence of a major lacuna between knowledge and praxis; and associates both with the functionality of 'trying to make sense of the imperfections, without necessarily converting it into a perfected nature of the Self. We shall, briefly, try and make sense of this proposition made here with respect to not only the alternatives suggested by three thinkers on the Religion-Nation-State relationship but also on the nature of our larger epistemic endeavours within any academic engagement. The table placed above may be referred to, for the same.

Roy's Good State and a Syncretic Society

Rammohan Roy's emphasis on the colonial state and its need to historically place Indian societies on the bandwagon of progress goes opposite to M.K. Gandhi's line of thought. There is no doubt that the contexts and the sentiments responsive to colonial rule were different in Roy's time. The popular sentiments of his time steered by the likes of him, towards the colonial rule, were emotions akin to an 'other' in awe at the enlightened 'Self' (that of the colonial ruler), a patronization that the society accepted as a given, for the significant 'lack' in the composition of the 'Self'. The nature of the *good* is rooted in this realization, which makes the State a harbinger of reason and therefore of all the cures for the evil the 'traditional/religious'

society faces. The good and the evil are superimposed into the State and the Society. In Roy, this tool of reformation will bridge the two entities, which are in constant deliberation with each other, based on the paradigm of reason.

Nehru's Good Secular State and a Religious Society

Jawaharlal Nehru's emphasis was on the need to break out of the past and the need to envision a new future rooted in the idea of a public space that is above narrow identities of class and creed, surpassing these identities to create a space encompassing a society of free peoples situated in a republican and democratic order. The nature of the *good* in him is rooted in the realization that State, based on reason was supposed to keep away from the religious society and steer a consciousness that would ideally secularize the spaces and make them equipped to become more reasonable. There is a conventional assumption underlying this notion that the Good can be steered by the State and it can be realized with religion being relegated to the personal space, that of the spiritual kind, where it shall not conflict with the goodness that will be imparted and created by the State, like a palimpsest, creating the new and erasing the evilness of the present and the past.[23]

Gandhi's Imperfect Society: Roots in theologico-political

> "In no part of the world, and under no civilization, have all men attained perfection. The tendency of the Indian civilization is to elevate the moral being, that of the Western civilization is to propagate immorality. The latter is godless, the former is based on a belief in God. So understanding and so believing, it behoves every lover of India to cling to the old Indian civilization even as a child clings to the mother's breast."[24]

This underlying obsession with every theorization to form an understanding of a perfect society gets fundamentally questioned by thinkers such as M.K. Gandhi. Gandhi, however, uses religious references to make this point by stating that the only perfected whole that exists is what he understands as God, while everything else is only the imperfectly existing entities, seeking an 'unnatural' perfection. Hence, religious morality will be this philosophical guide that will create an awakened swaraj. A collective good space. For this to happen the self needs to go through purification. i.e., the self must atone for the sins committed upon the other. The self can be made aware of this by the others practicing civil disobedience and non-cooperation, wherein the rules of the civil would be decided by its practitioners.

Thus, figuring out what constitutes evil and good is as much a political activity as is understanding the purpose behind it. When the good is removed from the side of the evil, the evil loses. Such is the import attributed to friendship, which, in Gandhi, comes to life, in the sustenance of both the good and the evil.[25] The associations between and the awareness of good and evil, therefore, become a matter of concern. In my understanding, keeping in mind such a site and space that Gandhi chose, in order to make credible the language and the practice of nonviolence is unique.

This is a relatively novel take on the nature of the Self and the Other in Gandhi's politics, where for the first time the Other features as a speaking other, speaking in the new language of nonviolence. This is new, also because the self and other are not superimposed into a friend and the enemy, the good and the bad, the right and the wrong. There is the presence of good and evil in both the self and the other. This provides us an understanding of a dialogical self-other relationship which is exactly how he envisioned the presence of religion in society and the role it played. The theologico-political, which already existed finds presence and new dimensions in Gandhi's thought.

