DECONSTRUCTING THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF INDIAN SECULARISM

Vikram Gautam

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science,

University of Delhi, Delhi

ABSTRACT

The idea of secularism in India appears to be borrowed from the western idea but in reality, this seeming resemblance cannot deny the distinctiveness of Indian secularism. The underlying theme of Indian secularism is to provide democratic foundations to its multicultural society. Moreover, it also attaches a great significance to the idea of social justice ensuring of their diverse social locations. Secularism is an essential ingredient of the multicultural political system of India. Indian secularism adopted a non-majoritarian multicultural perspective which recognizes the culturally specific needs of different communities. It is based on principles of neutrality and tolerance with a vision of cohesive and integrated society. The idea of Indian secularism is deeply rooted in its own socio-cultural and historical traditions. Although the state doesn't have its own religion, it is also not hostile to any religion. The research paper delineates the secular distinctiveness of the Indian nation-state and various contestations and debates among scholars for its effectiveness in the Indian society.

Key Words: Secularism, Constituent Assembly, Indian Constitution, Minority Rights, Religious Tolerance

INTRODUCTION

Indian secularism is a unique concept which was shaped by the experiences and the understandings of the political leaderships of the newly independent nation. Secularism was the most debated and contentious issue on which different opinions were presented in the Constituent Assembly. India is a religious country and hold of religion is present in every aspect of the life of its citizens. In such a religious country which form of secularism could be adopted that was the issue before our Constitution makers. The founding fathers of India did not endorse the notion of secularism that is based on complete separation of religion from politics as adopted in America. The model of Indian secularism is based on its own past experiences. Indian way of life has been deeply religious so in the context of such deep religious diversity, our forefathers of Indian Constitution understood secularism as a mean of coexistence between various faiths. The Indian Constitution endorsed the principle of non-establishment of religion but not completely the separation of religion from politics. 'This meant that the state was to have no religion of its own, but religion also not viewed as a personal or private matter: it was placed squarely in the public domain and the state was expected to be involved in a variety of ways with religion' (Mahajan in Bhargava 2008).

SECULARISM IN INDIA: A HISTORICAL DISCOURSE

To understand the conceptual framework of secularism in India, one has to look at the discourse in Constituent Assembly on the role of religion and religious communities in the public sphere. There were two models of secularism in front of Constituent Assembly, first one derived from American model and the second one from Britain. The American model was based on separation of religion from polity and later one with the practice of established religion. Both of them were discussed and debated strongly in Constituent Assembly.

Was a state secular only when it stayed away from the religion? Or did a state that equally respected all religions best capture the meaning of secularism in the Indian context? (Jha 2002: 3176). Shefali Jha elaborates different types of arguments regarding which type of secularism was to be adopted for Indian state? The first was the *'no-concern'* theory of secularism, in which there was a definite line of separation between religion and the state. The argument was that religion being an individual's private affair and state should not interfere in the private sphere of individuals and stayed away from religious matters. While moving a resolution for the Constitution of the Advisory Committee on Fundamental Rights G.B. Pant stated:

'The individual citizen who is really the backbone of the State, the pivot, the cardinal centre of all social activity, and whose happiness and satisfaction should be the goal of every social mechanism, has been lost here in that indiscriminate body known as the community. We have even forgotten that a citizen exists as such. There is unwholesome and to some extent a degrading habit of thinking always in terms of communities and never in terms of citizens. But it is, after all, citizens that form communities and the individual as such is essentially the core of all mechanisms and means and devices that are adopted for securing progress and advancement. It is the welfare and happiness of the individual citizen which is the object of every sound administrator and statesman. So let us remember that it is the citizen that must count. It is the citizen that forms the base as well as the summit of the social pyramid and his importance, his dignity and his sanctity, should always be remembered (Rao 1967: 62-63).

This type of secularism limited the religion up to the activity of religious worship and stressed upon creating nationalist citizens. The state remains away from every aspect of religious activities. Many members of Constituent Assembly supported this aspect of secularism and wanted to mention this in the Constitution. K.T. Shah demanded the insertion of an Article separating the state from any religious activity and dissented from the inclusion among fundamental right of any provision guaranteeing institutions belonging to any religious community. In this concept of secularism, the state should focus on individual citizen and religion was to be given a narrow space in the public sphere.

