The Metaphysics of Diversity and Authenticity: A Comparative Reading of Taylor and Gandhi on Holistic Identity

Author: Joshy P. Varghese

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:104265

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2013

Boston College

Graduate School of Arts and Science

Department of Philosophy

THE METAPHYSICS OF DIVERSITY AND AUTHENTICITY:

A COMPARATIVE READING OF TAYLOR AND GANDHI ON HOLISTIC IDENTITY

a dissertation

by

JOSHY P. VARGHESE

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

April, 2013

ABSTRACT

THE METAPHYSICS OF DIVERSITY AND AUTHENTICITY:
A COMPARATIVE READING OF TAYLOR AND GANDHI ON HOLISTIC IDENTITY

By Joshy P. Varghese
Director: Prof. Jeffrey Bloechl

The human self and society in general have always been in transition and transformation. Our senses of ourselves and of our society are in dialectical relation with our sense of whether or to what degree we feel part of important dimensions such as religion and politics, which are both an expression of our identity and factors that may sometimes change our identity. In modern western society it seems that identity has shifted from what Charles Taylor calls "embeddedness" in religion to a mode of life where religion is, to a great extent, expected to be a personal matter and even a personal choice. This is not impossible to understand, and historical work shows us that there are important continuities between the modern reason that rejects religion and the religion that it rejects. In this complicated process there is no mistaking the emergence of a democratic politics that rests to a significant degree on the rational project of modernity. We might even say that the success of that politics is one of the most important signs of the success of modern reason. In any case, we see in the west the development of a political system that has made society increasingly secular and religion increasingly private.

This is not the case everywhere in the world. In may other places outside the "west" religion and its expressions are more public and individuals consider religion as a significant factor in defining their self-identity. In these places, many people are found expressing and promoting an identity that they consider meaningful in a world that is not fundamentally defined—or only defined—by the sort of secular political system that restricts religious beliefs and practices to the private domain. In these places, there is somewhat less difficulty with the sort of dilemma that we find in many liberal secular parts of the modern west, where

even public expressions of religious beliefs are protested or challenged even though the right to such expressions are constitutionally guaranteed for all citizens.

The dialectics of religion and politics and their importance in defining human self-identity is the central domain for my research, though I need many detours into other cultural factors in order to substantiate my claims. Bouncing back and forth between western and eastern religious, philosophical, and political perspectives, I finally found some points of contacts in Charles Taylor and Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. They became my focus of this research. Still, I felt it necessary to offer a preliminary account of secularism, as our present context, in order to set the background of my exploration of the works and, in some important respects, the lives of Taylor and Gandhi. Hence, my first chapter is an overview of the sources of secularism in the West and in India. The second chapter deals with the Taylorian understanding of diversity, authenticity, and holistic identity. My third chapter is on Gandhi's understanding of diversity, authenticity, and holistic identity. My fourth and final chapter brings to light my own sense of our prospects for an integral understanding of religion, politics, and self-identity within the contexts of post-religious, post-secular, and post-metaphysical thinking.

While claims for secular humanism and secular politics have always been somewhat convincing to me, I was not sure why religion should be necessarily so 'problematic' for such a program. In fact, the pathologies of both reason and religion have become more explicit to us today. Secularism seems to repeat the exclusivism of the anti-secular stance of some religions by becoming anti-religious itself. Indeed, among secularists and even atheists there is a general trend to consider religions as intrinsically "anti-humanistic" in nature. It is true that secular humanism has sometimes helped religions to explore how deeply "humanistic" they are at heart, in their revelations and traditions. So perhaps, it is possible to have comprehensive frames and theories of humanism and secularism from within the boundaries of religions themselves without negating or diminishing either the spiritual or the secular. A dialogue between Taylor and Gandhi can be useful for us today especially

as pointers toward such a humanistic approach to self, religion and politics. This dialogue between these western and the eastern thinkers can enlarge, enrich, and enlighten each other. What we then see, on the one hand, is the limit of a purely secular politics that is lacking a proper metaphysical foundation to guarantee the religious needs of humanity; and on the other hand, we also see the hesitation and struggle of religions to accommodate the demands of secularism. In both cases, we have reason to hope for a new 'metaphysics of diversity and authenticity' which in turn might validate a role for religion, and perhaps also the ethical principles that it yields. Still, this is an incomplete and inconclusive dialectic and in that sense only a contribution to ongoing debate. I thank for your attention to my narrative and my proposals. Let me conclude now, so that I can listen to your stories, because you too help me to define myself.

Dedicated to

My Parents and

Rev. Thomas A. DiLorenzo

Agape and Ahimsa to whom I am indebted for my pursuit of life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THE METAPHYSICS OF DIVERSITY AND AUTHENTICITY: A COMPARATIVE READING OF TAYLOR AND GANDHI ON HOLISTIC IDENTITY

DIVERSITY-AUTHENTICITY-HOLISTIC IDENTITY: A TAYLORIAN PERSPECTIVE

General Overview

Introduction

2.1. The Concept of Self According to Charles Taylor

2.1.1. Dimensions of Human Self:

2.1.1.1. Self as 'Human' Agent

2.1.1.2. The Concept of a Person

2.1.2. Self as an Embodied, Embedded and Engaged Agent

DIVERSITY-AUTHENTICITY-HOLISTIC IDENTITY: A GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

3.1. Human Self: A Gandhian Understanding

3.2. An 'Alternative' Vision of Freedom and the Nation State: Gandhi's Rootedness in Tradition and his Engagement with Modernity

CHAPTER: 4

CONVERGENCES AND DIFFERENCES OF TAYLOR AND GANDHI: *AGAPIC* (UNCONDITIONAL LOVE) AND *AHIMSIC* (NONVIOLENT) EPOCHS FOR THE PURSUIT OF *SATYA* (TRUTH)

Introduction

ABBREVIATIONS

Taylor's Original Works

SS: Sources of the Self

MM: The Malaises of Modernity

PA: Philosophical Arguments

PHS: Philosophy and Human Sciences

PP-1   Philosophical Papers 1

PP-2   Philosophical Papers 2

EA: Embodied Agency

SA: A Secular Age

BP: Before Present

MT: Moral Topography

RFS: Religion in a Free Society

CM: Catholic Modernity

PG: Plurality of Goods

DC: Dilemmas and Connections

CWS: Closed World Structures

ID: Intellectual Deviation

RMN: Reform Master Narrative

HL   Hegel

Gandhi's Original Works

MET: My Experiments with Truth: An Autobiography

ET: Ethical Religion

HD: *Hindu Dharma*

HS: *Hind Swaraj*

GAG: *Gita* According to Gandhi

SSA: *Satyagraha* in South Africa

AGH: A Guide to Health

KH: Key to Health

CP: Constructive Programme

CWMG: Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi

YI: Young India

HN: Harijan

THE METAPHYSICS OF DIVERSITY AND AUTHENTICITY: A COMPARATIVE READING OF TAYLOR AND GANDHI ON HOLISTIC IDENTITY

General Introduction

The human self and society in general have always been in transition and transformation. The participation or non-participation of the self in important spheres such as religion and politics necessarily influences our definition or redefinition of human self-identity. Arguably, modern western societies have redefined their identity in a way such that religion is, to a great extent, expected to be a personal matter, or in more political terms, a private matter. There are genuine reasons for such a transition, since the rational discourse of modern thinkers seems to find more common grounds than to do religious doctrines and dogmas among themselves, or with other modes of modern life. Undoubtedly the democratic form of political governance has demonstrated significant success by endorsing the modern rational pursuit of universal grounds, with religion increasingly left out. Hence, at least in the western part of the world, political systems have gained some momentum in making society more politically secular and religiously private. However, scenario is quite different elsewhere, in places where religion and its expressions are more public and individuals still consider religion a significant factor in defining their self-identity even as it is expressed publically. In the west it is often forgotten that a great many people around the world remain unconvinced that self-identity can be defined solely according to the principles of a secular political system that relegates practice of faith to private life. In the meantime, we see in many liberal secular parts of the modern west a strange dilemma where public expressions of religious practices are protested and debated even though such expressions are constitutionally guaranteed for all citizens.

The dialectics of religion and politics and their importance in defining human self-identity is the central domain for my research, though I need many detours into other cultural factors in order to substantiate my claims. Hailing from India and living amidst people of different religious faiths, personally I never felt 'believing' to

be in any way deeply problematic until I happened to live in the western world. This put some pressure on me to reflect on my own believes. Bouncing back and forth between western and eastern religious, philosophical, and political perspectives, I finally found some points of contacts in Charles Taylor and Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. They became my focus of this research. Still, I felt it necessary to offer a preliminary account of secularism, as our present context, in order to set the background of my exploration of the works and, in some important respects, the lives of Taylor and Gandhi. Hence, my first chapter is an overview of the sources of secularism in the West and in India. The second chapter deals with the Taylorian understanding of diversity, authenticity, and holistic identity. My third chapter is on Gandhi's understanding of diversity, authenticity, and holistic identity. My fourth and final chapter brings to light my own sense of our prospects for an integral understanding of religion, politics, and self-identity within the contexts of post-religious, post-secular, and post-metaphysical thinking.

While I have long been optimistic about the prospects for secularism and secular politics to face real problems in our world, I was for a long time unclear about why religion should be 'problematic' there. This work attempts to find its way through that idea, but without ignoring the pathologies of both reason and faith. In some respects, it can be considered a dialogue between the western and the eastern understanding of secular politics, religion, and modern self-identity, as they face the questions of our time. It is urgent that we participate in that effort.

CHAPTER 1:

RETRIEVING THE ROOTS OF SECULARISM IN THE WEST AND IN INDIA: A HISTORICAL BACKGROUND FOR THE UNDERSTANDING OF MODERN SELF-IDENTITY

"I can say without the slightest hesitation, yet in all humility, that those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means." (M.K.Gandhi, MET 420).

"The shift to secularity in this sense consists, among other things, of a move from a society where belief in God is   unchallenged and indeed, unproblematic, to one in which it is understood to be one option among others, and frequently not the easiest to embrace." (Charles Taylor, SA 3).

0.0. Introductory Concerns

The 'Human self' is the focus of analysis and primary concern of this thesis. 'Self' in the 'secular age'[1] stands in the middle of two other realities: religion and state (politics). In reality, both operate in and through the self. There can be mainly three ways in which these factors can inter-act each other: self and religion; self and state, and religion and state. The former two interactions are not as 'problematic' as the latter one, namely, state and religion. An analysis of the dynamism of these factors makes one understand that the essential factor here is 'self' (person or individual). In the monotheistic religious contexts religion and state could work hand in hand for many centuries. As society became more and more 'pluralistic,'[2] it had to re-define the relationship between 'religion and religion.' Countries with high democratic dreams and ideals thought out the possibilities of incorporating diverse faiths, nationalities and cultures into a state. It seems that this kind of integration is not amenable to the dogmas of religions since most of them unchangeable and in that sense unarguable. Rampant immigrations, expansion of communication media, development of travel facilities, and so forth have made societies much more diverse and plural, indeed around the world. Hence the quest for a 'secular state' and a 'secular identity' has been points of discussion, mainly in the political and philosophical circles. This ongoing

---

[1] "Secular Age" is the modern age, present time, where this human self tries to be more and more 'independent' and self-reflective and self-affirming. It can be understood as against the medieval period where mostly people framed their understanding of themselves in tune with their religious faith and commitment. The modern self is much more 'secular' compared to apparently more 'spiritually orientated' self of the ancient and medieval times.

[2] Pluralism here would mean the diversities of religious faiths, nationalities, and social and cultural differences.

discussion argues a cross-cultural importance since I bring the North Atlantic and Indian contexts into dialogue concerning those aspects in the progression of my research.

If 'self' is in the 'center' (that which is situated in the middle) of both religion and state, what must be the center of the self in a secular age? In a diverse and pluralistic society how can a self be authentic? Is it enough that the self be just concerned about its commitment to a particular 'state'? Or does it commit itself to its 'religious' commitment, too, or to anything other than the state?[3] These questions are essential for my investigation. Still my primary focus is on 'self' and its possible 'authenticity' in the 'middle ground' of the other two unavoidable factors: Religion and state. Initially I begin with some thoughts about the emergence of the idea of 'secularism' and 'secular state,' together with the new 'civil society' and 'secular self.'

0.1. Pluralism, Civil Society, and Secular Public Spheres

The condition of the identity of self in any modern state and civil society has been subject to change and challenge in the face of a growing tendency toward pluralism in almost every facet of life. While the state operates by the agency of government, civil society can operate *extra-politically*- as a whole outside the ambit of the state.[4] To a certain extent, the features of the state can also be comprehended and explained analyzing civil society. This is a modern conception, as distinct from that of classical civilizations. At present, the most important feature of the modern West lies in the fact that the forms of civil society are *purely secular*. Moreover, the scope of '*secular'* is no longer continuous with earlier meanings. Two major forms of civil society that have become very influential in forming the Western liberal (freedom oriented) society are the 'public sphere' and the 'market economy.' For Charles Taylor, the 'public sphere' is a 'common space' where the members of the society meet and discuss the matters of common interest, and thus 'form a *common mind*

---

[3] There are people who explain themselves as agnostics, atheists, and communists whose commitments are not in any way religious in nature, but are nonetheless truly committed.

[4] Charles Taylor, *Philosophical Arguments* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 259. (Hereafter: PA, will be provided within the body of the text)

about matters of shared concern.'(PA 259). For him, the public sphere is a central feature of modern society. The public sphere of any organized society has to have room for diverse religions, languages, cultures and practices. This gives rise to a demand and indeed a desire for a '*secular* public sphere.' Secularism as a political model emerged first in Europe, where in the meantime, arguably, it has shifted or evolved toward something else. At the same time, there is growing attraction to 'secularism' as a political model, especially in the US and other non-secular areas of the world.

There are variant understanding and associations of the terms 'secular' and 'secularism' which need to be addressed for our clarification. At this point, without proceeding any further, it may be helpful to attend to some terminological clarifications, which in turn may yield something of a theoretical perspective from which to proceed. To begin with, the concept of secularism must be considered and analyzed within a cluster of related terms, including secularism and modernity, secularism and secularization, and self-identity and secular modernity. Some of this propaedeutic work can be undertaken simply as a clarification of terms, before turning to a context that gives rise to a distinctive understanding of what is, after all, a global phenomenon. In addition to these, secularization must be related to, and perhaps distinguished from materialism. All these clarifications are eventually more relevant to situate my arguments for an Indian version of secularism. Finding some help from the 'Indian Materialist' school (*Cārvāka*), I proceed to open the way to some clarification of certain aspects of Indian secularism in the later part of the chapter (1.2), whereupon I will have come to the proper moment in which to develop an account of self-identity and secular modernity in view of articulating a major emphasis of my research. In short, all of this preparatory work will situate an emerging modernity and secularism in the west and particularly in India. This sheds important light on the emergence of a self-identity

in India that is, in that context, increasingly *modern and secular*.[5] Firstly, secularism and secularization are to be understood as related and as distinct.

0.2. Secularization as a Process, Secularism as an ideology, and Privatization of Religion

It is important to distinguish between secularization and secularism. The process of 'secularization' is and has been a phenomenon around the world. It is also part of the process of modernization. Here, the *anti-religious* or *privatization of religions* thesis of secularism is relatively unimportant. The "deprivatization of religion" is well documented and explained by Jose Casanova. He argues that religion's influence in the public sphere and in the realm of politics is in fact growing in the modern world. He describes the *religious resurgence* as follows: "[…] the public resurgence of Islam has been one of the main developments thrusting religion back into public view."[6]Casanova thus places the religious in the Christian world delicately. In his view, globalization is one of the chief factors in contributing to the deprivatization of religions. In this global context, religions will tend to assume public roles.[7]

The process of secularization that affected the modern west has been a major focus of Charles Taylor. He succeeded in bringing to light some of those important historical instances into the forefront, viz., reformation, renaissance, enlightenment, romanticism, globalization, science, and industrialization. Hence, the process of *privatizing* religion was a gradual process in the West. In India, such a progression of events is not immediately evident, though one can presume some indirect influence of its presence in the west. The process of

---

[5] The ongoing debate over on the concept and ideology of 'secularism' has been inconclusive and divisive. I am well aware of it. My purpose of this narration is to create a background for the explication of the "holistic" self-identity which I propose as a model for our modern times, and for which Gandhi and Taylor can be leading figures.

[6] Jose Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 10. Elsewhere, in his article, "After Secularization" in *The Hedgehog Review*, Vol. 8. Nos. 1-2 (Spring/Summer 2006), 7-22, Casanova places into question the empirical as well as the normative validity of the privatization thesis. Another account of similar concerns can be seen in the book *Rethinking Secularization: A Global Comparative Perspective*, eds., Peter Beyer and Lori Beaman (Boston: Brill, 2007), 101-120. See also his, "The Secular, Secularization, and Secularisms" in *Rethinking Secularism* eds. Craig Calhoun and co.(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 54-75.

[7] Casanova, *Public Religions*, 225.

secularization has not privatized religions in India as it has in the Modern west. Rather, many Indian scholars[8] associate it with as something closely related to the ideas of westernization by which the style of life becomes more materialistic and specifically in that sense secularist. Hence, in India secularization has only a limited relationship with the 'privatization' of religion. The fact is that Indians are still highly religious in nature. Here one must consider the distinctiveness of the 'secular' nature of Indian politics, where the concern is not deprivatization of religions but instead indifference, and especially for the purpose of political equality. In short, the question of public and private expression of religion is not an in issue in India. Rather it is the complex matter of equal inclusion of all the religions that has become the distinctive concern of Indian politics. Furthermore, while the process of secularization eventually led the modern west toward affirming an ideology of secularism, in India, on the other hand, the ideology of secularism was actually incorporated into the constitution with a view to respecting and recognizing all the religions in their expression and practice. Now it is useful to understand how secularism and modernity are intertwined.

0.3. Secularism[9] and Modernity

The emergence of the 'modern self'[10] and of secularism are intertwined. The history of 'capitalist modernity in the West' is the context and condition of the development of secularism in the Euro-American world,[11] for this has been the primary force by which religion has been driven into *private realms*. As C. Wright stated:

> Once the world was filled with the sacred-in thought, practice, and institutional form. After the Reformation and the Renaissance, the forces of modernization swept across the globe and secularization, a corollary historical process, loosened the dominance of the sacred. In due course, the sacred shall disappear altogether except, perhaps, in the private realm.**[12]**

---

[8] Ashis Nandy and Partha Chatterjee are examples of such authors.

[9] Jose Casanova understands secularism as an ideology or worldview. He also agrees that modern secularism comes in *multiple historical forms* (in *Rethinking Secularism,* 55)

[10] I argue that the 'modern self' is a byproduct of modernity. The relationship between modernity and secularism has influenced the making of modern secular identity.

[11] Anuradha Dingwaney Needham and Rejeswari Sunder Rajan, eds., *The Crisis of Secularism in India* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007), 3. (Henceforth: Needham and Rajan, *The Crisis of Secularism*).

[12] C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), 32-33.

In the Christian west, this expansion of modernity and secularism evolved in response to the impact of political developments or social life and organization. But in many ways this change is also applicable to non-Christian societies everywhere, in so far as they have become modern. Charles Taylor states,

> Now, in fact there is truth in the claim that secularism has Christian roots, but it is wrong to think that this limits the application of its formulae to post-Christian societies. […] The Christian origins of the idea are undeniable, but this doesn't have to mean that it has no application elsewhere.[13]

Now, as considerable scholarships makes clear, in the North Atlantic, modern secularized self-identity, is in many ways quite different from the pre-modern one. In countries like India, this difference is comparatively mixed and fuzzy, but the emerging, modern form of self-identity does break significantly from that of the past. In India, modern selfhood is formed in a background that is considerably more 'secular' than could be found two or three decades earlier. The modern understanding of the public sphere and private sphere, the modern notion of nation-state, democracy, liberalism, and so forth are not foreign concepts though perhaps they were just a few decades ago.

Even so, scholars like Talal Azad suggest that we question any easy import of 'secularism' into the Indian context, since it does originate in a very different historical, social, and religious context. After all, even in modern secular states such as France, Britain and US, the place of religion varies. "[…] though in France both the highly centralized state and its citizens are secular, in Britain the state is linked to the established Church and its inhabitants are largely nonreligious, and in America the population is largely religious but the federal state is secular."[14] Azad doesn't deny that the Euro-American secularisms have much in common. He is hesitant to ascribe the concept 'mediating' capacity, and is quite circumspect about its possible impact on

---

[13] Charles Taylor, "Modes of Secularism," in Rejeev Bhargava, ed. *Secularism and Its Critics* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 31, 37.

[14] Talal Azad, *Formation of the Secular: Christianity, Islam and Modernity* (California: Stanford University Press, 2003), 5. (Hereafter: Azad, *Formation of the Secular*).

debate. In short, the concept and understanding of 'secularism' itself has too many conflicting and contested aspects in it for it to serve as an organizing principle in sound analysis.

In view of presenting the *conditions of secularity*, I also present the historical instances of India. None of them alone accounts for the secular frame of India, but perhaps all of them together can indicate an *emerging* secularity and modernity on the Indian sub-continent. We might here emphasize Charles Taylor's *third sense* of secularity which does see that "There are alternatives."(SA 3).[15] Secularity in this sense of plurality of alternatives is a matter of the "whole context of understanding in which our moral, spiritual or religious experience and search takes place."[16]

The 'religious' affinity of the Indian people and a conception of their 'self-identity' must be further analyzed and articulated. In defining the self-identity of an Indian person, what are to be our criteria? Are the religions to which they belong decisive among the factors that make up their identity, or only one among many factors? India being the cradle of many religions, such affinity can apparently consist of factors that greatly divide a country, rather than uniting them. In my view, these can and should progress toward defining an Indian self-identity that includes but transcends the plurality of religious affinities which, to be sure, is an imported factor in Indian society. Indeed, to a great degree, my research looks for precisely this definition.

I am not claiming that the impact of modernity on Indian self-identity is quite the same as the impact of that concept on the West (where, in addition, it may have been understood differently). Rather I would argue that it affects them differently, and even distinctively. As Achin Vanaik states,

> [...] modernity affects identities in distinctive ways. In modernity we have considerably more and newer identities, not just of language group, kin, religion, caste or even class, but of belonging to the educated, being consumers, internationalists, nationalists, and so on. Our identities are sharper. The

---

[15] Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 3. (Henceforth: SA and provided within the body of the text).

[16] Azad, *Formation of the Secular*, 5.

sheer advance in the means of communications and the emergence of census-taking provide a sharper sense of difference, between say, Muslims and Hindus, a clearer sense of belonging to a religious minority or majority. Our identities are more flexible and revisable. Our identities compete, clash, repel, overlap and combine in new complex ways.[17]

Religious identities are not cancelled by this process, but they do acquire within themselves an awareness of the emergence of different and newer identities. The decline in the power and influence of religious identity relative to its own past and relative to other identities is a fact in India, just as it is in the more dramatic instances of the West. In India, it can be viewed as the beginning of the rise of a "genuine religious ecumenism that is compatible with a truly democratic life and with real religious equality."[18]

In that case, with regard to India, it is best to think of an *emerging secularism*[19] that attracts ongoing debate of the context and condition in which one must ask about a self that seems to become *more secular* in its perspective and perceptions. The average Indian person has grown tremendously in order to see his identity and individuality as distant from its powerful religious elements. Together with the principle of 'religious tolerance' secularism has given us a new vision of 'pluralism and diversity' that accepts and appreciates differences according to an ideal that is no longer predominantly 'religious.' Hence, generally, a definition of self-identity necessitates a context of secular modernity.

0.4. Self-Identity and Secular Modernity

We have already seen that the Latin root of the word secular which come from *seculum.* The Latin root of our identity is *identitas* (sameness or identity). Analyzing the root would be of great use here to understand secular identity in general and the uniqueness of Indian secular identity in particular. Secularity does not replace a nation's identity, but adds or profiles something new in that identity. This simple comparison of root meanings

---

[17] Achin Vanaik, *The Furies of Indian Communalism: Religion, Modernity and Secularization* (London, NY: Verso, 1997), 104.

[18] Vanaik, *The Furies of Indian Communalism*, 104.

[19] The debate on secularism in India is necessarily ongoing, since the reality of secularism is many respects still 'emerging.' Personally, I support the idea of a 'secularism of India' rather than 'secularism in India.' When I say 'emerging,' it involves an 'already' and 'not-yet' which I think can signal the nature of the concept of secularism itself.

leads us to think that one can speak of a secular identity which is unique to any context. That means a secularity that is indigenous to India is also possible. It must be understood from the historical, philosophical, and political instances of India itself. As is true of western history, there are streams of materialist/secular trends in Indian history that continue to develop or evolve to this day. The modern dimensions of such a trend in India can be specifically the inclusion of the word *secular* into the preamble of the constitution. In this context, it is relevant to see Dr. Radhakrishnan's[20] conception of such an intrinsic reality in order to understand the genealogy and development of our notions of self-identity, modernity and nationality:

> [W]e cannot start *de novo*, as if India had no history[21] and as if people could change their nature merely by taking thought. Possibilities must be grounded in the nature of the actual. Civilizations must live on the lines of their own experience. Like individuals, even nations cannot borrow experience from others. They may furnish us with light, but our own history provides us with the conditions of action. The only revolutions that endure are those that are rooted in the past.[22]

All of this suggests the primary importance of a genealogy of the origin, growth and variant understandings of the term 'Secularism.' Hence, Chapter one of this investigation is focused on bringing out the historical roots and philosophical importance of the concept of secularism in view of contextualizing the self in the modern secular age. The historical, social, cultural, philosophical and mostly religious encounters of 'secularism' and the proponents of the 'secular self' have contributed greatly to the modern emergence of secular civil society and the secular self. Tracing the roots of 'secularism' will permit us to see more about its ongoing and ever growing influence on the self in course over time, especially in the modern secular age.

---

[20] Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan (1888- 1975) was an Indian philosopher and statesman. He was the first Vice President of India (1952–1962) and subsequently the second President of India (1962–1967). One of India's most influential scholars of comparative religion and philosophy, Radhakrishnan is thought of as having built a bridge between the East and the West by showing that the philosophical systems of each tradition are comprehensible within the terms of the other. He was Spalding Professor of Eastern Religion and Ethics at Oxford University (1936–1952).

[21] Radhakrishnan has not specifically intended the history of secularism here. However, according to him anything that emerges in a civilization must originate and live by its own foundations. I think it is also true in the case of secularism.

[22] S. Radhakrishnan, *Religion and Society* (New Delhi: Harper Collins, 1995), 118

By retrieving the genealogy of secularism, I bring forth the use of the term 'secular' and 'secularism' in the west and in India. It is a chronological and historical description, in view of highlighting the philosophical importance of my research. Let me say again why I give a background on 'secularism' in order to work on 'self- identity and authenticity. The "self" of my concern is positioned predominantly in a 'secular age' or 'secular context.' It is quite explicit that the way religions are practiced in these parts of the world has a lot to do with the way they conceive the idea of 'secularism.' Hence a historical retrieval promises to bring our secular currents flowing in, and into, a generally "religious" domain, where they may bring problems or new riches.

1.1. RETRIEVING THE GENEALOGY OF SECULARISM IN THE WEST

It is relevant for my research to highlight some of the important milestones in the intellectual history of the West to demonstrate how those instances of history, directly or indirectly, contributed to the ongoing progression and development of secularism and self-identity for out times. This is not in any means a comprehensive account of this topic, but rather a background for the research I continue to define a holistic identity for modernity that incorporates both the western and eastern aspects.

1.1.1. Ancient trends of 'secular' Thinking

The original seeds of *Secularism*[23] in the West can be traced back to the ancient and medieval periods of the history. A clash of religion and politics (faith and reason) has its beginning when real philosophical thinking began in ancient Greece. Although the name "secularism" is of recent origin, its various doctrines have been taught by free-thinkers of all ages, and, in fact, secularism claimed to be only an extension of free-thought. First among the philosophers like Thales (6[th]C.) and his successors proposed materialistic views of realities as

---

[23] *Secularism* is the concept that morality should be based on the well-being of man in the present life, without regard to religious belief or a 'hereafter' which was first recorded in 1846 by George Jacob Holyoake. It also will emphasize that government or other entities should exist separately from religion and/or religious beliefs.

against the predominantly religious concerns of Homer and Hesiod. Skeptic thinkers, who were also known as 'sophists,' were proponents of 'arguments for argument's sake.' This line of thinking was promoted by Protagoras, Socrates, and others, in their own way, to challenge the validity of all received truths based on traditional authority. Plato thereupon reinvented Socrates in order to devise a metaphysics that could justify religion on a more sophisticated basis, and Aristotle initiated scientific inquiry that substituted empirical categories for Plato's theory of ideal forms. Aristotle's approach also reduced anthropomorphic deity to the abstract status of an "unmoved mover" and raised the possibility of an infinite universe both in space and time.[24] This preliminary thinking stream can be seen as the beginning of the ongoing movement from the 'mythos to logos.'

The rise of Christianity brought about a new kind of relationship between religion and state. The Gospel passage, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's (Lk 20:25)" has been one of the major sources of making the distinction between the 'temporal' and the 'spiritual' which has no clear parallel in most of other religions. The hostility of the church to the empire was very explicit in the first centuries of its history. The Roman emperors claimed themselves as Gods and they demanded worship and devotion from the people of the country. Christians being devotees of God (*Yahweh*) and His son Jesus disagreed to worship the emperors of Rome. They could not digest such mandatory practices like 'emperor-worship.' The history of Christian persecution by the Roman emperors was really history of state's intervention into the religion of the people. The conflicting scenario of 'state (Rome) and religion (Christianity) have been continued, of course, in different forms and ways, throughout history. A.D. 312 c. Under the *Edict of Milan* a great step toward religious freedom had been taken. Thus the "liberty of worship" was given to the people.

---

[24] Edward Jayne, "A Brief History of Secularism,*"* last modified on January, 23, 2011, http://www.edwardjayne.com-/secular./Secular_History_of_Western_Civ.pdf. (Henceforth: Jayne, *A Brief History*).

Conversion of Constantine to Christianity marked another stage of the relationship between the Church and State. By the year 346 the State and the Church became closely knit together. Christianity became the official religion of the state. This marked the closing down of the pagan temples and persecution of all non-believers. Hence, persecuted church started persecuting the 'pagans' with their close tie up with the state officials. The partnership between the popes and emperors, church and state, was constructive at some point of time. But this friendship did not go well with many popes and emperors or kings, in course time.[25] The first instance of serious encounter was seen between Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV which resulted in the defeat of the latter. However, three years later Henry marched Rome and deposed Pope Gregory VII and set up a rival Pope. Here one can see the slipping away of power which church held for many years. In the 13th C. Pope Boniface VIII clashed with Philip the Fair, King of France. In this battle the state of France won and she claimed a 'temporal supremacy'[26]and gradually this event marked the rising of the whole of Europe against the 'spiritual (Ecclesiastical) supremacy' of the church.

In the 14th Century Marsiglio of Padua contributed tremendously to the idea of 'independent secular rule.' He developed a theory of secular government based on the conceptions of Italian city-states. He understood state as a 'self-sufficient and independent community', with power to regulate the temporal concerns of the church. He also made sharp distinction between 'divine law and human law.' [27] However, his request was unheard and moreover, Augustine and Aquinas influenced the whole thinking of the time.

---

[25] Pope Gelasius I's doctrine of two swords implied dual organization of human society: Church to mediate eternal salvation and state to maintain peace, order and justice in temporal affairs. Both came from the Divine and given to the Church, and church gives power to the state to do the temporal administration. This shows the conflicting interests of the religion.

[26] John B. Noss, *Man's Religion's* (NY: Macmillian Company, 1949), 654-658.

[27] Donald Eugene Smith, *India As a Secular State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 11 (Henceforth: Smith, *India as a Secular State*).

1.1.2.   Modern and Contemporary Trends in Secular Thinking

"Political theology"[28]has been debated since the writings of Hobbes through Locke to Rousseau, Kant and so forth. Thomas Hobbes and John Locke postulated a world where religious ideas did not directly inspire political forms, where politics could proceed independently of church affiliation. I present here a general flow chart of modern and contemporary trends in secular thinking.

1.1.2.1.   Reformation and Its Impact on Secularism:

The conflicting context of Europe slowly paved the way for Protestant Reformation stated with Martin Luther King which was followed by John Calvin and Ulrich Zwingli. The authority of Christianity had been transferred a lot to the *sole* authority of the scripture by this movement. The waves of 'free-thought' had been unleashed by Reformation and Counter Reformation. Many of Lutherans 'tended to regard religion as an aspect of state policy.'[29] The monopoly power of Christianity had been declining by the protest movement of the Protestants. Most of Germany, France, Switzerland, Scotland, UK, Ireland, etc. became strong centers of protestant churches, which simultaneously marked the decline of Catholicism in those areas of the world. This split has been greatly conducive to the great momentum of secularism.

The establishment of Anglican Church with the royal head was another milestone in the church-state relationship. The progress of religious liberty in England in the 16th and 17th C. was quiet uncertain since Queen Elizabeth's usual policy was 'non-enforcement of the laws against Catholics.' Though there were a lot of positive signs of secularism, they were still fragmentary and religiously biased in many respects.

---

[28] It is a branch of both political philosophy and theology that investigates the ways in which theological concepts underlie our political, social, economic and cultural discourses.

[29] Smith, *India as a Secular State,* 12.

1.1.2.2. Prominent Pioneers of Secularism

Although was orthodox in his religious beliefs, Francis Bacon (1561-1626) was one of the prominent proponents of secularism who advocated 'scientific method' which became so influential in the modern history of the world. He argued that, "[...] God worketh nothing in nature but by second causes."[30] In his essay *Of Atheism* he argued that one cannot suppose the totality of things to be "without a mind."

> I HAD rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind. And therefore, God never wrought miracle, to convince atheism, because his ordinary works convince it. It is true, that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism; but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion. For while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them, confederate and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity. Nay, even which school which is most accused of atheism doth most demonstrate religion […][31]

The French philosopher Descartes (1596-1650) employed a "method of doubt" or 'skepticism,' intended to serve the religion but it unleashed numerous free-thinkers. He was trying make philosophy much more scientific, certain and clearer. His *Discourse on Method* (1637), stated that, "I think, therefore I am" (*cogito, ergo sum*).[32] Despite Descartes' devout Christianity, his theory was a major step toward modern secular philosophy. He affirmed the supremacy of reason, thereby diminishing the importance of belief, and he emphasized the invariability of the laws of nature, thereby calling into question God's providential intervention. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1629) rejected Descartes' geometric model of the universe for a 'mechanistic cosmology' drawn from Galileo. He defines religion in his masterpiece work *Leviathan*, "And this fear of things invisible is the natural seed of that which everyone in himself calleth religion; and in them that worship

---

[30] Francis Bacon, *Advancement of Learning* (The Online Library of Liberty, 1605), 5-6, last accessed on January 26, 2011, https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/jspui/bitstream/1794/646/1/advancement.pdf.

[31] Francis Bacon, "Of Atheism," in *Essays, Civil and Moral* (The Harvard Classics, 1909-14), 396.

[32] Rene Descartes, *Discourse on Method/Meditations on First Philosophy* (USA: BN Publishing, 2007), 81-88.

or fear that power otherwise than they do, superstition."[33] Hobbes's further treatment of religion in the next chapter, "Of Religion," (Part I, Chapter 12), explains, among other things, how religion can be used to manipulate society. With obvious irony, Hobbes defined atheism as "the sin of imprudence."[34] It was in the *Leviathan* that Hobbes wrote the famous description of man's life in nature as 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.' To free themselves from this natural state of warfare, men join in a compact with one another, make a social contract, and set up a sovereign who exercises absolute power over his subjects and maintains the peace. Succinct and contentious, Hobbes enraged many readers with such statements as "The universe is corporeal; all that is real is material, and what is not material is not real"(*Leviathan*). Hobbes also asserted that the Church must be subject to the State. Such ideas expressed so confidently and in an uncommonly accessible style, created an instant uproar, especially in ecclesiastical circles. Contemptuously dismissing Aristotle and his followers, Hobbes declared himself the creator of civil philosophy, or what would today be called political science.[35] Heavily influenced by his friend Galileo Galilei, Hobbes was a mechanist who viewed the world as matter in motion and man as movement of limbs. His Machiavellian insistence on looking at things as they are, rather than as they should be, his contention that expediency rather than morality motivated political obedience, and also his unshakable secularism, fueled countless attacks by his critics.

Spinoza (1632-77) proposed a pantheistic model of an infinite universe identical with the infinite powers of God.[36] And Leibniz proposed a theory of monads which are atomic particles each of which is aware of all the rest, and the universe comprises the sum total of these particles.

---

[33] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 56 (Henceforth: Hobbes, *Leviathan*).

[34] Hobbes, *Leviathan,* 75-86.

[35] Mark Lilla, *The Still Born God: Religion, Politics and the Modern West* (USA: Vintage Books, 2008), Book Review by John T. McGreevy, http://commonwealmagazine.org/why-secularism-exception-0.

[36] Benedict de Spinoza, *On the Improvement of the Understanding the Ethics Correspondence*, trans. R. H. M. Elwes (USA: Dover Publications, 1883), 43ff.

The contributions of John Locke (1632-1704) were of major importance in advancing philosophy from seventeenth century cosmology to the deism and finally the atheism of the eighteenth century. He sought to bring scientific method into epistemology based on distinctions already suggested by Epicurus between ideas of sense and ideas of reflection, between simple and complex ideas, and between primary and secondary qualities. He stated that, "If we will disbelieve everything because we cannot certainly know all things, we shall do much-what as wisely as he who would not use his legs, but sit still and perish, because he had no wings to fly."[37] Locke, in particular, made the powerful claim, which we now take to be virtually self-evident, that churches are voluntary associations dedicated to the *private worship* of believers and should be treated as such. Among Locke's intellectual descendants, the American Founders wrote a determinedly secular Constitution even as they hoped that their silence on religion would allow it to flourish. David Hume (1711-76) was another strong proponent of secularism. Most of his works had been sources of the same.[38] He stated that, "all our reasonings concerning causes and effects are derived from nothing but custom," and concluded, "[...]I am ready to reject all belief and reasoning, and can look upon no opinion as even more probable or likely than any other."[39] In his late essay, "Of the Immortality of the Soul," Hume similarly argued that "by the mere light of reason it seems difficult to prove the immortality of the Soul," that "everything is in common between soul and body," that the souls of animals "bear so near a resemblance to the souls of men, that the analogy from one to the other forms a very strong argument," and that it is difficult to believe that human consciousness, "seemingly the frailest of any [capacity], and from the slightest causes, subject to the greatest disorders, is immortal and indissoluble."[40]

---

[37] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* ed. Peter H. Nidditch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), I.i.5, 45.

[38] Hume's works like *The Natural History of Religion; Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion; Essay of Miracles; An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*; etc. explains very well about his major emphasis of reducing the over-emphasis of religions.

[39] David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), 183.

[40] David Hume, "Of the Immortality of Soul," in *Essays: Moral, Political and Liberty* ed. by Eugene Miller (Liberty Classics, 1987), 690, 596-97.

1.1.2.3.   Enlightenment Thinkers (18th and 19th Centuries) and Secularism

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) is commonly known as the greatest among the enlightenment thinkers began his career identified with the Enlightenment. His masterpiece work *Critique of Pure Reason* achieved him place and fame around the world. His synthesis of rationalism of Descartes and Empiricism of the empiricists initiated a 'revolution' in the history of philosophy. He divided reality into *noumenon and phenomenon.* In his final book, *Religion Within the Boundaries of Mere Reason* (1794) he stated that "Everything man does to please God apart from a moral way of life is mere religious delusion and spurious worship of God."[41] Kant's *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals, What is Enlightenment? Prolegomena, etc*. are explicit examples of his emphasis on 'pure reason,' and 'autonomy' of human person as rational beings. Undoubtedly his philosophy influenced many of the modern secular thinkers, especially Jürgen Habermas. German metaphysicians influenced by Kant included Herder (1744-1803), who emphasized the dynamics of becoming; Fichte (1762-1814), whose concept of the "I" advanced subjectivism to a new level; Schlegel (1772-1829), who explored nature as the ground for universal identity, and Schelling (1775-1864). And among theologians, Schleiermacher (1768-1834) used Kant as a point of departure by fully exploring the ramifications of the assumption that religious faith could be justified as "a matter of feeling."

Hegel (1770-1831) formulated a strictly idealistic theory of the universe. Like Kant, he stressed the importance of intellectual freedom, but he limited this freedom to the pursuit of godhead through absolute knowledge as transcendent self-realization. He justified religion as a pictorial image of Absolute Idea (*Vorstellung*). Hegel's re-discovery of history is very significant with regard to our 'secular' understanding of the world. Kantian transcendence was brought back to the 'here and now' of human life, which is so important for our 'modern secular self.' Hegel's understanding of the 'transforming' aspects of history which will be transferred to the

---

[41] Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy Vol. 6, Modern Philosophy: From the French Enlightenment to Kant* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 344.

ongoing history of humankind became the starting point of Charles Taylor's modern frame of secularism and secular identity. Second part of the thesis will analyze these aspects in detail.

Secular strands of thinking were further expanded by Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) who declared himself as an atheist and basically proposed philosophy. Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) took an even more hostile view of Christianity than Schopenhauer, incessantly challenging its ethics, its metaphysics, and its authority as a source of the truth. His slogan "God is dead" had significant impact many on the modern and contemporary thinkers. His emphasis on extreme humanism and 'will to power' indubitable contributed to the modern emergence of secularism and secular thinking. "What is needed above all is an absolute skepticism toward all inherited concepts."[42] He concluded *The Antichrist* by arguing that the Christian church "has turned every value into worthlessness, and every truth into a lie, and every integrity into baseness of soul." Such atheistic and agnostic thoughts have been influencing secular thinkers for decades. As a result, he argued, the Christian church has become "the one immortal blemish on the human race."[43] Karl Marx (1818-83) identified religion as "opium of the people" that must be eliminated before mankind can realize its full potential. Inspired by his early exposure to Feuerbach's arguments, Marx criticized him in his 1845 "Theses on Feuerbach" for emphasizing individual experience without acknowledging the relevance of his theory to collective ideology. First came personal liberation from religion, Marx felt, then collective liberation from social oppression. Marx explained, "The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of men, is required for their real happiness," since the rejection of illusions serves as a demand "to give up a condition which needs illusions." In other words, "The criticism of religion disillusions man so that he will think, act and fashion his reality as a man who has lost his illusions and regained his reason." In the end, Marx argued, the criticism of heaven would be

---

[42] Friedrich Nietzsche *The Will to Power* ed. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Random House, 1967), 221

[43] Friedrich Nietzsche *The Antichrist* trans. H.L. Mencken (New York: Knopf, 1918), 629-30. This book was written in the fall, 1888, a few months before he went insane, and belatedly published by his sister in 1895.

"transformed into the criticism of earth, the criticism of religion into the criticism of law, and the criticism of theology into the criticism of politics." Marx's hostility to religion dominated Marxism through the twentieth century and became a fixed tenet of communist doctrine. However, it fared poorly in the Soviet Union. Lenin was fully supportive, and atheism became official dogma, but Stalin (who had spent five years of his youth as a seminarian) relaxed state controls during World War II to improve public support for the war effort. With the collapse of the Soviet government in 1991 there was no further pretense and large numbers of Russians openly resumed practice as Orthodox Russian Catholics. Like both Feuerbach and Marx, Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) maintained that religion bears a harmful psychological impact. He identified religious experience as a kind of neurosis in both *Moses and Monotheism* (1937) and *New Introductory Lectures* (1932), and argued in sweeping terms that religion may be compared to a "neurosis which the civilized individual must pass through on his way from childhood to maturity."[44] Freud also described religion as a mass delusion whose "oceanic" sense of eternity is best explained as a vestigial fixation of infant helplessness.[45] Freud more specifically argued that religion functions as an obsessional neurosis, effectively a fairy tale that encourages "every possible sort of dishonesty." The primary value of religion for Christians, Freud explained, is that "their acceptance of the universal neurosis spares them the task of constructing a personal one"[46] (p. 44). The physicist Albert Einstein (1879-1955) was ambivalent about his religious beliefs. In Clifton Fadiman's collection of personal testaments, *I Believe*, (Simon and Schuster, 1931), Einstein praised religion as insight into "the mystery of life," but he rejected the concepts of an afterlife and a providential God. Later on he stated, "The scientific method can teach us nothing else beyond how facts are related to, and conditioned by, each other."[47] As a result, Einstein concluded, the individual must be "able to place his powers freely and gladly in the service of all mankind" as

---

[44] Sigmund Freud, "Lecture 35 of New Introductory Lectures," in *The Complete Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (Norton, 1966), 632.

[45] Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents* (New York: WW Norton, 1961), 11, 19, and 28.

[46] Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion,* trans. James Strachey (New York: WW Norton, 1961), 29, 43.

[47] Albert Einstein, *Out of my Later Years* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950), 21-23. Einstein included two later personal manifestos, of 1939 and 1941, in which his opinions seem to have shifted. (Henceforth: Einstein, *Out of my Later Years*).

mandated by "the highest principles for our aspirations and judgments […] given to us in the Jewish-Christian religious tradition."[48] In his 1941 statement, however, Einstein took a more balanced stance. He declared that religion "deals only with evaluations of human thought and action" and "cannot justifiably speak of facts and relationships between facts." In contrast, he argued, "science can only ascertain what is, but not what should be." As a result the two human endeavors, science and religion, are absolutely complementary: "Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind"[49]

1.1.2.4. British Secular Thinkers

Bentham (1748-1832), the founder of Utilitarianism, wrote numerous pages of anonymous tracts opposed to religion, in which he argued,

> People who do not believe in life after death do not fear being dead, but believers fear punishment more than they hope for bliss. Religion speaks well of God, but assumes otherwise! God is, after all, an unknown and incomprehensible entity from whom inconsistent and unintelligible actions are believed to flow.[50]

Later on, Thomas Paine continued the tradition of enlightenment by writing *The Age of Reason* (1794-95), a vigorous critique of the Bible while imprisoned in the Bastille in order to promote deism as belief in God's authority free of Biblical mythology. His contribution can be seen as another pioneering effort of making everything 'secular.' Richard Carlile (1790-1843) went to jail for nine years for having published Paine's *The Age of Reason.* He was succeeded in this role by Robert Owen (1771-1858), George Holyoake (1817-1906), and Charles Bradlaugh (1833-1891), each of them having taken a more "radical" stance than his predecessor in his rejection of religious orthodoxy.

---

[48] Einstein, *Out of my Later Years*, 21-23.

[49] Einstein, *Out of my Later Years*, 25-26.

[50] See Bentham's works, including *The Church of England Catechism Examined; A Few Self-Contradictions of the Bible* and *Analysis of the Influence of Natural Religion on the Temporal Happiness of Mankind*.

1.1.2.4.1.   Conceptual Origin – George Jacob Holyoake (1817-1906).

As a concept 'secularism' is a product of the European renaissance, though the term does not seem to have entered use until much later. Oxford dictionary defines 'secular' as "worldly" or "material" (not religious or spiritual) and "secularism" as "the view that morality and education should not be based on religion."[51] The primary understanding of secularism had thus always been as opposed to of what is spiritual or religious. And gradually this developed and formed into an "ism" which can stand by itself and indeed support its own conceptual framework.

There is a common agreement among scholars that the British writer George Jacob Holyoake (1817-1906) used the term "secularism" for the first time, and developed his own theoretical explanation for it. According to the available sources, the *Central Secular Society* that he founded compiled his secularist doctrine as follows: 1. Science as the true guide of man; 2. Morality as secular, not religious, in origin; 3. Reason as the only Authority; 4. Freedom of thought and speech and 5. That owing to the uncertainties of survival we should direct our efforts to this life only.[52]

It is explicit from the above description that Holyoake was an atheist and in fact at one point he was sentenced to six months of imprisonment for making the blasphemous statement that 'God should be retired.' He published his *Trial of Theism* in 1858. Charles Bradlaugh was another atheistic thinker who followed the same line of thought. He held that "the logical consequence of secularism is the denial, the absolute denial of providence." In short, while Holyoake said that ignoring God was enough, Bradlaugh insisted that God should be banished. But the common principle was the same: secularism demanded and desired complete separation of

---

[51] *Oxford Dictionary*, 1974 ed., s.v. "Secular and Secularism."

[52] Justice R. A. Jahagirdar, "Secularism in India: Inconclusive Debate," in *International Humanist and Ethical Union: The world union of Humanist organizations*, last modified May 11, 2003, http://www.iheu.org/node/298.

the religion (Church) from the state, as well as the abolition of all special privileges granted to religious organizations and all benefits in favor of religious believers.

1.1.2.5. Science and Secularism:

The emergence of science and its new discoveries contributed tremendously to the secular frame and free-thought in the minds of the people. Greatest scientists like Copernicus (1473-1543), Kepler (1571-1630), and Galileo (1564-1642), set the stage for a new era, together with the grand synthesis of Newton (1642-1727) in his *Principia* (1687). Scientific academies were established in Italy at Naples in 1560 and Florence in 1637, followed by England's Royal Society in 1660 and France's Academy of Sciences in 1666. These were of enormous importance in promoting science beginning in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[53]

The impact of renaissance, reformation, counter reformation, enlightenment, together with the scientific revolution, impacted most the 'secularization' and 'modernization' of the Western countries, and in many respect these factors have been influencing the eastern hemisphere too. I will be briefly dealing with some of the philosophers of the modern and contemporary period, to demonstrate their contribution to the emerging theory of secularism, which I keep apart for my 'philosophical justification of the research.

1.1.2.6.   Immediate Philosophical Strands

Secularism as it currently stands is a relevant and latest addition to the philosophical discussion. The concepts like 'secular'; 'post-secular'; 'post-religious'; 'post-metaphysical' 'modernity'; 'multiple modernity' etc. can never be properly understood without the philosophical frame of 'secularism.' My interest is to found the theory of secularism on an 'ethical' or 'moral' verticality. My reflections on history, politics, and religion, in this thesis, are mainly for the purpose of exposing the transition of the meaning of the concept 'secular and

---

[53] Jayne, *A Brief History*, accessed on January 1, 2011.

secularism.' Without such a background none can explain 'secularism' from the abstract since it is an 'emerging' political philosophy which needs to be traced and retrieved.

I really think that Locke and Hobbes initiated the debate on secularism which continued with Kant, Hegel, Habermas, etc. Taylor's *Sources of the Self, A Secular Age, Malaises of Modernity*, etc." take it forward. Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj, Ethical Religions*, etc. contribute to the same in a different way but substantially to the same core. There are fragments of the articulations throughout the history, though it was mostly one-sided. Karl Jaspers "Axial Age" articulated the contribution of religions to the world views and civilizations which gave a new twist to the secular thinking.

To me, 'Secularism' is an emerging branch of philosophy, especially 'as a fraction of the political philosophy.' Secular and Sacred debate has been taking turns. Major part of the history of human race has a history of religious dominance but the 'present time' has been experiencing the other way. So it is high time to analyze and understand what is good in it because we are all in it. Part of the reason for the emergence of secularism is the "extremely transcendental" religious doctrines and teachings which created a great gap and disconnect between the 'body and soul'; 'material and spiritual'; 'earth and heaven' 'secular and sacred' though it can be very well experienced and understood as complementary.

World is becoming plural in all the respects. It is always been a reality in India. I really think only a 'holistic' perspective can function as a commonly agreeable solution for the majority of the society and state. Fragmented sciences have their own one-sided claims and I think only philosophy can give a unity perspective. However, there must be some foundational metaphysical principles that should function as the basis of the philosophical "holism." Since religions differ in their dogmas and doctrines there can never be very limited areas of consensus. Religions function mostly by the feelings, emotions, and loves of the heart, but philosophy can have purely rational debates which can lead to some consensus.

1.1.3. Development and Variant understandings of the Concept 'Secularism'

The term 'secular' has since been defined in many different ways as it has been applied in many places and times. It is quite explicit that for a long period the concept was understood as something opposite to 'spiritual' or 'religious.' This 'negative'[54] definition is found in the history of both the West and the East-India. However, this still admits of many variants:

1. It is atheism (anti-God and anti-religious (For Marxists & other Atheists).

2. It implies separation of Church (Religion) and State (Politics) from each other (For Europeans and most of the Western Democracies).

3. It signals the recognition of different religions and ways of life (For the Indian *Vedic* tradition).

4. It represents a new model of state and public sphere, which has "human flourishing" (mostly, regardless of "Transcendence") as the main focus (There are boosters and knockers of this political model and this is still an emerging model and school of thinking. Mostly, it comprises of the naturalists, humanists and moderners).

The first meaning dominated for centuries, but its strongly "anti-" tone has seemingly disappeared in the second, third and fourth meanings. In the meantime, 'secularism' as a dimension of political philosophy has been gaining momentum. In Europe, the gradual transition from emphasis on 'theocratic' governance to 'secular' governance has invested 'secularism' with a positive sense, signaling a constructive move away from the baggage of a necessary root in atheism. This perhaps gives hand-in-hand with the fact that the divide between the 'secular' and 'sacred' is no longer much discussed, since it is now thought that a human being is a complex of both, can never undo them, and so must incorporate them fruitfully. At present, nobody can explain

---

[54] Recent debates on 'secularism (political form) and religion' has very little to do with such 'anti' and 'opposite' interpretations, rather it is more about a vision of a 'neutral' or 'indifferent' political society, public sphere, civil society and state.

himself or herself without recognizing the 'secular' context of one's existence, yet this context is essentially political, having very little to do with anti-religious or atheistic thinking. Of course, it is true that an unhealthy relationship between religion and politics has made 'secular politics' too atheistic in many places. But, there is in general a trend away from that wherever and to the degree that 'secular politics' is accepted as something 'positive' and 'inclusive' of all social differences and disparities. Most nations have become multi-religious. All of this stands in the way of identifying oneself solely in terms of religion. If the self is not wholly 'religious' what is it? Is religion just one among the many aspects of my self-identity or is it somehow the most important aspect? These are questions to be answered in our search for a secular identity.