The study carried out here, thus, conveys what I had intended to state in the light of the theme of the nature of the political, its interplay with politics, and the location of violence within it, hopefully in a convincing manner, through a fairly elaborate, analytical and an explanatory reading of the selected Indian political thinkers from the canon. With this, somewhat, imperfect study, I hope to make a modest contribution to an otherwise claimed perfect discourse on the relationship between religion and nation-state in the Global South.

Notes

[1] Etienne Balibar, "From Violence as Anti-Politics to Politics as Anti-Violence", pp. 384 – 399; and Etienne Balibar, *Violence and Civility: On the Limits of Political Philosophy*

[2] Shruti Kapila, "History of Violence", *Political Thought in Action: The Bhagavad Gita and Modern India*, pp. 177 – 199

[3] See Etienne Balibar, "From Violence as Anti-Politics to Politics as Anti-Violence" and *Violence and Civility: On the Limits of Political Philosophy*

[4] Faisal Devji, "Communities of Violence", p. 801

[5] Ibid, pp. 801- 802; Faisal Devji, "The Paradox of Nonviolence", pp. 269 - 274

[6] Faisal Devji, "The Paradox of Nonviolence", p. 269

[7] Ibid, pp. 269 – 274

[8] Peter Van der Veer, "Introduction", *Imperial Encounters: The Religion and Modernity in India and Britain,* p. 3

[9] Etienne Balibar, "From Violence as Anti-Politics to Politics as Anti-Violence", p. 391

[10] See Akeel Bilgrami, "Two Concepts of Secularism: Reason, Modernity and Archimedean Ideal"

[11] Etienne Balibar talks about extreme violence as the gap in times that shows the inability of the political or perhaps the transforming nature of the political exhibiting itself differently in the presence of violence through an analysis of what he likes to call, 'Cruelty'.

[12] Connect the term free here to what Hannah Arendt considers as 'groundlessness'.

[13] See Ajay Skaria, "The Religion of Gandhi: A Conversation About Satyagraha with Ajay Skaria", *The Wire*. Also see Ajay Skaria, *Unconditional Equality: Gandhi's Religion of Resistance*

[14] M.K. Gandhi popularly writes in the Hind Swaraj, "In no part of the world, and under no civilization, have all men attained perfection." MK Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj,* p. 71

[15] The use of the term agonistic is made by Chantal Mouffe to explain the nature of religion as being amorphous and open to dialogical connection with other political institutions in society such as the State. She emphasized upon an agonistic democracy, which would not lead to elimination of religion from public space but an agonistic deliberation over religion. Hent de Vries and Mark E. Sullivan, (eds.), *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-Secular World,* p. 57

[16] An elaborate account of this is present in Sophia Dobson Collett, *The Life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Roy,* pp. 93 – 120

[17] See C.A. Bayly, "Rammohan Roy and the advent of Constitutional Liberalism in India, 1800-30", Ramachandra Guha, "The First Liberal: Rammohan Roy", *Makers of Modern India*

[18] T.N. Madan, "The Crisis of Indian Secularism", *Modern Myths, Locked Minds: Secularism and Fundamentalism in India*, pp. 238 – 247

[19] Gopal Sarvepalli, ed., *Jawaharlal Nehru: An Anthology*, pp. 330 – 331; Cited in T.N. Madan, "The Crisis of Indian Secularism", *Modern Myths, Locked Minds: Secularism and Fundamentalism in India*, p. 246

[20] Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*, p. 133

[21] There is little distinction between the two, which has been sufficiently explained in the previous chapters, and thus, we run into solipsism if we hold on to the differences between the two, while also making the claim both are interlinked.

[22] This phrase is inspired and taken from the title of the seminal work by Hent de Vries and Mark E. Sullivan, (eds.), *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-Secular World*. This is indicative of a process-based conception of the political and politics, rather than an instrumental understanding located in the state and society as separate concrete entities.

[23] See Jawaharlal Nehru, "Ahmadnagar Fort Again", 'India's Dynamic Capacity', *The Discovery of India*, p. 556

[24] M.K. Gandhi, "What is True Civilization", Hind Swaraj, p. 56. Can be accessed at www.mkgandhi.org.

[25] Faisal Devji, "Speaking of Violence", pp. 18-20