There was another view about secularism on the minds of members of Constituent Assembly. As per this opinion, an *'equal-respect'* to all religions was to be provided and religious liberty to be given to all citizens. In a society like India where religion was such an important part of most people's lives, this principle entailed not stay away from all religions equally, but that it respects all religions alike. One of the main proponents of this view, K.M. Munshi, proclaimed that the "non-establishment clause was inappropriate to Indian conditions and we had to evolve a characteristically Indian secularism" he further said: "We are a people with deeply religious moorings. At the same time, we have a living tradition of religious tolerance… In view of this situation, our state could not possibly have a state religion, nor could a rigid line be drawn between the state and the church as in the US" (Jha 2002: 3176). The supporters of this model desired recognition to both right of citizen and right of community and supplemented each other. This '*no-concern'* and *'equal-respect'* positions on secularism was the most contested and constantly debated in the Constituent Assembly and all the deliberations were based on these two particular ideas.

In this way, the Indian Constituent Assembly endorsed the principle of non-establishment of religion without advocating the separation of religion from the politics. This meant that the state was to have no religion of its own, but religion was not also viewed as a personal or private matter: it was placed squarely in the public domain and the state was expected to involve in a variety of ways with religion (Mahajan in Bhargava; 2008: 301-302). According to Chandhok, the concept of secularism that emerged in India had three substantial components. One, that the state would not attach itself to any one religion. Second, all citizens were granted the freedom of religious belief. Thirdly, the state would ensure equality among religious groups by ensuring that one group is not favoured at the expense of another (Chandhok; 1999: 49).

FOUNDATIONS OF INDIAN SECULARISM

The secularist concept of Indian state was greatly influenced by vision and ideologies of Jawaharlal Nehru and Gandhi. Gandhi was in favour of spiritualization of politics. For him, politics should be based on moral values and religion is the best source of morality. According to him, politics separated from religion is meaningless. He said, 'my devotion to Truth has drawn me into the field of politics….those, who say that religion has nothing to do with politics, do not know what religion means' (Gandhi; The Story of My Experiments with Truth; 1929: 591). Even when he argued in favour of a secular state completely separated from religion, he clarified that this was to limit the role of the state to secular welfare and to allow it no admittance into the religious life of the people. (Madan 1987: 752).

For Gandhi religion was the source of absolute value and hence constitutive of social life; politics were the arena of public interest; without the former the latter would be debased. While it was the obligation of the state to ensure that every religion was free to develop according to its own genius, no religion which depended upon state support deserved to survive (Madan: 1987: 752). He believed that 'no Indian who aspires to follow the way of true religion can afford to remain aloof from politics' (Parekh; Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse. New Delhi: Sage, 1989). Gandhi's secularism was based on an idea of non-violent toleration which was important for nation-building and to counter communalism. He said, 'I do not expect India of my dreams to develop one religion that is to be wholly Hindu or wholly Christian or wholly Mussalman, but I want it to by wholly tolerant, with its religions working side by side with one another…. If we want to cultivate a true spirit of democracy, we cannot afford to be intolerant. Intolerance betrays want of faith in one's cause (Gandhi; India of My Dreams).

In his view, in a nation like India with such an enormous religious and cultural diversity, it would not be possible to completely dissociate religion from the politics. In a nutshell, Gandhi's basic approach to secularism was not based on abstract principles and ideals of modern secularism. He developed his concept on the basis of his experiences and complexity of Indian social and cultural structure of that time.

THE NEHRUVIAN CONCEPT OF SECULARISM

Jawaharlal Nehru was the main architect of modern India and Indian secularism. Nehru chose to construct an India identity by promoting secular nationalism and democratic policies. Nehru believed in institutional mode of changing social behaviour. The democratic and secular state would be the best mean for creating social change through various institutions. According to Nehru

religion creates hindrance in bringing change and progress in the society. He was inspired by Western and Marxian political thoughts. He considered that industrialization would weaken the influence of the religion on individual life. Nehru considered that Indian society and its cultural and religious customs could be refined through industrialization and education of its citizens and that would also change the mind-set of society. He argued that, quoting from a 1931 speech, "the real thing to my mind is the economic factor. If we lay stress on this and divert public attention to it we shall find automatically that religious differences recede into the background and a common bond unites different groups. The economic bond is stronger than the national one" (Madan 1987: 755). Nehru insisted that his conclusions were not speculative but based on practical experience. He wrote that once the national state came into being it would be economic problems that would acquire salience; there might be "class conflicts" but not "religious conflicts, except insofar as religion itself expressed some vested interest" (Madan 1987: 755-56).