1.1.4.   Historical Encounters And Evolution of Prominent Forms of Secularism

In the history of the development of secularism, one can see variant ways it encounters with different contexts. Its encounter with religion had its own distinctness that was related to particular historical context. This aspect is important for our ongoing discussion of an Indian definition of secularism due to the particular context it encounters.

1.1.4.1.   Separation of Religion and State

The concept 'secularism' has often been defined directly in response to encounters with factors belonging to a country or religious context. In what is probably most prominent sense, secularism asserts the right to be free from religious rule and teachings, and free it from the government imposition of religion upon the people. As such it defines a state that is neutral on matters of belief, and gives no state privileges or subsidies to religions. This view can be seen as a quest for equality in a pluralistic social sphere. Let me expose the most important variants of secularism in the world today.

It is widely assumed that the *sine qua non*e of secularism in Christian-Western contexts is the separation of church and state. Meanwhile, secularism is also assumed to be a pre-requisite for the successful democratization of societies. Secularism as practiced in France (*laïcité*) has meant evacuating religion from the public sphere and banishing it to the private one. Secularism as it developed in the United States, on the other hand, has been more accommodating of religious values and expression in the public realm. The relation between secularism and democracy is, therefore, a variable one and democracy as a universal phenomenon is still a work in progress.

1.1.4.1.1.   France and *Laïcité*

Prior to the revolution in 1789, France was the most religious country with Catholicism as the official religion and a Catholic Monarch as its ruler. The Church commanded great power and prestige. It controlled the educational system and enforced a civil law that was theocratic in nature. This condition has drastically changed in course of time, from a stage where the State was in the Church to a stage where the Church is in the State. By our own time, the French Republic has become wholly secular, through a gradual process of *laicization.* We must remember that French society was a society of Christendom and the state existed as an embryonic state to stand and support the Roman Catholic Church. On 24 December 1789, the assembly decreed that 'non-Catholics may vote and are eligible…and are qualified for all civil and military types of employment, just as other citizens' (but added 'without prejudging anything concerning the Jews'). The long journey of *laicization* continued through fragmentation (dissociation) of institutions, recognition of legitimacy and respect for religious pluralism.[55] However, the role of religion to satisfy and fulfill the religious needs of the people and to work towards the moral well-being of the country has never been denied in France.

---

[55] Jean Bauberot, "Two Thresholds of Laicization*,*" in *Secularism and Its Critics* ed. Rajeev Bhargava (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 95f.

1.1.4.1.2.   **The US and *the Wall of Separation***

The "separation" idea was incorporated in the US Constitution by the *First Amendment* (December 1781), which stated that "Congress shall value no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free existence thereof."[56] This idea was contained in the famous letter which Thomas Jefferson wrote to a group of Baptists in Danbury, Connecticut, in 1802 wherein he opined that the purpose of the First Amendment was to build 'a wall of separation between Church and State.'

1.1.4.1.3.   **Turkey and the Abolition of the Caliphate**

The Islamic religion has the most difficult relation with secularism. But Turkey remains as an exception. Turkey was the center of the Ottoman Empire and the seat of the Caliphate (Supreme religious and secular head of the Muslims all over the world). After Mustafa Kamal came into power, he dethroned the Sultan and abolished the Caliphate, in 1920s. A rigorous secularism was introduced, making it an offense to wear a fez cap, abolishing all monasteries and religious houses and confiscating their properties, closing Muslim religious schools and starting State non-religious schools, replacing *Shariat* law with elements from Swiss Civil law Code, Italian Penal Code and German Commercial Code, abolishing polygamy and opening the professions to women, who were prohibited from wearing *purdah.* Ataturk, the father of the Turks, thus founded, with the submissive collaboration of the Turkish National Assembly, a secular state, that remains in place even today.

1.1.5.   **Ungrounded 'Liberalism' of the West – Pseudo Secularisms**

Charles Taylor is associated with political theorists like Michael Walzer and Michael Sandel, for their communitarian critique of the liberal theory of the "self." Communitarians emphasize the importance of social

---

[56] The United States Constitution, "Amendments,*"* last accessed on November12, 2009, http://www.usconstitution.net/const.html.

and communal arrangements and institutions to the development of individual meaning and identity. Any narrow perspectives gradually lead to fragmented understanding of self instead of an integral and holistic one.

In his 1991 Massey Lectures, "*The Malaise of Modernity*," Taylor addressed what he saw as the central problems or "malaises" plaguing modern societies. He argued, among other things, that traditional liberal theory's conceptualization of individual identity is too abstract, instrumentalist, and one dimensional. Hence, individualism, instrumentalism and the politics comprised of the two are the malaises of modern liberal society. For Taylor, early theorists from John Locke and Thomas Hobbes to more modern standard-bearers of liberal theory like John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin have neglected the individual's ties to community. A more realistic understanding of the "self" recognizes what Taylor calls "horizons of meaning" (drawn from Gadamer): the important background of social and dialogical relations with others, against which life choices gain importance and meaning.

Paul Ricoeur captures the task at hand when he observes, "The fundamental perversion of the liberal state is that it came to function as a totalizing rather than detotalizing agency. That is why it is urgent for us today to discover a political discourse which would not be governed by states, a new form of society guaranteeing universal rights yet dispensing with totalizing constraints."[57] Ricoeur's term 'political discourse' opens up the possibility of dialoguing with the pluralistic realities of polity and society.

In the 18th Century, Judeo-Christian eschatology was replaced by the enlightenment horizon of humanism with its liberal notions of autonomy, freedom and human rights. Today the challenge is to find alternative forms of social rationality beyond the positivistic extremes of both state socialism and utilitarian-liberal capitalism. Habermas' distinction between three forms of rationality is essential here. They are: 1). Calculative

---

[57] Richard Kearney, *Debates in Continental Philosophy: Conversation with Contemporary Thinkers* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004), 114. (Henceforth: Kearney, *Debates in Continental Philosophy*).

Rationality: Positivistic control and manipulation; 2). Interpretative Rationality: Tries to represent the cultural codes and norms in a creative way; 3). Critical Rationality: Opens up the utopian horizons of liberation. For genuine social rationality to exist, one must refuse to allow the critical and interpretative functions to be reduced to the calculative.[58] In this, Habermas develops the Adorno's and Max Horkheimer's critique of positivist rationality.

As I have presented a general outline of the prominent trends in the west with regard to emergence of modernity, secularism, and public sphere of secular liberalism, now it is time for me to trace a similar narration of the Indian context. There are differences and of course some underlying aspects of similarities of approaches not only on account geographical basis but also on the way they conceive the idea of secularism itself.

1.2. RETRIEVING THE ROOTS OF SECULARISM IN INDIA: AN OVERVIEW OF THE INTELLECTUAL HISTORY ON SECULARISM, MODERNITY AND SELF-IDENTITY

Introduction

The religious and political conditions of India have tremendous impact on the Indian self-identity as well. Indeed, in all cases the manner in which religion and politics interact can have a positive or negative effect on identity. Now as regards their contact – whether to enrich one another or challenge one another – in the secular, it must be recognized that India will have reached it according to conditions that are to some degree uniquely its own. (SA 3-4). But we should also be careful with the terminology in play here. Whether as an imported concept or as the name of a distinct ideology, secularism can have only a limited influence on a nation like India, that has *a* history and heritage of thousands of years. It is therefore necessary to review at least some of the history before measuring developments that seem to resemble developments in the west, even if that history is too rich and complex for the brief treatment here to do it proper justice. What I propose is not at all a comprehensive or generally conceived notion of secularism as it is understood in the west, and not even a full

---

[58] Kearney, *Debates in Continental Philosophy*, 115.

account of secularism adjusted to the Indian context, but only a highlight of some of the prominent factors contributing to the advancement of the concept of Indian secularism and secular self-identity from the intellectual history of India.

In the Euro-American world the concept 'secularism' is generally understood as an ideology or school of thinking that appears against the background of Christianity. However the same concept is variously understood and misunderstood outside the Euro-American context. What does secularism mean in India? Is it an ideology, worldview, a position towards religion, a constitutional framework, a provision for minority rights, or an aspect of some other developments? These are a few major questions and concerns in my mind as I start with a narration of the emerging Indian secularism and self-identity.

1.2.1.   Contextualizing Indian 'secularism'

According to the predominant Western concept of secularism, it is aligned to atheism, agnosticism, anti-clericalism, and an anti-Christian or anti-church mentality, as something opposed to a spiritual or transcendental perspective. The institutional structure and growth of Christianity has been the major context in which such a form of secularism has developed in the West. This is already quite different than could be the case in India, which has not been dominated in this manner or to this degree by a single religion or faith. India cradled numerous religions in her bosom, and this indigenous plurality must be the context in which the concepts of 'secularism' and 'secular identity' have meaning in India. T.N.Madan has made this point well: "Secularism in India is a multivocal word: what it means depends upon who uses the word and in what context."[59]Nandini Chantterjee seems to address the result of this condition, as it were, from the complex nature of secularism in pluralized India:

---

[59] T. N. Madan, *Modern Myths, Locked Minds: Secularism and Fundamentalism in India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997), 235. (Henceforth: Madan, *Modern Myths*)

'Indian Secularism' always needs a long footnote-whether that consists of a revelation of India's failure to live up to true secular ideals, a prescription for achieving them, a questioning of the ideals themselves or, as in recent academic literature, an attempt to historicize its meaning.[60]

The genesis, growth and development of the concept of *secularism itself*[61] have been highly contested and inconclusive around the world. The understanding of Secularism in India too has been divisive, debated and inconclusive. I present *a narrative* of its origin and development by using some remote seminal traces and glimpses of secular modern trends in the history of India. I presume its arbitrary and ambivalent natures. However, by doing this I argue with Rajeev Bhargava that 'secularism in India has a history.'[62] The continuities and discontinuities of the ongoing secularism debates itself is a proof for such a history. My reading and understanding of the Euro-American understanding and conceptions of modernity and secularity together with the Indian streams of secular thinking is surely a major frame in analyzing the events and instances of Indian history in view of finding aspects of modern secularism. Taylor's retrieval of the history of secularity in his *A Secular Age* is an impetus for my retrieval of the *Indian Secularity* in view of better understanding 'how we got here.'

At the outset, it is important to make a few things clear without which an Indian claim of modernity and secularism can be extremely ambiguous and confusing for a non-Indian, similar to that of Taylor's North-Atlantic understanding of secularism and modernity. Firstly, Indian secularism is historically traced by the importance and inclusiveness given to the heterodox traditions (pluralism), and intellectual history of India throughout history. This can be seen from different perspectives -philosophical, religious, political (imperial), and linguistic – where equal recognition was intended or demanded. Such an intellectual history of India needs

---

[60] Nandini Chatterjee, *The Making of Indian Secularism: Empire, Law and Christianity, 1830-1960* (UK: Palgrave Macmillan publ. Lmt., 2011), 2. (Henceforth: N. Chatterjee, *The Making of Indian Secularism*).

[61] Even while global debate on secularism continues, scholars like Habermas have already began to assume that it is time to recognize *post-secular* times.

[62] Rajeev Bhargava, ed. *Secularism and Its Critics* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 4. (Henceforth: Bhargava, *Secularism and Its Critics*).

to be background for any understanding of (Pre-Independent or Post-Independent) modernity and secularism in India. Secondly, it is significant to understand that though secularism around the world (North-Atlantic of Taylor) has a demand for "neutrality" of concerns, Indian secularism safe-guard it by avoiding any "prohibitive" measures, which I argue as *secularism inclusive of religions*.[63] My ongoing analysis demonstrates that secularism of inclusivism and neutrality has an intellectual history in India. Whichever one's starting point, secular trends can be correlated with many patterns and developments in the history of India. For the purpose of my research I limit myself to the Ancient, Modern, Constitutional, and Contemporary periods within which I enumerate the philosophical (Ancient), historical (Pre-Colonial), Political (Colonial and Independent), Post-Colonial and Post-Independent (Gandhi and Nehru), Constitutional, and Contemporary aspects. Considered together, analysis of these different currents suggests that some form of secularism can be traceable from the Indian history, philosophy, and politics. This being a philosophical investigation, I start with the philosophical lineage of secularism in India.

1.2.2. Ancient Sources of Secularism

Predominant expressions of ancient times were highly religious in many respects. As I have already presented in the beginning of this chapter (cf. 1.1.1.) a transition from the 'mythical to the logical' marked remote expression of an emphasis on the rational and secular aspects of human being. Ancient India has its own philosophical resources in which one can possibly identify some remote expressions of secularism which is clearer when we look back to those accounts.

---

[63] Amartya Sen, *Argumentative Indian* (United States of America: Penquin Books Ltd., 2005), 19. (Henceforth: Sen, *Argumentative Indian*). Sen argues that Indians were always a debating and dialoguing community since its tradition has been extremely heterodox in nature. Hence, ancient roots of democracy can be traced from the intrinsic 'argumentative Indians.' He narrates this lineage from the ancient to the modern intellectual history of India. French and the US models of secularism have been "prohibiting" personal display of religious symbols and conventions. Indian secularism has significant distinction from this understanding of secularism.

1.2.2.1.   Philosophical Background of Secularism

Though there were non-religious poems in Rig Veda which were focusing on a secular issue such as work, morality and prosperity and so on, the Vedic texts marked the weakest stage of the development of Indian materialism.[64] "It is thought that any mention of "unbelievers" or "scoffers" in the *Vedas* refers to those who identified with Bṛhaspati[65] and his views on politics and material aspects of life. The *Rig Veda* being the first among the *Vedas*, has numerous hymns (1,017) which are heterogeneous in nature and themes which demonstrate a history of the development from a polytheistic religion to a monistic philosophical vision. Practically almost every natural phenomenon (E.g. sun (*Sūrya*), fire (*Agni*), sky (*Dyaus*), storms (*Maruts*), wind (*Vāyu*), waters (*Āpas*), earth (*Pṛthvi*) and so on) was worshiped and revered as divine in these texts. Hence, in such a world of deities, materialism was essentially anti-Vedic.[66]

1.2.2.1.1.   The Epic Period (C. 600BC – AD 200)

The Epic Period is noted for 'immense philosophic activity and many-sided development' though one cannot adequately explain it.[67] It was around the beginning of this period that the Bṛhaspati School began to merge with the philosophical naturalism of the time. It was the time of the emergence of *Cārvākas* and Buddhists. The importance of free philosophical inquiry and many-sided developments weakened the power of the traditional

---

[64] I argue that the seminal form of secularism starts with material trends as against the mainstream spiritual establishment. This is perhaps similar to the secular-spiritual dichotomy in the Western World.

[65] Bṛhaspati is a complex and confusing figure in the Indian philosophical circle. There have been thus three eminent persons known by the name Bṛihaspati : the first and well-known was the writer on politics whose name was referred and was even ascribed some ideas by Kautilya, the author of *Arthasastra*. This Brihaspati belongs to the theist school; (Vatsyayana's *Kamasutra* has reference to a Brihaspati who is the compiler of *Arthasastra*, and he is said to have lived in the beginning of creation itself); secondly, the Carvāka logician, who is presumed to have authored the *Lokayata* (natural world) philosophy as against the supernatural philosophy of the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*. This Brihaspati belong to atheistic school, and thirdly the poet who wrote the *samhita*. (Dr. F. M. Thomas, M.A, Intro and Trans, *Brihaspati Sutra* or *The Science of Politics According to the School of Brihaspati*, (Lahore: Motilal Banarsidas Press, 1921), 9. (Henceforth: Thomas, *Brihaspati Sutra*).

[66] Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Lokāyata/Cārvāka – Indian Materialism," last accessed on October 26, 2011, http://www.iep.utm.edu/indmat/.

[67] S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy Vol. I* (London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1989), 272 (Henceforth: Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*).

authority. "Materialism stood out as a doctrine because it rejected the theism of the *Upaniṣhadic* teachings as well as the ethical teachings of Buddhism and Jainism. It stood for individuality and rejected the authority of scripture and testimony."[68] As Radhakrishnan presents,

> Intuition was giving place to inquiry, religion to philosophy. The marvelous uncertainty and ambiguity of existence, the discordant attempts to systematize the world, the bewildering chaos of arbitrary by ways, side-streets and resting-places of thought invented by suffering humanity trembling in fear and delighting in the new and the untried, the desert of unbelief, exhaustion and frigidity in the midst of energy, youth and enterprise, make the epic period an eventful era in the history of Indian thought.[69]

There came about an intellectual curiosity and impatience towards formal authority. In general, "The allurement of the present yielded to the attractions of the beyond."[70] The centuries old religious faith takes a new turn here. 'The hold by authority was loosened and traditional bonds weakened.' And now we have the materialists (*Cārvakas*) with their insistence of the world of sense, and the Buddhists with their valuable psychological teaching and high ethics. Buddhist books mention other heretical teachers like Sanjana,[71] Ajita Kesankambalin,[72] *Purana* Kasyapa,[73] Maskarin Gosala,[74] and Kakuda Katyayana.[75] I have mentioned their names in order to demonstrate a few trends in ancient India which were not in tune with the highly religious and *brahminical* tradition of the time. According to Radhakrishnan, one necessarily has to distinguish three different strata of thought of the time which are chronologically and logically successive. He states them as 1). The systems of revolt, such as the Cārvāka theory, Jainism and Buddhism (600 BC); 2). The theistic

---

[68] Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Lokāyata/Cārvāka – Indian Materialism," last accessed on October 26, 2011, http://www.iep.utm.edu/indmat/.

[69] Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, 272.

[70] Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, 272

[71] Sanjana was a skeptic who repudiated all knowledge of self and limited his inquiries to the question of the attainment of peace.

[72] Ajita Kesankambalin is a materialist who rejected all knowledge by insight and resolved man into the four elements which dispersed at death

[73] Purana Kasyapa was an indifferentist who refused to acknowledge moral distinctions and adopted the view of non-causation or fortuitous origin and also the passivity of the soul.

[74] Maskarin Gosala was a fatalist who held that man had no power over life or death, and who believed that all things were living *jīvas* in process of constant change determined by their immanent energy till they attained perfection.

[75] Kakuda Katyana maintained qualitative distinctiveness of the elements of being, earth, water, fire, air, space and soul, with pleasure and pain as principles of change, making and unmaking individuals.

reconstruction of the Bhagavatgita and the later Upanishads (500 BC); and 3) the speculative development of the six systems (300 BC).[76]There are also references to the materialistic doctrines in the earliest Buddhist scriptures.

> Man is composed of four elements. When man dies, the earthly element returns and relapses into the earth; the watery element returns into the water, the fiery element returns into the fire, the airy element returns into the air; the senses pass into space. Wise and fool alike, when the body dissolves, are cut off, perish, and do not exist any longer.[77]

It is apparently true that materialistic thinking was prevalent in the pre-Buddhist period since its influence can be seen in the above citation from the ancient Buddhist writings. Other occasions of materialism can be seen in *Manusmriti* where Manu refers to *nastikas* (nihilists) and *paṣaṇḍas* (heretics). There are references to this doctrine in the epics too, especially in *Santiparva* verses 1414-1442 and *Salyaparava* 3619; *Vishu purana* iii 18. 14-26. *Sutras of Bṛhaspati* (the classical source of materialism) is said to be perished.[78]

1.2.2.1.2. *Cārvāka*: The Doctrine of *Lokāyata* - A Materialistic, Atheistic and an anti-religious Secular Approach to religions and Existence

In India the word 'secularism' has not been used as such until the late 19th century. However, apparent secular tendencies and indicators can be traced to the 'materialist' thinkers of ancient India. Purely materialistic thinking has only earthly or this-worldly concern, which also happened to be an essential emphasis of modern secularism. Extreme forms of secularism in Western countries have been mainly understood in the sense of atheism or purely 'this worldly' approach or rejecting the 'other-worldly' beliefs, all together. The ancient Indian *materialists* namely, *Cārvāka* were not different from this stream of thinking.

---

[76] Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, 276.

[77] Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, 278.

[78] Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, 278.

One can rightly make a judgment on the origin of such a secular group from the context of the overly '*brahminical*' background. Apparently, the *Cārvāka* school of thought progressed as a 'protest' group. They were against the over emphasis of the ritualistic practices of the Hindu religion of the time. *Brahmanic* priests were in complete control of religion and they considered themselves as the highest in the hierarchy of the society according to their caste – their birth. They misused their positions and religious forum for their own selfish interests.[79]

A summary presentation of the gist of the *Cārvāka* school of thought is initially seen in the *Bṛhaspati Sutra*[80] (which is also made available in the book *The Sarva-darsana-samgraha*).[81] Bṛhaspati is the founder of this school of thinking. They are atheists as against the predominant religious people. The mass of men, in accordance with their doctrine considering wealth and desire as the only ends of man, and denying the existence of any object belonging to a future world. Hence, another name for this school is *Lokāyata*, a name well accordant with the thing signified. The Sanskrit word *Lokāyata* means *prevalent in the world (Loka and āyata)*[82] Pleasure and pain are central to this theory. A sort of hedonism seems to be their ethical ideal. Eat, drink and make merry for death comes to all. Hence their refrain goes as follows:

> While life is yours, live joyously;
> None can escape Death's searching eye:
> When once this frame of ours they burn,
> How shall it ever again return?[83]

Virtue is the delusion and enjoyment is the only reality. A distrust of anything traditional, religious, and moral was a feature of this theory. They denied the concepts of good, high, pure and compassionate. The theory stands for sensualism and selfishness and the gross affirmation of the laud will.

---

[79] Vijaya Ghosh, ed. *Tirtha* (New Delhi: CMC LTD., 1992), 218.

[80] Thomas, *Brihaspati Sutra*, 4ff.

[81] Madhva Acharya, *The Sarva-darsana-samgraha*: *Review of the Different Systems of Indian Philosophy,* trans. E. B. Cowell, MA and A.E. Gough, MA (London: Trubner & Co., and Ludgate Hill, 1882). 1ff. (Henceforth: Madhva, *SDS*).

[82] Sankara, Bhaskara and others consider *Lokāyatikas* as a sect of *Cārvākas* school of thought. The etymological meaning of the word *Lokāyata* is synonymous with materialism.

[83] Madhva, *SDS,* 2.

Four elements are the foundational principle of the *Cārvākas*. They are: earth, fire, air and water. However, "into the body, intelligence is produced, just as the inebriating power is developed from the mixing of certain ingredients; and when these are destroyed, intelligence at once perishes also."[84] This school accepts perception as the only source of knowledge. They reject any form of inferences. Perception being the only form of knowledge, matter becomes the only reality. What is material is real. Their principles are the four elements mentioned earth, water, fire, and air which are eternal, and can explain the development of the world. A God is not necessary to account for the world. Under the dominance of religious men the idea of another world and of God are prevalent, which are illusions. They are the inventions of the imposters. Religion is a foolish aberration, a mental disease.

> Vedic pundits are mutually destructive, as the authority of the *jnana-kanda* is overthrown by those who maintain that of the *karma-kanda*, while those who maintain the authority of the *jnana-kanda* reject that of the *karmakanda*; and lastly, the three Vedas themselves are only the incoherent rhapsodies of knaves, and to this effect runs the popular saying: The Agnihotra, the three Vedas, the ascetic's three staves, and smearing oneself with ashes? Bṛhaspati says, these are but means of livelihood for those who have no manliness or sense.[85]

He denied the idea of hell and heaven too. "The only Supreme is the earthly monarch whose existence is proved by all the world's eyesight; and the only Liberation is the dissolution of the body."[86] Nature is absolutely dead to human values and it is indifferent to good and bad. Nature does things just by itself without meddling with the Gods. There is no need of harnessing one's passion and instinct, since they are nature's gift to men. Moral rules are conventions of men. The authority of the Vedas was denounced by Bṛhaspati in the terms as follows:

> There is no heaven, no final liberation, nor any soul in another world,
> Nor do the actions of the four castes, orders, etc., produce any real effect
> The *Agnihotra*, the three Vedas, the ascetic's three staves, and smearing one's self with ashes,
> Were made by Nature as the livelihood of those destitute of knowledge and manliness.

---

[84] Madhva, *SDS*, 3.
[85] Madhva, SDS, 4.
[86] Madhva, *SDS*, 4.

> If a beast slain in the Jyotishtoma rite will itself go to heaven,
> Why then does not the sacrificer forthwith offer his own father?
> If the *Sraddha* produces gratification to beings who are dead,
> Then here, too, in the case of travelers when they start, it is needless to give provisions for the journey.
> If beings in heaven are gratified by our offering the *Sradddha* here,
> Then why not give the food down below to those who are standing on the housetop?
> While life remains let a man live happily, let him feed on ghee even though he runs in debt;
> When once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever return again?
> If he who departs from the body goes to another world,
> How is it that he comes not back again restless for love of his kindred?
> Hence it is only as a means of livelihood that Brahmans have established here
> All these ceremonies for the dead, there is no other fruit anywhere.
> The three authors of the Vedas were buffoons, knaves, and demons.
> All the well-known formulae of the *pandits, jarphari, turpharl*, etc.
> And all the obscene rites for the queen commanded in the *Asvamedha*,
> These were invented by buffoons, and so all the various kinds of presents to the priest,
> While the eating of flesh was similarly commanded by night-prowling demons [87]

The element of reaction against the mainstream religious sphere is explicit in the above mentioned verses of the *Cārvākas*, perhaps developed as a reaction. The existing religious custom and ritualistic practices were criticized and challenged by this school of thought. The *Cārvāka*, along with the Buddhists and the Jains were labeled *nāstikas* or unbelievers in the *Vedas* and isolated from the mainstream. Buddhism as well as Jainism was in many respects protest movements against the monopoly of the *Vedas* and its *Brahminical* tradition. Both systems are either indifferent or opposed to the authority of the Vedas.[88] Both these religions have a lot of similarities. Both deny the existence of an intelligent first cause. Unlike the *Cārvākas*, Buddhism and Jainism are not secular or materialist movements. But they pioneered different spiritual paths to liberation.

1.2.2.1.3.   *Dharma* : The extensiveness of its meaning – Inclusiveness of the Secular and the spiritual

Apparently the nearest equivalent Sanskrit word that denotes Hinduism is *Sanatanadharma* which means eternal path, never beginning nor ending way, perennial philosophy, universal, tradition, all-pervading truth, harmony and so on. *Dharma* comes from the root word *dhṛ* meaning "to hold together," or "to sustain." In

---

[87] Madhva, SDS, 10-11
[88] Madhva, SDS, 290.

Hinduism, *dharma* is the religious and moral law governing individual and group conduct. It comprises the basic principles of cosmic or individual existence and involves moral obligation for conformity to one's duty and nature. It is treated in the *dharma sutras*, the oldest collection of Hindu laws, and in the compilations of law and custom it called the *dharmashastras*.[89] The word *religion* comes either from Latin word *religio* which means supernatural constraint, sanction, or religious practice, or from the word *religare* which means to restrain or to tie back. It basically involves a personal set or institutionalized system of religious attitudes, beliefs, and practices.[90] The word *religion* and *dharma* differ in their emphasis on the immanence and transcendence. *Dharma* seems to emphasis a dutiful way of life on earth where an order or harmony is established together with it orientation to ultimate attainment of liberation. It is practically impossible to limit the word *dharma* to the English word *religion*.

In *Mahabharata* one can find the elaboration of *Purushārthas* (four aims) of life, namely *dharma* (righteousness – which could be an order in the society, not just religion), *artha* (wealth), *kāma* (worldly enjoyment), and *moksha* (spiritual freedom).[91] It is noticeable that *artha* (wealth), *kāma* (worldly enjoyment) find separate mentioning and placed together with *dharma* (righteousness) and *moksha* (spiritual freedom).

> These worldly pursuits, though they are governed by socio-religious codes, have nonetheless been rated as independent goals of life. To these three a fourth goal, namely was added *moksha (*attainment of salvation) was added later. Over the centuries *moksha* gained in importance although at every stage it was emphasized that one could not move in the direction of salvation, without first being discharged one's obligations implicit in *dharma, artha*, and *kama*. *Dharma* was paramount because on it rested the order.[92]

---

[89] Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, s.v., "Dharma," last accessed on October 28, 2012, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dharma?show=0&t=1351450067.

[90] Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, s.v., "Religion," last accessed on October 28, 2012, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dharma?show=0&t=1351450067.

[91] Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and Charles A. Moore eds. *A Source Book in Indian Philosophy* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957), 99. (Henceforth: Radhakrishnan, *SIP*).

[92] S.C.Dube and V.N. Basilov, eds. "Harmonizing Dimension in Hindu Civilizational Processes*"* in *Secularization in Multi-Religious Societies: Indo-Soviet Perspectives* (New Delhi: Indian Council of Social Sciences, 1983)*,* 2. (Henceforth: Dube and Basilov, *Secularization in Multi-Religious Societies*).

Dube continues to state that dharma has to be understood in relationship with *desha* (land and territory), *kala* (time), and *patra* (person or individual or category of individuals) which will avail the consideration of *dharma* in accordance with the cultural differences and variations in different regions.[93] The *dharma* for the four different *varnas* (the principal castes) was different too. Namely, *brāhmin* (the priest-teacher), *kshtriya* (the warrior), *vaisya* (the trader), and *sūdra* (the worker). The *dharma* of the four *ashramas* (stages of life) namely, *brahmcarya* (the student – celibate), *gārhasthya* (the householder), *vānaprastha* (the forest-dweller), and *sannyāsa* (the wandering ascetic), were also different.[94] Thus the provisions of *dharma* have special reference to *Varna, ashrama*, and *varnashrama.* In addition to these there are guidelines in *Rig Veda* that are applicable to all equally, namely, *rita* or universal law regulating the cosmic order. "O Indra, lead us on the path of *Rta*, on the right path over all evils."(RV 10.133.6. The transition of the *rta* to the modern idea of dharma occurs in *the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*. The Upanishads saw dharma as the universal principle of law, order, harmony, all in all truth, that sprang first from Brahman. It acts as the regulatory moral principle of the Universe. *Brihadaranyaka's* verses goes like this:

Verily, that which is *Dharma* is truth Therefore they say of a man who speaks truth, "He speaks the *Dharma*," or of a man who speaks the *Dharma*, "He speaks the Truth." Indeed, both these things are the same (*Brh. Upanishad*, 1.4.14).[95] In the *Mahabharata*, Krishna defines dharma as, "*Dhāranād dharma ityāhur dharmena vidhrtāh prajāh, Yat syād dhārana sanyuktam sa dharma iti nishchayah*" i.e., Dharma upholds both this-worldly and other-worldly affairs. (Mbh 12.110.11).

Buddhist *dhamma* also has similar lairs of meanings. It can mean the *source of all mental* experiences or it can also be understood in relation to *citta* (heart/mind), *kaya* (body), and *vedana* (emotions/sensations). The

---

[93] Dube and Basilov, *Secularization in Multi-Religious Societies*, 3.
[94] Radhakrishnan, *SIP*, 100.
[95] Radhakrishnan, *SIP*, 100.

Mahasatipatthana sutra pairs *Buddhist-dhamma* with *citta*, *kaya*, and *vedana*.[96] *Dhamma* is also used to refer to the reflection of natural law (four noble truths, eight fold paths and three marks of existence) by the practice of which a person is a *dhammic* (righteous) person. *Dhamma* in this context is the origin of order and organization that is the foundation of ideas, wisdom, understanding, and values.[97]

1.2.2.1.3.1.   *Dharma* and *Bhagavat Gita*

The first words of the Gita are: *dharmakshetre Kurukshetre*, "on the field of *dharma (righteousness)*, at Kurukshetra …"[98] Dharma is the right ordering that supports the cosmos. It is equivalent to natural law, social order, the sense of duty that attaches to each caste or *varna*, and the right ordering of the human heart (i.e., conscience). The Gita refers to *dharma*, which is the right ordering that supports the cosmos. *Dharma* is equivalent to natural law and conscience. In the Gita, a Pandava brother Arjuna loses his will to fight and has a discussion with his charioteer Krishna, about duty, action, and renunciation. The Gita has three major themes: knowledge, action, and love. Three themes are three *margas* (ways) in the Bhagavad Gita towards *moksa* (liberation): knowledge (*jnana*), action (*karma*), and love (*bhakti*).[99] Radhakrishnan observes the ethical aspects of the Gita as follows:

> The Gita is a comprehensive *Yoga-sastra* (treatise of *yoga*), large, flexible, many-sided, which includes various phases of the self's development and ascent into the Divine. The different *yogas* are special applications of the inner discipline which leads to the liberation of the self and to a new understanding of the unity and meaning of mankind. This goal of union may be attained by *jnana-yoga* (the way of knowledge), *bhakti-yoga* (the way of devotion), or *karma-yoga* (the way of action). Knowledge, devotion and work are complementary both when we seek the goal and after we attain it. We may climb the mountain from different paths but the view from the summit is identical for all.[100]

---

[96]"Mahasatipatthana Sutta," in Buddhist Scriptures accessed October 28, 2012, http://www.buddhanet.net/pdf_file/mahasati.pdf. (Henceforth: *Mahasatipatthana Sutta*).

[98] *Mahasatipatthana Sutta*, 102.

[99] *Mahasatipatthana Sutta*, 112ff.

[100] *Mahasatipatthana Sutta*, 102.

The concluding session of Bhagavat Gita (40-48) demonstrates 'various duties determined by one's nature (*svabhava*) and station (*svadharma*).[101] "*Dharma* without *karma* is lame and *karma* without *dharma* is blind."[102] *Nishkamadharma* (selfless action) is extolled in *Bhagavat Gita.* Renunciation is to be practiced not towards work/action bot to the fruits of work. Krishna said to Arjuna, "The wise understand by "renunciation" the giving up of works prompted by desire; the abandonment of the fruits of all works, the learned declare, is relinquishment."[103] (*The Gita* chapter 18.2). Commentaries on the Gita have been produced by Shankara (eighth century CE), Ramanuja (eleventh century CE), and B. G. Tilak, M. Gandhi, A.D. Bhakti Vedanta, and Maharishi Mahesh Yogi (twentieth century).

G. C. Pande describes the centrality of the term *dharma* as follows: "The notion of *dharma* embodies the tradition of the pursuit of moral values and constitutes one of the most distinct and essential aspects of Indian culture. The concept *dharma* is not merely theoretical but intensely practical."[104] The emphasis on *action/work* in Gita reiterates the practical aspect of it.

Still the Sanskrit term *dharma* can be translated in more than one ways as law, duty, morality and religion. Though it was mostly used in the religious circle, the inclusive meaning of the term is relevant in the context of our analysis of secularism. "The conception of *dharma* in relation to the state indicated that the latter was ultimately tied up with the final goal of existence of the human being."[105] The state was tolerant to all the religions and they were supposed to promote the *dharmic* ideals. The fact that Hinduism itself is not just one single religion rather a communion of different tribal, sectarian and devotional streams of faith, would make one to understand the predominantly tolerant nature of the Hindus in India.

---

[101] *Mahasatipatthana Sutta*, 160.

[102] Arvind Sharma, *Classical Hindu Thought: An Introduction* (Oxford: University Press, 2000), 108. (Henceforth: Sharma, *Classical Hindu Thought*).

[103] Radhakrishnan, *SIP*, 157.

[104] G.C. Pande, *Dimensions of the Ancient Indian Social History* (New Delhi: Books & Books, 1984), 126.

[105] J. J. Anjaria, *The Nature and Grounds of Political Obligation in the Hindu State* (Calcutta: Green and Company, 1935), 280.

1.2.2.2. Imperial Background-The Maurya (ca. 321 BC) and Mughal (ca. 1175 AD) Empires and Their Links with the Early-modernity in India

The imperial/royal background is another aspect of my narration where I find some remote expressions of secularism, which in many ways can be read together with our modern understanding of secularism and religious neutrality. Here I present some specific contributions of Emperor Ashoka (ca. 304–232 BC), Kautilya, a royal politician, and Emperor Akbar (1542-1605) which were pioneering efforts with respect to religious inclusivism, secular politics, and recognition of diversities.

1.2.2.2.1. Ashoka's Humanitarian Approach to Religion

Ashoka, popularly known as Ashoka the Great, was an Indian emperor of the Maurya Dynasty who ruled almost the entire Indian subcontinent from ca. 269 BC to 232 BC. He reigned over most of present-day India after a number of military conquests. His empire stretched from present-day Pakistan and Afghanistan in the west, to the present-day Bangladesh and the Indian state of Assam in the east, and as far south as northern Kerala and Andhra Pradesh. After the conquest of Kalinga, and directly witnessing the suffering that resulted out of it, King Ashoka converted to Buddhism.[106]

Ashoka gave great importance to the ideal of tolerance towards different ideologies and religions. According to Romila Thapar, Ashoka's definition of social ethics is based on a respect for all religious teachers, and on a harmonious relationship between parents and children, teachers and pupils, and employers and employees.[107]As far as secularism is concerned, Buddhism is best remembered in India for its dearest adherent, the Emperor Ashoka, whose religious policies are some of the closest to the modern principles of humanism. The religious policies of Ashoka grew out of his concept of religion and its role in human society. Ashoka's practice of non-

---

[106] Vincent A. Smith, C.I.E., *The Oxford History of India*, ed. Percival Spear (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1967), 119. (Henceforth: Smith, *Oxford History of India*).
[107] Smith, *Oxford History of India*, 119.

violence and toleration of different religions are significant for our understanding of the historical foundations of secularism in India where we see secularism inclusive of all religions. The principle of universality and inclusivism kept Ashoka from all forms of communalism that the caste-Hindus were so fond of.

Ashoka followed the policy of religious tolerance and made a law that prohibited anyone from any act or word against any religion. The various pillars and inscriptions dating from the time of Ashoka point to the seriousness with which he understood the interrelationship between religion and the state. The goal was to instill in the people the knowledge of what is right and what is wrong and to motivate them towards right thinking and right action. This understanding of right or wrong was influenced by religions. However, Ashoka made pioneering effort to see a common principle of thinking and acting which he integrated not from a single religion rather from different religions. No doubt, Ashoka succeeded in doing so. This Lion Capital of Ashoka from Sarnath has been adopted as the National Emblem of India and the wheel "Ashoka Chakra" from its base was placed onto the center of the National Flag of India.[108]

Ashoka's understanding of *dharma* makes clear that it was a concept intended for a secular teaching. The teaching was directed toward the amelioration of social injustices embedded in a status quo of religiously based hierarchy.[109] It is worth reading closely a portion from Ashoka's Rock Edict (Number 12):

> [T]he growth of the essentials of *Dharma* is possible in many ways. But its root lies in restraint in regard to speech, which means that there should be no extolment of one's own sect or disparagement of others sects on inappropriate occasions and that it should be moderate in every case even on appropriate occasions. On the contrary, other sects should be duly honoured in every way on all occasions. And if there is cause for criticism, it should be done in a mild way. But it is better to honor other religions for this reason. By so doing, one's own religion benefits, and so do other religions, while doing otherwise harms one's own religion and the religions of others. Whoever praises his own religion, due to excessive devotion, and condemns others with the thought "Let me glorify my own religion," only harms his own religion. Therefore contact between religions is good. One should listen

---

[108] Wikipedia, "Lion Capitol of Asoka," last accessed on October 6, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lion_Capital_of_Asoka.

[109] Romila Thapur, *A History of India, Vol 1*(New Delhi and London: Penguin Books,1990), 163. (Henceforth: Thapur, *A History of India*).

to and respect the doctrines professed by others. The beloved of the gods, king *Piyadasi*, desires that all should be well-learned in the good doctrines of other religions.[110]

It is not clear that whether Ashoka insisted similar respect for the Indian materialist school, namely, *Carvakas*. It is interesting to note that his *edit* tremendously influenced the drafting of the legislation whose chief architect was Ambedkar who apparently is closely linked to Ashoka's contributions. Both were converts to Buddhism and were committed to social reforms.[111] In a recent times Amartya Sen stated, "It was indeed a Buddhist emperor of India, Ashoka, who, in the third century BCE, not only outlined the need for toleration and the richness of heterodoxy, but also laid down what are perhaps the oldest rules for conducting debates and disputations, with the opponents being 'duly honoured in every way on all occasions.'"[112] It is significant for us to learn from this *inclusivistic* approach to develop an integral self-identity for our secular modernity.

1.2.2.2.2. **Kautilya's *Arthasastra:* Treatise on the Science of Economy and Politics**

Kautilya's work on economy and politics are significant example to demonstrate that the ancient Indian thinkers were deeply interested in practical and theoretical problems of their 'secular' or 'worldly' life. This book has details on the nature of sovereignty, representative institutions, peace and war, the validity of punishment, the principles of taxation, and moral functions of the state. Radhakrishnan views this work as indicative of the political thinkers of ancient India "combined idealism with a high degree of realism."[113] *Artha* has always been regarded as one of the four *purusharthas* (four aims of life). However, *Arthasastra* was discovered only after the *Dharmasastras* and *Kamasutras.* It is interesting to note that *Arthasastra* was also known as *Nitishastra* and *Dandaniti* in the epic *Mahabharata.*[114] It is also significant to note that the *Arthashastra* starts by saluting Bṛhaspati and Sukra, who are gurus of the gods and anti-gods and the

---

[110] Gary Jeffrey Jocobsohn, *The Wheel of Law: India's Secularism in Comparative Constitutional Context* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 13. (Henceforth: Jocobsohn, *The Wheel of Law*). Also finds on Livius.org, "Ashoka's Rock Edict," last accessed on October 26, 2011, http://www.livius.org/sh-si/shahbazgarhi/shahbazgarhi2.html.

[111] Jacobsohn, *The Wheel of Law*, 14 n 18.

[112] Amartya Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, xii-xiii.

[113] Radhakrishnan, *SIP*, 100.

[114] R. P. Kangle, *The Kautiliya Arthasastra, Part III: A Study* (Bombay University Press, 1965), 3.

originators of the science of politics.[115] Both belonged to the class of *purohita* (priestly class). Kings used to appoint such learned priests to assist him in his royal administration.[116] They seem to have combined *dharmasastras* and *arthasastras* (religion and statecraft/economics) practically, and often simultaneously, to direct the course of secular life and economic activities.[117]

1.2.2.2.2.1. Sovereignty of Governance, Economy, and Policies in *Arthasastra*: A Source of Indian Secular Trends

Thomas R. Trautmann, who investigates on the authorship and evolution of *Arthasastra* indicates that there are many names associated with its authorship. This ancient Indian treatise on statecraft, economic policy and military strategy which identifies its authorship to three different names, viz., Kautilya, Viṣhṇugupta, and Chāṇakya who was a scholar at Takshashila and the teacher and guardian of Emperor Chandragupta Maurya, the founder of Mauryan Empire.[118] Chanakya, the Brahmin minister who, according to legend, engineered Chandragupta's rise to power and the unprecedented success of the Mauryan empire (321-185 BC). Historical accuracy of such individuals and stories are not enough to proof beyond doubt. However, it is significant for my research to illustrate that there were such elite group of people whose role was not primarily to oversee religious matters rather they played the role of secular Brahmin ministers in immensely shaping the state and economy. These small elite with a secular and realist outlook that actively worked to uphold the social and political functioning of the empire with a scheme and determination of its own significantly helped the external affairs of the kingdom. Trautmann's analysis indicates that the text is the compiled result of several different

---

[115] L.N. Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra* (New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 1992), 100. (Henceforth: Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra*).

[116] They were most exemplary in character, learned in all the Vedas and their branches, expert in reading omens, well-versed in the science of politics and capable of performing the correct expiatory rites against acts of God and human calamities. The King shall follow him as a pupil does his teacher, a son his father and a servant his Master. (Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra*, 212).

[117] Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra*, 685.

[118] Mabbett, I. W. "The Date of the *Arthaśāstra*" in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 84, No. 2) 84 (2): (April 1964), 162–169.

authors throughout history.[119] It is in this context that *Arthasastra* argues for a re-ordering of the order of *Purusharthas* in such way as to value *artha* for its own sake. Secular/material aspects of human beings has to be considered as more important than moral and religions ones. Efficiency in the management of wealth, governance and politics demands more realism than idealism. *Arthasastra* suggests:

> Wealth will slip away from that childish man who constantly consults the stars: the only star of wealth is itself; what can the stars of the sky do? Man, without wealth, does not get it even after a hundred attempts. Just as elephants are needed to catch elephants, so does wealth capture more wealth.[120]

An emphasis on the intrinsic value of *artha* (wealth) is explicit in the above statement. *Arthasastra* continues to suggest that there is a close relationship between the growth of economy and expansion of the empire (foreign policy). The wealthier the empire is the more expanded its geographical territory too. If the empire is poor, richer/powerful empires from the neighborhood will defeat them. A well run-state will naturally envisages its expansion to other territories. Such expansionist foreign policy is explicated in Book 7 of *Arthasastra.* It is only after dedicating its energies to this end the state (King and Kingdom) can move on to fulfilling *kama* and *dharma*.[121]

The *Arthashastra* provides extensive coverage on the overall economy, which includes: infrastructure (roadwork, irrigation, forestry, and fortification), weights and measurements, labor and employment, commerce and trade, commodities and agriculture, land use and property laws, money and coinage, interest rates and loan markets, tariffs and taxes, and government expenditures and the treasury. Despite the difference of time, the level of expertise and the standard of execution, in many respects, seem similar to the modern state. As Sayem Islam rightly views: "Economics was regulated through such central planning and the highly

---

[119] Thomas R. Trautmann, *Kautilya and the Arthasastra: A Statistical Investigation of the Authorship and Evolution of the Text* (Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1971), 174, 183.

[120] Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra*, 637.

[121] Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra*, 117ff. The word "state" and "King" were used interchangeably.

detailed attempts at identifying the optimal amount for every economic function stresses this constant strive towards efficiently improving the overall utility and welfare of society."[122] Significant importance was given to the stability, planning, and efficiency of economy.

The treasury received income from industries under state control (prostitution, alcohol, and gambling), taxes and tolls, service charges, fines, special levies, and voluntary contributions and sale of royal honors. In regard to taxation, the *Arthashastra* advises prudence, balance, and proper timing.[123] In the efficient execution of economic issues, the king was assisted by a group of councilors. Kautilya's *Arthasastra* gives emphasis to intelligence over physical and material strengths in efficiently handling the foreign and domestic policies of the state.

> The power of good counsel is superior. Intelligence and the science of politics are the two eyes [of a king]. Using these, a king can, with a little effort, arrive at the best judgment on the means, as well as the various tricks, stratagems, clandestine practices and occult means to overwhelm even kings who are mighty and energetic.[124]

Modern approach to strategic means to achieve political and economic gains can be traced from these ancient practice demonstrated in the *Arthasastra.* The use of *covert operations*[125] can be reflective of our modern time secret agencies. Religion (*dharma*) was suggested for kings and his people as a deterrent against deviations and imbalances in the pursuit of *artha, Kama,* and *dharma.*

Political legitimacy of the court councilors ideologically has its connection to *dharma.* It was an ideology that directed life in the state and life after life. *Dharma* preserved the status quo by maintaining the economic

---

[122] Sayem Islam, *The Arthashastra Insights on Statecraft and Reflections of Ancient Indian Society*, last accessed on October 10, 2012, http://www.umich.edu/~historyj/docs/2008-winter/islam.pdf. (Henceforth: Sayem Islam, *The Arthashastra Insights*).

[123] Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra,* 256ff.

[124] Rangarajan, *Kautilya: The Arthashastra*, 628.

[125] As an example, in several cases the *Arthashastra* recommends the use of "young women of great beauty," or courtesans, to seduce and become intimate with rival military leaders and political officials so as to set the stage for provoking quarrels amongst them or inducing assassination. Similarly, deceptive means are undertaken to ensure loyalty and immediately quell any dissension within the state. The text even advocates the continual testing of the king's own councilors in order to determine their proficiency in dharma, artha, and kama, as well as having secret agents test the loyalties of queens and princes by trying to tempt them to overthrow the king.

specialization of the *varnas* and discouraging opposing religious and political ideologies. Hence, *dharma* was the prime source of political legitimacy of the state and it was one that was *liberally tweaked* by those elites into order to make the statecraft more efficient.[126] As we have *instrumental use of reason* in the west apparently we can trace an *instrumental use of religion* in the *Arthasastra*. Still, that cannot be understood as a *theocratic politics*. Because, as Sayem observes it,

> There is hardly any mention of past events or specific individuals to illustrate its guidelines, and even more surprising, there is no mention whatsoever of Jainism or Buddhism, two religions which were practiced by the most renowned emperors in all of Indian history, Chandragupta and Ashoka.[127]

The emphasis on *artha* (wealth) together with political legitimacy and statecraft definitely give us significant insights into the pioneering efforts of secular perspectives in society and politics. As the Indian version of secularism eventually unravels, one can see marks of these initial contributions in its *inclusivistic* approach to all the religions.

1.2.2.2.3. Akbar's Rationalistic and Syncretistic Approach to Religions: The *Din-i-Ilahi* (Divine Faith)

Akbar (1542–1605),[128] who belonged to the Mughal dynasty, followed a broader tolerant attitude and approach to other religions. He forbade forcible conversions and permitted Hindus, Christians and other religions to make converts. The gradual changes in his religious views is said be associated with his Sufi studies in boyhood and the diversity of creeds among his people. Akbar's religious pluralism can be considered as first among such noble practices in the world. "Out of Akbar's own religious quest came his syncretistic Divine

---

[126] Sayem Islam, *The Arthashastra Insights*, 10.

[127] Sayem Islam, *The Arthashastra Insights*, 11.

[128] Akbar was the third Mughal Emperor. He was of Timurid descent; the son of Humayun, and the grandson of Babur, the ruler who founded the Mughal dynasty in India. At the end of his reign in 1605 the Mughal Empire covered most of northern and central India and was one of the most powerful empires of its age.

Faith, which incorporated elements of Sufi, Shi'a, Zoroastrian, and Hindu doctrine." [129] He even founded a

religion, the *Din-i-Ilahi* (Divine Faith), which included the teachings of major religions of the world, but it

amounted only to a form of a personality cult for Akbar and started dissolving after his death.[130] This great

gesture of religious tolerance practiced by a Muslim king has tremendous elements of inspiration and

encouragement for the vast majority of Muslim states which are predominantly theocratic in nature. Smith

states that, "The avowed principle of both Abu-l Fazi and Akbar was universal toleration (*sulh-I kul).* During

the latter half of the reign that principle was fully applied in favor of Hindus, Christians, Jains, and Parsis, who

enjoyed full liberty both of conscience and of public worship."[131]His religious policies in relation to Hinduism

and his marrying of Hindu princesses were being criticized as just his political tactic to gain support of the

mainstream Hindus. Still, his pioneering efforts to syncretize the elements of all other religions claim some

acknowledgment. His policy of inclusivism, religious tolerance, and inter-religious respect and endeavor

towards an empire based on unity and equality led to Jawaharlal Nehru calling him the 'the Father of Indian

Nationalism.'[132]

This new religion of Akbar founded was 'divine monotheism (*Tauhid Ilahi)* or Divine Religion (*Din Ilahi*). It

was in another sense 'his own political creed'[133] against Muslim religious interference. This new religion

incorporated aspects from different religions and rejected wholly the claims of Muhammad to be an inspired

prophet. Akbar had tried to synthesize entirely different religions with an utmost sense and sensitivity of

religious tolerance. He can be considered as the first and greatest experimenter in the field of religious

toleration if the scope of his toleration, the races to which it was applied, and the contemporary conditions be

taken into account. One can see a lot of 'secular' features, as we understand it now, in the state envisaged by

---

[129] Sayem Islam, *The Arthashastra Insights*, 64-65.

[130] Wikipedia, "Akbar," last accessed January 25, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akbar.

[131] Smith, *Oxford History of India*, 358.

[132] Laxminarayan Gupta, *History of Modern Indian Culture* (Agra: Prem Book Depo, 1973), 24. (Henceforth: Gupta, *Modern Indian Culture*, 24.

[133] Smith, *Oxford History of India*, 348.

Akbar. There are even claims of positioning Akbar's attempt as first among the conscious attempts to formulate the conception of a secular state, because it demands an acute rational approach and application to implement such a religious syncretism. If institutional separation of state and religion is an essential component of a secular state, as predominantly proposed by the western states, Akbar might be lagging behind the modern idea of an ideal secular state with his idea of making a new religion with substantial elements from all the major religions. In the North-Atlantic world a secular state has an exclusivist attitude to religions all together as against the Indian notion of secular state where an inclusivist attitude necessitated.

It is worth re-thinking about such historical events of India, since the Hindu-Muslim issue is the most important challenge for the Indian aspirations of an ideal secular state. Akbar, being a Muslim ruler, did not favored Islam religion. He did not make it the national religion of his kingdom rather he implemented special regulations to the Muslims. There is apparently a wrong notion in the west that India is a Hindu nation. However, the intellectual history of India evidently has enough contribution from the Muslim rulers especially Akbar. For the 'inclusive secularism' argument of this dissertation Akbar definitely has his own share.

1.2.3. Modern Sources of Secularism

Here I present a few miles stones of from the historical progression of India toward modernity which comparatively modern with respect to the previous considerations. In that sense these are more relevant for a reader to find relevance to discuss Indian modernity to that the western counterpart.