In his view to it was very difficult to make India a secular state due to its religious society. He said: "We talk about a secular state in India. It is perhaps not very easy even to find a good word in Hindi for 'secular.' Some people think it means something opposed to religion. That obviously is not correct.... It is a state which honours all faiths equally and gives them equal opportunities" (Gopal 1980: 330). He further said, "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" (Madan 1987: 756).

The most important aspect of Nehru's vision of secularism was at the level of policy. Nehru specifically used the contextual concept of secularism to deal with specific issues at the level of policy. He was aware of the negative effect of majoritarianism nationalism and feeling of insecurity among minority communities at the time of independence. According to Nehru:

The communalism of the majority is far more dangerous than the communalism of minority because it wears the garb of nationalism. We have thus communalism ingrained in us and it comes out quite quickly at the slightest provocation and even decent people begin to behave like barbarians when this communalism is aroused in them (Noorani 2003: 316).

Nehru tried two very different kinds of policy treatment for the majority and minority communities. After the separation trauma, common Muslims needed some sort of encouragement from the State to deal with socio-economic and cultural problems. Therefore, the laws and public policy were formed in such a way that only the Hindu society could be reformed through the intervention of State, while minorities, especially Muslims, should be given some contextual concessions (for example, in the case of Personal laws). The vision behind this selective treatment was not only to reform majority community social problems, such as caste and untouchability, but also it would entrust feeling of security in minority communities. However, it did not mean to that minority communities were excluded from the scope of State-initiated social reforms but the provision was included in the Directive Principles of the state policies and at the proper time the state would take the initiative in this direction.

So Nehruvian secularism has four basis: First secularism meant, separation of religion from political, economic, social and cultural aspects of life, religion being treated as a purely personal matter; second, dissociation of the state from religion; third, full freedom to all religions and tolerance of all religions; and four, equal opportunities for followers of all religions, and no discrimination and partiality on grounds of religion (Chandra 1994:63).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF INDIAN SECULARISM

The uniqueness of the Indian conception of secularism has been discussed extensively in recent times. Before mentioning the distinct characteristics of Indian secularism let first elaborates the theoretical and conceptual framework of secularism. What secularism is all about? Secularism, as generally accepted, is the separation of religion from the policy and practice of the state. It is a normative concept in which there is no scope for inter-religious or intra-religious domination. It promotes freedom and equality between, as well as within, religions.

A secular state is one in which religion has been disestablished i.e. separation of the state not merely from one religion but from all religions. It is also not anti-religious. It provides equal protection for believer and non-believers of religion. All secular states are neither theocratic nor do they have an established religion. According to D.E. Smith, a secular state has three distinct features which relate the state, religion and the individual.

i. The first is the relation between individuals and their religion (freedom of religion) from which the state is excluded.

ii. The second is the relation between individuals and the state (citizenship) from which religion is excluded.

iii. Lastly, the relation between the state and different religions (separation of state and religion) in which they perform as independent actors in their respective domains. In this sense secularism means the strict separation of religion and the state for the sake of the religious liberty and equal citizenship of individuals (Smith 1963: 4).

Freedom of religion means that the individual has the freedom to embrace, follow, practice and worship any religion and state will not interfere or force him to profess a particular religion. However, the state can regulate the particular practices of a religion in the interest of public health, safety or moral. The citizens of a secular state are not differentiated on the basis of their religion. All citizens have the same rights and duties irrespective of their religious affiliation. So in a matter of citizenship, all individuals enjoy equal participation in the public domain and there is no discrimination on the grounds of their religion. No policy of the state can be based on exclusively a particular religion. The basic idea of secularism is the separation of religion and the state. Both, the state and religion have different domains in the life of an individual and each of them has their own objectives

and values. Under the principle of separation, both religion and the state have autonomy to perform their functions without interfering with each other. There will be mutual exclusion between them: the state will not intervene in the matters of religion and, in the same manner; religion will not interfere in the affairs of the state. Each will have a separate sphere of its own with independent jurisdiction. So the concept behind secularism is the separation of religion and the state for the sake of civic peace, religious liberty, and equality of free citizenship.

INDIAN MODEL OF SECULARISM

Rajeev Bhargava (2010) argues that Indian secularism is a complex and multi-value doctrine. It rules out theocracy and the establishment of religion. Indian model of secularism is quite different from the Western model of secularism. As aforesaid, India is a very religious country and religion has its intrusion in every aspect of life. Indian model of secularism is greatly influenced by the relationship between two major religions, Hinduism and Islam over the centuries. After independence, Indian state did not embrace any religion as its state religion.

In Indian constitution principles of non-establishment is followed by various Articles. These principles make Indian secularism closer to the Western model. Its Constitution provides religious freedom to its citizens. Under Article 25(1), 'all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practice and propagate religion. Under Article 27, 'no person is compelled to pay any taxes, the proceeds of which are specifically appropriated in payment of expenses for the promotion or maintenance of any particular religion or religious denomination.' Under Article 28(1), 'no religious instruction is to be provided in any educational institution wholly maintained out of state funds.' And under Article 28(3), 'no person attending any educational institution … shall be required to take part in any religious instruction or to attend any religious worship that may be conducted in such institution.'

The Indian Constitution also provides equality of citizenship through its various Articles. Article 15(1) states that the state shall not discriminate against any citizen on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth, or any of them. Article 16(1) & (2) provide an equal opportunity for all its citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment in any office under the state and no citizen, on grounds of religion or race will be eligible for or discriminate against in respect of any employment or office under the state. Article 29(2) states that no citizen shall be denied admission into any educational institution maintained by the state on grounds only of religion, race, etc. These articles of the Constitution make Indian model of secularism a replica of the Western model. It completely separates religion and state from their domains. Articles 15, 16 25, 29(2) support the idea of disestablishment while Article 27 and 28(1) keep strict separation.

But there are some Articles which deviate Indian secularism from Western model. Article 30(1) provides the rights to religious minorities which is a community based right. Article 30(2) commits the state to give aid to educational institutions established and administered by religious communities and permitted religious instructions in these institutions. These are significant departures from the 'wall of separation' view of the secularism state. Some Articles also require the state to interfere in religious affairs of different communities. Article 25(2)(b) states that 'nothing in Article 25(1) prevents the state from making a law providing for social welfare and reform or the throwing open of Hindu religious institutions of public character to all classes and sections of Hindus.' Article 17 directly interferes in Hindu religious affairs by abolishing untouchability and making it a punishable offence (ibid. 84).

These characteristics of the Indian secularism deviates it from the Western model in two ways. First, it enables the state to interfere in religious affairs and second, by intervening in the affairs of one religion which is against the norm of equidistance of state from all religions and non-preferential treatment. In this way, some Articles of the Indian Constitution supports individualistic interpretation and others community specific. Some support the complete separation between state and religion while some interfere in religious matters. This unique characteristic is due to its cultural and social background. Bhargava mentioned four features of Indian socio-cultural tradition which are responsible for such deviation of its secularism. First, India has profound religious diversity which results in both cooperation and conflicts between different religions. Second, in India, there is more emphasis on the practice of religion than belief. Third, there are many oppressive practices present in different religions which result in intra-religious dominance. Finally, the main religion of India does not have an organised institution like the Church. For these reasons, an independent institution is required which has the enormous collective power to curb intra-religious domination and to remove disparity presents among members of the religious community (ibid. 85). The role of the state becomes very important in such context to remove hierarchical and communal conceptions present in the society to transform these religious practices. For this reason, it becomes the duty of the state to intervene and reform oppressive practices of the religion. The Indian state thus devises a unique solution by providing religious liberty to individuals and necessary intervention in religious affairs for an egalitarian society.

IS THE MODEL OF SECULARISM ADOPTED BY INDIA IN A REAL SENSE A SECULAR MODEL?

Indian secularism is a distinctive concept of secularism which provides an alternative in a religious and diverse society like India. Bhargava elaborates its three unique features which differentiate it from the Western model these are, *principled distance, community-specific rights and contextual secularism*. He elaborates these in a systematic manner and tries to prove that India in a real sense is a secular state. He argues that the idea of principled distance based on the premise in which a state is secular by institutionally separated from religion but 'must engage with religion at the level of law and social policy' and this 'engagement must be governed by principles of a secular state'. The state can interfere more or less in different religions depending upon the