1.2.3.1. Colonial Background: British Raj and Its Influences in Shaping the Secular Trends of India (Divide and Rule)

Under the founding leadership of Clive, Hastings, and Cornwallis most part of India came under the control of the British rule. During this same time, secular ideals were indirectly influencing the religiously oriented Indians. Pioneers of secularism, namely George Jacob Holyoake (1817-1906) and Charles Bradlaugh (1833-

1891), also were from the Great Britain. This modern secular and scientific outlook had already begun to have

an impact on the governmental decisions of England, and began to indirectly impress itself in many ways on

the Indian mind through the colonial administration of India. Whatever I present here are signs and indicators

of British influence in some respects to the ongoing growth and development of the modernity, secularism and

self- identity in India. Among British Raj's many positive impacts were included, it's uniting of the country, its

laws, its reforms, and the impact on the constitution and impression on the minds of the natives. Peter van der

Veer views Indian secularism as a product of colonialism and there are similarities, both places it started as

anticlericalism.

> Secularism in India emerges in the context of a secular colonial state that is professedly neutral
> toward religious divisions in society. The British in India are deeply concerned with projecting an
> image of transcendent neutrality. They were at least partially successful in doing this, since Indians
> today often see *dharma-nirapekshata,* the indigenous term indicating the neutrality of the state as a
> distinctive character of Indian civilization, rather than a colonial civilization.[134]

The impact of British Raj in treating different religions of India with an apparent respect seems to have

influenced the constitutional endorsement of the inclusive attitude to religions. It is also interesting to note that

they found it easier to unite geographical territories those were separated by different kings and kingdoms,

rather than uniting people belonging to different religions.

1.2.3.1.1. Colonial Legal Pluralism and 'Unification'[135] of the Land

The British succeeded in colonizing this great country because, among other reasons, of its disunity of religion,

culture, kingdom, caste, race, and language. A significant result of this colonization was, however, the

unification of India under one British rule. This uniting of India under one rule also facilitated, later, the

---

[134] Peter van der Veer, "Smash Temples, Burn Book," in *Rethinking Secularism*, eds. Craig Calhoun, Mark Juergensmeryer, and Jonathan Van Antwerpen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 276. Partha Chatterjee refers to this as *dharma-nispekshata (*indifference or neutrality toward all religions) as synonymous to the tern *secular* in Hindi language, in his article, "Secularism and Tolerance" in *Secularism and Its Critics* ed. Rajeev Bhargava, 350.

[135] British Raj was accused of adopting the policy of "divide and rule." On the contrary they are given credit for the unification of the land. It does not involve a contradiction since they unified different Kingdoms and regions in India keeping their religious, caste and other diversities. Hence, there is a unity and at the same time an internal diversity.

democratization of the nation and of its being born anew as a republic nation. Once the whole land was united under one government, it became very easy for the ideas of nationalism, pluralism, equality, and dignity to spread to all corners of the land. As Mahajan states, "the highly centralized character of British rule in India promoted the growth of Indian nationalism."[136] Apparently the unification involves a 'separation' too as in 1657, when British Authorities authorized the East India Company to make laws and ordinances for the sake of administration, and punish or fine those who didn't conform to the laws. These laws were made in tune with the legal system of Great Britain. The granting of legislative powers to the Company has great historical significance, for it laid the foundation for the development of the Indian constitution. The Charter of 1726 marked the beginning of a systematic legal system and the courts. Corporations were also established by it. Still, their general policy was to 'divide and rule' since India was a country of numerous communities, castes, tribes and ethnicities and religions.[137] Nandhini Chatterjee views the key term for the imperial rule of the British in their policy making was 'neutrality towards all religions.'[138]

The religious policy of the British East India Company towards vast religious groups of Hindus and Muslims was based on common sense, since they wanted to exercise the functions of the government without hurting their religious sentiments. Hence, they had a 'religious neutrality' or 'non-interference' policy toward religions. But there were irregularities to this policy in later times. Protestant missionary work in India started in 1705, and for a century and a half the relationship between the government and the Christian missions was to be one of the one of the major critique on their religious policy. Nandini Chatterjee has an elaborated presentation of the impact of the Christian missionaries as a minority in formation of secularism in her book *The Making of Indian Secularism.* She states, "[…] I was deeply impressed by the deep commitment of Christian leadership across the board to a political concept they called 'secularism', which they explicitly related to the specific

---

[136] V.D. Mahajan, Modern Indian History, 643.

[137] Smith, *India as a Secular State*, 90-92

[138] N. Chatterjee, *The Making of Indian Secularism*, 8.

Indian constitutional provisions establishing freedom of religions."[139] The fact that missionaries and political government worked together for the support of religious freedom can be ambiguous. In reality missionaries were more or less worked as emissaries of the Government although they were also involved in the missionary propagation of their faith. They were used as messengers for the government and messengers of their God.

1.2.3.2. Political Background: Indian National Congress

For the political background I present the role of the Indian National congress party in promoting an *inclusive party politics*. This I argue as another expression of a distant expression of an idea of *public sphere of neutrality*. The history of the Indian national Congress can unfold some tendencies of 'secularism' in the medieval and modern periods of India. Every effort was made to place the Congress on the solidly *non-communal party*. There were members from all the religions, though the majority was Hindus. Differences of opinions, professions, faiths, and castes were accepted and acknowledged in the party. In the early congress sessions there were Europeans, Eurasians, Hindus of many castes and sects, Shi'a and Sunni Muslims, Jains, Jews, Parsis and Sikhs. Still one cannot deny the 'extremists' and 'liberals' within the same party who caused occasional tensions. In 1920 Congress came under the leadership of M.K. Gandhi who had a deep rooted religious faith. Gandhi's use of religious language and dream of *Ram Rajya (*Kingdom of Rama), his religious faith perspective, etc can be highly in dichotomy from the contest of a modern 'secular state' conception. However, his religious faith was completely different from the extremists. Though he was Hindu, his Hinduism could include all other religions in it.[140] Gandhi's 'hinduized' appearance could be criticized, but his emphasis

---

[139] N. Chatterjee, *The Making of Indian Secularism*, 5.

[140] His deepest conviction was that God is Truth and *Ahimsa* (Non-Violence). And so, his faith could easily be inclusive of all religions which also include manifestations of Truth and Non-Violence. I will be exposing and analyzing his understanding of religion and God, rather extensively, in the third chapter.

on social, political and religious unity of various communities undoubtedly "helped to lay the foundation of a secular state."[141]

It is interesting to trace back the movement of the Indian National Congress from the dominantly 'communal' structure to the 'non-communal nationalism.' Muslim leaders of Congress like Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad were non-communal nationalist leaders. Jawaharlal Nehru and Subbas C. Bose were proponents of the 'secularist' view of life. Hence, the ongoing dialectics between communalism, nationalism and secularism can be seen explicitly via the history of the Indian National Congress. The Karachi session of Congress (1931) adopted a resolution on the fundamental rights which were incorporated in the future constitution of India. There, one sees certain deliverance on religious liberty and minority rights. "The state shall observe neutrality in regard to all religions."[142]Thus the idea of secularism was not alien to the Indian leaders or Indian visionaries. The ongoing history of India has not changed from the original stream of secular state ideals. However, there have been conflicts and struggles in her journey towards its completion.

1.2.3.3. Post-Colonial/Post-Independent India of Gandhi and Nehru

The involvement of great politicians and national figures like Mohandas K. Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru in the activities of the Indian National Congress became very significant in the political history of India. Their role and leadership in the party had re-shaped the pre-colonial British history of India into the post-colonial and post-independent India. Their biographies are in many respects a history of India. For Gandhi, being my focus of the thesis, I present his understanding of politics, religion, modernity, civilization, and secularism in a rather detailed manner mainly based on his masterpiece work *Hind Swaraj –Indian Home Rule* and other relevant and

---

[141] Smith, *India as a Secular State*, 92.
[142] Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Unity of India* (New York: John Day Company, 1948), 406.

important works. Then I briefly present Nehru's perspectives and prospects on secularism. A possible synthesis

of their ideas on secularism is acknowledged.

1.2.3.3.1.   Gandhian Concept and Contribution to Secular Modernity of India

The polytheistic nature of Hinduism and the inclusive conception of religions supposed to be immensely

contributive to Gandhi's understanding and approaches to pluralistic perspective toward secularism. His

reading of the book of Max Mueller, Washington Irving, Tolstoy, Arnold, and so on impacted in forming his

multi-religious perspective.[143] He believed that religion and the politics are inseparable, that irreligiosity

encouraged by the State leads to demoralization of the people and that, therefore, and the state's religious

policy should be pluralistic with equal respect to all religions. He states,

> To see the universal and all-pervading Spirit of Truth face to face one must be able to love the meanest of creation as oneself. And a man who aspires after that cannot afford to keep out of any field of life. That is why my devotion to Truth has drawn me into the field of politics; and I can say the slightest hesitation, and yet in all humility, that those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means.[144]

Margaret Chatterjee sheds more light into this:

> Gandhi was not, as a religious thinker, fighting a battle against the inroads of secularism as many theologians feel they are doing today. Gandhi was in fact throughout his life concerned with very secular goals, first early in his career, the securing of civil rights for Indian settlers in South Africa, and back in his own country, from 1915 onwards, the gaining of national independence. […] Hinduism is not an institutional religion, and the meaning of secularism in India is not what it is elsewhere. (MET 420).

Gandhi's concept of Truth apparently goes beyond the frames of the religions. His identity as a Hindu did not

in any way prevent him to frame his concept to Truth inclusive of all religions and realities around him. Madan

is one among the proponents of Gandhian pluralism. He states "participatory pluralism, rather than a

---

[143] M. K. Gandhi, *An Autobiography Or The Story of my Experiments with Truth* (Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1927), 132-133. (Henceforth: MET and provided within the body of the text).
[144] Gandhi, *Autobiography*, 420.

hegemonic and homogenizing secularism, is what will serve India's interests best."[145] In his article *Religious Tolerance and Secularism in India*, Sudheer Birodkar argues that secularism has become possible in India only because of the pluralistic and unorganized nature of Hinduism, the religion of the majority in India.[146]But the 'Hinduization of State' attempted by the supporters of '*Hindutva*' ideologies defeat this claim in the recent times. However, the 'unorganized nature of Hinduism' still can be a constructive phenomenon reducing the element of religious communalism and nationalism in the ongoing formation of a pluralistic secular perspective. Gandhi's inclusivism of all religions and his pluralistic approach has been explicit in his public meetings.

> He began his public meetings, given his own and the nation's religiosity, with prayers drawing on the sacred texts of India's principal religions, among them the *Bhagavat Gita*, the Quran, the Old and New Testament, and the *Granth Sahib* of the Sikhs. He is known to have borrowed civil disobedience from Thoreau.[147]

Now the question might be whether a nation state has to abstain from any mode of prayer or include prayers from all the religions in a country. Is there anything in secularism that demands complete exclusion of religions? Romila Thapar states,

> The argument that secularism is inappropriate to South Asia because the majority of South Asians are adherent of a religious faith implies that a secular society is an atheist society which of course is never the case. Religious faith does not debar secularism since a secular society gives space to religion but does not make it primary. It is also said that secularism is incapable of countering religious fundamentalism. However, religious fundamentalism is primarily a political condition-especially in the contemporary world-and can be countered if the political inducement to fundamentalism is terminated.[148]

---

[145] Madan, *Modern Myths*, xxi.

[146]Sudheer Birodkar, Hindu History, "Secular Roots," last accessed on October 13, 2011, http://www.hindubooks.org/sudheer_birodkar/hindu_history/secularroots.html, accessed on 10/13/2011

[147] Jagdish Bhagwati, "Secularism in India: Why is it Imperilled" in *The Future of Secularism*, ed. T. N. Srinivasan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) 18 (Henceforth: Srinivasan, *Future of Secularism*)

[148] Romila Thapar, "Is Secularism Alien to Indian Civilization?" in *The Future of Secularism*, ed. T. N. Srinivasan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 85.

1.2.3.3.1.1.   Is Gandhi an Anti-Modernist or Anti-Secularist? *Hind Swaraj* in Point

Gandhi has been a conflicting and contested figure in the contemporary debates on modernity and secularism. As a matter of fact the concept 'secularism' is not seen in *Hind Swaraj –Indian Home Rule* since it is a later development. Hence, it is essential to understand the concept of 'modernity' together with the concept of 'secularism' in order to retrieve Gandhi's frame of it. There are mainly two groups of scholars on the basis of their understanding of Gandhi in relation to modernity and secularism: pro-modernist and anti-modernist. These stances are made mainly on the basis of his views on *Indian Home Rule.* However, an unbiased reader can understand that the primary intention of the work *Hind Swaraj* does not have anything to do with his critique on Western (British) civilization. The method of his writing is apparently apophatic (*via negativa*) in nature. Instead of *directly*[149] defining *Hind Swaraj* Gandhi starts with the various conditions of that time to find his point of departure. His critiques are mainly on three areas: British imperial rule, industrial capitalism, and rationalist materialism. His strong remarks on British civilization are not his original critiques rather; he picks them up from within the internal resistance of Britain itself. He states:

> Several English writers refuse to call that civilization which passes under that name. Many books have been written upon that subject. Societies have been formed to cure the nation of the evils of civilization. A great English writer (Edward Carpenter) has written a work called 'Civilization: Its Cause and Cure. There he has called it a disease. […]We rarely see people arguing against themselves. Those who are intoxicated by modern civilization are not likely to write against it. Their care will be to find out facts and arguments in support of it. (HS 34).

British civilization and modernity are the fields of analysis and critique here. Civilization is mainly understood as produced by the industrial revolution, a better standard of life with 'better houses, people making bodily welfare the object of life,' and so on. Apparently the transition of the British and European countries to industrialization had replaced and left a lot of people unemployed due to the 'mechanization' of labor. As

---

[149] M.K. Ghandhi, *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings* ed. Anthony Parel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 72. (Henceforth: HS and provided within the body of the text). Chapter XIV indicates that the former chapters in which he unleashes his strongest criticisms has been in preparation for explaining *directly* what he means by *Hind Swaraj*.

Gandhi says, "Men will not need the use of their hands and feet. They will press a button and they will have clothing by their side. They will press another button and they will have their newspaper."(HS 36). Gandhi's attack on British and European modernity and civilization is not completely his own, rather, 'several authoritative books' which he read on the same. He too agrees with them.

As a result of the emergence of modern civilization there is an eventual decline of moral and religious perspectives which he emphasizes. "This civilization takes note neither of morality nor of religion."(HS 37). Apparently this can be said about our modernity and secularism too, if one compares it with the former times.[150] Margaret Chatterjees states, "Gandhi does not speak out against secularization or secularism. He does not even speak against atheism, for he finds in many atheists that very desire for truth which he himself believed was identical with the religious impulse. What he does take a stand against is materialism, irreligion, and untruth."[151]

1.2.3.3.1.2. Civilization, Machinery and Materialism

British and European civilizations with their industrial capitalism and rationalist materialism were not appealing to Gandhi. Basically, "Gandhi sees capitalism as the dynamic behind colonial imperialism. […] Gandhi's rejection of capitalism is based on a profound repugnance to a system where profit is allowed to degrade labour, where the machines are valued more than humans, where automation is preferred to humanism."[152] In this context, he states that "Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilization; it represents a great sin." (HS ch. 19). It is to be noted that he eventually changed his strong positions on machinery starting from 1919 to 1947. Anthony Parel compiles Gandhi's changing position as follows: "I

---

[150] Charles Taylor's *Malaise of Modernity* speaks about the prospects and problems of individualism, instrumentalism, and the politics of both.

[151] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought,* 5.

[152] Rudolf C Heredia, "Interpreting Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj"* in *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 34*, No. 24 (June 12, 1999), 1497.

would wish to see such beautiful little mills in every home. But the country is fully in need of the hand-spinning and hand weaving industry. Agriculturists in no country can live without some industry to supplement agriculture."(HS 164). In 1947 Gandhi stated: "Machine-power can make a valuable contribution towards economic progress. But a few capitalists have employed machine-power regardless of the interests of the common man and that is why our condition has deteriorated today." (HS 170). Though he seems to undermine the importance of modernity in his *Hind Swaraj* he does so out of a reaction at exploitation he saw in South Africa. He also seems sure that the fruits of industrialization will never be of the 'benefit of the poor of the poor.'[153]

Gandhi's sensitivity to how machines and modern technology dehumanize and alienate the society can also be seen in his critique on lawyers and doctors. The least of the society is not benefitted from these services (HS chs. 11-12). He was also against the purely materialistic and humanistic use and development of reason. In his Collected Writings he says: "I plead not for the suppression of reason, but for a due recognition of that in us, which sanctifies reason itself." (CWMG 6:106)[154]. For Gandhi, truth was much more than our senses could grasp. "My uniform experience has convinced me that there is no other God than Truth."(MET 419). Truth is the transcendent reality that gives meaning and value to everything here and now. The mainstream Hindu conception is similar except they name that Truth as *Brahman.* This transcendental view of truth can be seen as belittling the importance of the 'secular life'[155] of mankind. In his interpretation of Hind Swaraj Rudolf C. Heredia states,

---

[153] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought,* 5.

[154] Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* (New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India, 1999), 9: 118. (There are 98 volumes. volume number and pager number are given in progression. It can also be found online: http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/cwmg.html. (Henceforth: Gandhi, CWMG will be provided within the body of the text).

[155] I want to connect it to the modern secular humanistic perspectives.

In a more secular world today we may not be sympathetic to such a worldview. And yet a materialism that is deterministic leaves no scope for human freedom and hope. Gandhi emphasizes this reaching out to a beyond, that gives this freedom and hope its dynamism and a reach beyond its grasp.[156]

It is clear that his focus of criticism on modern civilization was *of a specific period.* The imperialistic British colonialism, 'modernity[157],' and civilization were severely criticized by him. Mechanization was introduced by industrialization. Their capitalistic attitude had its major emphasis on profit making. The plight of the poor laborers caused Gandhi to criticize the industrial developments of that time. Rationality which concentrated on mere humanism and materialism was also criticized by Gandhi.

1.2.3.3.1.3. *Swaraj* and *Swadeshi*

Gandhi's first direct explanation of *Swaraj* comes up while he writes about *How can India become free?* He states,

> When we are slaves, we think that the whole universe is enslaved. Because we are in an abject condition, we think that the whole of India is in that condition. As a matter of fact, it is not so, but it is as well to impute our slavery to the whole of India. But if we bear in mind the above fact, we can see that, if we become free, India is free. And in this thought you have a definition of *Swaraj.* It is *Swaraj* when we learn to rule ourselves. It is, therefore, in the palm of our hands. Do not consider this *Swaraj* to be like a dream. (HS 72-73).

Here Swaraj is explained 'as something one has to experience *internally*, giving rise to a moral transformation of the individual.'(HS 73). Gandhi categorically emphasized that "the English have not taken India: we have given it to them. They are not in India because of their strength; but because we keep them."(HS 39). Judith M. Brown's observes,

> In this (*Hind Swaraj),* he had made it plain that, for him, India's Swaraj was not political independence from the British, but a radical return to her moral roots and what he saw as the values of her traditional civilization. His main concern was not with British rule but with the divisions among Indians that had made this possible from the eighteenth century and with what he interpreted as

---

[156] Rudolf C. Heredia, "Interpreting Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj"*in *Economic and Political Weekly* 34 (1999): 1497. (Henceforth: Heredia, *Interpreting Gandhi*).

[157] The modernity of the British is not the modernity in the 21st Century. The term 'modern' changes its meaning as times goes on. For example, what is 'modern' for us today will not be the 'modern' of a society that continues to exist after fifty or hundred years.

India's moral crisis, as so many of its leaders in politics and the modern professions seemed to be enslaved to the values of Western civilization and to be intent on creating an Indian version of a Western state.[158]

He is probably the first among those who proposed the transformation of one's own consciousness to overcome the bondage of colonialism. "Gandhi would not want to exchange an external colonialism for an internal one, a white sahib for a brown one, or a 'Hindustan' with an 'Enlighstan.'(HS Ch.4)

 Gandhi presents the full definition of *swaraj* only by near end of the book. He does it in four points: 1. Real home-rule is self-rule or self-control (one's rule over one's own mind is real *swaraj*). 2. The way to it is passive resistance: that is soul-force or love-force. 3. In order to exert this force, *Swadeshi* in every sense is necessary. 4. What we want to do should be done, not because we object to the English or that we want to retaliate, but because it is our duty (*dharma*) to do so. (HS 118). The intent of Gandhi in writing Swaraj was to make India completely her own by dispelling primarily the British colonial and western elements and then the rest of the external influences that destructively affected her civilization which he considered as 'the best civilization' (HS 67)[159] among the world due to its antiquity, soundness and "immovable foundations."(HS 66).

Anthony Parel considers that the concept *swaraj* holds the key to Gandhi's political philosophy, which is not in any way to minimize the importance of such doctrines *satyagraha, sarvodaya,* and *ahimsa.* He states, "What I am suggesting is that the significance and the effectiveness of these doctrines cannot be fully grasped unless they are placed within the framework of the concept of *swaraj.*"[160]

The word *Swadeshi* means *things pertaining to one's own country.* In his *Collected Writings* one can have more explication on the word *swadeshi.*

---

[158] Judith M. Brown and Anthony Parel, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Gandhi* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 5 (Henceforth: Judith and Parel, *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi*).

[159] Civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty. Performance of duty and observance of morality are inconvertible terms. To observe morality is to attain mastery over our mind and our passions. So doing, we know ourselves.

[160] Anthony J. Parel, "The Doctrine of Swaraj in Gandhi's Philosophy," in *Crisis and Change in Contemporary India* eds. Upendra Baxi and Bhikhu Parekh (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1995) 57.

No cause for unhappiness would remain if *swadeshi* were to replace everything foreign. […] It does not mean merely the use of what is produced in one's country. That meaning is certainly there in *Swadeshi*. But there is another meaning implied in it which is far greater and much more important. *Swadeshi* means reliance on our own strength. 'Our strength' means the strength of our body, our mind and our soul. (CWMG 9: 118).

Gandhi's final chapter of Hind Swaraj states that "In order to exert this force (love-force or soul force as against the brute force), *Swadeshi* in every sense is necessary."(HS 118). Hence, it is not difficult to understand the intertwined nature of *Swaraj* and *Swadeshi.* The latter can be understood as the means to the former. He perceived the exploitation or dominance of the urban population over the poor and uneducated people of the villages. The micro level operation of *Swadeshi* begins in the villages. "It [village] brought together his three basic themes of *Swaraj*: self-respect, self-realization, and self-reliance."[161]

1.2.3.3.1.4.   Relevance of Gandhi for the Present Time

We live in a post-colonial, post-industrial, post-modern, Post-metaphysical, and even a (post)- secular world. Does Gandhi influence the world today or is he disappeared to the oblivion of the history? Are he and his thoughts some way relevant for our intellectual debates or is he completely irrelevant for us? These and many more questions can be raised today. The distance of time – Gandhi's time and our time - is important in analyzing his relevance or irrelevance. My purpose is not to present a comprehensive account of it rather to open up a few general streams related to this topic. Time Magazine selected Gandhi as joint runner-up with Franklin Roosevelt to Albert Einstein as *person of the twentieth century*. "He was singled out as the century's foremost representative of the *crusade for civil rights and individual liberties*. Gandhi is that rare great man held in universal esteem, a figure lifted from history to moral icon."[162]He is an ever inspiring champion of incorporative nationalism, dialogic resistance, pacifist movements, and integral perspectives.[163]

---

[161] Heredia, *Interpreting Gandhi,* 1499.

[162] David Hardiman, *Gandhi in his Time and Ours: The Global Legacy of his Ideas* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 1. (Henceforth: Hardiman, *Gandhi in His Time and Ours*).

[163] Hardiman, *Gandhi in His Time and Ours*, 12, 39, 238.

Gandhi said, "The English are splendidly armed; that does not frighten me, but it is clear that, to pit against them in arms, thousands of Indians must be armed. […] Moreover, to arm India on a large scale is to Europeanize it."(HS 15). With all growth and development in the world together with its modern sciences, technology and industrialization, the world still has no answer for the irrationality of rampant violence taking place across the globe. If Gandhi's *ahimsa* (non-violence) is impractical, what else is our modern solution for it? Peter van der Veer states, "The secular utopia, as is clearest in Gandhi's campaigns, is thus one of the peaceful coexistence of equal religions within a neural state. Nonviolence is therefore the center of Gandhi's attempts to create a secular India."[164]Are we facing a serious problem of religious pluralism and fundamentalism around the globe? Gandhi can surely demonstrate some insights in this regard. As Margaret Chatterjee observes,

> Religious pluralism does not pose for him philosophical problems about rival truth claims, because of his adherence to the ancient Hindu and Jain belief in the fragmentariness of all men's visions of the truth. Religious pluralism is considered by Gandhi in connection with the practical exigencies of living together peacefully.[165]

Gandhi states, "Civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty. Performance of duty and observance of morality are convertible terms." (HS 67). This bridging of the terms duty and morality can be read from the context of the modern debates on the dichotomy of "duty" and "rights." Iyer says, "Socializing the individual conscience rather than internalizing the social conscience"[166] was Gandhi's concern. This approach to self-identity and self-realization seems to me a relevant contribution for all times. Gandhi can be an even inspiring model figure for a 'synthetic' approach and perspective. Iris Murdoch's depiction of 'broken totality' can be seen as follows: "Dora suffered from guilt, and with guilt came fear. She decided at last that the persecution of his (Paul her husband) presence was to be preferred to the persecution of his

---

[164] Veer, *Rethinking Secularism*, 280.

[165] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought, 8.*

[166] Raghavan Iyer, *The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi* (Oxford University Press, 1973), 123.

absence."[167]In the context of our modern brokenness, Gandhi's 'holism' and 'synthesis' can still provide input and inspiration for a reconstruction of identity. Further, "Gandhi's moral example could be an element in producing secular tolerance, but such an example is not enough for the daily business of regulating social life."[168]Another possible relevance of Gandhi can be seen in his principle of *religious neutrality-equal flourishing of religions* under the state's neutrality. The modern *public sphere of neutrality* can surely learn from him in its approach to the religious pluralism within a particular state. His discussion on *means and ends* in relation to *soul-force and brute force*, surely have relevance for our modern times. (HS 80).

Gandhi never lacked opponents. While he was alive he fought with the British Empire and with the 'extremists' and 'moderates' of the Congress Party. Nehru had a lot of differences with Gandhi in policies and priorities. Dr. Ambedkar could never forgive Gandhi for his imposition of the *Poona Pact*[169] which was an agreement between Hindu leaders in India granting new rights to untouchables (low-caste Hindu groups). The pact, signed at Poona (now Pune, Maharashtra), resulted from the communal award of Aug. 4, 1932, made by the British government on the failure of the India parties to agree, which allotted seats in the various legislatures of India to the different communities. Mahatma Gandhi objected to the provision of separate electorates for the Scheduled (formerly "untouchable") Castes, which in his view separated them from the whole Hindu community. He *fast unto death* ultimately forced Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar, the leader of the untouchables, concede since Gandhi was near death. He and the Hindu leaders then agreed to the pact, which withdrew separate electorates but gave increased representation to the Scheduled Castes for a 10-year period.[170] Separate electorates made for the *dalits* then and the reservations made for them now can be debatable. In modern times

---

[167] Iris Mudoch, *The Bell* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1958), 7.

[168] Veer, *Rethinking Secularism, 278.*

[169] The Poona Pact refers to an agreement *between* the lower caste Untouchables (then called "depressed Classes," now referred to as *Dalits*) of India led by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and the upper caste Hindus of India led by Mahatma Gandhi that took place on 24 September 1932 at Yerawada Jail in Pune (now in Maharashtra), India.

[170] "Poona Pact," accessed Noverber 1, 2012, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/469892/Poona-Pact.

he has been severely criticized as impractical because of his 'moral resources'[171]although the same is one among the criticisms against the modern secularism. A comparative reading of Gandhi's Critiques and modern Critiques on materialism and Secularism can really be rewarding. Connolly states in *Why I am not a Secularist?*

> The historical modus vivendi called secularism is coming apart at the seams. Secularism, in its Euro-American forms, was shifting, somewhat unsettled, and yet reasonably efficacious organization of public space that opened up new possibilities of freedom and action. It shuffled some of its own preconditions of being into a newly crafted space of private religion, faith, and ritual. It requires cautious reconfiguration now when religious, metaphysical, ethnic, gender, and sexual differences both exceed those previously legitimate within European Christendom and challenges the immodest conceptions of ethics, public space, and theory secularism carved out of Christendom. […]Secularism needs refashioning, not elimination.[172]

It is interesting to note John Hick's words in this context. He argues that Gandhi's ideas were always incarnated in his actions.

> For his life was a series of experiments with Truth, and the Truth made him free – free from selfishness; free to love and to be loved; free to live creatively, deeply, involved in the struggles of his own time and place. Hence he is also a great witness to Truth for other times and place.[173]

The second chapter of this dissertation will have a more elaborate and comprehensive exposition of the life, works, thoughts and person of M.K.Gandhi.

1.2.3.3.2.   Nehruvian Concept and Contribution to Secular Modernity of India

Nehru's *atheistic agnosticism*[174] depicts his predominantly 'secularist' preferences and priorities in his vision of the modern India. To Nehru, religion represents superstition, primitive fear, and suppression. Such blind faith is

---

[171] Gandhi's moral resources and Taylor's emphasis on 'moral resources' in an important point of my thesis.

[172] William E.Connolly, *Why I am not a Secularist?* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 19.

[173] John Hick, "Forward," in *Gandhi's Religious Thought,* ed. Margaret Chatterjee, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983), xii.

[174] Atheistic agnosticism or agnostic atheism is a philosophical position that encompasses both atheism and agnosticism. Agnostic atheists are "atheistic" because they do not hold a belief in the existence of any deity and at the same time they are "agnostic" because

antithetical to the rational and scientific character of secularism. While religion looks beyond the world, secularism looks within the world for answers. Nehru's secularism emerges out of such a thinking pattern. He states,

> India is supposed to be a religious country above everything else.. The spectacle of what is called religion or at any rate organized religion in India and elsewhere has filled me with horror and I have frequently condemned it and wished to make a clean sweep of it. Almost always it seemed to stand for blind belief and reaction, dogma and bigotry, superstition and exploitation, and preservation and exploitation of vested interests.[175]

He was also influenced by the British context where the mixing up of religion and politics caused a lot of complexity in the democratic functioning of the government. This background eventually helped him to frame a 'secular' perspective, devoid of religions, for the overall development of a modern India. In his autobiography he speaks of the older religions which have lost its real 'real content' and which have only their external forms:

> The Church of England is perhaps the most obvious example of a religion which is not a religion in any real sense of the word. Partly that applies to all organized Protestantism, but the Church of England has probably gone further because it has long been a State political department.[176]

It is not difficult to understand the context from where he constructed his notion of a new secular democratic India. Nehru explicitly expresses his differences to the predominantly 'spiritual' approach to the 'political' issues. Gandhi's method of 'fasting' was almost incomprehensible to Nehru. It appeared as 'magical', 'emotional', and 'sort of a religious miracle' for a political cause. Nehru wanted to drift away from this 'religious method.' He states,

> Again I watched the emotional upheaval of the country during the fast, and I wondered more and more if this was the right method in politics. […] All India, or most of it, stared reverently at the Mahatma and

---

they claim that the existence of a deity is either unknowable in principle or currently unknown in fact. The agnostic atheist may be contrasted with the agnostic theist.

[175] Domenic, April 29, 2010, comment on Indian Focus, "Nehru's Secularism," The Indian-focus-Blog, accessed November 2, 2012, http://indianfocus.blogspot.com/2010/04/nehrus-secularism.html.

[176] Jawaharlal Nehru, *Toward Freedom: The Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru* (Boston: Beacon Hill Press, 1963), 241. (Henceforth: Nehru, *Toward Freedom*)

expected him to perform miracle after miracle and put an end to untouchability and get *swaraj* and so on-and did precious little itself! And Gandhiji did not encourage others to think; his insistence was only on purity and sacrifice. I felt that I was drifting further and further away from him mentally, in spite of my strong emotional attachment to him. Often enough he was guided in his political activities by an unerring instinct. He had a flair for action, but was the way of faith the right way to train a nation? It might pay for a short while, but in the long run?[177]

Undoubtedly Nehru is the greatest champion of secularism if we understand it from the perspective of the western understanding of it. He continues to bring forth India as a secular country, even when India is supposed to be a religious country since the people of India – Hindu, Muslim, Buddhist, Sikh and others take pride in their faiths, seems to be an amazing insight and a herculean task for any modern mind. His courageous secular outlook and approach to religions can be seen as follows:

> The spectacle of what is called religion, or at any rate organized religion, in India and elsewhere has filled me with horror, and I have frequently condemned it and wished to make a clean sweep of it. Almost always it seems to stand for blind belief and reaction, dogma and bigotry, superstition and exploitation and preservation of vested interests. And yet I knew well that there was something else in it, something which supplied a deep inner craving of human beings.[178]

Here Nehru appears to be an agnostic rather than an atheist. He acknowledges there is "something" which does not come to his comprehension. However, it is not difficult to trace out his 'secularist' political and personal approaches and attitudes from what we have already seen. Nehru's *faith in reason* is the focal point of Sunil Khilmani's article *Nehru's Faith.* He suggests:

> In speaking on Nehru's faith, my intentions are not merely historical. I wish to recover "faith's" primary meaning: trust or confidence, unshakeable belief or conviction – meaning that do not necessarily imply a religious sense. It is crucial to do this, at a moment when our ideas of faith are in danger of becoming unnecessarily restricted.[179]

He continues to write about the 'other firm foundations' other than religious foundations upon which one can have moral and ethical projects, apparently gives hope for rational secularism. Nehru's use of *instrumental*

---

[177] Nehru, *Toward Freedom*, 240.

[178] Nehru, *Toward Freedom*, 240.

[179] Sunil Khilmani, "Nehru's Faith" in *The Crisis of Indian Secularism in India*, ed. Anuradha Dingwaney Needham and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan (London: Duke University Press, 2007)*,* 89. (Henceforth: Khilmani, *Nehru's Faith*).

reason is also recognized with its two derivatives: scientific reason and social reason. In this sense Indian secularism can be developed in the Indian minds since it's in the gradual 'refinement' and 'moral commitment' of reason, which is not a Western import.[180]

Nehru's rationalistic approach to politics and Gandhi's rational and religious approach to politics can be incompatible at conflict at some point. However, in Tagore, in Gandhi, and in Nehru one can observe *a search for a modern morality* which is explicit in their self-criticisms and in their public debates which in many ways has been a building block for modern secular India. The *tradition of public reason* they initiated could really create an intellectual space for a moral and ethical debate. Khilmani states:

> No doubt Tagore, Gandhi, and Nehru represent a broad and diverse set of positions, and they frequently disagreed. But together, they are the most notable examples in our history of the effort to invent a modern ethics for Indians and India.[181]

Experience of the limits of reason never discouraged Gandhi rather he tried his own way to expand his *rational* positions. Unlike Nehru, who had tremendous confidence in human reason, Gandhi really needed *something like faith* to gain that confidence which made him even to spend almost ten years in the darkness of a prison. For Nehru, it was perhaps a mental or psychological one, not religious one. Nehru could not disagree more with the religious method of *ahimsa* (non-violence) as a weapon against the *himsa* (violence) which is very prevalent in modern society. He states: "Neither the growth of reason nor of the religious outlook or morality have checked in any way this tendency to violence."[182] He seems to believe in the emerging concepts and constructs of morality as it is necessitated by a particular time and place. He stated:

---

[180] Khilmani, *Nehru's Faith*, 91.

[181] Khilmani, *Nehru's Faith*, 93-94.

[182] Nehru, *Toward Freedom*, *542.*

> The necessities of today will force us to formulate a new morality in accordance with them. If we are to find a way out of this crisis of the spirit and realize what the true spiritual values are today, we shall have to face the issues frankly and boldly and not take refuge under the dogmas of any religion.[183]

The aforementioned statement speaks for itself how Nehru saw the vital importance of rationally defining the character of the India State and the need for political power to be accountable through the institution of democracy. Nehru's secularist position was in a view of making a modern India. Hence the relationship between modernity and secularity needs to be articulated in understanding the core of Nehruvian secularism. Post-independent India is indebted to Nehru for her booming technological and industrial developments. Still, the question remains: Could Nehru make India secular, the way he wanted it to be secular? Everybody knows that it is a 'process' and he did the best he could in his time. Still, his 'legacy of reasoning, and of intellectual and political understanding' with a very sound moral perspective remains unique and unparalleled in the history of India which still strives to achieve many realities which Nehru dreamt in his time.

1.2.3.3.3.   A Possible Restoration: By Bridging the 'Differences' between Gandhi and Nehru

Over decades the distance between Gandhi and Nehru has been exaggerated. It is interesting to note that the Nehruvian secularism has apparently fewer adherents compared to the Gandhian pluralistic position in India. I do not deny the emotional factor behind Gandhi being the "Father of the Nation" and his exemplary life as an inspiring model for anybody to endorse his ideas and ideologies. Both Gandhi and Nehru had similar concerns for the Indian nation-state. However both had their different means to achieve it. Kumkum Sangari observes their closeness of approaches as follows:

> Both had advocated the protection of minority interests (from the 1931 session of the Congress). Though Gandhi did not give the kind of priority to a shared economic domain that Nehru did, he too like Nehru could argue for focusing on common economic interests; both opposed a theocratic state and pointed out the divisive role as well as the unifying potentials of colonial rule.[184]

---

[183] Nehru, *Toward Freedom*, 550.

[184] Kumkum Sangari, "A Narrative of Restoration: Gandhi's Last Years and Nehruvian Secularism" in *Social Scientist*, 30 (2002): 7. (Henceforth: Sangari, *A Narrative of Restoration*).

Nehru asserted a "unity of common subjection" that is intended for a common political interest of all religious groups while Gandhi presented his task as that of "bridging social distance consistently with religious beliefs...by going out of my way to seek common ground on political fields."[185] If Gandhi had begun by fusing religions as an ethical system with politics, in his last years, he was also separating religions from the nation as well as communally defined religions from politics with increasing vigor.[186]

Nehru's agnostic and to a great extent atheistic life and policies was not appealing to predominantly religious minded people of India. Contextual secularisms and multiple modernities are to be seriously considered in this context. Gandhi still has something *wider* in his projects and prospects for a country like India. Kumkum Sangari sees the same but he attempts at reducing their distance and differences.

> Gandhi's address, however, was wider than Nehru's: a more interesting problematic would be the potential of eclectic syncretisms to 'secularize' pockets of cultural production, and the transformative nodes of jointing religious pluralism with 'western' secularism that he began to explore. And I believe it is in this jointing that a consensual base for both Nehru and Gandhi will be found.

A restoration of an 'Indian version of secularism' could be made possible by resolving the disparities and combining commonalities of both Gandhi and Nehru. Sangari argues that the *last years* of Gandhi and the Nehruvian secularism have more closeness that disparity.

> If Gandhi was not alone, neither was Nehru. And if Gandhi moved nearer Nehru then that too was a socially occupied position. Both presented versions of tolerance or respect for all faiths from which it became very difficult to 'other' and both represented or reflected a similar range of existing attitudes. I think it is a mistake to oppose their positions on religion as indigenous versus western because both were shaped by different types of internationalism: Nehru's by a definitionally secular socialism and a liberalism heavily mediated by colonial history, Gandhi's by a prescribed oscillation between humanism and the constellation of colonial indigenism and anti-modernity as well as by an idea of the secular anchored in the individual worshipper that blended an already hybrid medieval devotionalism with Protestant Christianity and a 'rational' secularism. Neither can be unequivocally said to be within or outside any single tradition.[187]

---

[185] Jawaharlal Nehru, The Unity of India, (London 1861), p.119 and Discovery of India (Calcutta, 1946) pp.333, 343, 448, 467; Hn 15 Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 134.

[186] Sangari, *A Narrative of Restoration*, 7.

[187] Sangari, *A Narrative of Restoration*, 22.

It is not easy to earmark the distinctions and disparities of them with regard to the idea of a democratic India. "In fact so much that it is hard to say whether the Constitution has a Nehruvian, Ambedkarite or a Gandhian framework."[188]Still it is possible to argue that Gandhi partially influenced both Nehru and Ambedkar in their vision of India. The purpose I brought the understanding of Nehru on secularism is to demonstrate that there is a *Nehruvian version of secularism* which is substantially different from the *Gandhian Secularism.* I would argue that Nehru's secularism was more in tune with the western understanding of secularism (exclusive of religions). However, Gandhi's secularism, which I endorse, is that makes Indian secularism distinctive (inclusive of all religions).

For Akeel Bilgrami the principal fault of secularism is the assumption that secularism stands outside the arena of substantive political commitments. Although he has some general appreciations for Nehruvian secularism he criticizes it as an imposition. He continues to state that "[…] because of the Archimedean rather than emergent character of India's adopted secularism that Nehru and other leaders refused to give genuine voice to Muslim leaders within or outside the Congress, thereby generating deep resentment in a shrill minority of Muslim voices." He views that,

> An alternative substantive secularism, emergent rather than assumed, sees itself as one amongst other doctrines such as Islam and Hinduism; a doctrine that its proponents must persuade all others (including Muslims and Hindus) to agree to as an outcome of negotiation. Thus, secularists must start in the political arena with its substantive commitments to its secular principles.[189]

Bilgrami sees the need of secularism in India. Nehruvian form flawed in its methodology. A new model is envisaged and expected in future. It is emergent, substantive, and revisionary in nature.

---

[188] Sangari, *A Narrative of Restoration*, 26.

[189] Akeel Bilgrami, "Secularism, Nationalism, and Modernity" in *Secularism and Its Critics*, ed. Rajeev Bhargava (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 394.

1.2.4. Constitutional and Cultural Sources and Factors: The Making of Formal Secularism in India

The constitutional frame of Indian secularism had not come about in a day. It was a slow and steady process. Cultural context of India was sufficiently recognized while the formal constitution was made. Here I present some major milestones, and issues faced by India in the making of its secular constitution. This will turn permit me to articulate a few distinctness, specificities, and even some of the major setbacks in the form of crises and failure in the practice of secularism in India.

1.2.4.1. Major Milestones in the Making of the Secular Constitution of India

What I present here is less than a complete picture of the constitutional genesis, growth and development; however, a few building blocks are appropriate to make my research coherent the ongoing thematic framework. Scholars like Shabnum Tajani attempts at tracing the tentative origin of the constitutional reform of India starting from *The Morley-Minto Reforms*[190] which is named after the viceroy for India. This was impacted by the partition of Bengal in 1905, which gradually leads to the institution of a *separate/communal* electorate for the Muslims. Tajani observes:

> But by 1909 the question of representation had shifted from being a qualitative one about what it meant to be a "community" in the Indian context to being a quantitative one, where "minority came to be defined in strictly numerical terms. […] In this sense, the reforms had been about recognizing certain parity among communities and the right of each to be heard.[191]

---

[190] Morley-Minto reforms (1909): Constitutional changes in British India, introduced to increase Indian participation in the legislature. They were embodied in the Indian Councils Act (1909) following discussions between John Morley, Secretary of State for India (1905–14), and Lord Minto, viceroy (1905–10). The reforms included the admission of Indians to the Secretary of State's council, to the viceroy's executive council, and to the executive councils of Bombay and Madras, and the introduction of an elected element into legislative councils with provision for separate electorates for Muslims. The reforms were regarded by Indian nationalists as too cautious, and the provision of separate electorates for Muslims was resented by Hindus.

[191] Shabnum Tejani, "Reflections on the Category of Secularism in India" in *The Crisis of Secularism in India.* ed. Anuradha Dingwaney Needham and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan (London: Duke University Press, 2007), 50. (Henceforth: Tejani, *Reflections on Indian Secularism*).

Later, the minority questions continued to appear synonymous to the aforementioned line. The other minorities of India are the Jains, Sikhs and Christians. They were 'from the vantage point of the colonial government.' The British policy of making separate constitutional provisions for particular religious and minority groups eventually and even *necessarily* got into the post-colonial frame of the constitution of India. Besides the recognized minorities there were the *Untouchables*[192] for whose representation Dr. Ambedkar stood strongly. The debates on the identity of the untouchables eventually lead the British India to propose the creation of constituencies on the basis of caste, which in turn draws strong opposition from the upper-caste Hindus.

1.2.4.2. Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar and the Genesis of the Indian Constitution

Ambedkar[193] was one of the founding fathers of independent India. He was also the Chairman of the drafting Committee of the Indian Constitution. He stated that,

> […]the British were faced with the task of creating institutions of representative government. The successful realization of such a project would be founded on an accurate understanding of the nature and structure, and composition of Indian society, and the constitution would have to be appropriately tailored to these particularities.[194]

In 1930, *The Round Table Conference* was held in London. This was led by Gandhi and Ambedkar together with the representatives of different segments of the Indian society – Hindus, Liberals, Untouchables, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, and European Commercial classes. Gandhi was the single representation of the Congress. He wanted a *Dominion India* in which he proposed to resolve the place of minority communities in view of raising the status by leveling the status *constitutionally.* Ambedkar thought along the side of the former British frame

---

[192] *Dalit* is a designation for a group of people traditionally regarded as *Untouchables*. *Dalits* are a mixed population, consisting of numerous castes from all over South Asia; they speak a variety of languages and practice a multitude of religions. While the discrimination based on caste system (not the caste system itself) has been abolished under the Indian constitution, evidence exists that there is still discrimination and prejudice against *Dalits* in South Asia. Since Indian independence, significant steps have been taken to provide opportunities in jobs and education. Many social organizations too have proactively promoted better conditions for Dalits through improved education, health and employment.

[193] Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar (1891 – 1956), popularly also known as *Babasaheb*, was an Indian jurist, political leader, philosopher, thinker, anthropologist, historian, orator, prolific writer, economist, scholar, editor, a revolutionary and one of the founding fathers of independent India. He was also the Chairman of the Drafting Committee of Indian Constitution.

[194] Tejani, *Reflections on Indian Secularism*, 53.

of minority rights since he was not convinced enough of the 'upper-castes' dynamism towards such an ideal.

Ambedkar argued:

> At every successive step taken by the British government to widen the scope of representative Government, the Depressed Classes have been systematically left out. No thought has been given to their claim for political power. I protest with all the emphasis I can that we will not stand this any longer. The settlement to our problem must be a part of the general political settlement and must not be left over to the shifting sand of the sympathy and good will of the rulers of the future.[195]

The constitutional development of the ideas of 'minority rights, personal laws, and reservations' can be traced back to this historical context. Ambedkar's demand to recognize the Untouchables as a minority community much the same way as the Muslims, Sikhs and Christians cannot be underestimated. Gandhi had extended the minority status to the Muslims and then to the Sikhs but he vehemently opposed to extend it further to the Untouchables which drew criticism on him.[196] Danton states, "Gandhi vehemently opposed the idea of separate electorates for the Untouchables on the grounds that they were part of the organic unity of Hinduism. He held that the 'institution of untouchability' was a heinous one, but to constitute them as an interest group would represent a "vivisection" of Hinduism."(CWMG 46:302-303). But Ambedkar totally disagreed to the idea of considering the Untouchables as a subset of Hinduism. It is interesting to note that Gandhi and the Congress were not so favorable to the idea of giving minority status to other communities such as Indian Christians and Anglo-Indian Commercial Communities,[197] since he had in view a unified India without the division between minority and majority. It is clear that for Gandhi the question of minority status is a *religious* and not a *political* one; where for Ambedkar it is surely a *political* question. Under the *Poona Pact*, the Untouchables were granted 148 seats with 18 percent reserved for Untouchable candidates in the central legislature. But elections

---

[195] Tejani, *Reflections on Indian Secularism*, 9-10.

[196] The disparity and differences between Gandhi and Ambedkar is still notorious. Ambedkar called the *Poona Pact* as Gandhi's *Vindication* of caste and lambasted him in a speech entitled *Annihilation of Caste* which he wrote for the 1936 *Jat Pat Todak Mandal of Lahore* (Tejani, *Reflections on Indian Secularism*, notes no. 11).

[197] Tejani, *Reflections on Indian Secularism*, 56.

would take place through joint electorates. These provisions are kept in the final constitution.[198] Ambedkar

criticized Gandhi's *fast for unity* as *preaching caste under the name of Varna*.[199] In 1956 Ambedkar converted

to Buddhism and he died after two months of being in the new religion. The wounded Ambedkar stated in 1935

that 'he would not die a Hindu.' Tejani observes, "That one so committed to liberal democratic ideals should

ultimately embrace religious conversion as a solution to the oppression of *Dalits* appears paradoxical. It is

apparently true that his endorsing of Buddhism was more a political decision rather than a religious one. This

could be argued on the basis of his political interest in the uplift of the untouchables. Ambedkar had been a

staunch advocate of constitutional solutions to these problems."[200] His interest in Buddhism was preeminently

secular, because compared to other religions Buddhism was based on reason and not revelation.

1.2.4.3. The 42nd Amendment and Inclusion of the Word "Secular" in the Preamble

Until the adoption of the 42nd amendment to the preamble of the Indian Constitution (1976), the only mention

of the word 'secular' was in article 25 (2) of the Constitution, wherein the state had been empowered to

regulate or restrict any "secular activity" associated with religious practice.[201] For example, regulating or

restricting any economic, financial, and political or other secular activity which may be associated with

religious practice. Here the connotation of "secular" was "nonreligious" or "pertaining to matters other than

purely religious." But, after the amendment of the constitution, discussion of the concept and its meaning has

been considerably more ambivalent. Much of this has to do with a lack of clarity and consensus over the

meaning and relation of the "sacred-religious" and "secular-political." The preamble to the Constitution of

India states as follows:

---

[198] This provision given to the untouchables is called *communal award.* Gandhi's famous "fast unto death" on Sept 20, 1932, draw him a lot of attention and criticism. Ambedkar was pressured to withdraw from his claims and he finally did. Hence, the Untouchables were retained within a general electorate of Hindus.

[199] Ambedkar, "Annihilation of Caste, Appendix II: A Reply to Gandhi, 93-94," accessed November 25, 2011, http://www.ambedkar.org/ambcd/02.Annihilation%20of%20Caste.htm.

[200] Tejani, *Reflections on Indian Secularism*, 61.

[201] "Constitution of India" article 25 (2*)*, last modified December 1, 2007, http://lawmin.nic.in/coi/coiason29july08.pdf.

> We, the people of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a sovereign, socialist, *secular* (Italics is mine), democratic republic and to secure to all its citizens: justice, social, economic and political; liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship; equality of status and of opportunity; and to promote among them all; fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity and integrity of the nation; in our constituent assembly this twenty-sixth day of November, 1949, do hereby adopt, enact and give to ourselves this constitution. [202]

Thus, the Indian constitution guarantees both individual and collective rights to freedom of religion through articles 25-28 enshrined in Part III of the Constitution which deals with Fundamental Rights.[203]

Articles 15 and 16 also guarantee non-discrimination on the grounds of religion. The former one deals with prohibition of discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth and latter deals with equality of opportunity in matters of public employment. Hence, the Indian constitution through its preamble, fundamental rights and directive principles has created a secular state based on the principle of equality and non-discrimination. With the advancement of the Indian Constitutional philosophy of social and economic democracy, secularism has been held to be one of the 'Basic Structures' of the Indian Constitution.

1.2.4.4. Ambivalent Positioning – Political and Religious (Ethical)[204] Secularism of India

Is there such a 'secularism' which is equally political and religious? At the outset the suggestion appears paradoxical though of course such a conception would be of great benefit for our reflection on a number of problems. It seems to be a missing link in the development of a general theory of "secularism" that India, the

---

[202] "Preamble of the Constitution of India," accessed November 28, 2009, www.Inidan constitution.com. (Henceforth: Indian Constitution)

[203] 25. Freedom of conscience and free profession, practice and propagation of religion. (1) Subject to public order, morality and health and to the other provisions of this Part, all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practice and propagate religion. Nothing in this article shall affect the operation of any existing law or prevent the State from making any law. 26. Freedom to manage religious affairs.—Subject to public order, morality and health, every religious denomination or any section thereof shall have the right. 27. Freedom as to payment of taxes for promotion of any particular religion. 28. Freedom as to attendance at religious instruction or religious worship in certain educational institutions. (1) No religious instruction shall be provided in any educational institution wholly maintained out of State funds. (3) No person attending any educational institution recognized by the State or receiving aid out of State funds shall be required to take part in any religious instruction that may be imparted in such institution or to attend any religious worship that may be conducted in such institution. (Indian Constitution, *Preamble*).

[204] Indian political thinker Rajeev Bhargava divides secularism into 'political' and 'ethical.'

largest democracy, has its own apparent genealogy of the concept. It will be rewarding to attend to the Indian alternative of secularism and modernity in the context of the North-Atlantic one. There is no doubt that the French, American and Turkish models have contributed greatly to the development of the theoretical framework of this new political theory of secularism. Unfortunately, however, we have reached a stage where most secularist thinkers cannot imagine models other than those that "divide" or "Separate" Church (religion) and State (Politics). Post-independent India has always been getting *secularized* as necessitated by its multi-religious, cultural and lingual context. Indian secularism never emphasized, or rather never thought it necessary to emphasize, the importance of a division or separation of religion from the public, but instead insists on the equality of all the religions in the public sphere. However, the *ambivalent* nature of the constitution with its political and religious articulations has not primarily been out of the ongoing debates on secularism. Nandini expresses it as follows:

> Soon after India's emergence as a republic, the incongruity between India's deeply religious society and formally secular constitution struck various observers –forcefully-sometimes to produce cautiously optimistic predictions of (future) success, but in all cases to draw attention to the many lapses.[205]

The problems of Indian secularism were enumerated by Donald Eugene Smith at the end of his book, *India As A Secular State.* For him, communalism, extensive state interference in Hindu Religious institutions, the position of religious personal law in the legal structure, and most importantly what it really means to be 'secular' in the Indian context, were the predominant problems or lapses of Indian secularism. Hence, his answer to the question "Is India a secular state?" was a qualified "Yes." He observed that it is still *meaningful* to speak of India as a secular state.[206]

---

[205] N. Chatterjee, *The Making of Indian Secularism,* 2.
[206] Smith, *SS.,* 495-501.

The lack of a perfect definition for the term 'secularism' opens up the possibility of further defining and understanding the same. This in turn will affirm the validity of being secular in a variety of meaningful and valid ways.[207] The fundamental question of the *potensity/capability* of secular frame as a principle of governance still begs a lot of doubts and questions.

1.2.4.5. Religious *Majoritarianism* and *Minoritarianism*

The presence of major world religions plays a pivotal role in deciding the version of secularism that India has been striving to achieve. But the role of religious minorities, including the *dalits* (outcaste), also play, apparently, as equal an importance in forming India's secularism and secular self-identity. This is not only a factor in India alone but rather a global factor; but for example the Euro-American demand and development of secularism came out of their immigrant minorities. The gradual development of pluralism in the West has a lot to do with the rampant immigrations from around the world, unlike the Indian pluralism which is basically indigenous in nature. It is not an immigrant reality, rather an innate reality of India.

> In India, by comparison, the minorities are not immigrant populations or outsiders who need to be accommodated by the rest of the society. Instead, identified religious and linguistic minorities are an integral part of the state and are included as equal citizens of the polity. Consequently, they are not dependent upon the largesse of the rest of the society or the so-called majority.[208]

The Muslim minority in India is the third the largest Muslim community in the World (approximately more than 100 Million). Christians are small but an important minority group in India. Smith notices that, "[…] the presence of fairly large religious minorities of the same ethnic stock as the majority, effectively organized and

---

[207] Marc Galanther, "Secularism: East and West" in *Comparative Studies in History and Society* 7, 2 (1985): 133-59.

[208] Gurpreet Mahajan and D.L. Sheth, "Introduction," eds. *Minority Identities and the Nation-State* (Oxford: University Press, 1999), 2. (Henceforth: Mahajan and Sheth, *Minority Identities*).

articulate will be an important factor in the development of the secular state."[209] There are numerous sizable

minorities in India; for examples Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhist, Parsees, and so on.

In a later point of time, Nandini Chatterjee presents the same issue in an interesting way:

> It is possible, of course, that Indian Christians, when arguing for 'secularism' were recommending legal protection against religious discrimination. Private belief in a set of doctrines does not contradict the claim to such legal protection but forms the basis for it.[210]

One of the key issues of Indian secularism is the legitimacy of the multiple *personal laws.* These are laws of

domestic relations, inherited property and religious institutions, applicable on the basis of the religious identity

of the persons involved. Religion and the State are closely related in Indian context. While the majority tries to

separate it, the minority group in an effort to promote secularism tries to retain the relationship between

religion and state.

Together with the minority rights, there were cultural rights given to both minority and majority groups. Hence,

while the Hindus were given 'Hindu Civil Code,' the Muslims were given "Muslim Personal Law." The

nation-states in the third world countries are faced with the task of incorporating all these segments of the

society while also retaining a certain degree of autonomy and neutrality in the society. It is partially true that

mostly they 'slide into a supra-cultural entity through the discourse on nationalism which involves activating

the principle of majority ethnicity.'[211]D. L. Seth emphasizes the inevitability of *ethinicization* in the process of

nation-building.[212] Rajeev Bhargava reaffirms the need for minority rights and maintains that the moral worth

of group needs to be protected and recognized. [213]

---

[209] Smith, *India as a Secular State*, 44.

[210] N. Chatterjee, *The Making of Indian Secularism*, 6

[211] Mahajan and Sheth, *Minority Identities*, 11.

[212] Mahajan and Sheth, *Minority Identities*, 15

[213] Mahajan and Sheth, *Minority Identities*, 15.

1.2.4.6. Prospects of a Comparative Constitutional Approach

It is challenging as well as rewarding to go through the constitutions of more secular or less secular countries to mutually give and take. Gary Jeffrey Jocobsohn's *The Wheel of Law* presents such an approach bringing the constitutions of India, Israel and United States of America with their *ameliorative, visionary and assimilative* constitutions respectively. The focus of book is the *The Wheel of Law* which is seen in the Indian Flag. *The Dharma Chakra of Ashoka* is depicted in the center of the Flag. (cf. my section on Ashoka: Section: 2.2.1.1.).While the flags of India and Israel have religious symbols in it, the US flag has more secular nature in it, having no religious symbols depicted in it. He states, "[…]the absence of any religious symbolism on the American flag comports with the view that questions of faith and piety are to be resolved more properly in private places, the featured presence of the Star of David on the Israeli flag points to the unavoidably public nature of the religious question in Israel."[214] Analysis of these constitutions will be rewarding.

A comparative reading of American, Israeli and Indian constitutions helps one to understand some of the apparent closeness and differences which in turn would be mutually beneficial. "It quickly became apparent that some of the ideas associated with secularism – most notably equality-are featured prominently in each of the separate locales."[215]It is not to be construed that they have the same meaning in all these places. If for all of these locales the ideal of equality is implemented in the same way, they 'may produce contrary results.' This eventually leads us to say that "A secular state may assume a variety of forms, with corresponding sets of constitutional norms and expectations for governing the relationship between public and religious institutions."[216] The complexity of this issue in India is not in any way the same or as complex as it is anywhere else in the world.

---

[214] Jocobsohn, *The Wheel of Law*, 5.
[215] Jocobsohn, *The Wheel of Law*, 5.
[216] Jocobsohn, *The Wheel of Law*, 11.

Jocobsohn brings forth the ideas of "positive" and "negative" secularisms from the context of the judgment on

Ayodhya in India. Accordingly he argues that,

> […] secularism, as a "basic feature" of the constitution, must be understood within the broader framework of the document's commitment to social reconstruction. […] only comparative analysis clarifies this distinctiveness and assess as the cleaver strategy of religious nationalists in employing familiar categories of liberal constitutionalism to advance a quite liberal agenda.[217]

In the context of his discussion on *religious speech in the public forum,* Jacobsohn uses the example of Indian

King Ashoka and his Rock Edict 12 (Cf. Ashoka: 2.2.1.) in view of bringing the John Rawlsian understanding

of *public reason.* He observes that, the use of *Rawlsian public reason*-based arguments to sustain the

constitutionality of restrictions on religious speech to be notably misplaced in the context of the Indian

sociopolitical environment. This is one of the reasons for judges, legislators, and others who make efforts to

engage in constitutional analysis to mutually benefit each other. The adaptive possibilities of *ameliorative*

constitution of India and the *assimilative* constitution of America are higher since these two have

constitutionally based models of secularism.[218] However, there needs to be a reconsideration of the 'religious

issue' in both. The example of the *Peyote Case*[219] demonstrates the failure of implementing constitutional

measures in the issues of religion. Jocobsohn observes,

> In my analysis, the subordination of conscience to civic obligation, which is at the heat of the assimilationist reasoning in Justice's Scalia's opinion for the Court, flows naturally from the Constitutional's secular aspirations.[220]

Here he feels that 'familiarity with the Indian *ameliorative* approach of India jurisprudence would be useful to

decision made in the United States, since the Indian model highlights a substantive equality to the achievement

---

[217] Jocobsohn, *The Wheel of Law*, 13.

[218] Jocobsohn, *The Wheel of Law*, 17.

[219] *Employment Division, Department of Human Resources of Oregon v. Smith, 494 U.S. 872 (1990)*, is a United States Supreme Court case that determined that the state could deny unemployment benefits to a person fired for violating a state prohibition on the use of peyote, even though the use of the drug was part of a religious ritual. Although states have the power to accommodate otherwise illegal acts done in pursuit of religious beliefs, they are not required to do so. (Wikipedia, "Employment Division and Smith," accessed November 11, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Employment_Division_v._Smith, accessed on 11/07/2011).

[220] Jocobsohn, *The Wheel of Law*, 17.

of religious tolerance. At the same time, the American model offers the importance of liberal democratic ideas in mitigating the communal obstacles to religious freedom and democratic functioning in India.

1.2.4.7. Indian Distinctness of the Nature of Plurality

The distinction of Indian secularism has to be understood against the religious, cultural, political and social context of India. I argue that *pluralism* is the most important factor that demands for a secular nature of the state. I argue that the nature of plurality existing in a country can help us to understand the nature secularity of the same. Now the question is, "Is India *plural* in a distinct or different way?" Or is not plurality a reality all around the world in some way or some form? In our modern times pluralism is really a global factor, especially in the North-Atlantic West due to the factor of immigration. Even otherwise, each nation can make convincing arguments in favor of their own pluralities. Amartya Sen states:

> […] I would like to argue that India is pluralist and diverse in a way that very few countries are. While we are indeed not unique in being diverse, there is something quite extraordinary in the extent of diversity in India. I don't believe that any of the contrasts in the other countries I mentioned begins to compare with the tremendous wealth of diversities- indeed diverse diversities.[221]

Is there any other country with as many numbers of flourishing languages and literatures? The central aspect of the distinct sort of pluralism is India's 'religious diversity.' The majority of the Indians are undoubtedly Hindus, but India has more than one hundred million Muslims. She has the largest number of Sikhs and Jains in the world. Buddhism has been flourishing elsewhere, around the world lately but it started in India. Parsee population is also fairly large in India. The presence of Christianity is almost as ancient as Christianity itself. Traditionally its presence is traced back to A.D. 52 when the apostle St. Thomas preached the gospel in India.[222] The religious diversity and its pluralism are unparallel to any other place in the world. It is possible to articulate the antiquity of the intellectual traditions associated with each of these religions and extraordinarily

---

[221] Amartya Sen*, "*Indian Pluralism" in *India International Centre* Quarterly (1993): 39.

[222] T.K. Joseph, *Six St. Thomases Of South India* (California: University of California, 1955), 27. (Henceforth: Joseph, *Six St. Thomases*)

large historical literature on arithmetic, algebra, geometry, linguistics, phonetics, astronomy, and so on. Sen states, "We are not unique in being diverse, but there is something quite special in the tremendous extent of diversity in our traditions. Our religious diversity is part of a much wider pluralist experience, of which we can be legitimately proud."[223] India just by herself was multi-religious, multi-cultural and multi-lingual in nature. I too argue that the importance and interpretation of Indian secular modernity has its predominant task as the 'national integration.'[224]

Rajeswari and Anuradha deliberate this as follows:

> Secularism is therefore interrogated for its usefulness in addressing other issues, without reference to religion (matters in which *religion* is not expected to be the central alternative that might provide a solution): among these are the problem of "national unity"; and the problem of achieving "real" democracy, also identified as the problem of minorities. Secularism, we are suggesting, is a more comprehensive and diffuse package of ideas, ideals, politics, and strategies that its representation soley as religion's Other would lead us to expect. This is particularly so in the postcolonial world where it has been called on to perform multiple functions in the service of nation building. [225]

Hence, there needs to be a real re-figuration or distinctive understanding of the non-western, specifically Indian version of secular modernity unlike the usual diagnosis of the Western understanding of secularism. With this in mind I present some of the Indian uniqueness and specificities of *secularism:*

1. Rajeev Bhargava's five distinctive aspects of Indian secularism is significant: a). Its explicit multi-value character; b) The idea of principled distance that is poles apart from one-sided exclusion, mutual exclusion, and strict neutrality; c) Its commitment to a different model of moral reasoning that is highly contextual and opens up the possibility of multiple secularisms, of different societies working out their own secularisms; d) It uniquely combines an active hostility to some aspects of

---

[223] Joseph, *Six St. Thomases*, 41.

[224] The prospect and problem of Indian secularism seems to have been rooted in the issue of either unity or disunity of it her diversity. If secular advancement can improve her 'national unity' by better awareness of her concept of 'nation state,' that would be a commendable aspect of secularism.

[225] Anuradha and Rajeswari, *The Crisis of Indian Secularism*, 4.

[225] *Post-secular* and *post-religious* thinking strands in the West re-affirm the fact that none can undo religions and their multi-faceted presences. In this respect India is a model for the rest of world to reflect on *secularism* in a different way.

religion with an equally active respect for its other dimensions; e) It is the only secularism that that

attends simultaneously to issues of intra-religious oppression and inter-religious domination.[226]

2. The distinctive features of Indian religious, cultural, social and political life themselves make up the

uniqueness of Indian secularism and the 'indifference' (neutrality) of her public sphere.

3. Indian *secularism* and secular reflection ever focused much on the exclusion of religions or undoing

of their presence in her intellectual and political debates and practices. Rather a *secular* frame has

been reflected within the context of the *unavoidable* presence of the religions[227]. In the wake of the

resurgence of religion this presence of the religions may signal a unique promise of Indian secularism

for the rest of the world.

4. Secular philosophies and theories have been emerging in Europe and North-Atlantic areas of the

world, primarily to confront the challenges of pluralism or multiculturalism. Pluralism was *not a*

latent reality in most of the secularized countries in the West, but a reality that gradually *developed*

due to the growing number of immigrations. Reductionist secularism has been trying to homogenize

pluralistic societies for the purpose of social equality. However, recognition of diversity of identity is

important both for Gandhi and Taylor. India can claim to be the *largest multicultural society* in the

world where all people speak a variety of languages, and all the major religions - Hinduism,

Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Sikhism, Zoroastrianism, Jainism, etc. have large numbers of

followers in India. Virtually all these religions are divided into a number of sects and all these sects

have hundreds, thousands or even millions of adherents. As the largest democracy in the world, India

---

[226] Rajeev Bhargava, *The Promise of Indian Secularism,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 64.

[227] Post-secular and post-religious thinking strands in the West re-affirm the fact that none can undo religions and their multi-faceted presences. In this respect India is a model for the rest of world to reflect on *secularism* in a different way.

is a 'unity in diversity.' Pluralism of all sorts is neither 'foreign' nor new to India, and this is also the case for her conception of secularism.'[228]

1.2.4.7.1. Specificities of Indian Secularity and Neutrality

Each nation and its political society and public sphere will have both similarities and differences. This can open up new possibilities and difficulties. The influence that is exerted by the public sphere on the state is stronger and much more extensive in a highly rational public sphere such as found in Western societies. When official institutions of the state are compelled to respond to the needs and requirements of citizens crystallized in public opinion and formed by rational – critical debate, then we have something akin to Habermas' liberal public sphere. Plainly then, the liberal public sphere is a form of, but is not identical to, political society. "Some form of political society may be *illiberal* but their non-liberal character cannot be turned into their defining feature. It is just as possible to have a liberal political society as it is to have a non-liberal one."[229] Habermas makes the startling observation that the critical institution that makes individual autonomy possible and prevents the dissolution of individuality is the family. This view seems contradictory since such an autonomous individual will have an 'oppositional' relation to the family. This picture is drawn from the Western context. On the contrary, the story of non-western societies such as India has a different kind of relationship between families and the individual, and in many ways it is not conducive to the development of the 'modern' autonomous individual. In India, the cultural incommensurability of family, language, society, state and public sphere will always be a great challenge for the emergence of communicative rationality in the discursive field, by means of which modern societies try to develop a public sphere of neutrality.

---

[228] 'Foreign' here means that the conception of Indian secularism can have its own claims to uniqueness, rather than fully adopting a non-Indian secular theory.

[229] Rajeev Bhargava and Helmut Reifeld, eds. *Civil Society, Public Sphere and Citizenship: Dialogue and Perceptions* (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2005), 19. (Henceforth: Bhargava and Reifeld, *Civil Society*).

Post-colonial societies have always had a problematic relationship with modernity[230] as projected and pressurized by the West. Once we accept that modernity originated in the West and migrated slowly to the rest of the world, different possibilities can and must be addressed. Firstly, that modernity failed to take root on its arrival because non-modern cultural systems were deeply entrenched, resilient to change and not easily displaceable. Secondly, that Western modernity easily found a safe niche in these societies (blind emulation or sheer seduction). Thirdly, the possibility exists that when Western modernity began to interact with local cultural systems, something like a hybrid culture began to emerge, possibly by creative adaptation, for which an analogue can be found neither in Western modernity nor in an indigenous tradition.'[231] Taken together, this cluster forged what can be called an 'alternative modernity,' and only from such a context can one speak of an Indian public sphere of neutrality.

The public sphere of India has always been multiple in natures. This was not devoid of friction and episodes of fusion. "Beneath the public script of conformity did exist a private script of rebellion constituting an individual subjectivity that questioned and negotiated in specific ways the pressures of families and other communities."[232]Hence the public and private spheres inscribed with 'dual marks of modernity and tradition.'

In India, modernization was induced by colonialism. Such modernity was only a 'foreign idea' rather than a 'life-reality' for the people of India. The process of individuation involving the freedom of people from their earlier bonds took place without mass democratic awakenings. The pre-modern communities did not dissolve as a result of the British induction of modernity, but instead the British made it a point to keep them 'divided' on the basis of religious affinity and communalistic bonding which made them weak, distanced and disunited.

---

[230] Modernity refers to an historical era, roughly defined as a post-traditional period beginning Renaissance characterized by a move from feudalism (or agrarianism) toward capitalism, industrialization, secularization, rationalization, the nation-state and its constituent institutions and forms of surveillance.

[231] Bhargava and Reifeld, *Civil Society*, 27-29.

[232] Bhargava and Reifeld, *Civil Society*, 37.

The specifically Indian notion of neutrality essentially evolves from its *Religious and political secularism*. The western secular thinkers might find it difficult to understand, since they mostly understand 'secularism' devoid of religions. But again, on the contrary, India never thought of a secular democracy that is devoid of religions. I think we still need a better means of evaluating standard form secularism. One might be able to make a state 'secular (devoid of religion) but none can make a society secular.' Charles Taylor has stated that a society devoid of a proper 'genealogy' lacks a stronger foundation. After all his rational discourses, Habermas finally came to "*An Awareness of What is missing*." India never lost her religious fervor, but still striving and struggling to take up the challenge of differentiating properly the 'religious from the political and vice versa.' An unhealthy mix of religion and politics, in place of healthy co-existence, has been the greatest danger for both western and non-western secularisms.

1.2.4.8. Narratives of Crises and Failures

The development of India as a 'secular democracy' has many phases. It has gone through the stages of communalism, nationalism and secularism. And the failure of the Indian secularism is related radically to the overlapping of those three phases. Conflict between them, in short, has weakened the force of any positive neutrality. This is especially unfortunate as fundamentalist forces rear their heads in India as in other countries of the world. No religion is an exception from this. In India, Hindu fundamentalism has become much more aggressive than its Muslim counterpart. *Hindutva* militancy threatens Indian secularism unlike ever before, and in so doing threatens the nation itself. Smith presents the complexity of Indian secularism like this:

> The problem of India as a secular state is a complex one. The rich diversity of religious life as well as the legacy of communalism and partition, the influence of ancient Hindu values as well as the impact of the West, the leadership of religious Gandhi and agnostic Nehru, the tendency of traditional religions to regulate virtually every aspect of life and the tendency of the modern state to do the same – all of these factors and many others are a part of the complex pattern. Problems frequently arise for

which there is no clear parallel in western experience, which has contributed so greatly to India's political evolution in other respects. Indian solutions must be found for Indian problems.[233]

Thus the crisis of Indian secularism is part of its context. India has been striving to formulate an Indian solution for all these Indian problems. It is undeniable that there are failed moments in moving toward this great task. Major narratives of the failure of Indian secularism have the following historical instances in mind:

a. The Emergency of 1975-77 which ironically occasioned the introduction of the term "secular" into the Indian Constitution by the Forty-second Amendment.

b. The *Shah Bano*[234] case in the 1980s

c. The anti-*Mandal* agitation and the Babri-Masjid demolition in conjunction with the *Ramajamabhoomi*[235] movement in the 1990s.

d. The rise of the Hindu right, viz., *Bharatiya Janata party* (BJP), in Indian politics has brought out their ideology of *Hindutva*. This idea of *Hinduization* of India eventually resulted in violent communal riots that seriously threatened the safety and rights of the minority communities. The recent success of the Congress party and apparent decline of the BJP party are "viewed by many as providing crucial breathing space within which a different-perhaps-renewed secular-politics may be articulated."[236]

---

[233] Smith, *India as a Secular State*, viii.

[234] The Shah Bano case was a controversial divorce lawsuit in India, in which Shah Bano, a 62 year old Muslim woman and mother of five from Indore, Madhya Pradesh, was divorced by her husband in 1978 and was subsequently denied alimony. The case created considerable debate and controversy about the extent of having different civil codes for different religions, especially for Muslims in India. This case caused the Rajiv Gandhi government, with its absolute majority, to pass the Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Divorce) Act, 1986 which diluted the secular judgment of the Supreme Court and, in reality, denied even utterly destitute Muslim divorcees the right to alimony from their former husbands. The Passing of Muslim Women Protection Act allegedly sent a message of Muslim appeasement practiced by the Congress party. (Wikipedia, "Shah Bano Case," accessed November 7, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shah_Bano_case).

[235] *Ram Janmabhoomi* is the "Birthplace of Lord Rama." Lord Rama is a major God in Hindu theology and the Hindu religion where He is described as an *Avatar* (incarnation) of Lord Vishnu in Hinduism. The exact location of Lord Rama's birth as stated in holy *Ramayan* as being in the city of Ayodhya in Uttar Pradesh, though it does specify a particular area of land there. From 1528 to, the *Babri Masjid Mosque* was a place of worship for Muslims. From 1853 to 1949, separate areas were earmarked for both Hindus and Muslims to worship and in 1949, Idols were placed inside the disputed structure. The site of the *Babri Mosque* which was surrounded on all sides by Mata Sita Rasoi (Lord Rama's wife Sita Devi's Kitchen - actually a Temple and other Temples of Hanuman) and the disputed structure sharing walls with Sita and Hanuman Mandir was destroyed when a political rally developed into a riot involving 150,000 people. This happened due to the movement that was launched in 1984 by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) to reclaim the site for Hindus who want to erect a temple dedicated to the infant Rama (*Ramlalla*), at this spot. Many Muslim organizations have continued to express outrage at the destruction of the disputed structure. Since then, this political, historical and socio-religious debate over the history and location of the *Babri Mosque*, is known as the *Ayodhya Debate*.

[236] Anuradha and Rajeswari, *The Crisis of Indian Secularism*, viii.

e. The Godhra and post-Godhra incidents. On February 27, 2002, some Mulims, it was alleged, had attacked the Sabarmati Express at the Godhra railway station in Gujrat. The train was carrying Hindu Pilgrims returning from *Ayodhya*, the site of *The Babri Masjid-Ramjanmabhoomi* dispute.

f. Pseudo-Secularists: RSS, *Sangh Parivar*, and *Bajrangal*, and *Bharatiya Janata Party*.

g. Bal Thakaray and his anti-secular and anti-western ideologies and the communal riots by his party, *Shiv Sena*.[237]

The leaders and freedom fighters were well aware of the need for a secular and a modern democratic polity for India. They also knew that India is a highly religious country and that secularism in the sense of hostility or antagonism to religion will never be acceptable to the people of India. Though Indian secularism originally meant to be 'indifferent' to religions, many leaders were unable to distance themselves from their religious ideologies and political policies. The greatest challenge of Indian secularism remains the overlapping of religious interest and political interest.

The most Orthodox Muslim, '*Ulama*, of the Deobandi School preferred secular India to a Muslim homeland such as theocratic Pakistan. They outright rejected the idea of Pakistan when mooted by Jinnah. They denounced two national theories, on the basis of religion. Nehru, though personally agnostic, never imposed agnosticism or atheistic secularism. In the 1950s, in answer to a query by an Indian student at Oxford University, he said that 'in the U.K. the state has a religion (Anglican Christianity) but the people of England are quite indifferent to religion. In India, the state has no religion but people are very religious. Therefore, in the Indian situation secularism means equal protection for all religions.'[238] Nehru never compromised on this matter. He was well aware of the fact that secularism is a great cementing force for the diverse people of India. As an idealist, he thought that with the spread of modern scientific and technological education secularism,

---

[237] Bal Thakaray is the founder and chief of the Shiv Sena, a right-wing Hindu nationalist, and Marathi ethnocentric party active mainly in the western Indian state of Maharashtra. His political philosophy was largely shaped by his father Keshav Sitaram Thackeray, a leading figure in the Samyukta Maharashtra movement (United Maharashtra movement), which advocated the creation of a separate linguistic state of Maharashtra. In 1966, Thackeray formed the Shiv Sena party to advocate more strongly the place of *Maharashtrians* (People of the State of Maharashtra) in the Bombay's (Mumbai) political and professional landscape.

[238] Asghar Ali Engineer, "Future of Secularism in India," in *CSSS Archive 2003*, accessed November 20, 2011, http://ecumene.org/IIS/csss115.htm. (Henceforth: Engineer, *Future of Secularism*)

would also spread and achieve acceptability. Yet, not only did it not happen that way, but communalism and obscurantism spread with more intensity than secularism.

The failure or diminishment of secularism in India, seen from a Western secular perspective, is due mainly to the lack of support from the vast majority of political leaders especially of the post-independent India in which Nehru was the great exception. Many eminent Congress leaders were opposed to it in their heart of hearts. They tried to sabotage the Nehruvian vision. Moreover, an outdated educational system which prevailed even after the independence of India became a huge obstacle to forming and training a new generation of modern secular thinkers. In fact, the educated were thus more affected with the communal 'viruses than were the illiterate masses who never studied in schools and colleges. Similarly, urban areas were more affected with communal riots than rural areas. The formation of Pakistan also greatly affected the thinking of the educated middle class Hindus and they looked upon Muslims as responsible for it. It was never properly explained that complex political factors brought about the existence of Pakistan, and that it was only a small percentage of elite Muslims who were truly responsible for this. Jinnah, in his struggle for power with the Congress leaders, never cared to understand what would be the impact of the creation of Pakistan on the Muslim minority that would remain in India.[239]

Thus, the education system did not cultivate a secular outlook, and a conservative political outlook continued to strengthen the communal mindset of the educated middle classes. After the death of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Zakir Husain, the Muslim leader of Independent India could not provide moderate and wise leadership to Muslim masses. They also not only remained extremely cautious in their approach but never prepared the Muslim masses for modern secular polity in India. They were more insistent on minority rights than on the necessity of change. This attitude was further strengthened among these leaders due to frequent

---

[239] Engineer, *Future of Secularism*.

occurrences of communal riots. The Jabalpur riot of 1961 shook Nehru as much as Indian Muslims, to the core. For the first time, they became greatly apprehensive of their security and began to withdraw into a shell. This further reinforced conservatism and became an obstacle to developing a secular outlook among Muslims. The Jabalpur riots were followed by the more intense communal violence in Ahmedabad in 1969 and Bhivandi-Jalgaon in 1970. The end of the seventies and early eighties witnessed a number of major communal riots in which hundreds were killed brutally. The RSS propaganda, on the other hand, brought more and more Hindus into the fold of *Hindutva*. All these developments were a sure prescription for weakened secular forces in the country.

The decade of the eighties saw the rise of religious militancy among Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims. This decade also witnessed horrendous communal violence in North India. At the same time, caste stratification became much more pronounced, and led to Hindu militancy. And in the beginning of the nineties *Babri Masjid* was demolished, which pushed Indian secularism to the brink, giving rise to shocking riots in Bombay (Mumbai). Thus we see Indian secularism has followed a tortuous course all through the post-independence period. But this is not surprising in a developing country like India, with its immense poverty, insurmountable levels of unemployment and widespread illiteracy.

In the given political circumstances, the claims of secularism do not seem to be totally accepted by everyone. However, one should not take a short- term view based only on the immediate context. Human beings have always struggled to transcend their given situation. A purely contextual view tends to be realistic, but also restricted. A transcendent vision, on the other hand, may not always be realistic, but it does offer a much broader sweep. And it is this broader sweep which shapes new realities, which in turn enable us to shape our future. The emergence of India as a world power can also be understood as a new dawn of its latent secular ideals. A pluralist country like India needs to have secular polity as its life-blood. Since none can undo her

pluralistic identity, it is inevitable for her to seek and maintain the most realistic and vital neutrality (indifference) available.

1.2.5. Contemporary Understanding and Ongoing Debates on Indian Secularism

The issue of secularism still discussed and debated and indeed Indian secularism is still emerging. There are numerous scholars reflecting and debating this issue from their own perspectives. Here I present the ongoing debates on secularism.

1.2.5.1. Early Debates and Conceptions:

In 1963, Prof. Donald Smith analyzed India as 'a secular state' in his book *India as a Secular State*. Ved Prakash Luthera wrote another book on the same theme titled, *The Concept of Secular State of India* (1964). In 1965 the Law Institute of India (Delhi) organized a seminar on *The Secular: Its Implications for Law and Life in India*. These works, coming in just three years' time, signal the importance of the themes of Indian secularism for serious debate. Later on, Marc Galanter intervened with a demonstration of the limits of Smith's understanding of Indian secularism. Against the *unconvincing* theory of Smith he argued that, "[…] the Indian state interferes with and promotes Hinduism, thereby compromising its secular credentials."[240]According to him a secular state cannot be function without presupposing a *normative conception of religion.* Hence, some sort of interference between the state and religion is *unavoidable.*[241] Since then, scholarly debate on the concept of Indian secularism and modernity have been inconclusive, divisive, ambivalent and incomplete. Perhaps this can be said of the 'secularism debates' around the world but with regard to the Indian secularism, two main views have emerged: that of the *communitarians*, who oppose coercive state secularism and advocate a 'pluralist and decentralized polity and also support the autonomy of religious communities, and *left-liberal*

---

[240] Bhargava, *Secularism and Its Critics, 19.*

[241] Bhargava, *Secularism and Its Critics*, 19-20.

secularist who support egalitarianism, uniformity of law, and the separation of religion from politics.[242]
Whatever their differences, both these groups are united in their opposition to *Hindutva hegemony.* It is
therefore useful to understand the concept of *Hindutva*, since it is mainly conceived as a *pseudo-secular*
position.

1.2.5.2. **'Pseudo-Secularism': Its Ideology and Proponents**

The concept of *Hindutva,* as it has come to mean today, has limited relevance to the Indian tradition and our
common understanding of secularism today. Essentially, it is a political and cultural concept based on certain
key Hindu values and is of relatively recent origin. It began to be actively promoted in reaction to the
tendentious interpretation of secularism by some Indian intellectuals in post-independent India. This ideology
promotes a plan of social analysis and a prescription for sustained action for revitalizing Hindu society and the
nation along traditional lines. The emergence of Muslim communalism at the beginning of the century
contributed to its rise. In contemporary India the *Vishua Hindu Parishad (VHP), the Rastriya Svayamsevak*
Sanga (RSS), Shiva Sena, and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), are the major organizations-political forces
that actively seek to promote and implement this religious, cultural and political program.[243] This view of
hinduization of India is considered modern scholars as a great threat to India's aspiration towards real
secularism and democratic values. The *hindutva* ideal of secularism is basically against the intrinsic Indian
diversity of identities – religious, cultural, and linguistic – where people debate, organize, express, and even
define their Indian identity by incorporating all these aspects. Extreme *hindutva* proponents fail to recognize
such pluralities of India which in general can endanger India's age old tradition of toleration and recognition of
differences. Moreover, such an understanding of secularism which based on fundamental Hindu ideals

---

[242] Anuradha and Rajeswari, *The Crisis of Indian Secularism*, 1.

[243] Srinivas Tilak , "*Hindutva* – the Indian Secularists' Metaphor for Illness and Perversion," in *Hinduism and Secularism* ed. Arvind Sharma (Great Britain: Palgrave Publications, 2001), 123. (Henceforth: Tilak, *Hindutva*).

contradict the very idea of secularism itself which either exclude religions all together from the political arena or include religions all together to enrich political life of the people.

At present, prominently in Indian soil, secularism is more a subject of politics than of metaphysics. The claim of *Hindutvavadis*[244] as being secularist does not have sufficient reason since basically they are political proponents of *Hindu Nation*. They reject any form of recognition of minorities and hold that a 'genuinely secular state would not recognize any differences amongst its citizens and that it would treat each as equal before the law.' On the other hand their secular ideals are founded on the *dharmic Universalism.*[245] However, they ignore India's ancient tradition and intellectual history of being inclusive of all the religions and their values since extreme form of *hindutva* happened to permit and favor only those values which belong to the Hindu religion. This view of secularism is ambiguous, and not recognized as 'secularism' around the world. Amartya Sen, while emphasizing the importance of the long Indian history of being inclusive of differences in view points and cultural heterodoxy, reiterates the need of the role of such ancient Indian practices in our ongoing cultural discussions. Pointing to the *hindutva* proponents to the liberal integrationists he states,

> In contemporary politics, the enthusiasm for ancient India has often come from the Hindutva movement – the promoters of a narrowly Hindu view of Indian civilization-who have tried so to separate out the period preceding the Muslim conquest of India (from the third millennium BCE to the beginning of the second millennium CE). In contrast, those who take an integrationist approach to contemporary India have tended to view the harking back to ancient India with the greatest of suspicion.[246]

Generally modern Indian political thinkers reject the idea of *hindutva* and the intended *hinduization of India* as a secular one. Since, it goes against the very basis history, culture and ideals of India itself. Srinivas Tilak continues to observe that, "secularists grudgingly accept diversity of religious beliefs and practices. Diversity

---

[244] *Hindutvavadis* are those who support the idea of making Indian a Hindu Nation by political measures.

[245] Bhargava, "Introduction" in *Secularism and Its Critics, 1-28.*

[246] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, ix-x.

and pluralism are accepted not on their own terms, but only in terms of a reinterpretation favorable to secularism."[247]

1.2.5.3. Highlighting Prominent Debaters of the Present Time

Here I present a few contemporary authors and their positions on the issue of Indian secularism. This section is to indicate the nature and intensity of intellectual involvement that has been active among the Indian scholars around the world.

1.2.5.3.1 Madan-Nandy-Chatterjee: The Triad of Critics on Secularism and Modernity

T.N. Madan, Ashis Nandy, and Partha Chatterjee are predominantly known by their traditionalist approach to secularism and modernity in India. They basically maintain that given the pervasive role of religion in the life of Indian people, secularism as defined in the western world as the separation of politics and religion is an imposition of an ideology that is alien to the tradition and culture of Indian society. At least Chatterjee emphasize the importance of keeping the constitutional vision of India by pointing out the numerous operative departures of the Indian state in the past. Though Nehru was a secularist in the western sense the constitution did no envisage religious or antireligious one rather they emphasized equality of treatment to all the religions. They basically reject secularism as it is proposed in the western countries as radically in tune with the Indian culture and tradition and hence, they call for a return to genuine religion and the indigenous traditions of religious tolerance as the best means to preserve and maintain a pluralist and multi-religious Indian society.

Secularism was never 'indigenous' to India and it is still a foreign reality is the position mainly held by T. N. Madan. Indian religions have not gone through a period of Reformation and Counter-reformation as Christianity definitely did and so the 'secular' and 'sacred' distinction has to be explained differently in India.

---

[247] Tilak, *Hindutva,* 125.

To my understanding, Madan takes this position to make a space to present a contextualized rethinking of secularism. I do agree with Madan in this respect where I see the possibility of multiple conceptions of modernities. Though he criticizes the imported secularism of the west he stated, "[…] I am not advocating the establishment of a Hindu state in India-not at all. It simply will not work." For him, secularization and secularism are directly associated with Christian Tradition and the Enlightenment. He states,

> […] secularization ordinarily refers to socio-cultural processes that enlarge the areas of life-material, institutional and intellectual-in which the role of the sacred is progressively limited; secularity is the resultant state of social of social being; and secularism is the ideology that argues the historical inevitability and progressive nature of the secularization everywhere.[248]

Madan considers secularism in the west as a gift of Christianity and hence not indigenous to the religious cultures of India. He started being part of the debates on secularism in the late 1960s and 70s reiterating the importance of historical specifications in the study of secularization of India. He argues that

> […] it is important a blueprint for the future because, by its very nature, it is incapable of countering religious fundamentalism and fanaticism. Secularism is the dream of the minority that wishes to shape the majority in its own image that wishes to impose its will upon history but lacks the power to do so under a democratically organized polity.[249]

Apparently he considers secularism as a "modern myth" and in the context of the religious fundamentalism of "locked minds." While presenting Gandhi as radical pluralist, he considers Nehru as a representative of the predicament of modernity, better than anybody else. To sum up, secularism is culturally inappropriate in India because the established hierarchy in Indian culture encompasses the secular within the religious. His traditionalist approach to the political operations of the Indian state does not seem to me in tune with modernity, post-modernity, and identity of the contemporary Indian society. Modernity cannot be cast off easily as Madan desires to. His idea of a non-political religious tolerance of the past is helpful in developing a contemporary transformed practice of religious neutrality for which, I argue, Gandhi can be relevant mediator.

---

[248] Madan, *Modern Myths*, 5-6.

[249] T. N. Madan, "Secularism In Its Place," in *Secularism and Its Critics* ed. Rajeev Bhargava (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 298.

Ashis Nandy's is a social psychologist and political thinker who has contributed enormously to the debates on colonialism, civilization, nationalism, democracy and identity. Modernity that needs to be interpreted according to the social context is one of the proposals of him. He notices that 'as India gets modern, violence is increasing.' What exactly is 'modernism' that does not disrupt the process of the Indian ideal of 'tolerance,' is another prominent question here. The true meaning of modernism is being analyzed socially by him in view of placing an Indian modernity in its place, rather than endorsing an imported sort of modernism which is another form of Western dominance for them. He also makes a distinction between religion-as-faith and religion-as-ideology. He argues against the 'public/private distinction' of the modern secularism which makes no sense to the faithful. Nandy argues that the understanding of self is intertwined with those of race, class, and religion under colonialism. Gandhi and his political and spiritual movements can be understood in part as an attempt to transcend a strong tendency of Indians to articulate political striving complete independence in the western terms.

Nandy claims that Gandhi was against modernity and secularism in order to safeguard religious tolerance. This onside reading of Gandhi, to my view, does not do justice to the overall contribution of him to religion tolerance, politics and modernity. Gandhi's approach to religious tolerance and his unparallel interreligious dialogues were in view of a unified political action for the independence of India. It is clear for an unbiased reader to identify Gandhi's democratic visions for a future Indian State, According to Pantham, "In his satyagraha way of bringing about religious tolerance, Gandhi, far from making any wholesale rejection of modernity, did rely on the civil liberties and democratic rights components of modern liberal democracy as well as on the institutions of the modern democratic state." [250] Nandy reading of Gandhi and Nehru in contrastive terms places him in dichotomous position between Nehruvian secularism and Gandhian

---

[250] Thomas Pantham, "Indian Secularism and Its Critics: Some Reflections," in *Review of Politics*, 59.3 (1997): 8. (Henceforth: Pantham, "Indian Secularism,").

spiritualism. However, he rightly viewed the Gandhian perspective that interreligious harmony can be secured without requiring the people to become irreligious or antireligious. This useful democratic-political aspect is not reflective in his recent readings of Gandhi where he depicts him preliberal, nonmodern, and an anti-secularist.[251]

According to Partha Chatterjee, another social scientist, a strict separation between modern state and traditional religion cannot be the only possible way of understanding secularism. Rather, Chatterjee like to understand it meant as a strict neutrality and non-preferentialism, since the former version of secularism it becomes unsuitable for the defense of minorities. Hence, the Indian state has never been and is hardly ever likely to be secular in the modern western sense of the term. The untenable framework of reason endorsed by the western secularism is unacceptable to him. However, he emphasizes the idea of toleration as follows:

> The liberal doctrine tends to treat the question of collective rights of cultural minorities from a position of externality. Thus, its usual stand on tolerating cultural groups with illiberal practices is to advocate some sort of right to exit for individual dissident members. […] I give a different construction to the concept of toleration. Toleration here would require one to accept that there will be political contexts where a group could insist on its right not to give reason for doing things differently, provided it explains itself adequately in its own chosen forum. […] toleration here would be premised on autonomy and respect for persons.[252]

Other scholars who share Partha's social scientific views are Neera Chandoke and Aditya Nigam. They all argue against the profound intolerances in the normative approach of homogenizing the ideology of secularism. All of them argue that "secularism in India has not had to do simply with the legal contours of separating political and religious institutions." While Chatterjee proposes an autonomous forum for the representation of minority rights, Chandhoke contends that secularism in India represented a democratic ethos, albeit one expressing itself in the language of religion. Nigam argues passionately against the totalizing nature of

---

[251] Ashis Nandy, "Cultural Frames of Transformative Politics," in *Political Discourse*, ed. B. Parekh and T. Pantham (New Delhi: Sage, 1987), 240-241.

[252] Partha Chatterjee, "Secularism and Tolerance," in *Secularism and Its Critics* ed. Rajeev Bhargava (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 374-75.

normative secularism and the homogenous empty time in which it exists. He argues for the identity of the

Dalits. 'The immense burden on secularism to create the abstract citizen should be lifted.' Together with

Chatterjee, he agrees that the nation as little selves must be seen as inhabiting heterogeneous time.

Indian secularism and its ongoing debates can be seen as taking two directions: traditionalist and modernist.

Both have their own prospects and problems. Extreme traditionalist interpretations of Indian culture and

Gandhi in particular has not been 'letting India and Gandhi grow' beyond the traditions confinement. Similarly

extreme modernist thinkers have been trying to export western secularism as it is to the Indian context which in

many ways does not suit to the social-religious context of India's ancient civilization. As Pantham rightly

suggested,

> For Gandhi […] the reformist intervention of the modern democratic state in the socio-religious
> sphere had to have as its complementary side some form of moral-political intervention for
> transforming the modern state by integrating its institutions and practices with the principles with the
> principles of satya and ahimsa. The significance of the former part of the Gandhian approach is
> missed out by the traditionalist critics of Indian secularism, while the latter part of Gandhian approach
> is misperceived by the modernist-political redefiners of Indian secularism.[253]

Being part of the ongoing debate on Indian secularism by myself, I present two other authors who to my

reading of them, demonstrate a different pathway to integrate both the traditional and modernist perspectives to

the Indian secularism drawing aspects from the global perspectives of the religious-political context with its

democratic and secular aspects to which they have been sufficiently exposed.

1.2.5.3.2. Amartya Sen's Global Concerns and Understanding of Indian Intellectual History, Pluralism, and Secularism

Amartya Sen's identifies himself as an *unreformed secularist* (AI 295). His skepticism on secularism draws

inspiration from the high theory of Indian culture and society.[254] Secularism as a principle which necessitates a

---

[253] Pantham, "Indian Secularism," 8.

[254] Ashotosh Varshney, "Contested Meanings, Indian Nationalism Unity, Hindu Nationalism, and the Politics of Anxiety," *Daedalus* 122 (1993): 231. (Henceforth: Varshney, "Contested Meanings,").

separation of politics and religion is not convincing to Sen. There is a need of 'self-examination of belief'

beyond the practical reason and a political philosophy as it is articulated. He indicates Taylor's insistence on

The Politics of Recognition in this respect. He states that role of secularism has to work *with* and *for* religious

communities. Such symmetry of treatment is part of his analysis.[255] It is significant to know that Sen is a self-

proclaimed agnostic who considers Hinduism as a political entity. In that sense he is a secularist in the modern

understanding of the term. In an interview for the magazine California, which is published by the University of

California, Berkeley, he noted,

> In some ways people had got used to the idea that India was spiritual and religion-oriented. That gave a leg up to the religious interpretation of India, despite the fact that Sanskrit had a larger atheistic literature than what exists in any other classical language. Madhava Acharya, the remarkable 14th century philosopher, wrote this rather great book called *Sarvadarshansamgraha*, which discussed all the religious schools of thought within the Hindu structure. The first chapter is "Atheism" – a very strong presentation of the argument in favor of atheism and materialism.

On the one hand, Sen wants to give a secular interpretation of India as against the religious interpretation, on

the other hand he takes issue on the existing theorists of secularism in India and abroad. Undoubtedly he has

tremendous respect and concern for the argumentative tradition, democratic culture, and inclusive secularism

of India. Sen considers democracy as probably the most important political change that occurred in the 20th

century. In democracy the most important aspect is the opportunity it avails for participatory reasoning and

public decision making. His critiques on partial understanding and practices of democracy around the world

make to present a wider ancestry of democracy from around the world where he even speaks of the "global

roots of democracy." In another article titled *The Diverse Ancestry of Democracy* he states, "Tribute must, of

course, be paid to the powerful role that modern western thinking, linked with European enlightenment, played

---

[255] Varshney, "Contested Meanings," 14.

in the development of liberal and democratic ideas. But the roots of these general ideas can be found in Asia and Africa as well as in Europe and America."[256]

Sen's understanding of secularism is intertwined with his understanding of democracy and its inclusivism of multiculturalism where everybody's voice is heard and their identities acknowledged. While emphasizing the importance of integrating identities Sen bring to light the idea of *multiplicity of identities* and this will help us in understanding people and harmonizing the relationship between them.[257] Politicization of ethnic identities and thus defining identity in a stereotyped manner can cause existential dilemma and confusion for our modern times. He also viewed that Gandhi refused to see India as a "federation of religions" though he was a highly religious in his life orientations. He believes that Indian secular democratic state emerges out of its long tradition of the "argumentative" intellectual culture which has its own ancient roots. However he is skeptical and critical about the direction of debates on secularism in general and Indian secularism in particular. He enumerates them in his article *Secularism and Its Discontents*.

According to Sen's understanding there is a basic *incompleteness* and need for *supplementation* in our understanding of the concept of secularism. Generally secularism in the political sense[258] requires a separation of the state from any particular religion where state be "equidistant" from all religions or that the state must not have "any relation at all" to religions. In both these approaches there it is difficulty to guarantee "symmetry of treatment." Secularism is incomplete, according to Sen, to deal with religions and religious communities since those realities are 'beyond' secularism.[259] Analyzing those aspects of incompleteness also opens up opportunities improve the same. His presentation of the skepticism of secularism appears in six arguments. Sen gives his own counter reflections for each of them.

---

[256] Amartya Sen, "The Diverse Ancestry of Democracy" in the *Financial Times*, June13 (2005): 19.

[257] Amartya Sen, *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company Inc., 2005), 18, 149f.

[258] For Sen secularism can be understood in two senses: Ecclesiastical sense (as against spiritual) and political sense (as a forms of democracy).

[259] Sen, *Argumentative Indian,* 295-296.

1.2.5.3.2.1. The 'non-existent' critique: This is a general view of western intellectuals for whom Indian secularism as essentially non-existent and they contrast it with the interplay of 'Hindu-India' with 'Muslim Pakistan.' This view is based on a presumption rather than facts. A secular republic and a religion-based state have important differences in their legal system. Indian constitution is not a theocratic one compared to the constitution of Pakistan. Western intellectuals overlook extensive and important features of the Indian constitution and polity. The predominant Hindu presence itself must be considered as a reason *for* practicing secularism (AI 302). The non-existence argument will not help anybody to identity the kind of secularism exists in India. The presumption of a superior form of secularism can make others incapable of understanding any different forms of secularism. Anti-blasphemy laws are asymmetrical in many countries. The nature of such laws goes beyond the scope of secularism. There is a need to choose between different secular forms.

1.2.5.3.2.2. The 'favoritism' critique: Many Hindu activists and intellectuals criticize Indian constitution, political, and legal system for favoring minority rites. This 'favoritism' has caused many Hindu activist parties (RSS, BJP, Sang *Parivar*, and *Shiva Sena*) to reject inclusive secularism since they see it as a different form of pseudo secularism. The difference in 'personal laws'[260] has been a point of contention in India. For example a Hindu or Sikh can be prosecuted for polygamy, a Muslim cannot since the Muslim Personal Law permits it. This legal difference has been cited to demonstrate the discriminatory nature of it. Moreover, this Muslim personal law makes the Muslim women more vulnerable[261] than the Hindu men. The makers of Indian constitution made some preferences for uniformity of fundamental laws, civil and criminal to maintain the unity of the country. There is a problem of 'symmetry of treatment' which needs to be addressed means of fairness and justice which secularism might not be able to address itself. (AI 305-306).

---

[260] Particular laws for all the different religious respecting the religious traditions rather than making them homogenous by way of a secular state polity.

[261] A Muslim women can be divorced by her husband and her financial support was not ensured by the law until the case of Shah Bano. The supreme court ruled the case more in tune with the ideal of 'uniform civil code' but the Muslim reaction was not uniform and ultimately Rajeev Gandhi (then Prime Minister) ultimately 'caved in' for a separatist legislation.

1.2.5.3.2.3. The 'prior-identity' critique: This argument states that the identity of a Hindu, or of a Muslim, or of a Sikh person is primordial to their understanding of identity. Hence the Indian identity is a constitutive reality of many factors or separate identities. The predominant Hindu identity will have its predominant influence on anybody's identity in India which on contrast is against the homogeneous identity concept of secular identity. It is important for us to make a distinction between political and religious identities. Pre-independent Indian leaders and their respective beliefs in a secular identity would be of significant importance. Jinnah who was instrumental for the partition of India and he became the father of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, was scarcely a devout Muslim whereas Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the President of the Indian National Congress and a major leader of the Indian union, was deeply a religious Muslim. Gandhi was highly religious in his personal life and staunchly secularist in politics (insisting symmetric political treatment of different religions). (AI 306-307). There no need to define somebody primarily by their religious identity and then by their political identity. It might not be misleading to project the philosophy of 'nation state' and thus giving an inescapable 'statist' orientation to the very idea of any political unity across religious communities and other social divisions. State cannot be the central part of the conceptual foundation this unity, nor provide the constructive genesis.[262] Even if the religious identities are prior to the political identities, such an argument cannot gain any momentum to disproof Indian secularism since the same argument can be raised against secularism in general. Indian has around 140 million Muslims, not many fewer than Pakistan. To see India just as a Hindu country is a bizarre idea in the face of numerous other factors. The term *Hindu* was traditionally used to indicate the location (Indus or Sindhu) rather than any religious belief. The Persians and the Greeks saw India as a group of people settle around the River Indus and Hindus where the native people of that land. At one state the Muslims in India were called 'Hindavi.'[263]

---

[262] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 308.
[263] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 310.

1.2.5.3.2.4. The 'Muslim sectarianism' critique: The dominance of Hindu Identity in *Indianness* places the Muslims and other religious identities in a sectarian position. The failure of Muslim rulers to identify themselves with others in the country also referred to support this argument. Jinnah's 'two-nation' theory even before the Independence of India which eventually resulted in the partition of India and Pakistan is seen as a continuation of the Muslim refusal to identity with India. Alleged accusations on Muslim sectarianism are a hypothesis. "A great many Muslims stayed on in post-partition India as a deliberate decision to remain where they felt they belonged."[264] The issue of Kashmir and some sectarian approaches of Muslim kings cannot be attributed to the Indian Muslims. Moreover such an argument raised against Indian secularism has no intrinsic rationality.

1.2.5.3.2.5. The 'anti-modernist' critique: Contemporary intellectuals both in the West and in India criticize secularism as a part of the folly of modernism. Prominent social scientist like Ashis Nandy has the view that as India get more modernized, religious violence increases. Most of his arguments exalt 'traditional ways of India.' Progressive ideologies of modernity/secularism can contradict the existing culture of India. The general level of violence has come down if one makes a comparative study between 1940s to the present times. Hence a literal interpretation of Nandy's statement is not true. Sen views Nandy position as a 'terrifying-vision.'[265] Understanding of secularism and modernity is odd. Secularism in the broader sense which is endorsed by India demands symmetric treatment of religions in politics and in the affairs of state. It is not clear why such symmetric treatments induce violence. Even an ancient form of state ruled by an Ashoka or an Akbar went a long way towards achieving just such an equal treatment of religions. The development of secular politics needs not remote from the traditional tolerance which social analysts are concerned.[266] The idea of modernity is

---

[264] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 310.

[265] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 313.

[266] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 313-314.

deeply problematic in general. That which is 'modern' today is going to be 'pre-modern' in another fifty years. Gandhi and Nehru were modern in their times. Abraham Lincoln was modern in his time.

1.2.5.3.2.6. The 'cultural' critique: Culturally India is a Hindu country and hence it is not appropriate to treat Hinduism as just one among the religions of India. According to this view it is Hinduism that makes India what it is. In Britain the Archbishop of Canterbury has special state privileges and British laws of blasphemy are protective of Christianity. In India, Hinduism does not have such indigenous cultural privileges. This argument sheds light into the problematic of doing injustice to the historical heritage of India by turning an *epistemic error into a political blunder.*[267] Sen continues to reflect on the problematic of this argument. Even if the 'Hindu country' theory is right it would be very odd to alienate the minorities of the country on the basis of it. This reading of Indian history and culture is very shallow. The present day India is definitely an amalgamation of different traditions, religions, and linguistic aspects. The impact of Islamic Sufi thought is clearly recognizable in parts of contemporary Hindu literature. Poets like Kabir were born as Muslim but transcended sectional boundaries.[268] There are other issues related to such narrow readings of India culture which is not directly related to religion as such. India is a country where decisive steps were made in algebra, geometry, and astronomy. Indian mathematicians dealt with decimal system and classical philosophical concerns of "epistemology and logic along with secular ethics where people invented games like chess, pioneered sex education and initiated systematic political economy and formal linguistics."[269]

Sen analyses all these critiques against Indian secularism. Still he is optimistic of the silver lines of secularism which is clear from his statement: "The winter of our discontent might not be giving way at present to a 'glorious summer', but the political abandonment of secularism would make India wintrier than it currently

---

[267] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 297-300; Amartay Sen, "Secularism and Its Discontents," in Rajeev Bhargava ed. *Secularism and Its Critics* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), 454-486.
[268] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 315-316.
[269] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 316.

is."[270] It is significant for this research that Sen acknowledges Gandhi as a model for the *symmetric treatment* of religion in both political and religious aspects of his life. He takes issue with Western definition of secularism since it does not have the faculty deal with the broader issues of religious communities which naturally goes 'beyond' their power. I have complete agreement with him in this respect. Sen's passive attitude to religion in his personal life (unlike Gandhi, who was religious substantially in his personal life) makes me skeptical about him. However, his extensive and substantial reflections, analysis, and criticisms on Indian Secularism are significant.