historical and social condition of these religions. If there found any social evils and intra-religious discriminations such as caste hierarchies in Hinduism than the state have the right to interfere to eliminate such discrepancies. This interference must be guided by non-sectarian motives. So he argues that for eradicating oppressive customs of a religion if a state interferes more in one religion than other it does not depart from secularism. Unlike Western model which imposes 'active hostility or benign indifference', in Indian secularism 'respect of religions is entirely consistent with the identification of local faults within them. The second characteristic which deviate Indian secularism from the normative Western model is community-specific rights. But in Indian social context, it was necessary for our leaders to provide specific minority rights to install confidence in minority communities particularly Muslims minority. The Constituent Assembly provided community-specific *cultural rights* to minority communities instead of *political rights*. These cultural rights were provided so that minority communities can become able to resist assimilation and proper recognition to be granted to them. Bhargava argues that secularism is a multi-value concept and there should be reconciliation and harmonization among its various values. In contextual secularism, the form and content of secularism vary from context to context and from place to place and also have contextual moral reasoning (ibid. 94). It recognizes the difference between individual rights and group rights, between equality and liberty and finds a solution based on the circumstances that prevail on particular time and place. Secularism in India is not a mechanical concept based on the water-tight compartment of values it is an amalgam of various values originated by deliberations in the constituent assembly. It tries to bring together seemingly incompatible values such as individual rights and group-specific rights which provide strength to Indian democracy. Bhargava argues that ' the Indianness of Indian secularism is derived entirely from its strong link with home-grown traditions and that therefore India had worked out its own conception of secularism that is neither Christian nor Western' (ibid. 102).

'*SARVA DHARMA SAMBHAVA*' CONCEPT OF INDIAN SECULARISM

Many scholars argue that Indian secularism is based on the ideal of '*Sarva Dharma Sambhava*' which means religious coexistence, inter-religious tolerance and equal respect of all religions. These ideals are important ingredients of secularism but they do not cover entire concept of secularism. The main idea of toleration is to refrain from intervening into other religious affairs even if one finds it not conducive i.e. to tolerate customs and beliefs of other religions. This type of toleration can be possible in a state which has a dominant religious majority which may not respect other religion on equal terms. 'Respecting other religions as equals does not entail their blind acceptance or endorsement…..the idea of equal respect for all religions is closely linked with the proposal for an inter-faith dialogue' (ibid. 103). Indian secularism respects all religions and also allows the state to intervene in religious affairs to transform religion for eradicating caste and gender-related injustices. Indian secularism has qualities of both, Western model of secularism and traditional inter-religious tolerance. To compare it only with Western model and to judge its reliability on that basis is erroneous. As aforementioned India has a public presence of its religions and the Constitution has accorded due recognition to its religious communities and granted various cultural rights to them. But by rejecting the separate electorates for religious communities, Indian Constitution showed that there is a need of separation between religion and politics on the particular context which could increase communal differences and sectarianism. So the Indian secularism endorses such values which suited its cultural heritage

According to Chandhok (1999) secularism was adopted in India due to three reasons: first to manage irreconcilable differences between religious groups. The historical situation present at the time of independence favours secularism as a vision to curb divisive and the sectarian environment exists between different communities. Indian secularism was designed to regulate bitter religious conflicts and to assure minority communities that their specific religious rights would remain safe in a newly formed state. Secularism was a modern concept and which aligned to equally modern concepts of equality and freedom, this became the second reason to endorse secularism in India. The third factor responsible for adopting secularism was its alignment with state legitimacy as did not discriminate between religions and committed to equality among them. 'The dominant themes of secularism – freedom of religious belief and conscience, equality of all religions, and equidistance of the state from all religion – were backed up by special provision for minority rights' (ibid. 56).

CONCLUSION

The main question before makers of India was how to premise the idea of the nation-state on the basis of the multicultural social base. Unlike the West where the formation of the nation-state was led by the process of the steady decline of Roman Catholic Church, the critical understanding of Indian historical resources and enduring social plurality foregrounded the necessity of a nation state truly reflecting its constitutive plurality. The empirical social reality was conceded simultaneously with the need of transcending it to form a cohesive structure and idea of a nation.

The idea of secularism appears to be borrowed from the Western idea but in reality, this seeming resemblance cannot deny the distinctiveness of Indian secularism. The underlying theme of Indian secularism is to provide democratic foundations to its multicultural society. Moreover, it also attaches a great significance to the idea of social justice ensuring of their diverse social locations. Such model of secularism is an essential ingredient of the multicultural political system of India.

It would be entirely mistaken to conclude from this that secular states are sufficient for building inclusive societies. Secular states are part of a wider institutional matrix and a larger public and political culture. They work well only in appropriate public, political, social, and institutional settings. For example, no secular state can work without a properly functioning regime of rights. More generally, they work only with an appropriate legal culture, on that is free from impunity. They also require a democratic culture with space for dialogue, discussion, criticism, as well as accommodation. Without these background conditions, a secular state cannot work well.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, G. (1999), *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Bajpai, Rochana. (2000, May 27), 'Constituent Assembly Debates and Minority Rights', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35(21/22), 1837-45.
3. --(2002), 'Minority Rights in the Indian Constituent Assembly Debates, 1946-1949, *QEH Working Paper Series no. 30*, June 2002, Oxford.
4. Bhargava, R. (ed) (2008), *Politics and Ethics of the Indian Constitution,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
5. --(2010). *The Promise of India's Secular Democracy.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
6. Bhargava, R. and Helmut Reifeld (eds) (2005), *Civil Society, Public Sphere and Citizenship: Dialogues and Perceptions*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
7. Bhargava, R., Bagchi, A and Sudarshan, R. (eds) (1999), *Multiculturalism, Liberalism and Democracy,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
8. Chandhok, N. (1999). *Beyond Secularism: The Rights of Religious Minorities.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
9. --(2002). *Individual and Group Rights: A View from India* in Zoya Hasan, E. Sridharan, R. Sudarshan (eds). *India's Living Constitution: Ideas, Practices, Controversies, (pp 207-241).* Delhi: Permanent Black.
10. Chandra, Bipin (1994), *Ideology and Politics in Modern India,* New Delhi: Har Anand Publication
11. Chaterjee, P. (1993), *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Post-Colonial Histories.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
12. --(1997), *A Possible India: Essays in Political Criticism.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
13. Cossman, Brenda, and Ratna Kapur (1997), "Secularism's Last Sigh?: The Hindu Right, the Courts, and India's Struggle for Democracy." *Harvard International Law Journal* 38.1, Winter, 1997: 113-170.
14. Das, Veena (ed) (1990), *Mirrors of Violence: Communities, Riots and Survivors in South Asia,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
15. Gopal, S (1980), *The Mind of Jawaharlal Nehru,* Madras: Sangam Books.
16. Government of India (1947), Parliamentary Debates, XV, Part 2, New Delhi: GOI
17. Government of India (1948), Constituent Assembly Debates, VII, New Delhi: GOI
18. Government of India (1950), Constituent Assembly (Legislative) Debates, II,III, Part 2, New Delhi: GOI
19. Government of India (1954), Lok Sabha Debates, Vol. V (2), 7253-54, New Delhi: GOI
20. Hasan, Mushirul (1993), *Legacy of a Divided Nation: India's Muslims since Independence.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
21. Hasan, Zoya, Sridharan E., Sudarshan R. (eds) (2002), *India's Living Constitution: Ideas, Practices and Controversies,* Delhi: Permanent Black.
22. Jha, Shefali. 2002. „Secularism in the Constituent Assembly Debates, 1946-1950‟, EPW (Vol. 37: No. 30).
23. Karna, M.N. (ed) (2006), *Democracy, Pluralism and Conflict,* Delhi: Rawat Publications.
24. Madan, T.N. (1987), 'Secularism in its Place', *The Journal of Asian Studies,* Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 747-59.
25. Mahajan, Gurpreet (2013), *India: Political Ideas and the Making of a Democratic Discourse,* London: Zed Books.
26. Nandy, Ashis (1994), *The Illegitimacy of Nationalism: Rabindranath Tagore and the Politics of Self*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
27. --(et al) (1995), *Creating a Nationality: The Ramjanmbhumi Movement and Fear of the Self (ed),* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
28. --(1998), "*The Politics of Secularism and the Recovery of Religious Tolerance*" in *Secularism and its Critics, (*ed) Rajeev Bhargava, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 321-344.
29. --(2003), *"An Anti-Secularist Manifesto",* in *The Romance of the State and the Fate of Dissent in the Tropic,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 34-60.
30. Needham, A.D. and R.S. Rajan (eds) (2007), *The Crisis of Secularism in India*, Ranikhet: Permanent Black.
31. Noorani, A G. (2003), *The Muslims of India: A Documentary Record, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.*
32. Parekh, Bhikhu (1989), *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse,* New Delhi: Sage.
33. --(2015), *Debating India: Essays on India Political Discourse,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
34. Sen, A. (1998), *Secularism and its Discontents* in Rajeev Bhargava (ed) *Secularism and its Critics,* (pp. 454-485). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
35. Sen, Ronojoy (2010), *Articles of Faith: Religion, Secularism, and the Indian Supreme Court,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
36. Smith, D.E. (1963), *India as a Secular State,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
37. Shiva Rao, B. (ed) (1967), *The Framing of the Constitution: A Study (vol. 2).* New Delhi: IIPA.