1.2.5.3.3.   Rajeev Bhargava: An Indigenous (Contextual) and Integrated (Inclusive) Secularism

Arguably Bhargava is the most comprehensive political scientist who reiterates the *desirability* and *inescapability* of secularism in India.[271] He has succeeded to draw attention to the Indian secularism of a unique vernacular and its need to integrate appropriate aspects from other secular states around the world. According to him the discussion on Indian secularism has to move beyond the 'secular' and 'spiritual.' However he hopes to get there by a dialectics of religion and politics together with their tensions and dilemmas. His commitment to Indian secularism is a unique one since he uses it as a forum to reflect also on the importance of religion, democracy, and modernity. Bhargava's defense of a distinctive Indian form of secularism is a constitutional and institutional arrangement against the background of Hindu majoritarian fundamentalism and post-modern and post-colonial critiques. He also wanted to make an ethic for everyday life that was not irreligious or hostile to religion and was not bound by any particular religion or its tradition.

---

[270] Sen, *Argumentative Indian*, 316.

[271] Bhargava, *Secularism and Its Critics,* 28.

1.2.5.3.3.1.   **In India Nationalism Precedes the Idea of Democracy**

According to the understanding of Bhargava in India democracy originated in the form nationalism and hence arguments for nationalism were coterminous with arguments for democracy. In elaborating the nature of India nationalism he states,

> The predominantly cultural character of nationalism in India and its traditional proclivity for recognizing the importance of collectivities forced the makers of constitution to move beyond individualist liberalism, in order to wrestle with the tension between constitutive attachments and personal liberty, between group disadvantage and personal merit, and that all these factors shaped the character of the emergent secular-democratic state of India.[272]

The preliminary influences of the British rule and such an inheritance of liberal and secular ideals were only "skin deep." However the constitutional secular frame of India was not a mere intellectual deliberation of a few intellectuals rather came out of 'the political struggle of an elite eager to give India a new social order.' Indian secular democracy has ever been sensitive to the "group-specific rights" which is intrinsically part of the cultural nature its nationalism. Can Indian democracy be a liberal democracy?   Bhargava is aware of Sunil Khilnani's criticism that the idea of natural rights and individual rights which are essential to modern liberal democracies were only faintly emphasized in India due to its nationalist thought and collectivist mentality.[273]On the other hand, basic ideals of liberalism revolve around individual freedom, choice, and autonomy. Bhargava takes the debate back to the meaningful account of the history of the birth of constitutional democracy in India. He claims that, "[…] a classical political libertarianism with its emphasis on individual rights came to India as a structural feature of modern political life. Above all, democracy grew in India, as it did in many other places, under the guise of nationalism, and its commitment to political equality fitted in neatly with the egalitarian strands of liberalism as well as utilitarianism."[274] An analysis on the history of France, America, and India can

---

[272] Rajeev Bhargava, "Democratic Vision of a New Republic India, 1950," in *Transforming India: Social and Political Dynamics of Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 25-26. (Hereafter: Bhargava, *Democratic Vision*).

[273] Sunil Khilnani, *The Idea of India* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1997), 24-26.

[274] Bhargava, *Democratic Vision*, 30.

be rewarding with respect to their constitutional origin. French revolution, American Revolutionary War, and Indian non-violent mass politics were not illiberal with respect the context of those events. None of these events does prove that their liberal visions had been abandoned. The fact is that liberalism while admitting the right to resistance to an illegitimate system, cannot/does not propose an adequate method for such a resistance. He continues bring to light some of Gandhi's liberal concerns: "Gandhi's programme for the abolition of untouchability; of equality for women; of the extension of franchise to every person; and his deeply individualistic vision of spirituality have much in common with reasonable interpretation of a number of liberalisms."[275]

Bhargava argues for an inclusion of *communitarian egalitarianism* together with the *individual egalitarianism* within the frame of liberal democracy so that 'group-rights' receive equal justice and fairness. Individualist response to nationalism and communalism would be to 'dissolve groups into individuals by a state policy.' From the collective stand point this policy fails to understand the importance of groups and the way they sustain culture. Parity is necessitated between these positions.[276] Hence the Indian secular democracy demonstrates a model of 'non-individualistic' egalitarianism where equality of rights of individuals and groups are respected and recognized.

1.2.5.3.3.2. *Contextual* Democracy and Secularism

Bhargava's significant contribution is in his emphasis on the historical and social context of a nation (India) in shaping its form of democracy and secularism. Social hierarchy and how that affects the 'group rights' while introducing an egalitarian and liberal principles of governance, are major issues for his conception of

---

[275] Bhargava, *Democratic Vision*, 32.
[276] Bhargava, *Democratic Vision*, 38

'contextual democracy.'[277] The process of democratization in India revolves around the principle of individual equality across the interlocking hierarchical social structures and cultural norms which in many ways differ across regions. Bhargava also bring to light the issue "majority-minority syndrome"[278] which is another feature of a contextual secularism of India. Unlike the equality principle of liberal democratic understanding (which arguably demands a homogenization of policy issues) a contextual conception of democracy leaves room for several patterns of intersecting political, social, and cultural change within a similar framework of democracy itself.

1.2.5.3.3.3.   Inclusive Secularism of "Principled Distance": A Modern, Indian Model

According to Bhargava any attempt to evaluate Indian secularism in comparison to 'a particular model of western secularism might not be good idea. Since secularism itself has its own *internal tensions* when to come to its relationship with religion. He ear marks at least four features of the Indian socio-cultural context: the mind-boggling diversity of religious communities, within Hinduism itself (especially in South Asia religions) a greater emphasis is placed on practice than belief, many religiously sanctioned social practices are oppressive by nature of their illiberal and inegalitarian character, and Hinduism being a non-institutional one needs an external institution like state to impact any internal reform. Hence Indian needs a coherent set of intellectual resources to tackle inter-religious conflict and to eradicate other social injustices.[279] All these, for Bhargava, demonstrate explicitly that secularism with the classical liberal model simply does not work for the context of India, though India also needs a united, liberal, democratic, egalitarian state to struggle against religious and communal forces. Western secular and liberal democracy entails uniform rights for all individuals with specific

---

[277] Francine R. Frankel et al., eds. *Transforming India: Social and Political Dynamics of Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 5 (Hereafter: Frankel et al., *Transforming India*).

[278] Majority-Minority Syndrome: Majority group or minority group in a society may wish to shape the structure exclusively but not be allowed. Thy syndrome is well grounded when either group is really discriminative against the other. This syndrome can also be set off when a minority resists the attempt by the majority to exclusively shape the social and political institutions in accordance with its own cultural predilections. Bhargava, *Democratic Vision*, 22, 23.

[279] Bhargava, *Democratic Vision*, 48.

articulation on the principle of separation of religion and state (mutual exclusion). Bhargava proposes the idea of *principled distance* between religion and state which entail flexibility of intervention or abstention. He emphasizes that "All it must ensure is that the relation between religious and political institutions be guided by non-sectarian principles that remain consistent with a set of values constitutes of a life of equal dignity for all."[280] He continues to states that the exclusion of religion as religion from the state resulted in the inclusion in policy matters of cultural import.[281] A uniform right principle was not considered as an essential aspect for an integration of the nation. Rather group rights were granted to ensure dignity of particular groups. Bhargava endorses the view that democracy as nationalism where the idea of "inclusion" was a significant aspect.

Bhargava's view can be seen as a 'spiritual humanism.'[282] He is trying to trace out the possibilities of a "spiritualized, humanistic secularism."[283]His attempt at a *spiritualized politics* is closer to pluralistic position of Gandhi and really brings some relevance to the modern times. Still, Bhargava is not ignorant about the Indian context. He observes, "[…] the real challenge before us continues to be one of working out an alternative conception of secularism rather than simply an alternative to it."[284]He argues against the claim that 'secularism was alien to Indian culture and civilization and hence, the distance between secularism and an Indian cultural ethos was so great that it had little hope.'[285]In several of his paper and writings Bhargava emphasizes and

---

[280] Bhargava, *Democratic Vision*, 50.

[281] For example, separate electorates, reserved constituencies for religious communities, reservations for jobs on the basis of religious classification, and the organization of state on religious basis.

[282] Tejani, *Indian Secularism,* 7-12.

[283] Rajeev Bhargava, "Religious and Secular Identities" in *Crisis and Change in Contemporary India*, ed. Upendra Baxi and Bhikhu Parekh (London: Sage Publications, 1995), 341. (Henceforth: Bhargava, "Religious and Secular Identities.").

[284] Bhargava, "Religious and Secular Identities," 341.

[285] Rajeev Bhargava, "The "Secular Ideal" before Secularism: Preliminary Sketch" in *Comparative Secularisms in a Global Age* eds. Linell E. Cady and Elizabeth Shakman Hurd (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 159f. (Henceforth: Bhargava, "The Secular Ideal")

claims that Modern Indian Constitutional Secularism (MICS) is different from, and provides alternative to, both the idealized American and the French conceptions of secularism.[286]

1.3. POINT OF DEPARTURE

1.3.1. Prospects for Re-reading Gandhi through the Modern-Secular Frame of Taylor

I have presented a narrative of Indian roots of secularism touching on some of the most important building blocks from the history of India. As I have mentioned previously, Taylor's narrative of *modern identity* and *secularity,* especially in *A Secular Age,* has provided me with a method and frame to deliberate an Indian model. Though the contents are essentially different, a similar descriptive and narrative method is employed. The retrieval of the genealogy of Indian modernity together with its apparent secular trends unfolds the nature and condition of an Indian self-identity of the present time. As I have shown, this debate is inconclusive and incomplete, though one cannot deny some historical progress. After my analytic, descriptive and critical exposition of the Ancient (philosophical and imperial), Modern (colonial, political, and post-colonial/Independent), Constitutional, and Contemporary contributions and debates on modernity, identity and secularity in India, I return first to Taylor in my second chapter and then to Gandhi in my third chapter. The reason for my focus and re-reading of Gandhi is my reading of Taylor and his understanding of modernity, identity and secularity.[287] I argue that reading Gandhi through the frame of Taylor is mutually enriching and

---

[286] Bhargava, "The Secular Ideal," 161. According to him the idealized American model and the French model concentrate on the *separation* theory with *mutual exclusion* (Wall of Separation). This noninterference is justified on the basis that religion is a *private matter.* This means to them as *religious freedom.* MICS like the US and French models rejects theocracy and a state that endorse institutional and personnel differentiation between religious and political institutions but which continue to have formal and legal links with one another. Similarly, MICS also is value-based and rejects amoral secular states. The key difference is that MICS interprets separation of state and religion to mean not mutual exclusion, on-sided exclusion, strict neutrality or opportunistic distance, but rather what he calls "principles distance."

[287] Charles Taylor undoubtedly is one of the champions who have tried to bring to light the importance of a narrative by which the genealogy of the modernity, identity, and secularity could be traced out. The predominant *reductionist* trends tempt to reduce one reality to another. Taylor is a strong critique of such biases. He demands to take account of everything in your narrative process of the foundations of modern self-identity. Gandhi was never a reductionist rather he is was a terrific narrator of everything around him.

beneficial.[288] This has to be seen against other views found in the debates over modernity and identity. It is appropriate to bring a few of them to light in order to demonstrate why Gandhi is a uniquely promising resource for our modern moral identity.

Against the background of the predominately *secular* conception of the modern frames[289] I have presented a few of the major Indian figures and their attempts at developing or initiating modern identity with a secular emphasis. For example, there is a Nehruvian model of secular state and secular identity with an apparent exclusion of religious perspective. This is the model of an agnostic and to a certain extent an atheistic model which will have few adherents in a predominantly religious minded society and in the multi-religious context of the nation. Again we see Ambedkar's model which emphasized the uplift of the *untouchables* and the *dalits.* This noble cause needs to be further addressed and an ongoing program for the emancipation of such lower segments of the people is still an important need of India. However, such *partial* aspects of Indian-nationalism (*dalit cause)* over the *integral unity* of India cannot function as a common frame for everybody. I have also presented the efforts made by contemporary philosophers and political thinkers in developing an appropriate secular modern frame for making an Indian moral identity. In my view, they present either politically or religiously dominated frames which in many ways fail to find a common ground in their discussion. Amartya Sen though understands the intellectual history of the inter-religious and inter-cultural dialectics of the highly pluralistic Indian society define himself as an unreformed secularist and remain skeptical of both religion and secularism. Rajeev Bhargava attempts to frame Indian moral and political identity with the help of Western concepts. Yet, it is not clear how much importance he truly gives to the explicitly 'religious' aspect of Indian identity. Unlike Bhargava, T.N. Madan, Partha Chatterjee and Ashis Nandy seem to be *totally* against western

---

[288] Reading of Gandhi can enlighten the *purely* secular approaches of the North-Atlantic to self and state to a richer conception of self with an *inclusive* approach to religion and state. While Taylor bargain for a society with an *open immanent frame* Gandhi realistically is an example how one can be simultaneously open to the transcendent and be politically serving the state.

[289] Numerous modern social imageries can also be called as "modern frames" as Taylor sees it. These frames have tremendous influence on the society – at least a segment of the society.

lead in secular and modern political thinking and in turn argue for *totally indigenous* frame of modernity for India. This in turn is not sound enough for a modern India facing the realities of globalization and open market. Besides these models we have the skeptical and purely secularist views of Akeel Bilgrami, which also fail to bring out an inclusive and integral frame appropriate for India. Hence, I argue that a re-reading of Gandhi is worthwhile and relevant for our time to construct a *harmonious, holistic,* and *integral* modern identity.

1.3.2. Possible Recovery through Taylor and Gandhi

Though Mahatma Gandhi belongs to another time and another place, one may find in his works and in his practice many features that are similar to what could be found in Taylor's writings. However, Gandhi did not have Taylor's access to the 'resources' enabling him to trace the making of modern 'identity.' It does not seem that Taylor gets as much as he could from the abundant resources available to him in the work of Gandhi and the emergence of Indian identity and secularity; which in turn, makes it difficult for an *installment* of the Taylorian frame to the Indian context. And needless to say, Gandhi, for his part, had drawn deeply from the 'resources' of his time to frame his own identity and the renewed identity of India.

These and other differences between Taylor and Gandhi present significant challenge for a comparative reading of them. One might do well to face them, for the prospect of such an approach also promises considerable reward. Taylor, being an academician, prolific writer, scholar and teacher of the present time, contrasts with Gandhi, who is mostly a spiritual and political activist, writer of different and differing genres and to various audience; and at the same time a national, even global figure par excellence. Differences of these kinds, I argue, need not be problematic with regard to their predominant style and articulations. Their style was mostly *narrative/descriptive* and their articulation was predominantly *moral.* Taylor is convinced of the problem of

inarticulacy,[290] which in more than one way is explicit in the writings and activities of Gandhi. That said, it was apparently impossible for Gandhi to systematically articulate all of his striving of truth, since he never had the intellectual or academic purpose that Taylor clearly does have. Even beyond his written works, Gandhi displays a constant thrust toward an experiential notion of truth by which he could authenticate his words and actions by his own life. It is therefore above all by his example, his witness, that he offers our research a wealth of possibility. Once a British reporter asked Gandhi, "Do you have a message I can take back to my people?" It just happened that it was a day of silence for him. In spite of his heavy speaking schedule, he was very religious about a day of silence. He wrote a few words on a scrap of paper and gave it to the reporter. The scrap paper read "My life is my message."[291] With all his systematic formulations, and dense historical research, Taylor can also be viewed as falling short of clarity, brevity, and focus since his style is descriptively narrative. One who reads through his works might well become lost in many occasions, due to the detours and digressions encountered along the way of the story. I argue that Taylor also shares a remote *ambiguity of writing*[292] which is apparently more explicit in Gandhi. Without forgetting those differences, I propose to concentrate on certain among those similarities and thus to read Gandhi and Taylor together.

My research, therefore, argues that the quest for 'moral or ethical' foundation in view of *making a modern identity* seen in Taylor is not foreign to Gandhi, since the same if not similar, or even stronger, quest is also evident in his lived message. What about the *recognition of pluralism*? I argue that Gandhi had a deeper and more strongly positive approach to *recognition,* and to a much greater extent, than what one finds in Taylor.

---

[290] Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 53ff. Henceforth: Taylor, SS)

[291] Eknath Easwaram, *Gandhi The Man: The story of His Transformation* (USA: Nilgiri Press, 1997), 140.

[292] Gandhi does not have a systematic and scientific account of his philosophy or political theory. Many of his writings were autobiographical, historical, spiritual, political and miscellaneous in nature. Moreover, Gandhi is being accused of changing his positions occasionally. A lot of his ideas and reflections were delivered by means of speeches, letters to the different peoples, articles to newspapers and magazines, and so on. If one focuses only on his systematic writings one might get very limited resources to construct a meaningful theory on his thinking and activities. Gandhi's life and works were an ongoing narrative. As he learned new insights he changes former ones. Perhaps one needs to get into the flow of his consciousness to trace out what is in there.

It is true that a large part of the Indian society is neither liberal nor bourgeois. And it is also true that the political society in India as in most developing countries has its own specificities and uniqueness. But this is no reason to take the specific properties of Indian political society and community as the template for all the political societies around the world. What we need today is a 'neutralily of attitude and sense of mutuality' in our encounter with one another. One aspect to be avoided is the unhealthy rejection of modern western insights, such as when it is supposed *a priori* that for example, the liberal public sphere articulated by Habermas is really something 'foreign' to a developing country like India. As Bhargava notes " […] this only proves that Habermas' theory is not equipped to *fully* illuminate the public domain in India, rather than lacking the capacity to throw light on *some* features that resemble Western public spheres."[293] Unfortunately, critics of the liberal public sphere are quick to catch its weaknesses and abstinences, but 'painfully blind' to the presence of any useful ingredients. "It is futile, irresponsible and even unethical to ask people to deliberate when neither the opportunity nor the capacity for deliberation exists."[294] The initial task for a morally sensitive political theory is to show precisely why deliberation and inclusion must be valued. A vibrant public sphere cannot exist without active citizens.

If one evaluates Indian secularism on the basis of the general principles that have emerged from the European and North-Atlantic contexts, the present crisis in India's secularism is at once a crisis in India's hierarchical structure and a crisis in its religious culture. A genuinely democratic and socialist India requires a secularism that transcends the traditional Indian theory and practice of tolerant hierarchical pluralism and embraces a more universalistic, rational and humanistic culture, one that is not defined by any single religion, but also is not opposed to any religion as such. Gandhi's importance and significance reappear here in the absence of any

---

[293] Bhargava, *Secularism and Its Critics,* 44.
[294] Bhargava, *Secularism and Its Critics*, 46.

other compelling alternatives to propose and project a prospect for such a *holistic frame* which is pluralistic, positively inclusive, and fundamentally moral in its core.

The general picture and condition of modern secular identity and modern views on moral identity in the European and North-Atlantic world can in many ways be conducive or beneficial to the Indian-Gandhian attempt at reconstruction. At the same time the modern west can also benefit from this mutual give and take, especially to minimize its *exclusive* tendencies with regard to religion and morality from its relationship with secular politics. Gandhi's perspective is a good starting point for a healthy co-existence of religion and politics against the backdrop of *separation* theories.[295] The concept of separating church and state is often credited to the writings of English philosopher John Locke (1632–1704). According to his principle of the *social contract*, Locke argued that the government lacked authority in the realm of individual conscience, as this was something rational people could not cede to the government for it or others to control. For Locke, this created a natural right in the liberty of conscience, which he argued must therefore remain protected from any government authority. These views on religious tolerance and the importance of individual conscience, along with his social contract, became particularly influential in the American colonies and the drafting of the United States Constitution. The phrase *separation of church and state* is derived from a letter written by President Thomas Jefferson in 1802 to Baptists from Danbury, Connecticut, and published in a Massachusetts newspaper soon thereafter. In that letter, referencing the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, Jefferson writes:

---

[295] Church and State separation theories apparently started with the works of John Locke and Machiavalli. The concept of the separation of church and state refers to the distance in the relationship between organized religion and the nation state. The concept of separation has been adopted in a number of countries, to varying degrees depending on the applicable legal structures and prevalent views toward the proper role of religion in society. A similar but typically stricter principle of *laïcité* has been applied in France and Turkey, while some socially secularized countries such as Norway, Denmark and the UK have maintained constitutional recognition of an official state religion. The concept parallels various other international social and political ideas, including secularism, disestablishment, religious liberty, and religious pluralism. Whitman (2009) observes that in many European countries, the state has, over the centuries, taken over the social roles of the church, leading to a generally secularized public sphere.

> Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between Man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof", thus building a wall of separation between Church & State.[296]

A re-evaluation of the French *Laicization* model and the US *Separation* model between Church and State gives us insight into the fact that such exclusive approaches can never be fully actualized, since religion is a permanent and active element of any society. In a world of pluralism, much interference between State and Religion is also problematic, since religious ideologies and rational (political) ideologies will always clash with each other. What about "Secularism" as the center of the public sphere? This is only wishful thinking, since no real "neutrality" exists in the *secular public sphere*. What must be the foundation of the public sphere that will ensure and envisage recognition of plurality? It must be something that acknowledges and recognizes a plurality of realities, and that can go beyond the visible realities. This is because secularism is not a finished product, but only, as Taylor has shown, a new frame in search of *flourishing*. Hence my research focuses on the metaphysical foundations of the 'authenticity and diversity' which comprise the 'holistic identity' of self in the modern secular milieu. For this purpose, Charles Taylor and Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi are especially apt discussion-partners, since we find an apparent balance of the "secular" and "sacred" in their writings and lives.

1.3.3. Other Philosophical Concerns

The following contemporary issues are in my concern as I embark on my project. I am not claiming to have complete answers to these issues; rather my research will have ongoing references to these concerns since they too will contribute to my frame of a modern secular self-identity and authenticity.

1.3.3.1.   Secularism: A 'Problematic'

---

[296] Thomas Jefferson, "Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists," in *U.S. Library of Congress*, accessed February 7, 2012, http://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danbury.html.

My primary concern is the nature and future of modern secular identity. And I want to consider "secularism" as 'problematic' since secular identity is an 'emerging identity.' There are still many problems and questions in need of resolution before one might seek general consensus about its meaning. Secularism as a school of thought is not reducible to anti-religious approaches, though one cannot deny the presence of the notion in the history. Hence, secularism is still a 'problematic,' and it still has to deal with the relationship between religion and politics.[297]

1.3.3.2. Resurgence (Revival) of Religions (Post-Religious)

Europe, US and Turkey exhibit the "resurgence of religion" which compels us to re-think our conceptions of "secularism." In France, there is a tendency among secular thinkers to trace back their religious roots. Turkey has been facing Islamic revivalism. The US has been struggling to achieve a "secular state" which still is a dream.

1.3.3.3. Recognition of Multiple Modernities (Post-Secular)

The basic resistance to the Western model of secularism and modernity has been, to a certain extent, resolved with the concept of "Multiple Modernities." Accordingly there is no one model or ideal of modernity but each nation has its own ways and means to develop a modernity of its own. There is no reason for a homogenous conception and model of modernity. Modernity is not uniform so much as united in diversity.

---

[297] Kashyap, "The Case for a Divorce Religion and Politics," 83. Dr. Radhakrishnan, a prominent Indian philosopher and politician emphatically asserted that 'Indian secularism did not mean irreligion, atheism, or indifference to religion, or even stress on material comforts; it meant that we respected all faiths and religions and that the state did not identify with any particular religion.'

1.3.3.4. The Mirage (Utopia) of "Public Sphere of Neutrality" as the Center (Post-Metaphysical Thinking)

The outcome of a fully developed secular state is supposed to be a "public sphere of neutrality" which is powered and functioned by rational principles. But in present reality secularism is not a commonly accepted center which is neutral, but rather a conflicted concept still in need of positive establishment. And what are the real prospects for establishing it? What is its center?

The foregoing review of historical and political developments suggests that the French *Laicization* model and the US *Separation* model between State and Church can never be fully actualized, since religion is a permanent and active element of society. In a world of pluralism, too much interference between State and Religion is also problematic, since religious ideologies and rational (political) ideologies will always clash with each other. What about "Secularism" as the "center- public sphere?" This is a wishful thinking since no real "neutrality" exists in the "Secular Public Sphere." What must be the foundation of the public sphere that will ensure and envisage recognition of plurality?" It must be something that can acknowledge and recognize a plurality of realities and which can even go beyond the visible realities. This is because secularism is not a finished product, but only a new frame in search of "flourishing. "Hence my research will focus on the metaphysical foundations of the 'authenticity and diversity' which comprise the holistic identity of self in the modern secular milieu. And, for my purpose Charles Taylor and Mahatma Gandhi are apt discussion-pointers, since one finds a beautiful blending of the "secular" and "sacred" in their writings and lives.

Conclusion

Among the contemporary scholars, nobody has concentrated on 'secularism' as Charles Taylor did. His approach has been very open, committed and positive. Other reflections on 'secularism' are predominantly

thick with 'one-sided and subjective or relativistic perspectives, but Taylor's legacy has been his focus on the method of "retrieval" and his perspective of "communitarianism." I understand and reference him in view of tracing out a coherent construction of 'secularism' and an 'immanent frame' for the society and the self. My focus on the 'secular self and its identity' argues with the help of Taylor's works. His masterpiece work, *The Sources of the Self* is also my *resource*[298] to frame a 'holistic identity' for a modern secular self. Though he has not been explicit enough with regard to his 'religious' positions, we can be comfortable with his 'religious' and 'moral and ethical' interests and commitments throughout his works. There is a 'balanced' reading of the history in Taylor together with his own 'inclusive' and 'positive' flavor reflectively added on the way. The 'anti-religious' baggage of history of 'secularism' is not so much a visible reality in his writings rather he acknowledges and appreciates the contributions of religions, even to the 'flourishing of humans in their secular lives.' I recover 'a secular self' with the help of Taylor, which is more 'holistic' and 'integral' compared to most of the 'one-sided' and 'biased' secular reflections.

Against the above background I have furthered my philosophical research, firstly on Charles Taylor and his contributions towards the making of a modern self- identity. Hence, his understanding of diversity, authenticity and holistic identity, will comprise the second chapter of this thesis. The third chapter concerns Mohandas K. Gandhi and his understanding of self-identity, diversity, authenticity and holistic identity in view of bringing him and his legacy for the present time as a relevant and necessary perspective. The fourth and concluding chapter presents a comparative analysis and understanding of the two authors and their thought patterns, and facilitates some cross-reading between the predominantly *secular/moral/sacred* emphases of Charles Taylor with the predominantly *sacred/moral/secular* emphasis of Mohandas K. Gandhi. My argument is in favor of

---

[298] The use of the word '*resource*' is in the sense of 'history' since the 'sources of the self' is a retrieval of identity from the available history.

both, claiming that there is an 'ambivalence'[299] positioning between them. Undeniably, the secular and sacred

can and must co-exist. One cannot completely negate the other; rather, each one reaches the other.

---

[299] Ambivalent nature of the spiritual (religious, ethical and moral) and secular (political and social) in the human self is explicit. Mostly human self is in the middle of both secular and spiritual. This ongoing conflict or struggle is unavoidably part of any human lives.

"What we are constantly losing from sight here is that being a self is inseparable from existing in a moral space of moral issues, to go with identity and how one ought to be. It is being able to find one's standpoint in this space, being able to occupy, to *be* a perspective in it." (SS 112)

CHAPTER II: DIVERSITY-AUTHENTICITY-HOLISTIC IDENTITY: A TAYLORIAN PERSPECTIVE

General Preview

The first chapter, with its historical retrieval of the general sketch of the emergence of modernity and secularism pave the way to this new chapter on Taylor's unique narration of modern self-identity within the context of secularism which is the latest background in which self is defined. The reader is expected to read this chapter as a continuation of the first part of the previous chapter where I present a preview of the milestones of Western philosophical world, with their historical progression, which eventually evolve into what Taylor calls 'a secular age.' I used materials from a wider context, of course sufficiently from Taylor, to bring out such a narration of secularism. While I do such a narration, my focus should not be confused as on *secularism* rather it should be understood as a background for the analysis of modern self-identity. The modernity, together with its "secular" emphasis, as against the previous "spiritual" emphasis has significant influence on our understanding of self-identity. This demands a background study of secularism in my dissertation before I deeply delve into the aspects of modern self-identity.

This second chapter begins with a general understanding of human self, which I bring together from numerous articles and books with specific focus on Taylor's masterpiece work *The Sources of the Self.* Needless to state that all those themes spread out in many other articles are in some minor level one can trace out from this work. As the first part of the first chapter is background for the second chapter, section 2.1 to 2.1.4.2 of this chapter are to be considered as specific background for further progression of it. Taylor's works entails a complexity of its own because of their wide range of concerns. Hence my summary presentation of the different aspects and understanding of human self in these first pages (up to p. 20) is expected to make clearer the rest of his analysis

on modern moral self-identity. Still, my important concentration, in this chapter, revolves around Taylor's understanding of *Diversity-Authenticity-Holisitic Identity.* Let me start with a specific introduction to this chapter.

Introduction

The second chapter exposes Taylor's position on *Authenticity and Diversity* where I have read Taylor's major works with specific focus on those concepts in relation to holistic identity (recognition of pluralistic realities). Authenticity and diversity have both become catch words in modern and contemporary societies. What has not, however, been widely explored is their interrelation. To this end, it will be especially helpful to draw out Charles Taylor's thoughts on authenticity, showing how they can serve as a ground for a new form of cultural diversity. For him, authentic "being-in-the-world"[300] affords us access to our own deep reservoir of cultural 'sources' that is the necessary resource for fruitful engagement with other cultures. This is of course the point at which he also brings us forward some reflection on diversity, but the two notions are, as I have suggested, addressed in view of developing an approach to holistic identity.

Taylor tries to trace out a genealogy of 'moral sources' which in turn constitutes the identity of the modern self. Unlike other philosophers of secularism, Taylor did not consider it as something to be addressed and understood as if opposed to religion and morality. His unique contribution consists in receiving what is good in the modern secular trends while also identifying what has been lacking. In this sense, his approach can be considered 'cumulative reflective.' In the most general terms, Taylor takes the view that one cannot construct buildings without strong foundations. With regard to the modern public sphere, this means that secularism cannot articulate its principles by negating its own origins. North-Atlantic civilization is an ongoing product of

---

[300] Heidegger's contribution to the reflection on 'authenticity' must be considered the foundation for any further reflection on the concept. Taylor is influenced by Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty as the starting point for his reflections on the human self and its identity. (See Taylor, *"Embodied Agency"* in Critical *Essays on Merleau- Ponty* ed. Henry Pietersma (Washington DC: The University press of America, 19891), 1.)

a 'process.' Still, as a Hegelian, Taylor does not restrict his reading of any historical developments to reference to their past, but also asks whether they might also be leading toward something discernible that lies ahead. Of course, the first task is to take stock of everything that has happened and develop the results as sources for 'strong evaluations' that may yield 'qualitative standards' for existence and identity. The major tenets of Taylors' thought along the line can be explicated under five headings, each of which contributes to his concept of 'holistic modern secular identity.' They are: 1. The Concept of Self According to Charles Taylor, 2. Portrait of a Modern Identity: A Historical Retrieval, 3. Tripartite Recognition of Plurality: A 'Constitutive' Factor of Modern Self-Identity, 4. Authenticity of 'Strong evaluations': From Diversity to Authentic Moral Articulations, and 5. Modern Identity and Holistic Identity.

2.1. The Concept of Self According to Charles Taylor

One of the major concerns of Charles Taylor has been the 'human self.' He is not a loner in emphasizing the 'inherited' aspects of human self against the predominantly individualistic focus of a vast majority of modern thinkers. (SS 3)

In casual conversation, the word 'self' is used in all sorts of ways, one of which refers to people as 'selves. 'All other uses of 'self' have to be separated from this use which we see in psychology and sociology. (SS.32). E.g. Chimpanzees have self or ego in the Freudian sense based on desires and capacities. But this self of image bears no connection to identity. It is seen as a fact about human beings that they care that their image matches certain standards that are generally socially induced. It is not seen as something essential to human personhood (SS. 33). When in contrast to this, Taylor uses the word in a way that connects it with a need for identity, he intends to isolate the source in which human agency cannot do without some orientation to the good. This self ought to be an object of study, yet it does not hold certain things which are generally held true of objects properly submitted to scientific study. There are four aspects that one needs to keep in mind in order to resist

making the self an object of scientific study. They are: a). The object of study is to be taken "absolutely" not in its meaning for us or anybody else, but as it is on its own (objectively); b). The object is independent of any descriptions or interpretations offered of it by any subjects; c). The object can, in principle, be captured in explicit description; d). The object can, in principle, be described without reference to its surrounding (SS 33-34).

But, as selves, we do not live as if in isolation from any surroundings or with a meaning that is unchanging or neutral. We are 'selves' insofar as we move in a certain space of questions; as we seek and find an orientation to the good. Accordingly, the self can never be interpreted completely or explicitly. A full and final account is impossible, though we can increase our understanding. And ever so, whatever language we may use is always clarified in relation to another (person), then can be further unpacked, and so on (Wittgenstein). In the study of 'self' no language is final, because the language at work can never be made fully explicit because of the nature of the 'object' studied (SS. 34).

Taylor is considered by many as a *communitarian* critic of the liberal understanding of the "self," where self tends to be dealt with as an 'independent' entity essentially separated from society. Against liberalism, communitarians like Charles Taylor, Alasdair Macintyre, Michael Walzer, Michal Sandel, and Gad Barzilai emphasize the importance of social institutions and cultural importance in the development of the self and its meaning and identity. His Massey Lectures on *The Malaise of Modernity* (1991) also emphasized the neglect and disregard of the 'societal role' in the making of the human self by political theorists from John Locke and Thomas Hobbes to John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin. A more realistic understanding of the "self" recognizes the social background against which life choices gain importance and meaning.

2.1.1.   Dimensions of Human Self

Taylor understands and analyses the human self in different dimensions which in anyway divides the unity of the self. Rather, they all constitute to the wholeness of the self. I provide a few prominent ones as articulated in the works of Taylor.

2.1.1.1.   Self as 'Human' Agent

Taylor's concern is 'self as human agent.' His initial goal is to analyze its scope and limits. Drawing inspiration from Harry Frankfurt, Taylor endorses a distinction between 'first and second order desires' in a human person (or self).[301] Frankfurt states in his book as follows:

> Human being is not alone in having desires and motives, or in making choices. They share these things with members of certain other species, some of which even appear to engage in deliberation and to make decisions based on prior thought. It seems to be peculiarly characteristic of humans, however, that they are able to form… second order desires.[302]

For Taylor, the key insight here grasps the uniquely human ability to *evaluate* our own desires, with some as desirable and others as not. Hence, no animal other than a human being has the 'capacity for reflective self-evaluation which is manifested in the second order desires.'[303] Taylor sees it as an 'essential feature of the mode of agency' we call human. When somebody refrains from acting on a 'given motive' to pursue a 'higher

---

[301] Charles Taylor, "What is Human Agency?" in *Human Agency and Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 15. This idea is taken from Harry Frankfurt's article "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of the Person," in *Journal of Philosophy* 67(1971): 5-20. (Henceforth: Taylor, *Human Agency*).

[302] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 15. "My conception of the freedom of the will appears to be neutral with regard to the problem of determinism. It seems conceivable that it should be causally determined that a person is free to want what he wants to want. If this is conceivable, then it might be causally determined that a person enjoys a free will."(336) There is an opposing Humean distinction between Reason and the Passions, but on Hume's view, only the Passions can motivate. The faculty of reason can be used to draw inferences, but it is not the source of states that can move one to action. Basically the contention is that "freedom of action" does not imply "freedom of will." However, "freedom of will" implies "freedom of action." Hence, human agent can evaluate his/her actions with a *second order* perspective of the will.

[303] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 16.

motive' there comes a qualitative evaluation. Hence, we have classified desires in such categories as higher and lower, virtuous and vicious, more and less fulfilling. Taylor says:

> Intuitively, the difference might be put in this way. In the first case, which we may call weak evaluation, we are concerned with outcomes; in the second, strong evaluation, with the quality of our motivation. […] For what is important is that strong evaluation is concerned with the qualitative *worth* of different desires.[304]

The notion of "strong evaluation" is foundational for Taylor's theory of morality which I deal with later on in this chapter (2.4.3). What about 'quantity'? If it is 'weak evaluation,' no 'quantity' will render the quality of second level desires and their motives; Taylor thus considers this a matter of the concept of 'commensurability.'[305] Utilitarianism will have overlooked this when it tried to do away with 'qualitative distinctions.' According to Taylor all of the 'weak evaluations' are only 'quantitative' in the weak sense that they do not involve qualitative distinctions of worth. But "there would be no qualitative distinction of the worth of the motivations."[306] To explain further, 'in a weak evaluation, for something to be judged good, it is sufficient that it is desired; whereas in strong evaluation, there is also a use of 'good' or some other evaluative term for which being desired is not sufficient. With the help of 'strong evaluation' one can characterize the alternative contrastively, and thus can arrive at what is really desirable for us in a given situation (e.g., courage versus cowardice, red versus other colors, the natrual good versus the material good, etc). Evaluation is an essential nature of a self, or a person. "He has reflection, evaluation and will. But in contrast to the strong evaluator, he lacks (the weak evaluator) lacks something else which we often speak of with the metaphor of 'depth.'"[307] The former resorts to a richer language. While the weak evaluator is more or less 'inarticulate,' with the strong evaluation there is the beginning of a language in which to express the superiority of one alternative as higher

---

[304] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 16.

[305] Incommensurability is a feature of highly motivated desires and actions. This quality cannot be replaced by any number of lower actions.

[306] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 18.

[307] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 23

and lower, noble and base with the strong evaluator because he has the language of 'contrastive' characterization.

Taylor applies this quite broadly: "With strong evaluation, however, there can be an often is a plurality of way of envisaging my predicament, and the choice may not be just between what is clearly the higher and the lower, but between two incommensurable ways of looking at this choice"(26). Hence, intuition of second order desires is essential to human agency. The human agent needs to be emphasising strong evaluation with inner depth.

This notion of second order desire leads Taylor to another important aspect of human agency i.e., responsibility. After all we speak of human beings as responsible as well, in a way which animals are not, and this does seem to be bound up with the capacity to evaluate desire. There is some sense of responsibility which is already implicit in the notion of will but our modern notion of self has a stronger sense of responsibility, which is partly suggested by the word 'evaluation.' Now, together with Sartre, one might approach this in terms of a relationship between responsibility and radical choice.[308] But Taylor argues that moral dilemmas become inconceivable in the theory of radical choice. The theory is incoherent, since it wants to keep both strong evaluation and radical choice, and this is clearly impossible, since it reduces the question of responsibility to a question of accepting a radical choice.[309]

Taylor proceeds to explain what it means to be responsible:

> Responsibility falls to us in the sense that it is always possible that fresh insight might alter my evaluations and hence even myself for the better. So that within the limits of my capacity to change

---

[308] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 28-29. Taylor brings to mind Sartre's example of a young man who has to make a choice between going to fight a war or to stay home with his mother.
[309] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 32.

myself by fresh insight, within the limits of the first direction of causal influence, I am responsible in the full direct 'modern' sense for my evaluations.[310]

It is a plurality of realities that forms the context in which I am responsible in my articulations, amid any number of factors around. I will return to this in later sections of this work.

2.1.1.2. The Concept of a Person

Taylor uses the term 'person' apparently as a synonym of the terms 'self' and 'human agent.' Still, he reflects on the term in a special way.

> Where it is more than simply a synonym for 'human being', 'person' figures primarily in moral and legal discourse. A person is a being with a certain moral status, or as a bearer of rights. But underlying the moral status, as its condition, are certain capacities. A person is a being who has a sense of self, has a notion of the future and the past, can hold values, make choices; in short, can adopt life-plans.[311]

According to Taylor any theory of person *must* address the question what it is to be a respondent. "Person" forms a sub-class of "agent". We do not give personal status to animals though we attribute action to them in some way. According to Taylor there are two conceptions of what is to be be a human person: 1. The first view is rooted in the epistemologicaly grounded notion of the subject (17th Century). "A person is a being with consciousness, where consciousness is seen as a power to frame representations of things."[312] Only human persons possess consciouness, or at least that they have it in a higher degree than any other animals possess. 2. The second view focuses on the nature of agency[313] where naturalist and behaviorist demonstrate a reductionist approach to human agency. Taylor criticizes such one-sided approaches toward human agents. This leads him to a general critique of naturalism, its historical development and its importance for modern culture and

---

[310] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 39.

[311] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 97.

[312] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 98.

[313] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 99-100. Human agent has not only the dimension of naturalistic evolution (physical, psychological, and rational evolutions) but also has the dimension of epistemological (meaning), and hermeneutical (values) evolutions. Taylor emphasizes a harmony in contrast to the reductionist tendency of modern sciences. For him human agents are "self-interpreting animals."

consciousness; and that in turn points, forward to a positive account of human agency and the self, the constitutive role of language and value, and the scope of practical reason.

The crucial difference between the first and the second view lies in the fact that the first does not take purpose seriously, whereas the second does. What distinguishes human persons from other agents? If purpose is thus so important for defining personhood, we must suspect that consciousness, while a necessary feature of the definition, is not sufficient.

Hence, in one view what makes an agent a person is the power to plan. In the other view, contrastingly, agent is in principle simply distinct from other things. In the first view, agent is a being for whom things matter, who are subjects of significance. This is what gives them a point of view on the world. A distinct feature of the human person cannot be just strategic power; it is in our 'recognizing certain goals.' Consciousness is indeed essential to this but this cannot be understood solely in terms of the power to represent.[314]

2.1.2.   Self as an Embodied, Embedded and Engaged Agent

According to Taylor, the single most significant contribution of phenomenology is the discovery that human self is an 'embodied agent.' Taylor has been influenced by Martin Heidegger and especially Merleau- Ponty in this respect. Together with them he wholeheartedly embraces the idea of a human being as an 'embodied agent.' He reflects on Merleau- Ponty's contribution to this idea as follows: "The core thesis might be put in a few terse assertions. The human subject is an agent, engaged in activity, and engaged in a world, which is his world. He is an embodied subject."[315] A person is in 'a world' and he finds his meaning essentially in relation with the world where he is. One cannot describe one's 'state' without addressing these features of the world,

---

[314] Taylor, *Human Agency*, 103-105.

[315] Taylor, *"Embodied Agency"* in Critical *Essays on Merleau- Ponty,* p. 1 (Henceforth: EA will be provided within the body of the text).

which goes beyond the person in space and time (EA 2). We are 'inescapably in a world' such that it is impossible to give a 'purely intrinsic description' of the subject, neglecting the surrounding world. Drawing inspiration from Heidegger, Taylor states that "one cannot start with a subject and relate to a world, but can only describe the subject-in-the world.' (EA 3).

Human being is not only in 'a world' but also in this world (field of meaning) 'as an agent.' Still following Merleau-Ponty, Taylor articulates meaning in terms of perception. "Our perception of the world is essentially that of an embodied agent, engaged with, or at grips with the world. […] The claim is rather that our perception as an experience is such that it could only be that of an embodied agent engaged with the world." (EA 4). We perceive the world and take it in, in our own ability to act in it. Moreover, as a bodily agent it is not only that I act on the world but also the world can act on me:

> […] even if we neglect the ways in which my field is shaped by my capacities to act in it, we must acknowledge that the sense of myself as a bodily agent is essential to its being a perceptual field in the full sense mentioned above, that is, my opening onto a world. For without this sense of my stance among things, I lose all orientation, and hence all sense of the shape of my world. (EA 6)

Embodied aspects of human agency can be seen as impersonal or personal since I cannot shut myself off (except in suicide) from being in the world. It should also be recognized that much of our perceiving activity is involuntary (EA 10). But these complexities only reaffirm my engaged and embodied nature. Hence, I am a 'life-form' engaged with the world. Our more developed, fully voluntary modes of awareness arise on the foundation of this embodied being-in-the-world. Of course, there are people who take up 'contemplative ways' of looking at the world or relating to things. Perhaps phenomenology has helped us remember the root of even these perspectives in our bodily existence, but then we still need an effective language to explain them. A first important step will be to resist the constructions of idealism, skepticism and solipsism. Sense data is not a construct of the senses; but our very relatedness to the world we are in. The moment one discards or doubts

sense-data or considers them as 'mere appearances' there will be practically no self consiousness at all. According to Taylor:

> Perception is thus our access to a world, which far transcends what we now perceive, or could ever perceive. And this is a feature that must obtain of the perception of an embodied agent engaged with the world. What I am perceiving is a world with which I am already engaged, which envelops me, of which I am a part, where I am situated. (EA 12-13).

Being an agent, I am part of the world and I perceive things from the 'inside' of the world not as an object 'outside' of the realities of the world, as the traditioanal epistemology seems to argue. It is essential for perception that we have a sense of ourselves as bodies in the same world. Taylor argues that we cannot effectively exercise our subjectivity without being well aware of a world, with a sense of ourselves as being embodied subjects. This sense is 'constitutive' to our awareness. (EA 14).

This understanding of human being as an embodied subject/agent has tremendous impact on the scientific debate and also on our own understanding of what it really means to be human and thus on our practical reasoning. Yet identifying myself with my body and identifying myself with my embodied agency are different. "My embodied being sets the framework for my identity."(EA 16). On the one hand, it is integral to my identity, on the other hand it constitutes a prepersonal background.

> [...] our way of being in the world, of having a world, is something that we can never properly focus, never completely grasp, never dominate, as we can an object of study, or landscape made out below us. It remains in fact as something enigmatic, rather opaque, hard to formulate clear theses about. (EA 19).

Taylor has an elaborate analysis of the 'embeddedness of the self in nature.' Apparently this is an outcome of the Hegelian and Herderian emphasis on nature, history and feelings. I will return to agent's embeddedness in nature later in this chapter. Suffice to say that it underpins a powerful sense of the self as *engaged.* The concept *engaged* is understood in the context of reflection on the 'disengaged' self of modernity. In Taylor's works

disenchantment (a term which he seems to take first from Karl Jaspers) and disengagement are virturaly

synonymous terms, insofar as each is a crucial index of the nature of the self in the modern times. This modern

(secular) self has cut ties with cosmos, gods, and communities, which is not good for the construction of a

healthy modern self identity.

2.1.3.   Argument for a *Dialogical Self*

Taylor notices that the use of the term 'the self' is a modern western development, as the earlier usage of

'human person' is abandoned or marginalized. The additions of articles, definite or indefinite, to define

selfhood, uniquely demonstrate a certain 'powers of reflexivity' attributed to the modern human person. Thus

signals an important shift from what came before. (DS 304).[316]The 'soul' of ancient times is now considered as

'the self.' Taylor sees it as a radical shift of emphasis:

> The shift reflects a change in our understanding of what is essential. We have developed practices of
> radical reflexivity in the modern world. By 'radical reflexivity' I mean not only the focus on oneself,
> but on one's own subjective experience. […] when I examine my own experience, or scrutinize my
> own thinking, reflexivity takes a radical turn. (DS 304).

There are different kinds of reflexivity being developed in the course of the history of philosophy. Descartes

initiated a movement of reflexivity where the subject 'disengages' from its rootedness in the external world.

This was furthered by the post-Cartesian thinkers, even while, the post-Romantic ideal of self-sounding and

self-expression has given us another model of reflexivity which eventually helps us to have 'creative

imagination.'(DS 305). According to Taylor, we are selves because of our 'morally important self-description'

and our association with it. Hence, self-descriptions inevitably imply 'moral and ethical self-characterization'

which is perennial to human life. And in that way the human self is reflexively related to some goods or

---

[316] Charles Taylor, "Dialogical Self," in *The Interpretative Turn, Philosophy, Science, and Culture*, (1991), 304. (Henceforth: DS, will be provided within the body of the text)

standards of excellence. Taylor seems concerned about its distortions in modern disengaged reflexivity when he states:

> A human being exists inescapably in a space of ethical questions; she or he cannot avoid assessing himself or herself in relation to some standards. To escape all standards would not be a liberation, but a terrifying lapse into total disorientation. It would be to suffer the ultimate crisis of identity. (DS 305).

Identity is related to the question 'who are we?' which in turn can be explained by one's profession, social status or familial relationship to somebody (e.g., 'I am a professor,' or 'I am the father of Matt.' Etc.). Here I define my identity in the social, professional or familial space. Taylor would argue that the foundation of the identity of a self is much more substantial. "[…] the kind of identity that is crucial to having a coherent sense of self is one that relates us to ethical space. To have an identity is to know "where you are coming from" when it comes to questions of value, or issues of importance." (DS 305).

There have always been some 'moral spaces' operative in human history as standards of reflection though they vary in striking fashion. Sometimes the range of ethical spaces is so different and even unique that it even renders them 'incommensurable.' Procedural reasoning will fall short of explaining the terms *Dharma* or *Tao* which thus become very good examples of incommensurability in their relations. According to Taylor, the modern emphasis on reflecting ourselves as 'a self' is something new to us. And here we join an earlier theme: this seems to demonstrate our 'disengagement from embodied agency and social embedding.' (DS 307). Understanding the self as something 'already established in our personal constitution' will blind us from what a self really is, and for Taylor this is an ominous possibility. He blames Descartes and Locke for the reification of the first person singular self that founded the modern epistemological tradition. Here the human agent is primarily a subject of representations: first about the world outside, and second, about an end that is desired or feared. According to Taylor this subject is a 'monological one' since he or she sees the world as something in

simple, even single terms directed from its own perspective. The modern subject represents the world in an 'inner space (within consciousness). The human mind has or even is the 'mechanism of processing representations.' "I" am an inner space capable of defining myself independent of the body; my 'self' is the center of this 'monological consciousness.' (DS 307).

This method of reflection has a huge impact on the social sciences and methodological individualism. Taylor considers that this view of the self stands in the way of a 'richer and a more adequate view of what the human sense of self is really like.' And yet it was not impossible to gain some critical distance from these developments. Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and Ludwig Wittgenstein could stand away from the above mentioned monological consciousness. According to Taylor, "What all these have in common is that they see the agent, not primarily as a locus of representations, but as engaged in practices, as a being who acts in and on a world." (DS 308). This gives our body a greater role in our reflective activity. Our very understanding is embodied.

Bearing all these in mind, Taylor plainly sees that it is very important to distinguish between acts of a single agent (monological acts) and those of more than one (dialogical acts). (DS 310). From the standpoint of the old epistemology, all acts were monological which in reality fails to account for some actions which require and sustain an integrated agent. Rhythm in dancing, for example, requires the conjoining of two agents. Taylor states that:

> An action is dialogical, in the sense I am using it, when it is affected by an integrated, non-individual agent. This means that for those involved in it, its identity as this kind of action essentially depends on the sharing of agency. These actions are constituted as such by a shared understanding among those who make up the common agent. Integration into a common rhythm can be one form this shared understanding can take. But it can also come to be outside the situation of face-to-face encounter. In a different form it can also constitute, for instance, a political or religious movement, whose members may be widely scattered but who are animated together by a sense of common purpose […]. (DS 311).

The more one understands the importance of dialogical action, the more one will realize the inadequacy of the monological subject. We cannot understand a human being merely from the individual subject and his or her representations. Since a great deal of human action happens when I constitute or cooperate with the "we," Taylor's self is socially constituted, through its relation to the attitudes of others, as the "me." (DS 312). Here the importance of the self being able to confront or conform to the influences of community is emphasized. Together with Mead, Taylor is also in agreement with the fact that something in the self (me) feels the tension or harmony as it encounters the social situation. Thus Taylor comes up with the 'demands of the community' which had been previously unarticulated. Dialogical action is very important to be aware of what Jean Piaget has called our early "egocentricity."[317] The more one define oneself in terms of the "I" the less one will be able take up the attitude of the *other*. Hence, Taylor places dialogue as very central in understanding our human selves. Taylor's dialogical self-understanding draws inspiration also from Bakhtin,[318] who says that human beings are constituted in conversation.

2.1.4. Types of Selves

In his recent work, Taylor distinguishes between types of selves, depending on their predominant natures and features. (SA 27). He likes to call the pre-modern self "porous" and the modern self "buffered." He reflects on these two types of selves as against the background of the 'exclusive humanism' of the modern western world. Historically, this suggests an important difference between the outlook of the individual of 1500 and the contemporary person. Almost everyone can agree that one of the big differences between us and our ancestors

---

[317] Jean Piaget (1896–1980) claimed that young children are egocentric. This does not mean that they are selfish, but that they do not have the mental ability to understand that other people may have different opinions and beliefs from themselves.

[318] Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975), was a Russian philosopher, literary critic, semiotician and scholar who worked on literary theory, ethics, and the philosophy of language. Taylor draws inspiration from Bakhtin's book *The Dialogic Imagination* (1975) which is a compilation of four essays concerning language and the novel. He explains the generation of meaning through the "primacy of context over text" (heteroglossia), the hybrid nature of language (polyglossia) and the relation between utterances (intertextuality) in M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Texas: University of Texas press Austin and London, 1981), 270ff.

of a thousand or even five hundred years ago, is that they lived in an "enchanted" world and we do not. Though perhaps it is better to say that we live in a *much less* "enchanted" world. We might think of this as our having "lost" a number of beliefs and the practices which they made possible. But more, the enchanted world was one in which these forces could cross a porous boundary and shape our lives, both psychically and physically. One of the big differences between us and our ancestors is that we live with a much firmer sense of the boundary between self and other. This is what Taylor means by "buffered" selves.

2.1.4.1. Porous self

The pre-modern self is 'porous' because it thought of itself as deeply situated in an enchanted world and open to being influenced by forces emanating from that world. Taylor acknowledges his indebtedness to Tambiah[319] for his use of the term "porous" in this context who uses the same term to show the contrast between Western and *Ayurvedic* medicine in their treatment of mental illness. In the latter, the empirical individual is seen porous and open to outside influences all the time. Taylor uses the same term to show the same openness and enchantment which the pre-modern people had, in their relation to the cosmos. The porous self is exposed to the whims of a superhuman benevolence or malevolence residing in the cosmos. There were occasions where people "charged" objects with extraordinary powers. Mercury, for example, was thought to cure venereal diseases because such diseases were believed to be contracted in the market places and the Greek God Hermes, who is apparently identified with the Roman God Mercury, thus happened to be the God of mercury and

---

[319] Stanley Jeyaraja Tambiah (1929) is a leading social anthropologist and the Esther and Sidney Rabb Professor (Emeritus) of Anthropology at Harvard University. He specializes in studies of Thailand, Sri Lanka, and Tamils (those who speak the language *Tamil* especially in Sri Lanka and in Tamil Nadu, a Southern State in India), as well as the anthropology of religion and politics. Taylor explains the details of the originality of the term "porous" in the notes of the book *A Secular Age.* The term "porous" is used with a same meaning by Stanley Tambiah in his book, *Magic, Science, Religion, and the Scope of Rationality.* (SA 781).

market or commerce.[320] Here those charged things have a causal power which matches their incorporated meaning. (SA 35).

Here we glimpse some of Taylor's understanding of how enchantment 'works'. He uses two terms: 'influence' and 'causal power,' to explicate the sense of which things are charged with power. Both remind us that boundary between mind and the world was much hazier in this earlier understanding. One explicit example is 'possession by spirits.' There can be possession of a good or bad spirit, in both cases there is an influence and causal effect. Something enters from outside into the 'internal.' And, for example, as somebody falls in love with somebody else, that has tremendous impact (good or evil) on that person. Hence, according to Taylor,

> Then the inside is no longer just inside; it is also outside. That is, emotions which are in the very depths of human life exist in a space which takes us beyond ourselves, which is porous to some outside power, a person-like power(SA 36).

The porous framework of the enchanted world provides room for such attributions. The use of analogous languages is another specialty of the porous self. Cosmic forces which break the boundary and act within us are not personalized creatures like us, still they incorporate certain meanings and hence can affect us and thus make us live those meanings in some fashion (SA 37). Taylor observes:

> By definition for the porous self, the source of its most powerful and important emotions are outside the "mind"; […] The porous self is vulnerable, to spirits, demons, cosmic forces. Along with it goes certain fears which can grip it in certain circumstances. The buffered self has been taken out of the world of this kind of fear. […] the buffered self can form the ambition of disengaging from whatever is beyond the boundary, and of giving its own autonomous order to its life (SA 38-39).

However, even in the predominantly modern buffered world, Taylors notices 'many people look back to see the world of the porous self with nostalgia.' And what they feel, then, is a sense that something important may have been lost. Part of his project is to 'recover some measure of this lost feeling.' (SA 39). Together with this

---

[320] In the Roman adaptation of the Greek *pantheon*, Hermes was identified with the Roman god Mercury, who, though inherited from the Etruscans, developed many similar characteristics, such as being the patron of commerce. The Latin word *mercari* means "to trade."

line of thinking, Taylor also sees that the clear boundary of today is not respected when it comes to the laws of physical science and the meaning things have for us. "Charged objects have causal power in virtue of their intrinsic meanings" (SA 39). The boundary between physical and moral was not drawn clearly before 500 BC. Until then, the boundary around the mind was constitutionally porous. Things and agencies which are extra-human could influence, alter or shape our spiritual and emotional condition and not just the physical state (40).The conditions of 'belief' also can be understood from the contrast of porous/buffered selves. "Disbelief is hard in the enchanted world" (SA 41) which is one of the reasons why emergence of buffered self could not eradicate belief in a 'god' or 'Satan.'

Let us close this section by noting that the porous self is basically related to nature and society, but the buffered self tries to disengage with those realities in view of finding one's own inner sources, whereupon we are led forward 'atomism' and 'individualism.'

2.1.4.2. Buffered self

The buffered self is the self that developed in early modernity in contrast to the 'open and porous and vulnerable' self of the previous epoch. That former individual, living in a world that was held to be 'enchanted', was vulnerable to the world of spirits and powers. The 'buffered self' of modernity considers its purposes and meanings as arising not from without but from within. As Taylor sees it, a crucial condition for the forming of this new self is the emergence of new concerns explicitly for the modern self. The "buffered self is not open and porous and vulnerable to the world of spirits and powers," (SA 27). But this is not everything we need to know in order to understand it. "It took more than disenchantment to produce the buffered self; it was also necessary to have confidence in our own powers of moral ordering."(SA 27).

According to Taylor, the modern thinkers like Descartes and Kant contributed enormously to the development of the modern buffered self. They tried to develop a sense of our own intrinsic worth, something clearly self-referential not in tune with nature (SA 134). The new ethic of rational control pre-supposes disenchantment, which eventually opens the way for the new 'buffered self,' visible in moral ordering. The key to this ordering is of course modern reason. Reason is supposed to debunk all the 'lower' desires and passions so that self has a 'higher 'ethical life. The very idea that feeling could be stripped of all aura came to seem not only erroneous but terribly impoverishing, a denial of our humanity. With this disengaged reason, disenchantment and instrumental reason go hand in hand, which eventually paved the way for exclusive humanism (SA 136). These features became very foundational to the modern identity and also to secularity.

It should not be overlooked that these developments also touch directly on religion. Modern religious belief became a "personal decision" especially after the Reformation and Counter Reformation (SA 142-143). Buffered identity being capable of disciplined control and benevolence generated its own sense of dignity and power, its own inner satisfaction:

> What emerges clearly from this, however, is that in both its positive and its negative motives, the rise of exclusive humanism was closely tied to the ethic of freedom and beneficent order. […] the centrality of ethic…fostered the anthropocentric turn. And it was the strong moral satisfactions of this successful ordering which positively motivated the embracing of the new humanism. (SA 264)

In sum, Taylor considers that the ethic of freedom and order of the new culture makes 'selves' basically buffered. This self has more complex meaning. The development of the buffered self came about through the following changes: a). The replacement of the cosmos of spirits and forces by a mechanistic universe; b). The fading of higher times: higher times of religion and its supernatural flow of events and lower time of natural events in ordinary time; c). The recession of a sense of such complementarities of both immanent and transcendent aspects of life. (SA: 300). The human subject and it conception of 'identity' effected these

changes. This "civilizing process"[321] is featured by 'disengaged reason, transformation brought about by disciplined, self-making, and the simultaneous narrowing and intensifying of intimacy.

According to Taylor the appeal of the buffered self is obvious: "As a sense of power, of capacity, in being able to order our world and ourselves. To the extent that this power was connected with reason and science, a sense of having made great gains in knowledge and understanding."(SA 300). Understandably, Taylor sees this as the emergence of "anthropocentrism," and indeed it includes a strong sense of "invulnerability" previously thought to belong more to spirits, Gods, or even to the cosmos itself. This 'anthropocentric turn' gives a sort of 'pride' and 'a sense of one's own worth' which is very strong in the modern age. Of course, it is the achievement of the self-disciplined reasoning, of having won through to this invulnerability out of an earlier captivity to the enchanted world. Yet this very process has an interesting complication: "In this sense, modern self-consciousness has a *historical* dimension."(SA 301).

Taylor notices that the buffered position of self making itself blind or insensitive to whatever lies beyond this ordered human world and its instrumental-rational project is really "missing something, cut off from something." (SA 302). The very claim of 'invulnerability' of the buffered self opens it to the danger that just as evil spirits, cosmic forces or god's won't *get to* it, so nothing significant whatsoever will stand out for it. (SA 303). The buffered identity has a condition of "cross-pressure" where on the one hand there is a 'deep embedding' to the identity and its relative invulnerability, but on the other hand there is a sense that something may be occluded in the very closure which guarantees this safety.

---

[321] Norbert Elias (1897-1990) describes these changes in modern self in his masterpiece work *The Civilizing Process Vol 1* and *2*. He brought to light the tremendous shift in manners which accompanies the developing ideas of civility and later civilization. Taylor describes it in SA 138 quoting from Elias' *The Civilizing Process*. Living together in larger numbers necessitated stricter rules. When more and more people started to live together and interacted, that situation demanded some disciplining of behavior which Elias explains as, "civilizing process." Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process*: *Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, Revised edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 332.

Taylor sees such developments as the source of the "nova effect"[322] which forces us to explore and try out new solutions for our dilemma as secularity comes into question. "Pluralism is certainly an important part of the answer, how things are different today."(SA 304). Taylor continues to speak about the "instability" in the buffered identity due to the "mutual fragilization" that came about as a result of the rampant plurality of the present age. 'Cross-presssured' by pluralism, we are prone or forced to change. "Homogeneity and instability work together to bring the fragilizing effect of pluralism to a maximum" (SA 304).

2.1.5.   Self in a moral space with moral sources

Taylor's primary project is to extract and clarify the 'moral sources' of the human agent in the frameworks of the moral space where it is situated. There have been numerous attempts in this field which is characterized by 'inarticulacy' due to the nature of the reality of 'moral intuitions.' Hence, philosophy has accredited a cramped and truncated view of morality in a narrow sense, where Taylor now tries to enlarge our range of legitimate moral descriptions (SS 3). 'Moral intuitions are so uncommonly deep, powerful, and universal that some may even consider them as almost as 'instinct' yet they seem to involve some claims (implicit and explicit) about the nature and status of human beings. But Taylor argues that "a moral reaction is an assent to, an affirmation of, a given ontology of the human" (SS 4-5) which few modern thinkers want to accept. This very reluctance is due to the nature of the things at issue: the moral ontology behind any person's views can remain largely implicit.

---

[322] Nova (effect): Taylor seems to presume that the reader is aware of the concept of "nova." To my reading, Taylor borrows such astronomical terms like *nova* and *super*-nova (The astronomer Tycho Brahe observed the supernova (1572) in the constellation Cassiopeia, and described it in his book *De stella nova* ("concerning the new star"), giving rise to the name nova. In this work he argued that a nearby object should be seen to move relative to the fixed stars). In order to describe an important aspect of the modern conditions of belief by saying that "we are now living in a spiritual super-nova, a kind of galloping pluralism on the spiritual plane." His secularity 3 is a result of different changes happened in history, specifically in the North-Atlantic, where one occurrence someway or other leads to the other which finally resulted in an apparent replacing of Western Christianity with secular humanism. For further explanation *cf.* Nova Effect in "Clarification of Important terms."

The articulation of moral ontology is a very difficult task because of the tentative, searching, uncertain nature of many of our moral beliefs (SS 9-10). One way of articulating morality is with the notion of 'respect' (morality is defined in terms of one's respect for the other); this has been influential in the modern West. (SS 13-14) The concept of 'respect' is gradually connected to 'right' and thus it falls into the notion of 'autonomy.' Taylor cannot see how 'strong evaluations' can work in this understanding of morality. "To understand our moral world we have to see not only what ideas and pictures underlie our sense of respect for others but also those which underpin our notions of a full life" (SS 14). Later he comes up with three axes of our moral thinking: a. Our sense of respect for and obligations to others; b. Our understanding of what makes a full life; and c. A range of notions concerned with dignity – which I give and which commands me due to my 'self-worth' or 'moral standing.' Presumably something like these three axes exist in every culture though there are differences in the way they are conceived, how they relate, and in their relative importance. Our modern age stands out for the importance it assign to the second axis –the meaning of life and the fullness of life. Yet all three are 'highly problematic' in our times. What we can look for is a 'believable framework' to progress. What does seem to agree on is a sense that no framework shared by everyone is likely to be taken as the one framework (SS 15-17).

Taylor's solutions are related to a set of 'qualitative distinctions' which makes an analysis of the different frameworks to see which is "higher" or "better." Some of them are 'incomparable' with others. Here, 'incomparability' connects with his idea of 'strong evaluation.' He argues that "these ends or goods stand independent of our own desires, inclinations, or choices, that they represent standards by which these choices and desires are judged" (SS 20) It is therefore necessary to act in a 'framework' with a sense of 'qualitative distinction.' (Though naturalism and Utilitarianism have each rejected any of these frameworks that envisage qualitative distinction).

Different frameworks, or in our case mainly three axes (Respect, Meaning of life and Dignity) for moral life interweave throughout our moral existence in at least two ways: (1). Frameworks provide us with a background (implicit or explicit) for our moral judgments, intuitions or reactions in any of the three dimensions. This gives a horizon within which one can take a stand. The naturalist's rejection of frameworks runs the risk of not having such a background (SS 27) (2).

2.1.6.   Self and Identity

The foregoing brief discussion of a moral framework will lead us forward the relationship between self and identity, since of course frameworks are the background for the self to operate and articulate in a patterned way. Taylor says: "To know who you are is to be oriented in moral space, a space in which questions arise about what is good or bad, what is worth doing and what not, what has meaning and importance for you and what is trivial and secondary"(SS 28). Some part of it is 'historical' and some 'not historical.' We often define our identity by what is salient in our lives but in fact identity is 'deeper' and more 'many-sided' than any of our possible articulations of it. "One orients oneself in a space which exists independently of one's success or failure in finding one's bearings" (SS 30)

Our identities are partly constituted by what we value, we aspire to, respect, care about and admire certain modes of life more than others. Internalizing an ideal *directly* contributes to what we are like. I am partially defined by my strong evaluations or orientations. "To know who I am is a species of knowing where I stand"(SS 27).

Taylor's use of the term 'self' and its relation to the term 'identity' needs to be clarified. The original meaning of the word identity is drawn from the Latin word, *identitas* (sameness). The philosophical use of the word identity is more in tune with a Latin origin, i.e., sameness of things. The concept of sameness has given rise to the general concept of identity, as in personal identity and social identity.

An entity can only be fully identical with itself. Any difference gives rise to a separate identity. Thus identity is whatever makes an entity definable and recognizable, in terms of possessing a set of qualities or characteristics that distinguish it from other entities. In layman's terms, identity is whatever makes something the same or different.[323]

Numerically there is no difference of identity in a person from ones birth to death. However, there is a process of *development* of identity of a person.

Taylor's emphasis on 'community,' 'genealogy,' and 'narrativity' surely will fall into the hermeneutical conception of identity. In this tradition, identity is collective and narrative. One wants to understand how it will be possible to maintain the modern conception of identity while realizing that many of our prior assumptions about the world are incorrect.[324]What does it take for individuals to persist from moment to moment or for the same individual to exist at different moments? Hence, the problem can be *diachronic* as well as *synchronic*. According to my reading, Taylor has a meaningful synthesis of the two in his conception of self-identity. Descartes brought out the dualism of body and soul and John Locke articulated the importance of human discipline and consciousness in improving our potentialities. These contributions cannot be discarded in any understanding of self-identity, not even one that is critical of modernity.

Self-understanding necessarily has temporal depth and incorporates narrative (SS 50). It seems clear from all of this that there is something like an a priori unity of a human life through its whole extent (SS 51). We understand ourselves inescapably in narrative. There is a close connection between the different conditions of identity. Because we cannot but orient ourselves to the good, and thus determine our place relative to it, or

---

[323] "Identity - Philosophy," in *Wikipedia* accessed April, 14, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Identity_%28philosophy%29.
[324]"Personal Identity: Philosophy," in Wikipedia-Free Encyclopedia, accessed April 26, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Personal_identity_%28philosophy%29, 2011.

hence determining the direction of our lives, we must inescapably understand our lives in narrative form, as what as Alasdair McIntyre simply calls a "quest."[325]

2.1.7. Identity and Good

According to Taylor the worth of the self is essentially related to its conception of 'good.' As self is so closely related to identity, identity is also closely related to one's conception of good. "Selfhood and the good, or in another way selfhood and morality, turn out to be inextricably intertwined themes" (SS 3). Hence the concept of "good" for Taylor virtually is interchangeable with the concept of "morality" in the project of Taylor. "The notion of self which connects it to our need for identity is meant to pick out this crucial feature of human agency, that we cannot do without some orientation to the good, that we each essentially are (i.e., define ourselves at least inter alia by) where we stand on this"(SS 33).

2.1.8. Moral Sources of Diversity

In the previous sections I have presented a rather elaborate understanding of Taylor on human self with its dimensions, types and distinctive understanding. Those sections intend to situate and even familiarize the particular considerations of Taylor in dealing with human self. Here, I start with specific focus on the pluralistic moral background of the human self which Taylor prefers to call *moral sources.* Taylor's use of the plural form "sources" has many implications. If it was a single 'source' it would never have been 'problematic'. Part of its nature of 'inarticulacy' also springs from the manifold sources of morality. Those different sources of morality are, to a greater extend, different 'frameworks' of morality for Taylor. A moral source can form into a particular 'frame' for the people in a later period of time, which continue to influence

---

[325] Alasdair Chalmers MacIntyre (born 1929) is a British philosopher primarily known for his contribution to moral and political philosophy but known also for his work in history of philosophy and theology. His book *After Virtue* refers to the character of generalizations in social science and their lack of predictive power which in turn reiterates the importance of our ongoing inquiry which Taylor uses here in the context of our ongoing process of the narration of identity. Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 103.

their moral decisions one way or another. For example, one can still speak of a *theistic frame* on the one side and a *rationalistic frame* on the other side. Apparently none of those frames are either complete in themselves or can anybody articulate them with utmost clarity and certainty. Still the question can be asked how or why one should articulate it, since it is going be partial and incomplete anyway? Taylor would answer this question as follows: "Articulation is a necessary condition of adhesion; without it, these goods are not even options (SS 91).

What is the point of articulacy about the 'good'? : The good exists through any number of articulations. There are different articulations of 'good' depending on the difference of cultures and languages. Perhaps we can even say that a vision of 'good' is received through the culture being given in some manner (SS 91). After all, this God of Abraham spoke primarily through the narrative of the Bible, but also in countless other ways from theology to devotional literature. Taylor addresses this difficulty by appeal to narrative. Narration emerges from a particular ethical view or range of views which sees reason, in the sense of the logos and of linguistic articulacy, as part of the *teleos* of human beings. We are not full human beings until we can say what moves us (SS 92). Articulation of the notion of good can bring us closer to the good as a moral source, and can give it power (SS 92). In Kant, rational agency is a 'constitutive good.' This tremendous move of internalization the move of modern humanism is to be appreciated. Whatever fills this role is playing the part of a moral source; it has an analogous place in the ethical life of Kantians to that of the Idea of the Good among Platonists. The move to an immanent ethic does not mean that this role of moral force completes its operation or stops being active in human lives, but it does not shift its 'plea' momentarily.

We often feel that we are less than our forebears in articulation, because "frameworks" in since their time has become problematic. Irish Murdoch said that the good is something which is non-representable and indefinable ("the Sovereignty of Good." (SS 95). Plato's theory of Ideas may not be appealing to many, still, the image of

Good as sun, in the light of which we can see things clearly and with a kind of dispassionate love, does have an impact in all of us. Articulating the 'good' is very difficult and problematic for us, and so we often simply eschew it. There seems to be very strong reasons in favor of articulacy wherever a constitutive good serves as a moral source. Articulation can bring them two closer. Words can empower, words can at times have tremendous moral force (SS 96). Of course, not all the articulations will do the same. Power is not only in the formulations but of the whole speech act. The most powerful case is when the speaker, the formulation, and the act of delivering the message all line up together to reveal the good, as the immense and continuing force that the gospel illustrates (SS 96). When the formulation brings the source closer, it has more power.

In contrast inarticulacy can cripple the reality. The silence of modern philosophy on a moral source is unhealthy. Not many want to deal with the 'underlying notion of good.' A major trend of attack came from the Neo-Nietzscheans,[326] chief among them Foucault,[327] who delivers on influential attempt to deny articulation. Yet the Neo-Nietzschean position attacks the procedural ethic mainly for its implicit moral inspirations (SS 99), killing the "hyper good" only to replace it with-or acting in the source of-their own. In our important sense, Nietzsche is better since he was clear about his own ideal "Superman" (SS 102). This was a 'hyper good' of unreserved yea-saying. Most of these moderns are occluded by the goods which they are inspired by; they also are drawn by their own subjectivism.

If we wish to articulate what has remained implicit, we must attend to moral outlook which underlies even the modern philosophies opposed to any moral outlook. For this, we need to invent a new language of articulation. (SS: 103). There is a great recourse here that is history. Articulation of the modern understanding of good has

---

[326] Neo-Nietzscheans base their thinking on Nietzsche though they digress from him as a particular theme or context may require. The neo-Nietzschean position attacks procedural ethics mainly for its implicit moral inspirations: for the conception of freedom it defends, for its attachment to a hypergood, and the consequent radical revisionism (SS 99)

[327] Michel Foucault (1926-1984), was a French philosopher, social theorist and historian of ideas. Foucault is best known for his critical studies of social institutions, most notably psychiatry, medicine, the human sciences, and the prison system, as well as for his work on the history of human sexuality. See Foucault's "What is Enlightenment?" in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984).

to be a historical enterprise. Present positions are always defined in relation to past ones, taking them either as models or foils (SS 103). In articulating these suppressed elements, we are forced to turn to predecessors' and also to raise the question as to what degree the new or the present is still living from the spiritual insights of the predecessor that it claims to have utterly repudiated. Whatever it is, for Taylor, the path of articulacy has to be historical.

These all appear in loose "packages," as it were. There is new narrativity and a new understanding of social bonds and relations. This new narrations will mainly include "stories of linear development, progress stories of history, stories of continuous gain through individual lives and across generations, rags-to-riches stories, and that which have no ending point."(SS 105). And there is the spiral picture of history, from innocence to strife and then to higher harmony (Christianity's divine history, the millennial movement of Marxism) (SS 106). And there is the free, disengaged society of modern times. Modern nationalism has its own narrative of history.[328] Once these connections are made it may not be easy to repudiate moral visions. If we do a good job with articulation, that will open up our moral sources which will eventually release their force in our lives. The cramped views of the modern philosophies involve denials, the sacrifice of one kind of good in favor of - often covertly - another. Articulacy is a crucial condition of reconciliation. If reconciliation is not possible, articulacy will buy us much greater inner conflict. As Taylor admits, this does involve a risk. (SS 107).

Now I present a historical narrative of the different models of modern identity proposed by prominent philosophers from different periods of history. This *retrieval* of the history of the "inwardness" is contributive for Taylor in making unique contribution to the *making of the modern identity.* While highlighting those portraits, Taylor, on the one hand, analyzes their prospects; on the other hand, he brings to light their problems

---

[328] "Imagined communities" is a concept coined by Benedict Anderson. He believes that a nation is a community socially constructed, imagined by the people who perceive themselves as part of that group. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1983), 224.

and limitation for being the complete picture of self-identity. Basically, one should agree on the fact that there is not a single model which is perfect or complete frame for one's imitation.

2.2. Portrait of *a* Modern Identity: A Historical Retrieval

One of the major concerns of Taylor has been to provide building blocks and possible foundation for a *modern identity.* Here I present his major frames of self-identity as it developed through the history. These are portrait of a modern identity. There is no claim that this the *only* possible frame. As the nature of the identity, as Taylor sees it, it is an *emerging* concept.

2.2.1. Tracing the Sources of Inwardness: Diverse Models of 'Radical Self-Reflexivity.'

Taylor's emphasis and genuine interest in the history of the human self and the way it develops in the course of events in history have made him uniquely important for our modern times. Dissatisfied with his contemporaries for not being faithful to the genealogy of self, morality (good) and identity, he boldly states that, "we cannot understand ourselves without coming to grip with history" (SS ix). For him, history and its chronological progression are real 'resources' for tracing out our 'sources.' His *sources of the self* are basically a re-reading of history to frame self-identity in a new (third) way'[329] with a unique combination of its 'greatness and dangers (*grandeur et misère).'* (SS x). Basically, he says that, "Understanding modernity aright is an exercise of retrieval" (SS xi) Taylor even argues that it is necessary to save modernity from its most unconditional supporters, whom he thinks are flawed because of their biased and one-sided perspectives.

One of the areas in which modern self-understanding is flawed is in its 'localization of the inner and outer.' As Taylor sees it: "What we are constantly losing from sight here is that being a self is inseparable from existing in a moral space of moral issues, to do with identity and how one ought to be. It is being able to find one's

---

[329] According to Taylor there are predominantly two kinds of reflections on human self: 1. Those who keep the self upbeat and see us as having climbed to a higher plateau; 2. others who like to draw a picture of decline, of loss, and of forgetfulness. Taylor does not seem to like both; rather he takes or makes his own 'third way' out.

standpoint in this space, being able to occupy, to *be* a perspective in it (SS 112). Being a self in our modern understanding is inextricably related to a moral predicament and human agency. In this moral space of issues, one is not just a 'biological organ' but living and engaging in the issues of a situation, and measuring up to what is good, what is right, and what is worth doing.[330] Heidegger's famous formulation of *Dasein* as "there-being" is "in question,"(MT 298) since it seems to lack this moral aspect of the self.

Here I bring out how Taylor reads the history of philosophy with its emphasis on the 'sources of self.' As the human self progresses in stages, modernity also develops. Ideals and interdicts of identity' in one way or another shapes our philosophical thought. Taylor's primary focus is to bring out what belongs to human agency *as such*, in all times and places, and what is shaped differently in different cultures. His main thesis is "that the self exists essentially in a moral space by means of a master image, a spacial one." (MT 300). I also present those historical developments, which have been distorted, one-sided, and conflicting in many respects, from the dimensions of 'inner' and 'outer' sources with a view position of combining them in the same self. (cf. 2.4). I hope to show, with Taylor, that they provide a principle of order for our lives.

2.2.1.1. Inwardness: Modern Directions (Forms)

What Taylor calls 'inwardness' I present here as 'inner sources' which contribute immensely to the making of the modern identity, though not without some problems. The history of philosophy has witnessed some of the most influential accounts of human self which are predominantly explications of 'solid localizations' of the powers of the self. In order make his argument, Taylor brings out two major trends, as follows in subsequent sections: 1. Moral Frames of Self-mastery (Self-control) and 2. Moral Frames of Self-exploration.

---

[330] Charles Taylor, "Moral Topography of the Self" in *Hermeneutics and Psychological Theory* ed. Stanley Messer, Louis Sass, and Robert Woolfolk (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988) 298. (Henceforth: MT. This will be given within the body of the text).

2.2.1.2. Moral Frames of Self-Mastery (Self-Control)

Here I focus on specific philosophers whom Taylor considers contributing significantly to the moral frames of self-mastery. There mainly three in this category: Plato, Descartes, and Locke.

2.2.1.2.1. Plato's Self-Mastery: For Taylor, the main theme of Plato's *The Republic* can be summarized as 'we are good when we are ruled by reason.' There are three kinds of selves: rulers, auxiliaries and farmers who were guided by desire, courage and reason, respectively. The harmony or balance of the society comes through the 'ruling of the reason.' Here we can identify a very explicit localization of the higher and the lower (reason and desire). The good soul enjoys order (*kosmos),* concord (*xumphonia),* and harmony (*harmonia).* According to Taylor, Plato offers us a view of moral sources and his higher moral state is in the domain of thought.[331] What we gain through thought is self-mastery. The good man is 'master of himself. (SS 115). With Plato the ethics of action and glory found in the poets was replaced by the ethics of reason and reflection. Plato never used the inner/outer dichotomy; for him, reason is connected to "order" and "unity". "To be ruled by reason, to have a clear vision, is to be ruled by that vision. One might almost say that on this view one's action is under the hegemony of the order of things itself."(MT 304). The soul ruled by reason is an ordered one. The same reason is instrumental for the ordering of desires and other ambitions. Hence there is an ordering of the lower to the higher in Plato's vision which can be seen as a 'substantive vision' of necessitated by Plato. Higher order of goods demands a higher order of reason which can see the *Good*. What is important for Taylor is how this 'ethic of reason' has brought about a new understanding of the human agent. Without the 'unified self' of Plato, the modern notion of interiority could never have been developed, though it took a further step to bring it fully about. (SS 116-120). Taylor states:

> […] mastery of oneself must mean that something higher in one controls the lower, in fact that reason controls the desire. From Plato through Stoics, into the Renaissance, and right to the modern day, this

---

[331] Taylor deliberately uses 'thought' in place of 'reason' because he wants to show the flow of the domain of 'thought.'

mastery of reason remains a recognizable ideal even though it is contested in modern civilization in a way it doesn't seem to have been among the ancients. (MT 303).

The Stoics refuted Plato's view and mainly its concept of "theoretic vision of truth and its soul/body dualism." (MT 304). They emphasized our ability to make deliberate moral *choices;*[332] for them, all that matters is to fulfill this capacity. This fulfillment must be in our power too. Hence, a proper form of life is sufficient unlike Plato's 'world of forms.' A shift from 'theoretical reason' to 'practical reason' is clear enough here. The concern is not "the good" but a "the vision of the order of goods"(MT 304). According to Taylor, in a *Secular Age,* something like this Stoic view influenced Rene Descartes. Here the implication is that even among the stoics there were distinctions of realities. Not all things were considered as equally pleasurable or profitable.

2.2.1.2.2. Descartes Disengaged Reason: In Descartes, we find advocated not hegemony of a certain vision but "direct domination of the faculty over the other: reason instrumentalizes the passions."(MT 305). He thus situates the moral sources within us (SS. 143), even if his first concern was not with morality. The goal is to gain mastery of oneself, shifting the hegemony from senses to reason (thus departs from Plato and Aristotle). Descartes makes a 'transposition' by which we no longer see ourselves as related to moral sources outside of us, or at least not at all in the same way. An important power has been internalized (SS 143). The universe has been understood 'mechanistically.' The Galilean-scientific-representational model takes its origin here. Hence, the order of ideas ceases to be something we *find* but it is rather something we *build*. The order of representation must meet with the standards of the thinking activity of the knower (SS 145). Descartes' "dualism" of body and soul is strikingly different from Plato's. For Plato, one realizes one's soul when one turns toward a supersensible notion of Forms or Ideas, which is eternal, immutable. There is no such Order of Ideas or Reality in Descartes (SS 145). The material world is mere extension. Thus, Descartes comes up with

---

[332] Taylor takes this from Chrysippus expression *proairesis.*

his "disengaged" or "disenchanted" reason which functions mechanistically and scientifically. He looks for 'evidence.'

> Descartes' intellectualism and instrumental reasoning creates a new theory of passions but not of tradition**.** Passions are emotions in the soul, caused by movements of the animal spirits. Reason rules the passions when it can hold them to their normal instrumental function. The hegemony of reason for Descartes is a matter of "instrumental control (SS 150).

Here, mastery of reason brings about the internalization of moral sources. But later on Descartes is concerned with "Generosity-*generosite*" and "inner peace" and he makes strength of will as the central virtue (SS 153). He places the notions of "dignity" and "esteem" at the heart of his moral vision (SS 155). His emphasis on reason (speculative and practical) pushes him to disengage from the world and worldly senses. Rationality is no more defined "substantively" in terms of the order of beings, but *procedurely* in terms of the standards by which we "construct" our own order (SS 156). A procedural approach will result in substantively true beliefs about the world. One meets one's own core in the utmost inwardness, which is not God (SS 156). This is a great internalization different from Plato and Augustine. The road to Deism is already open.

2.2.1.2.3. Locke's Punctual Self: Locke's view can be considered as the next stage of Descartes' view. The mind is a '*tabula rasa'* (empty tablet). There are no innate ideas, not even an innate reality sense or tendency to assent to reality as truth until it has been shaped by education. (MT 308). Human beings can be to a certain extent "self-shapers." The Lockean model[333] includes not only body-soul dualism and instrumental reasoning but increasing emphasis on a model of self-mastery which prepares the Cartesian transposition for another turn. Here a growing ideal of the human agent who is able to remake himself by methodical and disciplined action is articulated. What it calls for is the ability to take an instrumental stance to one's given properties, desires, inclinations, tendencies, habits of thought and feelings, so that they can be *worked on,* doing away with some and strengthening others (SS 156). This forms an aspect of our inescapable contemporary sense of inwardness

---

[333] Lockean Model: John Locke presented a model of 'self-mastery' where the self is supposed to discipline itself in a 'punctual' manner. Taylor calls this Lockean model of self the "Punctual self."

which Taylor likes to call "the punctual self." (SS 160). This self is not operating with any outside normative forces. The very nature of disengagement is to withdraw from ordinary first person experience. But here, disengagement involves our going outside the first person stance and taking on board some theory. Taylor observes: "Rather than disengaging, we throw ourselves more fully into the experience, as it were. There is a kind of search which involves being "all there" being more attentively 'in' our experience" (SS 163).

Locke took an uncompromising stance where the punctual self was to be defined through the Enlightenment and beyond (SS 164) and he went beyond Descartes to reject any form of innate ideas. Locke too proposes to demolish and rebuild (SS 166). Taylor continues, "Locke's theory generates and also reflects an ideal of independence and self-responsibility, a notion of reason as free from established custom and locally dominant authority"(SS 167) As with Descartes, knowledge for Locke is not genuine unless you develop it. He thereby places himself in the tradition of theological voluntarism, which is interwoven with mechanism. "The subject who can take this kind of radical stance of disengagement to himself or herself with a view of remaking is what I want to call the 'punctual self.' Identify oneself with the power of remaking." (SS 171)   He makes it on the basis of consciousness. Locke's person is a moral agent who takes responsibility for his action in the light of future retribution. Still, Taylor considers the 'punctual self' as a 'self'and an " I."

Taylor observes that the philosophy of disengagement and objectification has influenced the modern naturalists and reductionists. He also sees the importance of 'giving central place to the 'first person stance.' He states: "Radical objectivity is intelligible and accessible only through radical subjectivity." (MT 311). This is a place where the modern followers of Descartes, Locke, and Kant, in different ways become wrongly one-sided. Taylor says: "The turn to oneself is not also and inescapably a turn to oneself in the first-person perspective-a turn to the self as a self. That is what I mean *radical reflexivity*. Because we are so deeply embedded in it, we cannot but reach for reflexive language." (MT 312).

The modern disengaged self was also linked to a 'moral topography' which took away all our external moral resources and sees our moral resources as 'inner.' Undeniably this has contributed greatly to the human search for sources of the self, which goes along with a certain conception of the 'dignity of a human person.' However, there is a 'paradoxical' element in this approach:

> The modern disengaged self aspires after a kind of neutrality. Disengagement entails a kind of neutrality in relation to what it is disengaged from. With Descartes and Kant, the connection of this neutrality with a moral ideal is clear enough. But once the drive to objectification becomes all-encompassing, as with modern naturalism, and is meant to account for the totality of human life, this connection becomes lost to view. (MT 312)

Here the disengaged self is considered as a 'natural fact.' Taylor thus notices that something is lost from the fact that there is an unmistakable connection with the moral background.

2.2.2. Moral Frames of 'Self-Exploration'

The experience of 'inwardness' is so much a part of our nature and language that we speak of and identify people having inner depths simply because they have the ability to turn to themselves. Human thoughts are understood as something 'within.' Taylor contrasts our case with this experience of 'inwardness' with the fact that the ancients actively strived to reach it. Undoubtedly some strand of this inner/outer can be traced in our ancient cultures. Yet Taylor concentrates on something new here. "[…] the suggestion that in turning away from bodily things to those of the soul we are turning inward seems to be absent. Plato doesn't speak that way."(MT 313). Taylor continues to articulate the contrast of this self-exploration in comparison to the foregone explanation of self-mastery.

> The fact is that the lore of the soul gave no special status to the first- person perspective and that the moral sources were external. The turning is captured in the powerful image of Plato used in *the Republic*, where the soul swivels around to direct its gaze toward the illuminated reality, the Ideas. It is not self-focus, but attention to true reality that makes for wisdom and justice (MT 313).

This self-exploratory turn starts with Augustine which I present below. Augustine's inner and outer dimensions and ultimately his emphasis on the inner has significance for our modern self identity.

2.2.2.1. Augustine's Inward Man *"In Interiore Homine":* Though Augustine was influenced by Plato, Plotinus and Manichaeism, he shifted his primary emphasis from reason to 'soul.' His distinction of body and soul was based on Plato's notion of "bodily" and "non-bodily." (SS 127-128). Thus we find in his works such dichotomies as: spirit/matter, higher/lower, eternal/temporal, and immutable/changing. All may be seen essentially as forms of inner and outer. *Noli foras ire, in teipsum redi; in interiore homine habitat veritas* (Do not go outward; return within yourself. In the "inward man" dwells truth). Inwardness lies on the road to God (SS 129). Augustine takes a 'first person stance-reflexivity' which is almost like Foucault's "the care of oneself." Augustine is between Plato and Descartes. He is the inventor of *"Cogito"* because he is the first one to identify the *first person stance* as essential for the discovery of truth (SS 133). Taylor's view is that,

> […] he (Augustine) means by "within "is that one encounters God in one's own presence to self. That is because God is not only the maker of heaven and earth whose work can be seen in the cosmos; he is also the power that continually sustains me as a spiritual being. He is at the foundation of my power to think, know, and love. (MT 314).

His proof for the existence of God was framed by his inward journey, as distinct from what Aquinas proposes. God is found in the intimacy of Self-presence. *Memoria* is not a collection of thoughts, rather the 'Master within (God)' who lights it there, Illuminated by another source (SS 134-135). At the very root of memory, the soul finds God. Two-way movements of the Soul demonstrate the tremendous difference between knowing and loving. Thus the notion of "will" is developed in Augustine. A teleological Theory of nature underlying the Greeks (Plato and Socrates) supposes that everyone is motivated by a love of the Good, which can be sidetracked toward evil by ignorance or distortion and bad habits (Aristotle). But Augustine, according to Taylor, for the "will" must first be healed through "grace" before we can fully function in the Socratic model (SS 138). In Plato and Aristotle, the eye already has the capacity to see, in Augustine the eye has lost its capacity to see which should be restored by grace. Grace opens the inward man to God.

Augustine's self-exploratory method is part of our culture. Later on people started exploring the 'within' not to have an intimacy with God, but simply to know more and more of their own 'interiority.' This model "becomes central to our culture that another stance of radical reflexivity becomes of crucial importance to us alongside that of disengagement."(MT 314). It is different from and in some respect antithetical to the first disengagement.

2.2.2.2. Exploring the Human Condition: Montaigne: Montaigne attempts to recover contact with the permanent, stable, unchanging core of being in each of us – a unanimous feature of ancient thought. He sought, and found some inner peace, in his "*maistresse forme*." Self-knowledge is the indispensable key to self-acceptance. Coming to be at home within the limits of our own condition presupposes that we grasp our own limits and possibilities. (SS 179). It is in this context that one should 'live one's life to its natural condition.' Taylor states it clearly as, "To live right is to live within limits, to eschew the presumption of superhuman spiritual aspirations."(SS 180). Each of us has to discover his or her own being. Montaigne therefore inaugurates a new kind of reflection which is intensely individual, a self-explanation the aim of which is to reach self-knowledge by coming to see through the screen of self-delusion which passion or spiritual pride has erected. In this new kind of individualism, Montaigne tried to bring the particularity of human feelings to expression. The search for identity can be seen as the search for what I essentially am (SS 181-184). Hence, we have another model of self-reflexivity which also has tremendous influence on our modern culture. Montaigne gives us another model of self-reflexivity. There is a question about ourselves and our identity which cannot be fully unraveled or discovered.

> The search for identity can be seen as the search for what I essentially am. But this can no longer be sufficiently defined in terms of some universal description of human agency as such, as soul, or reason, or will. There will remain a question about me and that is why I think of myself as a self. (MT 316)

Taylor sees Montaigne as raising not just *a question,* but rather an *area* of questioning. Thus, the question can be seen as a question about the 'identity.' It is here that this question 'first arises in our culture.' We understand that there are individual differences, and each one has a 'moral significance.' Here, one's moral action constitutes the moral topography. "Our identity not only presupposes points of moral reference in relation to which we define ourselves, but also itself constitutes a central moral issue. Whether one is true to one's identity can never be a neutral issue." (MT 316).

2.2.3. Psychoanalytic Theory

Taylor apparently considers the modern psychoanalytic theory as yet another model of 'self-reflexivity.' The classical form of this theory was started with Sigmund Freud, whose work was developed into 'ego psychology' by his daughter Anna and later on by Heinz Hartmann. The central point of this theory is the consideration of "ego as a neutral steering mechanism."(MT 317). It has developed into another theory of the self. However, Taylor is sure of the fact that the development of the self cannot be understood in abstraction from the issues of moral topographies. He is therefore critical of the psychoanalytic consideration of moral space as an *optional extra* (MT 317). Still they think that the self only exists in a space of moral questions. There is no 'external moral topography that they agree upon. It should be noted that Taylor's references here are Winnicott (1965)[334] and Kohut (1977),[335] and not for example the French school of Lacan and his followers.

According to Taylor, the question of being or failing to be a self will even arise outside of a moral space. He too recognizes this aspect of the self-reflexivity but can never agree that their model is a complete one. He thus asks psychoanalysts the following question: "Can we understand ourselves adequately just as egos? Or does a

---

[334] Donald Winnicott (1896-1971) was an English pediatrician and psychoanalyst who was especially influential in the field of object relations theory. He was a leading member of the British Independent Group (psychoanalysis) of the British Psychoanalytic Society, and a close associate of Marion Milner. He is best known for his ideas on the true self and false self, and the transitional object.

[335] Heinz Kohut (1913-1981) was an Austrian-born psychoanalyst best known for his development of Self psychology, an influential school of thought within psychodynamic/psychoanalytic theory which helped transform the modern practice of analytic and dynamic treatment approaches.

satisfactory explanation of ontogeny and adult life require that we add a perspective in which we are selves? Put this way, the answer to the question seems to me obvious." (MT 317). The 'naturalistic foundation' of self-reflexivity is still very prevalent and many endorse it. For Taylor, this model cannot be a centrality of our radical self-reflexivity. His critique of 'behavioristic' views of self can be seen here indirectly. [336]

2.2.4. Rising Modern Ethic of 'Inner of the Outer': Affirmation of Ordinary life with Equality and Benevolence

In the process of the *retrieval* of the moral sources from the history, Taylor observes a shift of emphasis on the *ordinary life* in contrast to the *transcendental life*. There emerged a new modern ethic of seeing the inner spirit of nature unlike the *inner depth* emphasis of the *disengaged rationality.* Here human self sees himself/herself as inside the bigger horizon of nature. The self begins to evaluate the nature not as something 'outside' of it but as something *inside of the outer*.[337]

2.2.4.1. Affirmation of Ordinary Life – An Aftermath of Reformation

In fashioning an account of the identity of the modern self, Taylor continues to analyze different facets which can serve as building blocks. Here, he notices the rise of a new 'ethics' of 'ordinary life.[338] Together with it, there also emerge modern notions of nature. The very emphasis of ordinary life mainly implies production and reproduction which is related to the human labor that makes things needed for life and our life as sexual beings (marriage and family). This aspect of life was considered "lower" by Plato and Aristotle. "Slaves and animals are concerned exclusively with life."(SS 211). It is a narrow purpose; it is not a true polis (Aristotle). Theoretical contemplation was the highest ideal to be pursued. Stoics and Epicureans affirmed ordinary life.

---

[336] Charles Taylor, "Psychological Behaviorism" in *Encyclopedia Article on Psychoanalytic Theories of the Unconscious*, 1965: 516-519.

[337] Taylor has more explanation on the same theme in his article on *Embodies Agency.* I already presented that in earlier portion of the same chapter *cf. 2.1.2.*

[338] Charles Taylor, "Reply to Commentators," in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research vol LIV*(1994): 203.

They were considered lower in grade in that society since their ordering of reality was considered as have a less level of conception in comparison to higher degrees of metaphysical construct Plato and Aristotle were visualized. Taylor observes:

> The transition I am talking about upsets the hierarchies, which displaces the locus of the good life from some special range of higher activities and places it within 'life' itself. The full human life is now defined in terms of labor and production, on the one hand, and marriage and family life on the other. The former one is vigorously criticized (SS 213).

In the affirmation of the ordinary life what was previously categorized as lower is being exalted as the 'standard, and the previously higher is convicted of presumption and vanity. There has been a *social leveling* or *social reversal* taking place. Hence, in contrast to hierarchies there came equality and benevolence. The ethic of honor is replaced by ordinary life values. The Marxist theory is the best known, but not the only case in point (SS 214-215).

This new ethics gradually developed its own 'reformed theology,' and a 'rejection of the mediatory role of the religious priests and organizations,' which in turn eventually enhanced the previously condemned *profane life*. Personal commitments of the believers became most important. Protestant churches rejected a special order of the priesthood in favor of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers (SS 216-217). As a result, the distinction between sacred and profane slowly vanishes.

There came numerous analyses that exalted the ordinary for which the Bible itself has sufficiently enough sources. The creation account of the Book Genesis reads: *God saw all that he had made, and it was very good*.[339] This is one of the foundational beliefs for all of the three Abrahamic religions (Judeo-Christian-Islamic). Christian renunciation is an affirmation of the goodness of what is being renounced (SS 219). So life is good in itself. Paul states, "It is better to marry than to burn."[340] The highest life can no longer be defined by

---

[339] Gen. 1: 31 (NRSV).
[340] 1 Cor. 7: 9 (NRSV).

an exalted kind of activity; it all turns on the spirit in which one lives whatever one lives, even the most mundane existence. All of these affirm the sanctification of the ordinary life and activities. Calvin's[341] call for militant activism (ordinary life) to build a new and proper order of the world does make sense here. It does not in any way mean that he was without any fault in his religious activism. An Old Testament imperative to rectify the disorder in the world also is another source for the articulation of our life in the world. The New Testament focuses on the poor, sick, sinners and ordinary life, is also taken as 'source' for the emphasis of ordinary life. All the apostles were illiterate and fishermen. The Puritan theology of work and ordinary life provided a hospitable environment for the scientific revolution. God's role in creation assumes: 1. We must assume that working in our calling preserves ourselves and God's order. 2. It is also what protects us against the absorption in things which would wrench us away from God. Hence action takes over reflection (SS 233) and a new theology and ethics of ordinary life (pragmatic theology) evolves.

2.2.4.2. Deistic Turn An Offshoot: The Rationalized Christianity of Locke

The emphasis on ordinary Life and Romantic age has largely shaped modern culture and self-identity and our moral ideals. The trend can be commonly called *deistic*. Locke's theological voluntarism became another form of Rationalized Christianity. The law of nature is normative for us, according to Locke, because it is God's command. He reconciles the two since he thinks that human beings are capable of understanding God's purposes fairly easily from the actual nature of his creation.[342] This linking of theological voluntarism with the

---

[341] John Calvin (1509-1564) was an influential French theologian and pastor during the Protestant Reformation. He was a principal figure in the development of the system of Christian theology later called Calvinism. Originally trained as a humanist lawyer, he broke from the Roman Catholic Church around 1530. After religious tensions provoked a violent uprising against Protestants in France. Taylor analyzes his concept of *militant activism* to emphasize the new interest in *ordinary life.*

[342] A larger debate in natural law theory that predates Locke, the so-called "voluntarism-intellectualism," or "voluntarist-rationalist" debate can be more insightful in this context. In short, the voluntarist declares that right and wrong are determined by God's will and that we are obliged to obey the will of God simply because it is the will of God. Unless these positions are maintained, the voluntarist argues, God becomes superfluous to morality since both the content and the binding force of morality can be explained without reference to God. The intellectualist replies that this understanding makes morality arbitrary and fails to explain why we have an obligation to obey God. ("Locke's Political Philosophy," in *Stanford Encyclopedia*, accessed Novermber 2, 2012, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke-political/).

natural law of human reason makes him a hedonist[343] too. Locke's moral theory consists of two explicit and distinct elements — a broadly rationalist theory of natural law and a hedonistic conception of moral good. Taylor cites Locke, "For humans good is pleasure, pain evil."[344] (SS 235).

In making our preservation the central point of God's will for us, Locke seems to follow the Protestant affirmation of ordinary life which can be seen in two aspects: a) The activity designed to acquire the means to *life* is given central importance and dignity. b). The need to work for the common good (Puritan emphasis). Locke is in fact a crucial hinge in the evolution of the ethic of ordinary life from its original theological formulation to the modern "bourgeois" naturalist one, which has both facilitated and been entrenched by the rise of capitalism. Taylor states: "His ethical outlook was plainly an endorsement of the serious, productive, pacific improver of any class and against the aristocratic, caste-conscious pursuit of honor and glory through self-display and the warrior virtues." (SS 240).

According to Taylor, 'Locke's psychology could be seen as a new transposition of the theology of ordinary life, on the way to its naturalistic successor doctrine.' (SS 242). In this version, we come to God through reason. That is, the exercise of rationality is the way we take part in God's plan. The ethic of ordinary life, while rejecting supposedly "higher" activities, makes the crux of the moral life depend on the manner in which we live our ordinary life.

Taylor uses Joseph Hall's[345] words: "God loveth adverbs." (SS.242). In Locke there is a shift of adverb. Living "worshipfully" became living "rationally." We need moral rationality, of course, but also intellectual rationality (SS 243). There is a 'maximizing of reasoning.' Instrumental rationality, properly conducted, is the essence of

---

[343] Ethical hedonism is the idea that all people have the right to do everything in their power to achieve the greatest amount of pleasure possible to them. It is also the idea that every person's pleasure should far surpass their amount of pain.

[344] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding,* ed. P.H. Nidditch (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), Book 2. 28. 5.

[345] Joseph Hall (1574 -1656) was an English bishop, satirist and moralist. His contemporaries knew him as a devotional writer, and a high-profile controversialist of the early 1640s.

our service to God. In thus making reason central, Locke was plainly stepping outside the orthodox reformed

theology; rejection of original sin is also part of it. Thus, rationality became *procedural*[346] and *instrumental*[347]

which is to say essentially concerned with our practical affairs. But Taylor notices that Locke's "reasonable"

religion is not just a swallowing of religious obligation in egoism, as it too easily can appear to critics or just a

step on the road to naturalism. According to Taylor, Locke offers a new understanding of what it is to serve

God where one recaptures the old terms in a new significance. (SS 243-244). Taylor also thinks that Locke

helped us to give a new vision to the *centrality of ordinary life* which is significant for the modern view of life

together with way to define the growing *deistic* turn of life. Hence, "instrumental rationality," for Taylor, "is

our avenue of participation in God's will. Rather than seeing this as an abasement of God's will to the status of

a factor in our game, we see it as the exalting of our reasoning to the level of collaborator in God's purpose."

(SS 244). This appears to be a new *form of faith* Taylor proposes which can incorporate modern disengagement

and procedural rationality in itself.

2.2.4.3. Turn to Moral Sentiments: An Ethic of Benevolence and Equality

3rd Earl of Shaftesbury (Anthony)[348] is the greatest proponent of the *moral sentimentalism.*[349] A new turn to

such a variant of moral sentiments or moral outlook can also be seen as part of the new emphasis on ordinary

life perspectives. This new view of morality comes was also expounded through a set of influential writings by

---

[346] Procedural Rationality: It is opposite to what is known as "substantive rationality" where reason is considered to have a substantive unity. *Cf.* "Clarification of Important Terms."

[347] Instrumental Rationality: In social and critical theory, instrumental reasoning is often seen as a specific form of rationality fusing on the most efficient or cost-effective means to achieve a specific end, but not in itself reflecting on the value of that end. *Cf.* "Clarification of Important Terms."

[348] Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third Earl of Shaftesbury (1671 -1713), and exerted an enormous influence throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries on British and European discussions of morality, aesthetics, and religion. His philosophy combined a powerfully teleological approach, according to which all things are part of a harmonious cosmic order, with sharp observations of human nature. He is often credited with originating the moral sense theory, although his own views of virtue are a mixture of rationalism and sentimentalism.
("Shaftsbury," in Stananford.edu, accessed June 21, 2011, http:// plato.stanford.edu/entries/shaftesbury/).

[349] Moral sense theory (sentimentalism) is a theory in moral epistemology concerning how one knows moral truths. It is a view in meta-ethics according to which morality is somehow grounded in moral sentiments or emotions.

Francis Hutcheson, David Hume and Adam Smith.[350] Being closest to the Stoics in his views, Shaftesbury

considered that 'the highest good for humans is to love and take joy in the whole course of the world' (SS 251).

His questions are rather more *cosmological* than theological (SS 253). According to Taylor Shaftsbury was

unalterably opposed not only to hyper-Augustinian Christianity but to its offshoot in Lockean Deism and he

rejected the idea that God's law is something external. For Shaftsbury, as Taylor views it, "The highest good

doesn't repose in any arbitrary will, but in the nature of the cosmos itself; and our love for it is not commanded

under threat of punishment, but comes *spontaneously* from our being."(SS 253). This of course entails a

rejection of the externality of divine law such as was emphasized by deists.

According to Shaftesbury, the good person loves the whole order of things. Instead of finding this dignity in a

disengaged subject, objectifying a neutral nature, he sees it in the inherent bent of our nature towards a love of

the whole as good. For Shaftesbury, language itself is "natural affection" which keeps societies together. He

speaks of the "internalization or subjectivization," a transformation, of an ethic of order, harmony, and

equilibrium into an ethic of benevolence (SS 254-255). Shaftesbury's language is a "language of inwardness,"

but one which is quite lot different from the inwardness of Plato, Descartes, and Locke. Hutcheson continues

very much in his line, developing it into the "theory of moral sentiments" perhaps best-known from Adam

Smith's book by that name.

2.2.4.4. Providential Order/Design- A Natural Order

According to Hutchenson,[351] the world was designed so that each in seeking his or her good will also serves the

good of others. The fullest human happiness, is attained when we give full reign to our moral sentiments and

feelings of benevolence, which will in turn contribute mostly to the general good. "God's goodness thus

---

[350] Taylor refers Shaftsbury's books *Philosophical Regimen* and *Characteristics;* and Hutcheson's *Essay on the Nature and Conduct of the Passions* and *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue.* Cf. also Hume's *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739) and Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759).

[351] Francis Hutcheson (1694 – 1746) was a philosopher born in Ireland to a family of Scottish Presbyterians who became one of the founding fathers of the Scottish Enlightenment.

consists in his bringing about our good. His beneficence is explained partly in terms of our happiness."(SS 267). This is the central tenet of the Judeo-Christian religious tradition that God loves and seeks the good of his creatures. However, Taylor observes that the modern Deistic views have tendency to define good as self-contained. Though God is not wholly absent (at least they refer to God) in their view, it seems to be *subordinate to a conception of happiness* which is defined purely in creaturely terms. (SS 267). Thus, as a purely self-contained, non-theocentric notion of good, happiness plays a central role in this outlook. In short, human happiness is central to the moral order. For Taylor, "Humans are there for God, not vice versa."(SS 268).[352] Here we see the emergence of Deism, breaking away from the Christian tradition. We also see an anti-hierarchical affirmation of ordinary life. (SS 271). These are the foundations a "rational religion" where inter-connection of mutual service and harmonious life together become major tenets. Living according to the design of nature became the very principle of living. Hierarchical and instrumental conceptions gradually give way to a sense of 'providential order' (SS 279-281). This new order is more connected to natural design (immanent) then to supernatural design (transcendental). And these arises a commitment to an "immanent frame" that will be developed further in what Taylor calls the 'expressivist turn.'

2.2.4.5. Articulation of the Expressivist Turn

The modern notions of "inner" and "inwardness" too a new turn in the 18th century as they were connected with an experience of "nature as inner source." (SS 369). Key to these development is English and German Romanticism. Taylor speaks of, "The notion of an inner voice or impulse, the idea that we find the truth within us and in particular in our feeling." (SS 369). This new turn came about as a 'Romantic Rebellion' against a previous over-emphasis on rational enlightenment. Blake, Wordsworth, and Herder belong to those prominent streams of thinking. All these writers see human beings as set in a larger natural order, often conceived as a 'providential order' with which we should be in harmony. Nature stands as a reservoir of good, of innocent

---

[352] Taylor states that the traditional catechism of the catholic: Human being are created "to serve and to love God."

desire or benevolence and love of the good. There is frequent talk of "providential creation" and "cosmic truths"(SS. 371). Moral sentiment is also seen and accepted positively here, since it is through one's feeling that one has access to the deepest moral and cosmic truths. One thus also sees can see the dissolution of a gap between the ethical and aesthetic. (SS 373). And, therefore, it is difficult to distinguish them.

In all of this, Taylor sees two new avatars of our Western models of self-control (Plato, Descartes, and Locke) and self-exploration (Augustine and Montaigne). They are the discovery of the power of creative imagination, and – as we have already noted- an understanding of nature as source.

2.2.4.5.1. Power of Creative Imagination (Fruition of Self-control)

If our access to nature is through the 'inner voice or impulse within' then the only way we can know this nature is through articulating what one feels and finds within ourself. This turn to the expression of the inner experience is largely what Taylor means by "Expressivism."[353] He states, "To express something is to make it manifest in a given medium. I express my feelings in my face; I express my thoughts in the words I speak or write. I express my vision of things in some work of art, perhaps a novel or a play."(SS 374). There is something new in the notion of 'expression' as we understand it in modern times. Expression is not making a copy of something or reproduction of something already existing. In an expressive object or reality there is a 'making' which Taylor calls "creation" where something is brought out new. This is part of the new self-identity that he tries to formulate. There is something new in all of us and it develops and is manifested in our expressions. Hence does Taylor claim that, "the idea of nature as intrinsic source goes along with an expressive view of human life. Fulfilling my nature means espousing the inner élan, the voice or impulse." (SS 374). Here we have the early signs of a "biological model of growth" (SS 375) as against the mechanistic one (mental development).

---

[353] Hegel's influence on Taylor can be seen here. After the enlightenment rationality of Immanuel Kant, Hegel envisions a historical rebellion in which 'spirit'(*Geist)* is the central drawing dynamism.

As Taylor sees it, Expressivism actually paved the way for new and fuller individuation. Every individual is considered as different and original and that 'originality determines how one ought to be.' We are called to live up to our originality (SS 376). This new view has changed our understanding of art, now defined by the two fold sense of creation and expression. Taylor states, "The awe we feel before artistic originality and creativity places art on the border of the numinous, and reflects the crucial place that creation/expression has in our understanding of human life." (SS 376). Manifestation required articulation, must be more than the repetition of what already exists. This is the reason why, according to Taylor, modern writers and artists give such "a central role to the creative imagination" (SS. 378). We are already far from the merely reproductive imagination of the 18th century. The Romantic period is of vital importance for the rise of creative imagination, a "power which we have to attribute to ourselves." (SS 379).

2.2.4.6. Understanding of Nature as the Source (An Achievement of Self-Exploration)

The expressivist formulations of nature as source helped to develop a new conception of history and of the narrative forms of human life. According to Taylor, both these trends conduced to the unfolding of the individual toward a self-discovery and how this life fits into the whole human story. Enlightenment civilization is sidelined by these new 'self-explorations.' For their part, those who hold fast to theories of rational integrity tend to the pessimism that says the world has gone into decline. Yet for Taylor, "the expressivist revolution constituted a prodigious development of modern post-Augustinian inwardness, in its self-exploratory branch" (SS 389).

Let us pause to consider the importance of this moment. We have been tracing the roots of our inner depths as human selves. This has involved us, even in these short remarks, in many facets spread out along the history of North Atlantic civilization. The diverse models of inwardness presented by Plato, Descartes, Locke, Augustine and Montaigne are certainly building blocks for our modern self-identity. Their contributions to our moral and

religious self-explorations have no match in history. But only with an expressivisitic turn could we articulate not only the nature of our inner depths, but also see the grounds for construing this inner domain as even having *depth*.

Taylor would argue that the 'domain is within' for the whole post-expressivist era. But it is be open only the mode of self-exploration which involves the first person stance. Augustine's 'inner' goes beyond the human self to reach to a 'higher' who is God. "This nature unlike Augustine's God, cannot offer us a higher view on ourselves from beyond our own self-exploration."(SS 390). Hence this new view of the voice of nature gives us something new for the self-exploration that has defined our relation to self since Augustine. The exploration that since Augustine has been personal and inward now includes the investigation and discovery of inner dimensions that are natural. Of course, whatever we explore must be articulated, so that we can evaluate and thus improve upon it. For Taylor, they are inseparable: self-exploration passes quickly over to expressions. "A subject with depth is a subject with this expressive power."(SS 390)

And so, the modern self has predominantly two facets/power of inwardness or inner depths: the power of disengaged rational control and the power of expressive self-articulation that is ascribed to the creative imagination. There is an ongoing tension between the two powers. Once you disengage from your own nature and feeling, you cannot exercise the second of them. In other words, the first cannot be first without a proper disengagement. So, these two powers are *constitutionally* in tension. (SS 390).

This diversified moral source with two frontiers of self-exploration (Enlightenment and Romanticism) on the one hand complicates our moral predicament, but on the other hand enriches it. Expressivism relates to these frontiers differently than enlightenment humanism. This distinction can be seen broadly as the differences of approaches between *rational* and *emotional.* Procedural rational approach considers nature as an object outside of the subject where they scientifically analyze it. However, the romantic approach considers the self as a

reality within the nature as a part of it. Here, self *cannot* disengage as being *engaged* to the nature. The prospects and problems of this diversity is the inspirational force for my dissertation. There are two variants of thinking which can be traced here: The Enlightenment rational frame of thinking and the Romantic expressivist frame of thinking. Besides these two frontiers, there is a theistic variant of thinking which most ancient, original, and still most influential around the world today. Majority of human race, still have affinity to a theistic source, as their model and moral predicament. Hence, we are products, some way or other, of these three frontiers/sources: Theistic (Christian/Any Religion), Rational (Disengaged), and Romantic (Expressivisitic) moral predicaments. I will return to the theistic moral predicament of Gandhi and Taylor as their metaphysical foundation of a moral ontology for the modern self-identity, in my final chapter.

2.3. Tripartite Recognition of Plurality: A 'Constitutive'[354] Factor of Modern Self-Identity

Until now, we have been concerned with diverse models for understanding and defining modern identity. It is also important to deal with 'diverse' *modes of recognition* such as Taylor emphasizes especially his conception of 'the modern context of 'multiculturalism and pluralism.'[355] Why should there be a *need* and *demand* for recognition? Taylor would argue that such an urgency for recognition is due to the supposed links between recognition and identity, "where identity designates something like an understanding of who we are, of our fundamental defining characteristics as human beings."(PA 225). Hence, the recognition of identity can take place in three levels: In the self, within the society, and within one's own beliefs/faith.

2.3.1.   Recognition of Plurality in the self (Individual)

Taylor's contribution to the concept of *recognition of plurality* has its roots apparently in his own cultural background as a French Canadian. Canada has been dealing with *multicultural* issues. Here I provide his

---

[354] *Constitutive*: Taylor uses the word to demonstrate the 'partial' role played by many aspects of modern identity. There is no one 'good' that defines modern identity in its entirety; rather, all goods are 'part of the whole.'

[355] One might argue that 'pluralism' has always been a feature of any society. In many respects, this is true. However, the modern world has certainly witnessed many new forms and dimensions of pluralism and multiculturalism. One might begin to account for this by taking into consideration rampant immigration, globalization, and the revolution of multimedia.

significant contributions to the conception of plurality and the conception of the concept of *recognition* within

one's own self and in the wider horizon of the society.

2.3.1.1.   Physicality (Embodied, Engaged, and Embedded)

Taylor's conceives of self as a unity of many facets or faculties. He is inspired by Heidegger, but attempts to

extend his hermeneutics of the human agent. For Taylor a person is not only a *languaged* being but also an

embodied agent. (EA 1). This is not an original contribution of Taylor, but is drawn explicitly from Merleau-

Ponty. The human agent exists with a physical body which is 'constitutive' (EA 8) to the identity of the person

and it is not just a correlation. "Our perception is essentially of an embodied agent. Its structure only makes

sense in relation to the agent's activities, and it requires at its margin an agent's sense of his own stance"(EA

6). In his critical analysis of Merleau-Ponty, Taylor articulates two main aspects of the bodily existence of the

human agent: The subject is in *a world* and the subject is *in this world* (field of meaning) as an agent (EA 1-2).

Hence, the human self as Taylor conceives it, is an embodied, engaged and embedded agent. Physicality, or

bodily existence, is an essential aspect of our existence.

2.3.1.2.   Rationality (From Disengaged to Engaged)

Taylor acknowledges that part of the modern self is framed by the self-control and self-discipline made

available by naturalists, rationalists and enlightenment thinkers beginning with Descartes, Kant, and Locke.

But he blames contemporary philosophy as a whole for giving an overly *narrow focus to morality* (SS 79).

"Morality is conceived purely as a guide to *action.* It is thought to be concerned purely with what it is right to

do rather than with what it is good to be. In a related way the task of moral theory is identified as defining the

content of obligation rather than the nature of a good life" (SS 79). The mixture of Kantian and naturalist

understandings of morality, both of which are basically founded on reason, still exercises a lot of control over

our approach to the human agent. Not that Taylor has ever rejected the importance of 'reason' in the making of

modern identity. His critique has been generally of the claims to 'universality' made by 'substantive and procedural theory.' Later, some Kantians turned to 'social contract theory', for examples Jürgen Habermas and Hanna Arendt. Instead of defining legitimacy substantively they made recourse to 'society.' Habermas' *discourse ethic* is another approach in the same direction. It offers a "dialogical" procedure in place of the Kantian autonomy of reason. Taylor considers this a positive move forward because it involves a fuller acceptance of the free self-determination of diverse people. In a way, it unites Kantian universality and the Benthamite[356] refusal to decide for other people what is right for them (SS 85-87)

Taylor has committed an essay on the "Dialogical Self" to the contrast between 'monological' and 'dialogical' self. Both work *essentially* by reason. Yet his theory of the "Politics of Recognition" necessitates a wide range of studies, analyze, assessment, evaluations, and reflections on multicultural realities in order *not* to squeeze them into a predominant culture or pattern of thinking. Kantian philosophy is still dominant in the 'liberalism of neutrality,' where only restricted acknowledgment of distinct cultural identities is possible. (PA 242). It really takes a great deal of 'rational' analysis to understand and evaluate the 'depths of ethnocentricity' (PA 255). Taylor states that, "There must be something midway between the inauthentic and homogenizing demand for recognition of equal worth, on the one hand, and the self-immurement within ethnocentric standards, on the other."(PA 256). This has to be worked predominantly through a 'dialogical' process which necessarily entails reason as its medium.

In addition to the foregoing argument in favor of the importance of rationality in the conception of self, Taylor's method of "strong evaluation" (SS 20, 332-3) of goods in a wide horizon of moral space also places a high premium on *reason*. The very term "qualitative distinction"(SS 19, 53-58) which Taylor uses on several

---

[356] Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) was an English jurist, philosopher, and legal and social reformer. He became a leading theorist in Anglo-American philosophy of law, and a political radical whose ideas influenced the development of welfarism. He is best known for his advocacy of utilitarianism and animal rights, and the idea of the panopticon. Bentham formulates the Principle of Utility as a single simple rule, as against the views of Kant.

occasions to articulate his moral position, essentially looks for our acute sense of comparison, evaluation, and verification, which of course are primarily operations of reason.

Taylor is pessimistic concerning the 'formal' expression such as 'understanding of rationality'; rather, he likes to see the 'richer' aspects of it.[357] As he reminds us, theoretical understanding has its origin in the Greek term *theoria* (contemplation; see PHS 136). For the ancient Greeks, 'theory' was not delivered from a 'a disengaged perspective' envisioned by the moderns. We see this in its association, as *theoria*, with the Greek. The word 'reason' comes from the Greek counterpart *logos,* which has an extensive meaning like word, speech, account, and indeed reason. Taylor thus sees that both Plato and Aristotle have understood reason as a *condition* of really knowing something. (PHS 136). In Plato's *Republic* the word *episteme* means 'to give an account,' which shows that rational understanding is connected to articulation. Hence, Taylor states, "we have a rational grasp of something when we can *articulate* it; that means, distinguish and lay out the different features of the matter in perspicuous order." (PHS 137). This seems to call for a reconsideration of the connection between the rational and the theoretical. Perhaps there is perspicuous articulation that cannot be simply theoretical. Taylor says,

> To strive for rationality is to be engaged in articulation, in finding the appropriate formulations. But it is a standard intrinsic to the activity of formulating that the formulations be consistent. Nothing is clearly articulated with contradictory formulations. So consistency is plainly a necessary condition of rationality. (PHS 137)

Taylor analyzes Plato's conception of human rationality is an ongoing dynamism in the person not a stable state. This is not what human being is, but what it ought to be. That means that to be 'rational' is his goal (*telos*) which is implicitly directed towards finality by nature (PHS 142). When one achieves that finality s/he achieves happiness and well-being. Plato kept the close connection between "understanding the order of things

---

[357] Charles Taylor, *Philosophy and Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985, 134. (Henceforth, PHS).

and being in attunement with it. We do not understand the order of things without understanding our place in it, because we are part of this order" (PHS 142). What you see as good for you, and which you are part of, you cannot help loving. Taylor is not unaware of those who see the world-order as merely accident and chance. This sort of dispassionate approach to the world has been the center of focus for natural sciences for a long time. Yet loving the world as part of you is important for him. One cannot know something without 'loving' it. For him, the principle of knowing by rationality and knowing by loving are 'incommensurable' (i.e., not only just different but incompatible in principle). The same is applicable when it comes to the evaluation and understanding of ancient time religious rituals and magic and the events of modern times. They are different even though they somehow occupy the same space. One way of comparing them is by seeing these relative success and superiority. The ancient sages valued 'wisdom' as the highest value. But the modern science would value technological control as his highest value. (PHS 144-146). Based on the principle of *incommensurability*, Taylor articulates the possibility of different degrees of rationality (lower and higher). This woks much as does Winch's argument for agreeing on the "plurality of standards of rationality"[358] (Winch is famous for his studies on "primitive societies and their practices such as magic). Taylor states,

> We must speak of a plurality of standards. […] plurality we have here, between incommensurable, precisely opens the door to judgments of superiority. […] Rationality involves more than avoiding inconsistency. What more is involved comes out in the different judgments we make when we compare incommensurable cultures and activities. These judgments take us beyond merely formal criteria of rationality, and point us toward the human activities of articulation which give the value of rationality its sense. (PHS 151)

Still, the disengaged rationality of radical enlightenment is not without use for us. Taylor clearly understands the aspects of modern conception of self-identity contributed by such an understanding. He states it as follows:

> The ideal of disengagement defines a certain-typically modern-notion of freedom, as the ability to act on one's own, without outside interference or subordination to outside authority. It defines its own

---

[358] Peter Winch (1926-1997) was a British philosopher known for his contributions to the philosophy of social science, Wittgenstein scholarship, ethics, and the philosophy of religion. He is perhaps most famous for his early book, *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy* (1958), an attack on positivism in the social sciences.

peculiar notion of human dignity, closely connected to freedom. And these in turn are linked to ideals of efficacy, power, unperturbability, which for all their links with earlier ideals are original with modern culture. (PHS 5)

2.3.1.3.   Emotionality (Sentiments) and Self-Exploration

The human self is found in multiple, fractured horizons. However, it is still possible to trace out the modern human self as an individualist in three senses, "It prizes autonomy; it gives an important place to self-exploration, in particular of feeling; and its visions of the good life generally involve personal commitment." (SS 305). As distinct from a more radicalized rationality as the only pure means of the source of the inwardness, there is a tendency in modernity to see inwardness through emotionality, feelings, sentiments, love, pains, sufferings, and the like.

The moral sources of disengaged rationally and moral sources of engaged sentiments are wholly distinct. Taylor states, "In one case, we find them in the dignity of the disengaged, self-responsibly clairvoyant, rational, controlling subject. In the other case, we also look for them in the sentiments we find within […] with developing conception of the nature as an inner source." (SS 265). With this in view, he contends that we need a *re-engagement* to recover the movement towards good that is within us. It is the true form of natural affection or our benevolent sentiments, which function as the real force and source of human self's orientation to the good.

In this connection, Rousseau's[359] contribution to the expressivist self-interpretation are important. He brought back into the world the 'Augustinian concept of two loves' which were two basic orientations of the will. With this there came a shift in self-interpretation. "The muddle and confusion are no longer seen as simply the result of negligence and bad habits, something which a little resolution and proper understanding can clear up.

---

[359] Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) was a major Genevan philosopher, writer, and composer of 18th-century Romanticism. His political philosophy heavily influenced the French Revolution, as well as the American Revolution and the overall development of modern political, sociological and educational thought. Taylor's interest in Romanticism and its expressivism shows a significant influence by Rousseau.

Indeed, the Cartesian idea that we are in principle transparent to ourselves, and only fail to know ourselves through confusion, is abandoned." (SS 356) This denial of self-transparency is crucial to the expressivist followers of Rousseau. In orthodox Christianity, the source of one's higher love is grace; for Rousseau it has become the 'voice of nature.' The doctrine of original sin is abandoned and nature is fundamentally good (SS 357). According to Taylor, "Rousseau is actually pushing the subjectivism of modern moral understanding a stage further. This is what made him so tremendously influential." (SS 361). He is the originator of the contemporary culture of self-exploration. In the inner voice of nature he sought an inwardness and a radical autonomy where the rational autonomy of Kant is the only *constitutive good*, and not a substantive one.

2.3.2.   Recognition of Plurality of the Society (Political)

Taylor has brought out the importance of 'recognition' or 'misrecognition' in framing one's identity and authenticity. "It is a vital human need" according to him (PA 225). The history of black people, colonized people, subaltern groups, and feminists, will amply explain the role of recognition, or its absence, in framing the identity of an individual. Taylor mentions the dialectic of 'master and slave and its used by Hegel to emphasize the same point. As since "social hierarchies" and their "honor ethics" recede slowly from society, there emerge the importance of human 'dignity,' which is used in the wider sense of a modern 'universalism and egalitarianism,' where the inherent dignity of every human being is re-articulated. Equal recognition has been essential for democratic culture. But the importance of recognition as it has been modified and intensified by the new understanding of individual identity that emerged at the end of the 18th century when the notion of an individual as endowed with moral sense and an intuitive feeling for what is right and wrong is emphasized. The notion of authenticity develops out of a displacement of the moral accent in this idea. It articulates the 'inner depths.' The first variants of this view were theistic, or at least pantheistic. (PA 226-228).

Rousseau and Herder were great contributors to this modern idea of identity and recognition. The former, according to Taylor, is significant by his emphasis on morality as that of one's following of the voice within. This voice is also drowned out through our dependence on others. Hence, our authenticity comes out of our intimate moral contact with ourselves. The latter puts forward the idea that each of us has an original way of being human: each person has his or her own "measure."[360] This idea of "measure" has become deeply rooted in modern consciousness (PA 228), and defines an instrumental stance toward myself. That sort of isolated measuring limits the horizons of the individual merely to rationality and thus ends up in a *narrow* definition of human being. Taylor's states:

> Being true to myself means being true to my own originality, which is something only I can articulate and discover. In articulating it, I am also defining myself. I am realizing a potentiality that is properly my own. This is the background understanding to the modern ideal of authenticity, and to the goals of self-fulfillment and self-realization in which the ideal is usually couched. (PA 229)

Herder applies his notion of originality in two levels - Individual and cultural level**.** But the new idea of authenticity based on dignity gradually replaces any hierarchical understanding. The birth of a democratic society doesn't by itself do away with this phenomenon, because people can still define themselves by their social roles. So by definition this ideal of 'authenticity' cannot be socially derived, *but must by inwardly generated* (PA 229). For Taylor, this is problematic:

> But in the nature of the case, there is no such thing as inward generation, monologically understood. In order to understand the close connection between identity and recognition, we have to take into account a crucial feature of human condition that has been rendered almost invisible by the overwhelmingly monological bent of the mainstream modern philosophy. This crucial feature of human life is its fundamentally *dialogical* (Italics is mine) character. We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence defining our identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression (PA 229-230). *Cf.* also 2.1.

Accordingly, one defines identity as *always* in dialogue with, and sometimes in struggle against, the other. In the case of a hermit, his interlocutor is God. Whoever it is, a certain kind of *dialogicality* is essential in

---

[360] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "Cinquieme promenade," in *Oeuvres completes* (Paris, 1959), 1. 1047, cited in PA 228; J. G. Herder, *Ideen*, chap. 7, sec. 1, in *Herders Samtliche Werke,* ed. Bernard Suphan (Berlin, 1877-1913), 13.291.

attaining identity. Thus, my discovering of my own identity doesn't mean that I work it out in isolation, but that I negotiate it with others through dialogue, partly overt, partly internal. That is why the development of an ideal of inwardly generated identity gives a new importance to recognition. My own identity crucially depends on my dialogical relations with others (PA 231). A form of dependence has always been there.

Taylor notices that today recognition has 'Private' and 'Public' spheres (intimate identity and public identity; universal rights, equality, and the like). We live in an age where we recognize the "politics of difference." Everyone should be recognized for his or her unique identity. With the politics of equal dignity, what is established is meant to be universally the same and the 'politics of difference' asks for a 'politics of dignity' (PA 233-4). The quest for freedom and dignity is explicit here. According to Taylor, the aboriginals of many places were denied 'certain rights and powers' commonly enjoyed by others. Closest to him is Canadian example where English Canadians and French Canadians had disparities. In contrast, the politics of nationalities have been functioning for a long time with a 'difference-blindness.' According to Taylor, the politics of equal dignity is based on the idea that all humans are equally worthy of respect. And this is underpinned by a notion of what in human beings commands respect. Kant's use of "dignity" was one of the earliest evocations of this idea; what commanded respect in us was our status as rational agents, capable of directing our lives through principles. Thus we have the notion of 'universal human potential' or something all humans share, which ensures that all deserve respect. In the case of 'politics of difference,' we might also say that a *universal human potential* has its basis in the potential for forming and defining one's own identity as an individual and also as a culture. This potentiality must be respected equally in everyone. In the new intercultural context, this way of thinking has encountered considerable pressure (PA 235-236). There, two modes of politics are both based on equal respect but they are in conflict: For one, the principle of respect requires that we treat people in a difference-blind fashion. For the other, we have to recognize and even foster

particularity. The reproach the first affects to the second is that it violates the principle of nondiscrimination. According to Taylor, difference-blind society is not only inhuman but also highly discriminatory (PA 236-237).

2.3.2.1.   Politics of Equal Dignity

This situation of a demand for equal dignity emerged in the western civilization at the point where the approaches of Rousseau and Kant meet. Looking at them should enable us to gauge to what extent they are guilty of the charge of imposing a false homogeneity (PA 237). Rousseau is the initiator of the 'discourse of recognition' since he began to think about the importance of "equal respect and deems it indispensable for freedom." He tends to oppose a condition of "freedom-in-equality" to one characterized by hierarchy and other-dependence (a slave to "opinion."). People live very much in the public gaze (PA 237-238). Taylor says: "In contrast to the hierarchical honor, we are in competition; one person's glory must be another's shame, or at least obscurity." (PA 240).

To the two traditional ways of thinking about honor and pride he adds a third one: denouncing pride, and removing ourselves from this whole dimension of human life to the point of being utterly unconcerned with esteem. According to Taylor, it is an act of cowardice. In contrast, his republican model has esteem as the central part. The new critique of pride, leads not to solitary mortification but to a politics of equal dignity (Hegel took this up in his dialectic of master/slave). Rejecting the importance is not the remedy (Rousseau), but rather an entry into a very different system. One that features equality, reciprocity and unity of purpose, and which makes possible the equality of esteem. Each person's consciousness seeks recognition in another, and this is not a sign of a lack of virtue: the 'we' is an 'I' and the 'I' is a 'we'. Rousseau misses that because of his "rigorous exclusion of any differentiation of roles" (PA 241).

In a liberal politics, the margin for recognizing differences is very small. Taylor observes, "The notion that any of the standard schedules of rights might apply differently in one cultural context than they do in another, that

their application might have to take account of different collective goals, is considered quite unacceptable" (PA 242). He sees this problem in his own country and its political life. The Canadian political system necessitates two distinctive modes of recognition, one for the French Canadians and another one for the English Canadians.

On this point, Taylor sees early leadership in the Americans who safeguarded individual identity and rights when they wrote the bill of rights, which probably is the first of that sort in the world. He feels that "even if overriding individual rights were not possible, espousing collective goals on behalf of a national group can be thought to be inherently discriminatory" (PA 244). In the liberal perspective of the Anglo-American world there is a tendency to override individual rights vis-à-vis the collective. According to Taylor, this comes from the influence of the US. He argues against it. These views have recently been elaborated and defended by some of the United States' best philosophical and legal minds including John Rawls, Ronald Dworkin and Bruce Ackerman. Dworkin, for example, distinguishes between two kinds of moral commitments: procedural (a commitment to deal fairly and equally with each other, regardless of how we conceive our ends) and substantive (we all have views about the ends of life, about what constitutes a good life which we and others ought to strive for) (PA 245).

2.3.2.2.   Politics of Liberalism

As Taylor sees it, liberalism is rooted in Kant. Among other features, the Kantian/liberal view understands human dignity to consist largely in autonomy (ability of each person to determine for him/herself a view of the good life, such that one's departure from this would detract from one's own dignity as rational beings). It is only a claim. This model of "self-determining and self-expressive choice" supports the liberalism of the West emphatically. We must also consider that it has been urged with great force and intelligence by liberal thinkers in the Unites States, and precisely in the context of constitutional doctrines of judicial review. The liberal

society cannot accommodate publicly espoused notions of the good (PA 246), at least according to Sandel's conception of 'procedural republic'.[361]

According to Taylor, there is a form of politics of equal respect, as enshrined in a liberalism of rights, that precludes differences because: a). It insists on uniform application of the rules defining these rights, without exception; b) it is suspicious of collective goals. Taylor sees that, "The rigidities of procedural liberalism may rapidly become impractical in tomorrow's world. The politics of equal respect, then, at least in this more hospitable variant, can be cleared of the charge of homogenizing difference" (PA 248). Taylor also observes that there is a form of 'politics of equal rights' mainly proposed by the proponents of the liberalism of rights which is *difference-blind* in nature. Such variant of liberalism with its apparent neutral ground seeks to abolish cultural differences. It is difficult to understand how such liberalism can accommodate and recognize members of distinct societies and their particular aspirations. Perhaps the discourse between politics and religion also face a dilemma here, since liberalism of political neutrality fail to understand the unique religious aspiration of a private citizen. Hence, it can lead to a conflict of the spheres e.g. Salman Rushdie's[362] *Satanic Verses* shows how wrong is this view of the differences. Islam seeks a sort of separation between politics which cannot be actualized by the same kind of liberalism of neutrality. Taylor states:

> Liberalism is not a possible meeting ground for all cultures; it is a political expression of one range of cultures, and quite incompatible with other ranges. Moreover, as many Muslims are well aware, western liberalism is not so much an expression of the secular, post religious outlook that happens to be popular among liberal *intellectuals* as it is the more organic outgrowth of Christianity - at least as seen from the alternative vantage of Islam. The division of the church and state goes back to the earliest days of Christian civilization. The early forms of the separation were very different from ours,

---

[361] Michael J. Sandel (1953) is an American political philosopher and a professor at Harvard University. He is best known for the Harvard course 'Justice' which is available online, and for his critique of Rawls 'Theory of Justice' in his *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (1982).

[362] Sir Ahmed Salman Rushdie, Kt. (1947) is an Indian-British novelist and essayist. His second novel, Midnight's Children (1981), won the Booker Prize in 1981. Much of his fiction is set on the Indian subcontinent. His style is often classified as magical realism mixed with historical fiction, and a dominant theme of his work is the story of the many connections, disruptions and migrations between the Eastern and Western worlds.

but the basis was laid for modern developments. The very term *secular* was originally part of the Christian vocabulary (PA 249).

Taylor continues: "All this is to say that liberalism can't and shouldn't claim complete cultural neutrality. It is also a fighting creed" (PA 249). Multicultural contexts become more porous and become more open to multinational migrations. Western liberal societies are supremely guilty in this regard. In an older period of colonization and confiscations no one considered the recognition of cultures and people as an important reality. Taylor noticed the transformation that took place in course of time,

> The demand there was that we let cultures defend themselves, within reasonable bounds. But the further demand we are looking at here is that we all recognize the equal value of different cultures; that we not only let them survive, but acknowledge their *worth.*[…] the demand for recognition is now explicit [...] spread of the idea that we are formed by recognition.(PA 250-251).

The validity of the cultural claim has to be demonstrated concretely in the actual study of the culture because considering all cultures as having equal worth will apparently be a mistake. Taylor thinks that Gadamer's idea of a *fusion of horizons* seems to be an applicable method here. We learn to move in a broader richer horizon. The fusion of horizons operates through our developing new vocabularies of comparison, for articulating these new contrasts (PA 252-3). Still, there is the question of 'objectivity' of judgments in this field, and even in science objectivity is a mirage. Even the forms of subjectivism are also in confusion where we have half-baked neo-Nietzschean theories which are often quietly invoked in this debate. Derived frequently from Foucault or Derrida, they claim that "all judgments of worth are based on standards that ultimately are imposed by and further entrench structures of power. It should be clear why these theories proliferate" (PA 254) But in taking sides they miss the driving force of this kind of politics, which is precisely the search for recognition and respect.

Another issue is the "fused horizon of standards" where we simply judge the cultures by our old familiar standard. A favorable judgment made prematurely would be not only condescending but ethnocentric. It would praise the other for being like us. But there is yet another major problem with multiculturalism:

> The peremptory demand for favorable judgments of worth is paradoxically-perhaps tragically *homogenizing*. For it implies that we already have the standards to make such judgments. The standards we have, however, are those of a North Atlantic Civilization. And so the judgments implicitly and unconsciously will cram the others into our categories (PA 255).

Here the demand for equal recognition is unacceptable. Still we cannot end the process here. Rather we should concentrate on the "depths of ethnocentricity" to really know the excellence of the cultures (Saul Bellow).[363]

There must be something "midway between the inauthentic and homogenizing demand for recognition of equal worth, on the one hand, and the self-immurement within ethnocentric standards on the other" (PA 256). How can this presumption be grounded? One ground that has been proposed is of that of the Religions. In Herder's[364] *divine providence,* the variety of cultures is not a mere accident but meant to bring about greater and richer harmony. Another ground is merely on human grounds as follows:

> One could argue that it's reasonable to suppose that cultures that have provided the horizon of meaning for large numbers of human beings, of diverse characters and temperaments, over a long period of time-that have, in other words, articulated their sense of the good, the holy, and the admirable-are almost certain to have something that deserves our admiration and respect, even if it goes along with much that we have to abhor and reject (PA 256)

There is a moral issue here. We only need a sense of our own limited part in the whole human story to accept the presumption of seeing the 'whole' in a human ground. Considered in the context of ultimate horizons, we

---

[363] Saul Bellow (1915-2005) was a Canadian-born Jewish American writer. For his literary contributions, Bellow was awarded the Pulitzer Prize, the Nobel Prize for Literature, and the National Medal of Arts. He is the only writer to have won the National Book Award three times, and the only writer to have been nominated for it six times.
His writing exhibited a subtle analysis of our culture and the dilemma of the age.

[364] Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803) is a philosopher of the first importance. This claim depends largely on the intrinsic quality of his ideas. Hegel's philosophy turns out to be essentially an elaborate systematic development of Herderian ideas (especially concerning the mind, history, and God). ("Herder," in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* accessed June 20, 2011, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/herder/).

are just a small part. It is a humbling experience to encounter multiculturalisms, but it is also a great experience to realize their worth and recognize them.

2.3.3. Recognition of Plurality of Religious Doctrines and Political Principles

Taylor's analysis of religion is based mainly on the North-Atlantic religious context where 'Judeo-Christian Religion is predominant. Hid views include a critique of the American context, and are stated perhaps most clearly in observations found in a *A Catholic Modernity.*

Taylor also agrees with the predominant understanding of religion in the modern world as something "relegated to a private sphere." He sees the "liberal" and "civic" notion of freedom as the source of considerable bedevilment to religions. These are two forms of freedom in our modern world, and religion seems not to know what to do about them. One is the 'negative' sense where the individual is given immunity from interference from others, whether state, church or any other person. The other notion is that we enjoy life together to the extent that we govern ourselves as a society and do live under despotism. Taylor sees this as "civic" freedom.[365] The history of numerous countries is that they have been facing the conflict between the liberal and civic notions of freedom.

Taylor contends that,

> It is one of the legacies of Christendom that religion can neither be fully integrated in nor fully excluded from the State. But the peculiar modern problem that we have about religion and civic freedom, particularly in America, springs from the being of a rapproachment in early modern times between the two (RFS 100).

---

[365] Charles Taylor, "Religion in a Free Society," in *Articles of Faith, Articles of Peace. The Religious Liberty Clauses and the American Public Philosophy* eds. J.D. Hunter and O. Guinness (Washington D.C: The Brookings Institution, 1990), 94. (Henceforth: RFS and will be provided within the body of the text).

The 'religious liberty' clauses of many nations were constituted mainly for the purpose of preventing any national 'confessional conformity' from being superimposed on existing diversity. In their light, it is significant to see how Taylor views the concept of 'separation' between church and state.

> […] the separation of church and state did not have to mean bracketting God or Religion. It may have for some, but that is not the way most Americans understood disestablishment. In fact, many supported the measure in the name of religion, to preserve its strength and integrity from the enervating and corrupting effect of state interference, as James Madison put it, "religion and government will both exist in the great purity, the less they are mixed together. (RFS 103)

Taylor argues more in favor of 'civic freedom' and its incorporation of religions. Of course, both liberal and civic notions of freedom, and hence their impact on the state and church relationship, have had to face considerable ups and downs. Extreme liberal stance tend to sideline civic freedom of the citizens. Another substantial problem with the liberal frame is that it tries to bring about a 'common good' that has no connection to a community. It is easy to see 'philosophical atomism' working as an undercurrent in this perspective. Taylor thus considers, 'liberal solution' inadequate. Still, he believes a context of conflict can be turned to a *source of hope*; if Americans remain committed to the capacity for discussion and debate, which makes them 'greater' than many other groups of people (RFS 108-113).

Taylor's understanding of the recognition of plurality of faith comes from his own religious life as a Roman Catholic believer. His *Catholic Modernity* has contributed a new understanding to this strand of his thinking. As we have seen, he functions within the frame of the 'theory of recognition' where the 'unity-across-difference', as against 'unity-through-identity,' seems the only possibility. Taylor would like to see the differences and diversity between people, their faith, and way of acting and believing from a much deeper level of his own religious understanding. And he does see that such a diversity/plurality has its originality in the Trinitarian doctrine of Christianity itself. He states, "[…] it seems that the life of God itself, understood as

Trinitarian, is already a oneness of this kind. Human diversity is part of the way in which we are made in the image of God." (CM 15).

Were it to be widely accepted, Taylor's view would definitely affect the missionary approach of Christianity where the predominant approach was of 'an outsider's standpoint' in order to make the outsiders into insiders. According to him, such an approach is outdated and irrelevant in the 21st century, where people are primarily considered as having 'individualized identity.' (PA 227)

Of course, this does place him at odds with significant features of our modernity. As we know, liberal political culture is characterized by an affirmation of universal human right-to life, freedom, citizenship, and self-realization which are seen radically unconditional, and which in many ways could never have attained this 'little help from our enemies'.[366] It is difficult for a "Christian" society, in this sense, to accept full equality of rights for atheists, for people of a quite alien religion, or for those who violate what seems to be the Christian moral code. (CM 17). Moreover, Christianity redefines life by using expressions like, "beyond life," "eternal life, "and "abundant life"[367] (Jn. 10: 10). This entails a radical decentering of self in God, and a vision of "self-flourishing" that is clearly theocentric. The Christian expression 'Thy will be done' also rearticulates the same emphasis. In Christianity there is a 'renouncing' and 'flourishing.' Renunciation-aiming beyond life-not only takes you away but also brings you back to flourishing (CM 21-22). This is what the Bible means by "*agape.*"

All of this – and we have only sketched it – brings us to the well-known conflict between modern culture and the transcendent. The 'affirmation of life' that defines the contemporary concern to preserve life, to bring prosperity, and to reduce suffering worldwide, is without precedent in history. The modern idea of 'affirmation of ordinary life' can be seen in it, and it constitutes a major component of our modern ethical outlook. Yet it

[366] Liberal politics is to be strongly contrasted with the orthodox faith of religions, especially in the Western context of Christianity.
[367] Jn. 10.10 (NRSV).

was originally inspired by a mode of Christian piety that exalted practical agape and was polemically directed against the pride, elitism, and one might say self-absorption of those who believed in "higher" activities or spiritualties such as the reformers saw in monastic life.

There is a modern conception that aiming for 'civilized' world would mean a reversal of the order of priorities, in which life and happiness could be sacrificed on the altars of renunciation. Hence, even believers are often induced to redefine their faith in such a way as not to challenge the primacy of life. Taylor wants to claim (see his concluding chapter of "Sources") that the reverse is the case: that clinging to the primacy of life in the second (call this "metaphysical") sense is making it harder to affirm wholeheartedly in the first (practical) sense (CM 25) He further observes:

> Western modernity is very inhospitable to the transcendent. … in Western modernity the obstacles to belief are primarily moral and spiritual, rather than epistemic. I am talking about the driving force here, rather than what is said in arguments in justification of unbelief (CM 25).

For Taylor, it is clear that the roots of 'exclusive humanism' and its emphasis on universal justice, rights, benevolence, and dignity, are deeply Christian. It, together with the 'immanent revolt' of the Reformation, closes what had been a transcendent opening, as though there is in fact nothing beyond. Against this, Taylor suggests the possibility of an *enhanced life* that is presented in the New Testament as *eternal life*. According Taylor, the Nietzschean understanding of enhanced life also aims at full affirmation life which also 'in a sense takes beyond life. Hence the *spiritual* and *secular* orientations of an *enhanced life* are analogical in their take of the understanding of a *life beyond.* Here Taylors tempted to speculate and suggest that the perennial human susceptibility to be fascinated by death and violence is at its base a manifestation of our nature as *homo religious*. The religious affinities to human sacrifices, cult of violence, and inter-communal massacres were not strange to a believer. Religion and violence are not alternatives rather only by one's turning toward *transcendence- the full-hearted love of some good beyond life*, we can be freed from violence in the world.

(CM 27-28). The understanding of human beings as religious being (*homo religious)* has its roots an aspiration to transcend suffering, violence, and even death. When they fail to accomplish it the same energy is diverted to something very negative.

Let us now come to what for Taylor, at least recently, is the real heart of the matter. The vision promoted by 'secular humanism' has problematic. In his view, this must be understood in terms of four cornered battle in the modern culture: a). Secular humanists; b). Neo-Nietzscheans; c). those who acknowledge that there is some good beyond life; and d). multiple and distinct acknowledgers of transcendence i.e., some who think that the whole move to secular humanism was just a mistake which needs to be undone. To all this, Taylor adds another group of people, among whom he places himself. These people think that,

> […]the practical primacy of life has been a great gain for humankind and that there is some truth in the "revolutionary" story: this gain was, in fact, unlikely to come about without some breach with established religion (We might even be tempted to say that modern unbelief is providential, but that might be too provocative a way of putting it) But, we nevertheless think that the metaphysical primacy of life is wrong and stifling and that its continued dominance puts in danger the practical primacy (CM 29).

Taylor places emphasis on 'ordinary life.' Even 'unbelief' can be providential. The Reformation started by Luther was a revolt which helped in forming the 'immanent frame' which Taylor eventually concentrates on. It is interesting to see that all of these developments in history, are, as Taylor sees them, an extension of a gospel ethic to a universal solidarity, to a concern for human beings on the other side of the globe whom we shall never meet or need as companions or compatriots (CM 30). Our age makes higher demands for solidarity and benevolence on people in our times. The contribution of modern secular humanism to our aspiration for a *decent, civilized human life*, to have a feeling of self-worth which is proper to all human beings, and 'to be in the register of justice rather than just benevolence, is to be appreciated. According to Taylor, "Humanism not only has given us the courage to act for reform but also explains why this philanthropic action is so immensely worthwhile (CM 32).

And so Taylor asks, how must we have the greatest degree of philanthropic action with the minimum hope in mankind? A figure like Dr. Rieux[368] in Camus' *La Peste* epitomizes one possible solution to this problem. If we wish to respond adequately to the needs and dilemmas of our time, it is not enough to have appropriate beliefs. The transformation of high ideals into brutal practice was demonstrated lavishly already in Christendom, well before modern humanism came on the scene. Taylor hints at moments of counter representations of Christianity which happened in the history of Christendom. Though Christian spirituality points to unconditional love and compassion to everybody and the understanding that everybody is most profoundly created in the image of God that same principle did not guarantee that it is being practiced without failure. So how can Christianity truly help us forward in the fact of the dilemmas of humanism? Perhaps along either –or both-of two ways: Either with a love or compassion that is unconditional, or in a form of life based on that one is most profoundly a being in the image of God. In either case, the love is not conditioned on the worth realized in you only as an individual, and also not on what is realizable in you alone (CM 35). Is unconditional love possible for human beings? Yes, if we open up to God, overstepping the limits accepted by exclusive humanisms.

But for Taylor, this is clearly not yet enough. We have traced just a few facets of modernity. They are, "The espousal of universal and unconditional rights, the affirmation of life, universal justice and benevolence"(CM 35). Still we have a lot to explore on human freedom and the ethic of authenticity. One must be a 'fellow traveler' to understand and assimilate the positives and negatives of modern secular humanism- whether exclusive or inclusive. To this point, Taylor has only argued that one will find in a study of the very achievement of modernity an unexpected and humbling debt to the gospel ethic from which modernity has nonetheless broken away on its wholesale rejection of Christendom. This calls us to separate the gains from the possibility of dangers that arise along with them (CM 36-37).

---

[368] Dr. Rieux is a fictional character.

2.4.   Authenticity of 'Strong evaluations': From Diversity to Authentic Moral Articulations

For Taylor the concept 'authenticity' is a "child of the romantic period which is critical of the disengaged rationality and any form of atomism that cuts the individuals relationship with the community."[369] The modernity of diversity has placed the self in a situation of some conflict. Still, the self has never lost the foundational 'moral sense' which can also be understood in terms of an 'intuitive feeling' or 'a voice within.' As Taylor sees it, "the modern notion of authenticity develops out of a displacement of the moral accent of this idea."(MM 26). This displacement can result in a disconnect with the former moral views (God and the Idea of Good) though its interest is to give more 'independence' to the individual.   Hence, Taylor needs a method of prioritizing values or goods in order to do justice to the primordiality of self-identity and authenticity. The modern self no longer looks for a 'source' beyond itself, but instead, 'connects with the source within itself' (MM 26).

2.4.1.   The Concept of 'Authenticity'

Long before Heidegger assigned so much importance to it, the concept of authenticity was a modern term emerging as a continuation of the self-exploration initiated by the Romantic period. Taylor develops authenticity from the three moral frameworks or frontiers that examined at some length in an earlier context (see section 2.2.). They are: theistic, rational and romantic. The originality of authenticity can be traced back to the 18th century and was initially close to the idea of individualism. Descartes' disengaged rationality contributed to this, as did the political individualism of Locke. But it is interesting to notice that there is something in authenticity that is antithetical to disengaged rationality. After all, as a child of the Romantic age, it was part of a strongly critical response to the disengaged rationality of Descartes and Locke. The Romantic period recognized an individual's relationship with nature and community. Romanticism traced back the origin

---

[369] Charles Taylor, *The Malaise of Modernity* (Concord, Ontario: Anansi, 1991), 25. Republished as *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992). (Henceforth: MM and will be provided within the body of the text).

of authenticity to 'moral sense, an intuitive feeling' which gave one the knowledge of what is right or wrong. This notion is not just based on a dry calculation but on feeling, 'a voice within.' (MM 25-26). Taylor contends: "The notion of authenticity develops out of a displacement of the moral accent in this idea (voice within). On the original view, the inner voice is important because it tells us what the right thing to do is. Being in touch with our moral feelings would matter here, as a means to the end of acting rightly." (MM 26).

We have also had occasion, earlier, to propose a genealogy of the notion of 'inwardness.'(see 2.2., section). Let us review the results. We began with a rational localized *inner* as the *inwardness* of the self as we saw in Plato, Descartes and Locke. However we found in Augustine another concept of *inwardness* in relation to God. He saw the road to God as passing through our own reflexive sense of ourselves. Hence, Taylor argues that the first variants of authenticity were *theistic*, or at least *pantheistic*. The importance and influence of Rousseau is significant in the development of the notion of authenticity based on the idea of the 'voice of nature within us.' The idea of "self-determining freedom" is also a contribution of Rousseau (MM 27). Later, Herder developed the concept of authenticity further when he put forward the idea that "each of us has an original way of being human." (MM 28). Taylor sees that this idea is deeply rooted in consciousness of the modern world. People now speak of their own 'measure' of realities and 'my way' of thinking and acting. Taylor states this trend as follows: "I am called upon to live my life in this way, and not in imitation of anyone else's. But this gives a new importance to being true to myself. If I am not, I miss the point of my life; I miss what being human is for me." (MM 29).

Yet this seems to run a two-fold risk of being lost either through my conformity to the outward world or by my instrumental stance to myself which will make me incapacitated to listen to the voice within. "Being true to myself means being true to my own originality, and that is something only I can articulate and discover. In

articulating it, I am also defining myself. I am realizing a potentiality that is properly my own." (MM 29).

Taylor sees the ongoing expansion of goods which has reached unto 'authenticity' as follows:

> New conflicts emerge in the course of resolving old ones. But no particular one need be considered immovable. We don't have merely to resign ourselves. And sometimes new values emerge. For example, the goal of "authenticity," developing out of the Herderian idea that each person has his own way of being, is genuinely new. It was not part of the philosophical vocabulary of the seventeenth century, or for that matter of ancient Greece or the Middle Ages. (PG 113).[370]

This goes together with other concepts such as 'self-fulfillment' or 'self-realization.' Hence, the ethic and culture of authenticity gives the self a moral force by which one will be able to trace out and evaluate the plurality of goods in our culture. Those diverse goods are 'constitutive' to the authenticity of the self. Taylor would argue that only by 'strong evaluations' based on 'qualitative distinctions' can we come to the maximum of authenticity. With regard to this, let me then first take up Taylor's understanding of the plurality (Diversity) of Goods. Secondly, I provide Taylor's conception of 'constitutive goods.' Third, I will present the importance of language in his philosophy before fourth turning to his arguments for the method of 'strong evaluation' of qualitative distinction. In a fifth point, I will present his notion of 'hypergood,' in its prospects and problems, which will lead me to a sixth and final point where I argue how all of these can provide a framework of that which constitutes an authentic human self.

2.4.2. **Plurality (Diversity) of Goods**[371]

Taylor devotes considerable time and effort to articulating the human self and its search for self-identity in authenticity by exploring diverse sources of good in a moral space. He understands that space to exhibit diverse moral sources/frames, which are potential sources of a plurality of goods. Taylor is a supporter of 'moral realism,' or 'moral cognitivism.' He feels that these goods in some way e *impose* themselves, as binding on us,

---

[370] Charles Taylor, "Plurality of Goods," in *The Legacy of Isaiah Berlin* (2001): 113-120. (Henceforth: PG and provided within the body of the text)

[371] Taylor was influenced by the writings of Isaiah Berlin while he was in Oxford. His continued reflections on "plurality of goods" had been inspired by Isaiah Berlin's understanding that "we find ourselves drawn to a plurality of goods, some of which are incompatible."(PG 113)..

or making a claim on us. (PG 113). In the history of human beings there are different formulations and articulations of a 'range of value positions.' Taylor sees a modern tendency to "fudge" some goods in the context of the conflicting diverse goods. He criticizes the modern trend as follows:

> The most influential modern moral theories, at least in the Anglo-Saxon world, utilitarianism and Kantianism, operate this kind of pre-shrinking of the moral domain. […] The attraction of this is partly its rationalism: morality can be founded on clear, unambiguous reasoning. But it also has the incidental result of avoiding a clash of goods. (PG 116)

Taylor sees the 'conflict of goods' as part of the nature of goods themselves, which in turn comes from the complexity and limitations of human life itself. Given our finite condition, in all its facets, it is all but certain that we will have to face such conflicts forever. Of course these approaches to goods where one can try to 'combine' cherished goods or at least trade them off at a higher level. We can see such a model working in the Aristotelian framework. Still, for Taylor, whatever this case as one resolves one conflict there will emerge new conflicts. Yet no particular one needs to be considered as immovable. According to Taylor, the demands for male-female equality, a re-ordering of social, sexual and family life and the like are examples of new versions of conflicts of goods where the old ones are swept away. (PG 116-19). This depicts for us a process of self-identity and self-exploration. And it reminds us that it is possible to work for reconciliation and recognition, rather settling for building divisions and barriers.

Attempting to nuance this position, Taylor presents a strong critique of the utilitarian reductionist moral approach and the formalistic approach of Kant and his followers, but without failing to recognize Kant's contribution to our moral understanding. He states,

> Behind these Kant-derived formulae stand one of the most fundamental insights of modern Western civilization, the universal attribution of moral personality: in fundamental ethical matters, everyone ought to count, and all ought to count in the same way. Within this outlook, one absolute requirement of ethical thinking is that we respect other human agents as subject of practical reasoning on the same footing as ourselves. (PHS 231-232).

We have already seen enough to know that Taylor's resistance to the Kantian formalism – and untilitarian reductionism - will in defense of an essential need to recognize differences and admit, even insist on inequality on occasion. Taylor wants us to shake ourselves from the 'formalist illusion.'

> One of the big illusions which grows from either of the reductions is the belief that there is a single consistent domain of the 'moral', that there is one set of considerations, or mode of calculations, which determines what we ought 'morally' to do. The unity of the moral is a question which is conceptually decided from the first on the grounds that moral reasoning just is equivalent to calculating consequences for human happiness, or determining the universal applicability of maxims, or something of the sort. (PHS 233).

Taylor has problems with fixing moral questions and issue in this manner. He is convinced of its 'inarticulacy' and 'open boundaries.' He has no problem in accepting the fact that the universal attribution of moral personality is valid, and lays obligations on us which we cannot ignore. Nonetheless, there are also other moral ideals and goals than those which can serve as the universal ideals or maxims. Evidently, they cannot be included in the formalism of universalism. And so Taylor has a serious objection to the 'homogenizing' of morality by utilitarianism and formalism. In his view, it is almost indubitable for Taylor that there is a 'qualitative distinction' of values, morals, actions, feelings and modes of life. It is undeniable that there is something lower or something else higher, noble or base, admirable or contemptible. He then warns that, "The temptations to be avoided here are those of conformity to established standards which are not really one's own, or of dishonesty with oneself concerning one's own convictions or affinities." (PHS 234).

But there is more to say in this line. Essentially, it is a matter of insisting on nuance and complexity in moral life. Taylor delves deeper into the concepts of contrasting goods and incommensurability. He makes sure that it is not the same as Kant offers. "But, as I have already indicated, I do not think that a line can be drawn neatly and unproblematically around the moral."(PHS 238). He illustrates the point with a stunning analysis of the concepts of 'admiration' and 'contempt.' Those who show forth higher goods are admired (like Mother Teresa) and those who fail to do so will be treated with contempt. Here it is explicit that there is a normativity of

standards at a society. It is also plain that emotions have a place in our moral lives. Our admiration for the 'beautiful,' charismatic and 'intelligent' have much to do with this kind of a distinction. Taylor would argue that admiration and contempt comes out of a 'qualitative contrast in our lives.' (PHS 238-240).

Taylor states, " […] it may well be that much of human behavior will be understandable and explicable only in a language which characterizes motivation in a fashion which marks qualitative contrasts and which is therefore not morally neutral." (PHS: 243). Once we are liberated from the homogenizing tendency of formalism and utilitarian reductionism, which try to epistemologically reduce ethical realities, one will be able to realize that "the ethical is not a homogenous domain, with a single kind of good, based on a single kind of consideration. […] The goods we recognize as moral […] are therefore diverse (PHS 244).

Finally, let us note that Taylor believes that the conception of goods take place historically. Taylor says that, "Our political thinking needs to free itself both from the dead hand of the epistemological tradition, and the utopian monism of radical thought, in order to take account of the real diversity of goods that we recognize." (PHS 247).

2.4.3. Constitutive Nature/Role of Goods

One of the features of the Taylorian understanding of the 'plurality of goods' is that they function as our 'moral source' which has been suppressed in the mainstream of modern moral consciousness. This idea was familiar to the ancients. A good could be higher or lower; it could be some action, motive, or style of life. "'Good' was used here in a highly general sense, designating anything considered valuable, worthy, admirable, of whatever kind or category." (SS 92). But Taylor sees one significant difference between Plato's position and his own position. In the former the distinctive higher good was the hegemony of reason which was understood 'substantively.' For his part, Taylor is critical of those ancients for restricting the understanding of 'being rational' which, according to Taylor, is to have a 'vision of the rational order' to reference to a cosmic reality.

This is what 'good' is in its full sense. There is a comprehensive understanding of the whole order not a mere

particular aspect of it. This is key to the idea of the Good itself, a relationship to which constitutes the goodness

of one's actions and aspirations. Taylor calls this a "constitutive good." (SS 92). According to Taylor, "By that

(constitutive good) I mean features of ourselves, or the world, or God, such that their being what they are is

essential to the life of goods being good."[372] For example, God having created us and calling us is a constitutive

good for Judeo-Christian-Islamic theism is the God who creates and calls us.

For Plato, the constitutive good is the order of beings or the principle of order. For Taylor 'the order' of things

is not enough to constitute or define the goodness of action. Rather, he states,

> The Good is also the love which moves us to 'good' action. The constitutive 'good' is a moral source,
> in the sense that I use this term here; it is a something that the love of which empowers us to do and to
> be good." (SS 93).

It is not merely the content of a moral theory, but the love of it that empowers us to pursue a good life. These

constitutive goods or life-goods are important for Plato, Judaism, and Christianity. Taylor observes that

Platonism comes down to Jewish Christian theism through Augustine, who sees God as occupying the place of

Plato's idea of the Good. For the modern humanist there is no constitutive good external to human being.

Taylor definitely sees this very ability of materialist humanist to 'disengage' oneself as a constitutive good for

that sort of moral vision. The rational agency of Kant, who acts on the motive of the respect for pure maxims of

moral laws which emanate from the rational will, is itself, according to Taylor, a constitutive good. But again,

the tremendous move of modern humanism towards 'internalizing' goods has left no constitutive goods

external to us. (SS 94). Using those moral frames that are internal and external, Taylor sees the possibility of

framing an 'immanent view of good.' The contributions of the ancients are only part of this frame. The role of

the Kantian ethic of life is also constitutive of the new immanent ethics of life proposed by Taylor. One thus

---

[372] Charles Taylor, *Dilemmas and Connections- Selected Essays* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011), 10. (Henceforth: DC and provided within the body of the text).

sees that in the modern process of immanentization the empowering motive has changed from love to respect, and yet understands that this is not without an analogue for the distinction between 'higher' and the 'lower' goods which our modern moralists reject.

Perhaps this is the moment to recognize the importance of the narrative strand in Taylor's work. With regard to these differences among moral themes, his approach is broadly inclusivistic. "I will try to do justice to the differences and not fall into too seamless a picture of the continuities. But all things considered, I think this danger is the lesser one in our times."(SS 95). Taking up the need to provide clear articulation of moral sources, he looks everywhere for 'constitutive goods' which may help to empower humanity. He acknowledges the tremendous force of certain stories or traditions of the past even for the people of all times, which certainly are constitutive in our understanding of the relationship between the good and the self. These range as far from one another as Judeo-Christian stories, beliefs, and practices, Marxist ideologies and practices, Enlightenment rationalism and humanism, Romanticism and its self-explorative creative imagination, and 18th Century Deist notions of natural order.

In detail, his recourse is to what he calls 'descriptive prose,' in order to carefully articulate our sense of important qualitative distinctions. In this way, he attempts to correct for a modern philosophical tendency to suppress the results of historical and even genealogical works. (SS 97-98). The result is considerable enrichment: "[…] we cannot consider the life goods in a culture as self-contained, as without internal relation to various possible articulations of constitutive goods." (SS 308)

Does Taylor himself believe in "The Good"? As I understand him, his "The Good" can only be framed out of all the 'constitutive goods.' Good can be understood as one and many. However, one's ability to arrange them in an order of priority will help one more along an ascending higher perspective. Taylor states,

In the language I have been using in this work, we can say that God was in some way or other bound up with the only moral sources they (most of our forebears who could not deny the existence of God) could seriously envisage. 'Moral sources' has been my term of art for constitutive goods insofar as we turn to them in-whatever way is appropriate to them-through contemplation, or invocation, or prayer, or whatever- for moral empowerment. An "age of belief" is one in which all credible moral sources involve God. (SS 310)

Let us try to understand this distinction between life goods and constitutive goods. For Taylor, "the circular relation between life goods and the articulations of constitutive goods which underlie them" (SS 319) needs to be articulated to get the complete picture of the source of a good. The modern trend of secularization moves in a direction that suggests certain life goods can be realized more integrally if they are related to a non-theistic source. For example, radical utilitarianism appears to have rejected the idea of a constitutive good of Deism (providential order), while remaining committed to the life goods this order had underpinned. They are: the ideal of self-responsible reason, the notion that the ordinary fulfillments and pursuit of happiness, and the ideal of universal and impartial benevolence. (SS 322). According to Taylor, this constellation of *life goods* without any connectivity to a *constitutive good*s (higher order of goods) was themselves *under some strain*. For his part, Taylor is convinced of the empowering role of constitutive goods if one considers them as moral sources. In the course of tracing out such moral sources, he brought out different moral sources with their constitutive goods, including Platonic, theistic, Cartesian, and Deist sources. According to Taylor, one conflicting aspect of modernity one peril of modern moralism lies in the fact that "underneath the agreement on moral standards lies uncertainty and division concerning constitutive goods." (SS 498). Considerable amount of his effort is committed to resolving precisely this problem.

One can argue that constitutive goods only figure in theistic or metaphysical ethics, and that they have no place in a modern humanistic outlook. Taylor says that would be a mistake. In this new ethics, the locus of the constitutive good is displaced into the human being itself. (DC 11). Just as the theist is moved by God, modern man is some way or other *moved* by such human powers which came out of this new humanist is focus

endorsed and expressed by, for example, the humanist side of Kant's ethics. But this did not come without serious omission of other constitutive goods.

2.4.4. Importance of Language in the Narration and Articulation of Goods

Taylor's historical retrieval of the genealogy of moral sources has been a significant 'narration' of the moral stories and their 'articulations' through the medium of language. With all the problems and limitations of linguistic articulations, one may be tempted to withdraw from any attempt to articulate human goods. Again, Taylor rises to the challenge of a real problem. "The obvious point to begin with is that the goods I have been talking about only exist for us through *some* articulation." (SS 91). This need of articulation is of course a call to language.

The God of Abraham and the world of Homer exist for us in the 'narratives' of the Bible and of the works of Homer. The narration continues in the work of interpreters, commentators, evaluators, and critics, each of whom responds to it and works within it in differing ways. From the modern context of the ideal of universal rights and justice, one can understand the importance of their promulgation in the form of well-framed language. Taylor says,

> Articulations are a *necessary* condition of adhesion; without it, these goods are not even options. But it is clear that the notions of 'language' and 'articulation' are being used in an unusually broad and encompassing sense here. A sense of good finds expression not only in the linguistic descriptions but also in other speech acts-[…] of prayer […] liturgy […]. The gesture of ritual, its music, its display of visual symbols, all enacts in their own fashion our relation to God. (SS 91-92).

This passage helps us understand how extensive is the sense in which Taylor uses the term 'language.' If somebody depends only on 'prose language' for the articulation of the 'whole good' the result would simply be one-sided. Taylor argues that his 'descriptive language for the articulation of the good has roots in the Socratic source where a particular ethical view sees reason as *logos,* which is a linguistic articulation, are all part of the finality of a being human. Taylor is not naively optimistic about the prospects for this effort. Of course, nothing

assumes us of great and lasting success as we work with linguistic, descriptive articulations, but there is, in fact, no other means available to us.

It is interesting to observe that some formulations die away soon and some others stay longer. Perhaps there is a lesson to this. The way you narrate, formulate, and articulate has its own importance in the future survival of stories, morals, and goods. Taylor says, "[…] words can empower; why words can *at times* have tremendous moral force." (SS 96). Still, he warns us that all formulations not hold the same power or force. Hence, his use of language is not only the linguistic formulation but the whole *speech act* which includes the speaker, the formulation, and the act of delivering the message. Once all these three aspects lined up together to reveal the good, that will have tremendous moral force, which is explicit in the case of the continuing force of the gospels. (SS 96)[373] Just one aspect of the language can be an impoverishing attempt to articulate. Taylor indicates how an articulation can be empowering:

> And in the most evident examples the power is not a function of formulation alone, but of the whole speech act. Indeed, the most powerful case is where the speaker, the formulation, and the act of delivering the message all line up together to reveal the good, as the immense and continuing force of the gospel illustrates. A formulation has power when it brings the source close, where it makes it plain and evident, in all its coherent force, its capacity to inspire our love, respect, or allegiance. An effective articulation releases this force, and this is how words have power. (SS 96).

Taylor is not ignorant of the mistrust some people have of narratives, thinking they may well be sources of delusion and distortion. Taking into account, those incomprehensible dimensions of the goods, perfect silence can reasonable. However, Taylor's approach is evidently modest in choosing to articulate those comprehensible aspects of realities. The exercise of narration is open ended, ongoing, and necessarily incomplete. These conditions are of a single piece with the recourse to language. In a world of plurality of

---

[373] *Speech Act***:** Speech act is a technical term in linguistics and the philosophy of language. The contemporary use of the term goes back to John L. Austin's doctrine of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. As with the notion of illocutionary acts, there are different opinions on the nature of speech acts. The extension of speech acts is commonly taken to include such acts as promising, ordering, greeting, warning, inviting someone and congratulating. ("Speech Act," in *Wikipedia*, accessed June 20, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speech_act.

goods and their competing conflicts and claims, one inevitably depends on some form of language to articulate one's moral frame, and indeed finds that others will also have done so. Applying this to Taylor himself, I would argue that his 'frameworks' are drawn primarily by his own chosen words of description, i.e., his own relation to language. But he is very particular about his commitment: "The articulation of modern understanding of the good has to be a historical enterprise, viz., that our present positions are always defined in relation to past ones, taking them either as models or as foils." (SS 103). We have also traced the developments of our modern outlook in relation to the older frames. Taylor sees a dangerous tendency among modern articulators to be cut off from all the historical connections.

Taylor's narrativity suggests a connection between four terms: (1) our notions of good; (2) our understanding of self; (3) the kinds of narrative in which we make sense of our lives; and (4) conceptions of society (human agent among human agents). All of these come in "loose packages." (SS 105). Our modern self-understanding has changed considerably and so too the form of its narrativity. Hence, there are new modern narrativities and new self-understandings. Still there are mainly only two forms of narrativity, which any narrative endeavor can adhere to: *linear* and *spiral.* The *linear* approach narrates historical progress stories, or stories of continuous gains through individual lives and across generations, rags to riches stories, which have no ending point. And the *spiral* picture of history, from innocence to strife and then to a higher harmony borrowed from Christian divine history and the millennial movements secularized by Marxism and a host of other theories, are immensely powerful in holding of modern thought and feeling. In the face of any difficulty or dilemma, concentrate on possible connections between the aforementioned terms. Once those connections are drawn, certain moral visions may come into view. Likewise, one will also be able to associate with the best available narration of a moral frame. Ultimately the conflicts of modern culture are within us, and greater clarity and lucidity can help us to see our way to reconciliation.

2.4.5. Argument of "Strong Evaluation" on the principle of "Qualitative Distinctions."

The method of "strong evaluation" is essential to the project of Taylor. As I have already noted, the inspiration for this notion seems to have come from H. Frankfurt's understanding of "first order" and "second order" desires in the human agent, where a human agent has a special ability to *evaluate* the *qualitative worth* of the desires based on their outcomes and motives.(*Cf.* 2.1.1.1: Self as 'Human Agent').

In the beginning of *The Sources of the Self,* Taylor analyzes moral and spiritual intuitions (SS 4). Both of these terms have an ambiguity due to either because of our narrow perspectives or of the nature of the concept itself. But Taylor has no doubt with regard to an aspect in common to them. He observes,

> What they have in common with moral issues, and what deserves the vague term 'spiritual', is that they all involve what I have called elsewhere 'strong evaluation,' that is, they involve discrimination of right or wrong, better or worse, higher or lower, which are not rendered valid by our own desires, inclinations, or choices, but rather stand independent of these and offer standards by which they can be judged.(SS 4).

He thus extends the world of morality from its one-sided and biased contours to a wider and more common space. To be sure, numerous moral positions and articulations contest one another, as for example between morality or 'respect' for others, morality as obligatory, and morality as a matter of the issues related to my worth in living. These call for 'strong evaluation.' For his part, Taylor wants to keep our moral question in relation to our understanding of 'a full life.' "To understand our moral world we have to see not only what ideas and pictures underlie our sense of respect for others but also those which underpin our notions of a full life." (SS 14).

There are different goods. All of them have ends which are to some degree in some way worthy or desirable. They could be divided into absolute goods, and relative goods though they will be conceived differently by different people. Taylor prefers the concept 'incomparability' in relationship to 'strong evaluation'(SS 20). Here he emphasizes the 'independence' of each these goods. They all stand by themselves and hence they must

be judged by their own principles (incommensurability), not with reference to anything external on them.

Analyzing Plato's understanding of moral resources, Taylors states,

> The good of the whole, whose order manifests the Idea of the Good, is the final good, the one which englobes all partial goods. […] since the Good is what commands our categorical love and allegiance. It is the ultimate source of strong evaluation, something that stands on its own as worthy of being desired and sought, not just desirable existing goals and appetites. (SS 122).

Utilitarianism has acknowledged only one good viz., pleasure, which itself is not strongly valued as good. In the context of moral and non-moral goods, one must to resort to a different principle to evaluate them. It is here that Taylor invokes his principle of 'incommensurability.' Depending on this principle, one might be able to make a decision on the 'worthiness of strong evaluation.' But his 'strong evaluation' has nothing to do with the any reductive account of human life. In fact, and as we have seen, Taylor strongly criticizes such reductionisms. Instead, he uses the method of 'qualitative distinction' where each of the goods is arranged according to their own commands and standards. Let me explain.

Taylor says that "frameworks incorporate a crucial set of qualitative distinctions."(SS: 19). But the aim of naturalists, as he sees it, was precisely to reject all qualitative distinctions and to construe all human goods as on the same footing. The question of arranging all the ethical[374] categories of human life calls for hard labor. What Taylor calls "qualitative distinctions" are meant to address this difficulty. According to him, "qualitative distinctions give the reason for our moral and ethical beliefs."(SS: 53). In a context where naturalistic and subjectivist arguments are apparently gaining momentum, this can be a 'dangerous articulation.' Because the way they define *quality* limited ascending possibilities. The aspect of *transcendence* is what is endangered. Most of those arguments consider that 'goods or 'values' are *projections* of ours onto the world which itself was neutral. Taylor argues that this projection can be understood in two ways: as something we did, or ideally

---

[374] Taylor borrows this use of ethical from Bernard Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (Abingdon: Routledge Press, 2006).

as something we could bring under voluntary control. Endorsing Hare's prescriptivism,[375] Taylor separates our

descriptive level of meaning of goods and values from their *evaluative force.* (SS 53). "What is good and right

are not properties of the universe considered without any relation to human beings and their lives."(SS 56).

While natural sciences try to conceive the world as maximally freed from the anthropocentric conceptions,

Bernard Williams[376] tried to have an 'absolute' conception. Siding with Williams, Taylor thinks that what we

understand as good and right are not part of the world studied by natural science. There is search for an

'absolute' both in Williams and in Taylor which goes beyond the 'relative' concerns of natural sciences. Taylor

views that, "Platonism and the natural science model are thus objectively allied in creating a false picture of the

issue of moral goods." (SS 56).

Human beings are 'living their lives' (Donald Davidson's[377] expression in contesting the manner in which

behaviorism denies proper of phenomenology), and they look for a means to 'make sense' of their lives. Hence,

the terms one selects have to make sense across the whole range of both explanatory and life uses. As Taylor

sees it, "just as physical sciences are no longer anthropocentric, so human science can no longer be couched in

the terms of physics." (SS 58). The value terms which we use in our human lives have a different insight into

what it is to live in the universe. In a multicultural world our horizons of goods are numerous and plural. In our

contact with other cultures and ethnocentricities, we will be faced with a moral *force* to recognize their

incommensurability, as against a simple balance of goods. The modern tendency to define and criticize goods

---

[375] R. M. Hare (1919 – 2002) was an English moral philosopher. His meta-ethical theories were influential during the second half of the twentieth century. Hare is best known for his development of prescriptivism as a meta-ethical theory. He believed that formal features of moral discourse could be used to show that correct moral reasoning will lead most agents to a form of preference utilitarianism.

[376] Bernard Williams (1929 - 2003) was an English moral philosopher, described by *The Times* as the most brilliant and most important British moral philosopher of his time. His publications include *Problems of the Self* (1973), *Moral Luck* (1981), *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (1985), and *Truth and Truthfulness* (2002). He was knighted in 1999. ("Bernard Williams," in *Wikipedia* accessed June 20, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bernard_Williams).

[377] Donald Davidson was one of the most important philosophers of the latter half of the twentieth century. Davidson's ideas, presented in a series of essays (and one posthumous monograph) from the 1960s onwards, have had an impact in a range of areas from semantic theory through to epistemology and ethics. His work exhibits a breadth of approach, as well as a unitary and systematic character, that is unusual within twentieth century analytic philosophy. ("Donald Davidson," in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* accessed June 20, 2011, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/davidson/).

in universal terms is insufficient and incomplete. There is a predominant tendency to *squeeze* particulars into a universal where the uniqueness of the former are either discarded or forced to compromise in order to have a homogenization of heterogeneous realities. Taylor argues against such a move, since it has a tendency to force individual goods to be something other than themselves. Taylor argues for a principle of 'all things considered,' but only those which will pass the strong evaluation of qualitative distinction will have priority in their standards.

2.4.6. The Notion of Hypergoods – Prospects and Problems

Taylor continues to discuss the higher order and lower order of goods. There are people those who may feel a *qualitative discontinuity* between one good and another. People who believe in rational mastery, or a rich conception of family life, or expressive fulfillment, and the like, need not keep all these goods in the same rank; rather, they should keep any one of them as the most important for them. "[…] this ranking makes one of them have supreme importance relative to the others." (SS 62). The overriding importance of certain goods makes the qualitative contrast of the goods explicit. The highest good of a person whatever it can be, has a tremendous impact on his qualitative evaluation. Still, they place all other goods in positions around his/her highest good. Taylor observes it as follows:

> […] there is a qualitative discontinuity between this one good and the others; it is incomparably above them, in an even more striking fashion than they are seen as incomparably more valuable than a life which lacks them. Thus I may see expressive fulfillment as incomparably more worthwhile than the ordinary things we all desire in life; but I see the love of God or the search for justice as itself incommensurably higher than this fulfillment. A higher-order qualitative distinction itself segments goods which themselves are defined in lower-order distinctions. (SS 63).

Having said this, Taylor would not claim that everybody is committed to such a highest good whole heartedly or single-mindedly, though they all recognize such higher goods in their lives. Taylor calls this kind of evaluation *second order quality distinctions* which define higher goods on the basis of which one assigns differential worth or importance to each of the goods in our moral space. Taylor calls such *higher-order goods*

as "hypergoods," i.e., goods which not only are incomparably more important than others but provide the standpoint from which these must be weighed, judged, decided about."(SS 63).

Kant proposed the 'categorical imperative' as his avenue to a hypergood - moral autonomy - which he made necessary and universal. Following in his footsteps Jürgen Habermas apparently develops his made 'discourse ethic' in a similar manner. Taylor sees their moral encompasses as narrower compared to many other hypergoods, for example, the theistic hypergood of God, or the ancient Greeks' understanding of the 'ethical.' Though he sees, as always, difficulties around inarticulacy, he does glimpse a silver lining of hope:

> What justifies this kind of segregation, or whether it can ever be justified is a big issue of ethical theory. Of course there will always be ranking of goods. The most comprehensive ethical theory, that which most eschews the hiving off of a special class of ends or issues as uniquely crucial, must incorporate some notion of the relative importance of goods. (SS 64).

Different competing goods and their encounters is a serious matter for our concern. Taylor sees that *hypergoods* are themselves generally a 'source of conflict.' They are understood by those who espouse them as a step to a higher moral consciousness. One of the most important hypergoods of our time is probably the *principle of right,* which involves a notion of *universal justice* or *benevolence* whereby all are to be treated as equals, regardless of race, class, sex, culture, and religion. Yet the concepts of right, justice, benevolence, and equality are not new for us. These were part of the human race in a different manner and degree which was 'superseded' by this new formulation. In this context, Taylor has identified, two other hypergoods. They are Platonism and Judeo-Christian religious revelations. Both have their supersessions (Neo-Platonism and Protestantism can be considered as examples). Hence, hypergood has an inherently conflictual movement in history. This superseding of the earlier views with the hypergood that emerges in a "transvaluation of values" in the philosophy of Nietzsche. (SS 64-65).

A 'hypergood' can be viewed as presiding over other goods. Is there any hypergood that stays forever as the same? Not really. Earlier ones are superseded by the newer ones. There can be two possible ways of resolving the dilemma or conflict between the 'earlier' and 'newer.' First, one may is to go all the way with one, and deny anything that comes in its way. Plato's *Republic* takes this path (normal fulfillment of the family and property are denied the guardians in the name of social harmony). Against this we have the second approach already in Aristotle, who affirms all the goods. He seems proper for us. What plays the role of a 'hypergood in Aristotle? It is the *supreme good (teleion agathon)* itself. This is the *whole good life,* all the goods together in their proper proportions. Of course, we cannot fully endorse the Aristotelian vision in our own time, since the totality of goods which he envisaged, did support slavery and justified subordination of women. (SS 66). Thus, even at an exceptionally promising moment the notion *hypergoods,* too, is not without difficulty.

2.4.7. Making of the Modern Identity – Epiphanies and Encounters

This chapter reached something of a turning point where some clarity was given to both Taylor's conception of "authentic self-identity" and the method and means by which he defines it. (*Cf*. 2.4.1.). It should be clear that there is no finished product here, at least as Taylor sees it.[378] This is true partly in keeping with the fluidity of human self-identity, and partly insofar as Taylor's method of being sensitive to various dimensions of history and historical meaning. One might summarize simply by reference to the subtitle of *Sources of the Self:* "Making of the Modern Identity." Modern identity is *still* in the 'making.' Taylor is quite, extensive and elaborate in his *descriptive narrative* of the history of the human agent. His historical retrieval of the *sources* of the self is reconstructive, which is to say rewarding by reworking or recovering. Taylor is not the first to suggest that we lost a sense of our origins, and indeed each of us may know the experience personally. Taylor's

---

[378] This view can be contested from the alternative view of self-identity wherein 'identity' of a self remains the same in all times. But Taylor's position is a different one, wherein, he believes in an 'emerging', 'developing' and 'flourishing' movements of the self in the course of time.

work call us to open ourselves to different moral frames of the past (mainly theistic, rational and romantic), and insists on the relationship between self and good without which a self will not be able to properly conceive its own worth and goodness.

Exploring the moral space in which one found, as we have seen, many goods, Taylor's principle of 'incommensurability' enables him to recognize them and discern their worth. This self is thus, found, and finds itself amid a plurality of goods each of which has its own 'force' and 'command' over us. The self is found with choices to be considered as a matter of its search for *authenticity,* which call for a method of *strong evaluations* by which to make judgments on the 'qualitative distinctions' among goods. We express and articulate our evaluation of goods by means of what Taylor call "linguistic narration." Different narratives help us to compare and contrast between goods in order to evaluate their 'higher' or 'lower' status and their standards they entail. This, in short, is the dynamism or process of 'making the modern identity.' It has been framed from manifold models from the past, and it though not without also incorporating new *epiphanies* as they emerge.

Let me now develop this latter point, as it appears near the end of Taylor's *Sources of the Self,* and then subsequent work.

We may begin by noting, with Taylor, a pronounced tendency in modernity to slide into extreme subjectivism. It seems to be with this tendency in view that Taylor speaks specifically of thinking in and after the 20th century as "modernist." Modernists, in short, drift away from the Romantic period and anything prior to that:

> Twentieth-century art has gone more inward, has tended to explore, and even celebrate subjectivity; it has explored new recesses of feeling, entered the stream of consciousness, spawned schools of art rightly called 'expressionist.' […] at its greatest it has often involved a decentering of the subject: an art emphatically not conceived as self-expression, an art displacing the center of interest onto language, or onto poetic transmutation itself, or even dissolving the self as usually conceived in favor of some new constellation.(SS 456).

In fact, then, as Taylor's final lines suggests, we must observe – and oppose – a slide into not only subjectivism but also its negation into anti-subjectivism. Taylor detects a movement of lose and attempted recovery leading up to these developments. What he call "modernism" is rooted in a reaction to the development of an industrial society, urbanization, technological and scientific advancement, all of which promote the use of instrumental reason. Many modernists, thus identify themselves as specifically anti-Romantic. "The epiphany which will free us from the debased, mechanistic world brings to light the spiritual reality behind nature and uncorrupted human feeling." (SS 457). One can see such descriptions in Wordsworth, Holderlin and Schopenhauer, all of who exhibit a particular form of the modernist turn to interiority. But a vital relation to the Good, the True and the Beautiful has already become impossible in the mechanistic world that modernists only reject, without truly getting behind it. A renewed attempt at regaining those lost realities can be seen in the new *phenomenological* approach of Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty. Hence does Taylor say of Heidegger, "There is a steady tendency towards the *forgetfulness of Being*, which has to be reversed by an existential analytic, a study which brings to light the forgotten being of things and opens us to the meaning of Being, which has been obscured and covered over in our modern world view." (SS 461).

The entire process gets underway when the Romantic commitments to 'harmony' became problematic for the modernists insofar as they reject an alleged 'spirit in nature.' It is to be noted that the post-Nietzschean notion of nature as a source of amoral force can be seen as an example of a specifically disharmonious spirit in nature. Taylor states, "[…[a turn inward, to experience or subjectivity, didn't mean a turn to a *self* to be articulated […]. On the contrary, the turn inward may take us beyond the self as usually understood, to a fragmentation of experience which calls our ordinary notions of identity into question […] (SS 462). This is a new epiphany of modernity. Traditional views (ideals of disengaged reason and romantic fulfillment) regardless of their differences tried to find a unitary self. A cry to escape from such unitary identity is commonly seen in our

century. Post-modernism has contributed its own share to the same trend. In another view, criticisms of 'narrativity' have been developed in line with the new interpretation of 'time-consciousness and modes of narrativity associated with disengaged instrumental reason and Romanticism' (SS 463). Time is considered as a "homogeneous, empty time" by Benjamin.[379] For present purposes, quite what this means matters less than the conclusion Taylor draws from it and similar notions: "The modernist retrieval of experience thus involves a profound breach in the received sense of identity and time and series of reordering of a strange and unfamiliar kind." (SS 465). We may note that these changes also affected poetry, art and even our understanding of language itself. P.B. Shelley,[380] for example, evokes came up with the notion of 'subtler language'[381] which goes deeper than language as understood by Romanticism.

With these developments, only barely sketched, in mind, let us now look at the conflicts that follow upon them in modernity. Taylor begins with an nod to the most momentous of charges:

> […] theistic horizon is shattered, and sources can now be found on diverse frontiers, including our own powers and nature. […]. The disengaged view obviously leans heavily on our power of disengaged reason. […] Romantic or modernist views make more of our powers of creative imagination and generally draw on a much richer conception of nature. (SS 496)

And so there arise serious disagreements on 'constitutive goods.' Perhaps this is repeated with the failure of Communism, whereupon one can see another instance of disproving the belief that societies can be run by a *single principle.* Hence, Taylor argues, "Our challenge is actually to combine in some non-self-stultifying fashion a number of ways of operating, which are jointly necessary to a free and prosperous society." (MM 110). Disengaged rationality, instrumental reason, romantic modernism, utilitarianism, enlightenment

---

[379] Walter Benjamin (1892 - 1940) was a Jewish-German intellectual, who functioned variously as a literary critic, philosopher, sociologist, translator, radio broadcaster and essayist. His work, combining elements of historical materialism, German idealism and Jewish mysticism, has made enduring and influential contributions to aesthetic theory and Western Marxism, and has sometimes been associated with the Frankfurt School of critical theory. ("Walter Benjamin," in *Wikipedia* accessed June 20, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Walter_Benjamin).

[380] Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792 - 1822) was one of the major English Romantic poets, and is critically regarded among the finest lyric poets in the English language.

[381] *Subtler language*: Taylor borrows this term from P.B. Shelley.

naturalistic reductionism, atomistic individualism, hedonistic trends, deistic providential ordering, procedural approaches to self, expressivism and expressionism: these are all explicit examples of the fragmentation and conflict of modern identity. These sources are plural and the goods they offer are naturally 'constitutive.' Without simply rejecting modernity itself, Taylor tries to 'uncover buried goods' still to be found there. That said, he is far from uncritical about how to do this:

> If the highest ideals are the most potentially destructive, then maybe the prudent path is the safest, and we shouldn't unconditionally rejoice at the indiscriminate retrieval of empowering goods. A little judicious stifling may be part of wisdom." (SS 520).

Human beings live in their own 'iron cages' with their own views and visions. Certain malaises of modernities – individualism, instrumentalism, and a politics that comes from the two, have fragmented selves and societies.

How are we to frame an authentic self-identity in such a conflict-ridden context? Taylor says,

> What our situation seems to call for is a complex, many-leveled struggle, intellectual, spiritual, and political, in which the debates in the public arena interlink with those in a host of institutional settings, like hospitals and schools, where the issues of enframing technology are being lived through in concrete form; and where these disputes in turn both feed and are fed by the various attempts to define in theoretical terms the place of technology and the demands of authenticity, and beyond that, the shape of human life and its relation to the cosmos. (MM 120).

All of the foregoing points toward an effort to frame the possibility of defining and promoting an authentic holistic identity. We may expect to find the central aspects of this task within Taylor's *immanent frame.* Let us then seek some connections, but also essential dilemmas, in terms of Taylor's encounter with the modern secular age.

2.5. Modern Identity and Holistic[382] Identity

Let us concentrate on Taylor's notion of *Immanent Frame*, watching for some difficulties confronting his position but nonetheless seeking in it a model and basis for our reflection on *Holistic Identity.*

2.5.1. Concept of 'Secularity': A Conflicting Fresh Face of Modernity

Taylor's book *A Secular Age* is a good resource for retrieval of his 'Immanent Frame.' From the very outset, it is clear that Taylor understands secularity and secularization in three different dimensions/ways against the background of numerous one-sided and biased formulations. Still, his main focus is on the North-Atlantic World. With all the inarticulacy of what secularity is, Taylor presents his own understanding:

Secularity 1: **The expulsion of religion from the sphere of public life**. This is from the perspective of public spaces, which allegedly have been emptied of God or of any reference to ultimate reality. We function in various spheres of activity-economic, political, cultural, educational, professional, and recreational- in which the norms and principles we follow generally do not follow anything of the religious or the divine. The considerations we act on are internal to the *rationality* of each sphere-maximum gain within the economy that is the greatest benefit to the greatest number of political areas and so on. (SA 3). The US is a striking example this sort of secularity, as one might surmise from its model of "separation of Church and State."[383]

Secularity 2: The decline of religious belief and practice: In this sense, secularity consists in the falling off of religious belief and practice, in people turning away from God, and no longer going to any Church. In this sense, the countries of Western Europe have become mainly secular. Here the focus is on the condition of

---

[382] *Holism*: In philosophy, a number of methodological theses holding that the significance of the parts can only be understood in terms of their contribution to the significance of the whole and that the latter must therefore be epistemologically prior. ("Holism," in *The Free Dictionary* accessed June 16, 2011, www.thefreedictionary.com/holism.The opposite of holism is either reductionism or atomism.

[383] It is based on Jefferson's address to the Baptist Church in Connecticut. I have already offered more material of this sort in my first chapter.

belief. One is challenged by a sense that belief is only one option among others, and frequently not the easiest to embrace.

Secularity 3: The Modern Condition of the Human Agent: Most generally, the change Taylor wants to define and trace is one which takes us from a society in which it was *virtually impossible* not to believe in God, to one in which faith, even for the staunchest believer, is only one human possibility among others. Belief in God is no longer axiomatic. There are alternatives. "Secularity in this context is a matter of the whole context of understanding in which our moral, spiritual or religious experience and search takes place" (SA 3).

The predominant understanding and articulation of 'secularity' falls into the first and second category. But Taylor views it somewhat differently, and this third dimension of secularity suggests new insight into our modern identity, specifically within an immanent frame.

To bring Secularity 3 into view, one must call into question some of the presuppositions of the usual discussions of Secularity 1 and 2: namely, that "science" (or "rationality" or "modernity") has undermined the possibility of religious belief. According to Taylor:

> Christianity has always defined itself in relation to creedal statements. And secularism in the second sense has often been seen as the decline of Christian belief; and this is largely powered by the rise of other beliefs, in science, reason or by the deliverances of particular sciences (evolutionary theory or neuro-physiological). (SA 4).

And so he devotes much of his book to a history of the conditions that gave rise to Secularity 3. He argues that the Reformation, with its radical rejection of the monastic life and the demand of a kind of monastic discipline for everyone, is an explicit expression of the resistance of Christianity towards any form of change from its highly orthodox beliefs and practices. But later on, Protestantism itself comes into question first in 18th-century Deism and its attendant strong emphasis on Benevolence, and then in the 19th-century emergence of unqualified (secular) humanism with its emphasis on progress.

The variant forms of such trends can be seen in a number of different 'construals.' (1) One of the most prominent among them is Kant's "autonomy" where the power is within. The more we analyze this power, the more we become aware that it is within. Morality must be autonomous and not heteronomous, and hence the power of reason is to be exalted. (2) We have already examined the focus on 'nature' to find our own inner depths, such as is emphasized in Romanticism. We can recognize here the theories of immanence which emerge from the Romantic critique of disengaged reason, and most notably certain ecological ethics of our own times, particularly deep ecology. The rational mind has to open itself to something deeper and fuller. (3) A third variant is the Post-modern reflection on an alleged absence of fullness that is thought to signal a diminished worth for humanity, and a severely qualified capacity to truly make sense of our world (SA 8-10).

This and other developments produce shifts that are evident when we focus on certain fundamental distinctions; namely, between the immanent and the transcendent, and the natural and the supernatural. The condition of secularity in the 3rd sense thus has to be described in terms of the possibility or impossibility of certain kinds of experience in our age (SA 14). Yet all the three modes of secularity do refer to "religion." So Taylor dares to ask, what is religion? In the archaic society "Religion was everywhere?" Later on, we demarcated a set of beliefs, practices and institutions which exist under this title and were known as religions. A reading of religion in terms of immanent/transcendent is of great use here. The great invention of the West was that of an *immanent order* in Nature, whose working could be systematically understood and explained on its own terms, leaving open the question whether this whole order had a deeper significance and whether, if it did, we should infer a transcendent Creator beyond it. Taylor states,

> Every person, and every society, lives with or by some conception(s) of what human flourishing is: […] It is clear that in the Judeo-Christian religions the answer to this question is affirmative. Loving, worshipping God is the ultimate end. Of course, in this tradition God is seen as willing human flourishing, but devotion to God is not seen as contingent on this. The injunction "Thy will be done" is not equivalent to "Let humans flourish," even though we know that God wills human flourishing (SA 16-7).

Of course, Buddhism, for example, has another way to view this yet Buddhists do share a striving toward some flourishing beyond all illusion. Such a flourishing necessarily involves suffering or renunciation of at least certain sort of desire. We see this in the cases of Jesus and Buddha. God wills ordinary human flourishing, and a great part of what is reported in the Gospels consists in Christ making this possible for the people whose afflictions he heals. The call to renounce doesn't negate the value of flourishing; it is rather a call to center everything on God (SA 17). Now modernity with its secular emphasis, addresses 'human flourishing' in a different way. Taylor thinks

> […] that secularity is a condition in which our experience of and search for fullness occurs; and this is something we all share, believers and unbelievers alike. A secular age is one in which the eclipse of all goals beyond human flourishing becomes conceivable; or better, if it falls within the range of an imaginable life for masses of people (link between secularity and a self-sufficing humanism) (SA 20).

With this in mind, Taylor contends that our understanding of religion need not be only in terms of "transcendence". Whether one believes in some agency or power transcending the immanent order is indeed a crucial feature of "religion." But a richer understanding of the phenomena may be achieved by way of relating religion to a "beyond" in three dimensions: The crucial one is the sense that there is some good higher than beyond, human flourishing (*Agape* of Christianity). The second one is the notion of a higher power, the transcendent God of faith which appears in most definitions of religion. Thirdly, the Christian story of our potential transformation by *agape* requires that we see our life as going beyond the bounds of its "natural" scope between birth and death; our life extends beyond this life (SA 20). Taylor argues that one has to understand religion as combining these three dimensions of transcendence, and that this is often overlooked in the predominant debates that generally involve extreme positions. It is a misfortune of modern culture that a middle path is often difficult. Can we accept some sort of transcendence, and can we accept some sort of flourishing without its religious imports? These are questions of modern secular selves. Taylor's interest in his *secularity 3,* as against *secularity 1 and 2.* Secularity 3 sketches – or perhaps simply recognizes- new

conditions for belief. Yet he has no doubt that modernity brings about secularity in all of the three forms. Among the features of modernity he opposes is, chiefly, the trend leading toward unconvincing proclamation of the death of God. His particular interests, and enthusiasm, are for Latin Christendom, though not without acknowledging the fact that we do in a 'multiple modernity' context. Taylor is polemic about "subtraction stories" of modernity in general and secularity in particular.

2.5.2. Taylor's *Immanent Frame*

It is in his analysis of secularity 3 that Taylor defines what he calls the "Immanent Frame." The emergence of this 'Immanent Frame' against the predominantly 'Transcendent Frame' explains the history of secularity and the notions of unbelief and belief. Taylor assembles his immanent frame by *picking up* pieces from his foregoing discussions of a number of issues related to religion, cosmos, self, secularity, identity, authenticity, and the like.

We have also remarked on more than on occasion that according to Taylor, the development of individualism, instrumentalism and a combination of both in the political life of the people have contributed significantly to the process of secularization in the West. In short, he considers these three factors as 'malaises of modernity' (MM 1-12). Together, they leave the buffered self of disciplined individuality and instrumental reason in a constructed social space and a secular time. Precisely here, Taylor's holistic frame enables him to see important light:

> All of this makes up what I want to call "the immanent frame." There remains to add just one background idea: that this frame constitutes a "natural" order to be contrasted to a "supernatural" one, an "immanent" world, over against a possible "transcendent" one (SA 542).

Taylor has no doubt with regard to the distinction of the concepts 'immanent' and 'transcendent' as an achievement of the Latin Christendom. The idea of an enchanted world order goes with the sovereignty of God, as the transcendental reality. But the new order profoundly changed our self-understanding of ourselves (we

consider ourselves as buffered, disciplined and instrumental agents) and of society (as responsible agents, constituting societies designed for mutual benefit).[384] In a crucial development, the emergence of modern sciences gave theoretical form to the immanent order. Hence, the modern human agent began to understand him/herself without being connected to an 'outside' reality (Creator, Cosmos, and Community). People came together as secular agents in secular time and initiated new collective actions. And they come to understand their lives and activities as taking place in a self-sufficient immanent order which Taylor sees, properly, as a constellation of orders that are, in fact, which are cosmic, social or moral. (SA 542-543). This *immanentized* order is therefore like 'a plan without a planner' since individuals in this order does not reference God as the author of nature.[385] Does this eliminate the 'transcendent order'? Not necessarily. Taylor states:

> What I have been describing as the immanent frame is common to all of us in the modern West, or at least that is what I am trying to portray. Some of us want to live it as open to something beyond; some live it as closed. It is something which permits closure, without demanding it (SA 543-544).

Let us register this *something beyond* the 'immanent' order, which is 'openness' to the metaphysical and transcendental. Taylor gives us reason to understand it by way of two aspects or possibilities.

2.5.2.1. 'Open' Immanent Order

Taylor observes that the American people in particular have a "sense of something higher to aim at, some better or moral way of life that was indissolubly connected to God." In the present time this might be referred to the "civil religion," which has roots in the neo-Durkheimian[386] understanding of religion and civility. In any event, this designates an openness of human agents to a higher reality, even while being part of an 'immanent

---

[384] Taylor notices that these changes came out of the influences and impact of post-Galilean natural science and modern post-Baconian science. Bacon also thought of the goal of science is to "improve the condition of mankind."

[385] Major world religions believe that God is the creator of the universe. Christianity has an understanding the creator God as the One who designed the world as it is. This notion comes from the natural theology of St. Thomas Aquinas.

[386] A neo-Durkheimian social form is one in which religion is partially *disembedded* from the traditional social structure of kinship and village life, but comes to serve as an expression of a larger social identity, namely the newly emerging nation state in the West. The post-*Westphalian* regime of established churches—one realm, one church—is an example. And it is this regime that is closely related to the rise of modern nationalism, which may or may not shed its religious guise, but to which the churches in many ways remain oriented. ("Durkhein," in *Social Science Research* Council, accessed July 10, 2011, ssrc.org/Durkheim). More deeply, the influence of Providentialist and Deistic thinking can also be seen here.

order.' Here Taylor notices that this kind of distinction comes out of one's 'strong evaluations' on the basis of the 'qualitative distinctions' where some goods are incommensurable in comparison with others. His understanding of a 'hypergood' presiding over other goods is no doubt also formative for this analysis.

For those who are likened to God or to some ontically higher (transcendent) belief, these bases are obviously right and even undeniable. Religious openness has goods which are inconceivable without a God. This connection may be altered by another concept of 'highest good' or by certain factors or shifts on this immanent frame. Taylor states, "[…] experience might be construed differently, even though we go on feeling that the reference to God makes the best sense of it. Morality without God may be no longer inconceivable, even though still not fully credible for us." (SA 545). The conversion narratives of Pentecostalism, Black Muslims in the U.S.A., and other experiences of the Great Awakening and its successors depict people empowered by God or Christ, according to an order unlike what had previous been evident in the immanent order but which now exhibits a different stance of immanence.

Sometimes the 'collective good' of the people of a country or a locality seems 'consubstantial' with God, which in turn is essentially related to transcendence. As Taylor puts it, "This kind of consubstantiality is one, positive set of ways in which the immanent frame may be lived as inherently open to transcendence. But it may also be present for us negatively, as something whose lack we feel." (SA 545). It is interesting to observe that utilitarianism and other natural reductionists seem to have a very limited understanding of the immanent order. But Rousseau and Marx find a more radical and far reaching understanding of good within their immanent order, though they could not go beyond the natural and the social sciences. Some others have immanent orders at the cost of rejecting the moral order of equality and universal welfare. Taylor calls all these trends "immanent counter – Enlightenment." He writes, "As for the positive forms in which transcendence impinges, we see that they are connected to what we see as the highest good; they figure in the ethical or spiritual

dimensions"(SA 545-46). With all the modern immanent frames we have, we are still not *necessarily* or wholly modern, since we are nonetheless *open to something beyond.*

2.5.2.2. 'Closed' Immanent Order

As an open immanent order has a *consubstantial* relation to a 'transcendental' good, a closed immanent order has a 'consubstantial' relation to an *immanent* good. The orthodox belief and practice of religions is a danger for the goods of the modern moral order, or such has been the contention of Gibbon, Voltaire, and Hume. They argued,

> Strong Christianity will demand allegiance to certain theological beliefs or ecclesiastical structures, and this will split a society which should be intent simply on securing mutual benefit. Or else, the demand that we reach for some higher good, beyond human flourishing, at best will distract us, at worst will become the basis for demands which will again endanger the well-oiled order of mutual benefit" (SA 546).

This extreme manner of understanding religion as a source of fanaticism is one great source for the *closure of immanence.* Taylor sees a range of movements like this – clericalism, rejection of Christianity, and atheism which can also take other forms. In the case of Protestantism, they rejected Catholic asceticism and blamed monks for rejecting the gifts of God in the name of a bogus higher vocation. Taylor sees it as "one of the deep sources of the moral attraction of immanence, even materialism" (SA 547). Instead of being part of nature and everything in it, we try to be 'inhuman' by our particular believing. There is something mysterious in the nature to which we belong. We want to explore it. Taylor is sharply critical of how modern mechanistic trends would have us look past this:

> The mechanical outlook which splits nature from supernature voids all this mystery. This split generates the modern concept of "miracle"; a kind of punctual hole blown in the regular order of things from outside, that is, from the transcendent. Whatever is higher must thus come about through the holes pierced in the regular, natural, order, within whose normal operation there is no mystery (SA 547).

Taylor sees that there are things shared by materialists and Christian fundamentalists. One can see the tension in the materialist discourse here. While they emphasize the 'scientific' they fail to see the 'mysterious.' Any closed immanent order might have to deal with this sort of "punctual intervention interrupting a regular order." But the tremendous growth of natural sciences empowers the attempts at closure of the immanent order. For Taylor, the mindset seems to cultivate its own expression:

> […] a single-minded focus on the human good, aided by the fuller and fuller use of scientific reason, permits the greatest flourishing possible of human beings. Religion not only menaces these goals with its fanaticism, but it also undercuts reason, which comes to be seen as rigorously requiring scientific materialism (SA 548).

2.5.2.3. 'Cross-Pressured' Orientations of Immanent Order

Here Taylor speaks of another range of people who are "pressured" by both the 'open' and 'closed' immanent frames. On the one hand they want to be "scientific," on the other hand they want to be "spiritual" or "believing" in the openness of religions to a highest Good/God. Taylor sees Victor Hugo[387] as an example for this kind of orientation. About this group, and its lessons, he observes:

> What emerges from all this is that we can either see the transcendent as a threat, a dangerous temptation, a distraction, or an obstacle to our greatest good. Or we can read it as answering to our deepest craving, need, and fulfillment of the good. Or else, since religion has very often been the first: think of the long line that from Aztec sacrifice, through Torquemada, to Bin Laden; the question really is whether it is only threat, or doesn't also offer a promise (SA 549).

Are we free of these pressures? Do we see a common space where we feel the winds pulling us? Do we have times in which we all believe and other times we do not? In reality, one or another of these beliefs takes on our immanent frame – open, closed or cross-pressured. Unlike the predominant one-sided reading of the immanent order, Taylor insists forcefully on nuance, complexity and fluidity. Of course, he is certainly aware of the 'natural' reading of the immanent frame, which is most prominent in academia:

---

[387] Victor-Marie Hugo (1802 – 1885) was a French poet, playwright, novelist, essayist, visual artist, statesman, human rights activist and exponent of the Romantic Movement in France. In France, Hugo's literary fame comes first from his poetry but also rests upon his novels and his dramatic achievements.

The sense that this reading is natural, logically unavoidable, underpins the power of the mainstream secularization theory, the view that modernity must bring secularity into its train that I have been arguing against here (SA 550).

Taylor's position appears to answer to Max Weber's[388] vision of tension in those who still believe even in the face of "disenchantment." Taylor cites, "To the person who cannot bear the fate of the times like a man, one must say: may he rather return silently [...] The arms of the Churches are open widely and compassionately for him."(SA 550).

One can read immanent frame from any point of view. There need not be any compulsion from any side. Usually people are influenced by the general sense of things. Taylor would suggest that we be freed from the ideological distortions and blindness of any sort, to read immanent frames without any bias. There is a tendency to understand "faith" only in the theistic religious sense of the term. But Taylor argues that "it refers to a crucial feature of our over-all sense of things, namely the personal relation of trust and confidence in God, rather than to our motives for taking this stance. It describes the *content* of our position, not the *reasons* for it"(SA 550). Taylor emphasizes the "Jamesian open space"(SA 592) and call attention to "the spins" by which one avoids that space, instead preferences to think that "one's reading is obvious, compelling, allowing of no cavil or demurral" (SA 551). Cramped by this or that powerful readings one might even be unable to see the important aspects of reality. "I want to argue that those who think the closed reading is 'natural' and obvious are suffering from this kind of disability" (SA 551). Of course, the same can be accused of those who favor exceptionally "open readings." Taylor is sure that such people enjoy intellectual hegemony as much as their opponents do.

---

[388] Max Weber (1864 – 1920) was a German sociologist and political economist who profoundly influenced social theory, social research and the discipline of sociology itself. Weber's major works dealt with the rationalization and "disenchantment "that he associated with the rise of capitalism and modernity.

2.5.3.   History of CWSs (Closed World Structures) and Closure of Transcendence

Taylor calls the result of a forced 'secularist spin' on history and its articulations, *closed world structures* (CWS). He identifies three broad categories of CWS. "All CWS may be illegitimate, and yet there may be nothing beyond the immanent frame. […] just trying to dissipate the false aura of the obvious that surrounds one of these" (SA 551). They are: a) World Structures; b) World-types (Ideal Types); c). Intellectualization. Taylor considers them as different "pictures" which "hold us captive."[389] He is interested to demonstrate how these structures and conceptions are closed to transcendence. They all arise in an immanent frame but each of them has a certain twist or spin, not primarily as a theoretical move but rather in response to, or even on the basis of certain deep pictures.

Taylor thinks, for example, that such CWSs are operative in modern epistemology. He complains about the "overturn of the priority relations of epistemology." Reading through a Heideggerian lens, he states that, "There is no priority of the individual's sense of the self over the society; our most primordial identity is as a new player being inducted into an old game" (SA 559). Yet Descartes, Locke, and Hume gave priority to individual pictures, with emphasis on independence, disengagement and reflexivity. All these take us to a neutral point of view where 'transcendence' is problematic. Now their views have nonetheless assumed some values of their own in the course of time. Coming to the point, Taylor observes that, "the CWS in a sense 'naturalizes' a certain view on things"(SA 560). What he has in mind is not some process by which the natural would be 'socially constructed', but rather by which what is taken as natural is in fact a constructed picture of it. This process reinvents and recreates human identity, and those who fall into it are unable to see any alternatives. Taylor states, "The naturalizing emerges in a kind of narration they proffer of their genesis, which

---

[389] Taylor borrows these expressions from Wittgenstein. *Philosophical Investigations (*para 115).

I want to call a "subtraction story"[390] (SA 560). In order to delve deeper into this idea, Taylor takes up more examples. A great deal of the CWS from history centers mainly on the "death of God"[391] story. Reflecting further on the development of this narration, Taylor discovers that there are essentially two orders which served the emergence of this condition: the deliverance of science and the shape of contemporary moral experiences. The claims of science and its narration, is the most powerful CWS and established materialism. From its perspective, any claim for some form of 'transcendence' is a flight from reality for those sects of people. For many who held this view, "religion emanates from a childish lack of courage. We need to stand up like men, and face reality" (SA 561). Taylor sees a similar sort of accusation on religion by the Enlightenment thinkers. They considered religion a 'terrible self-mutilation.' All of these strands of 'unbelief' go easily together with modern exclusive humanism. Here, the rational mind is led to believe itself independent of any 'moral convictions.' Taylor sees a disconnect between the materialist science and the humanist affirmation of 'benevolence.' For him, it seems "full of holes." The scientific-epistemic-moralistic packages have power in our ethical predicament as 'beings capable of forming beliefs' (SA 562). Taylor states,

> This whole construal of our ethical predicament becomes more plausible. The attraction of the new moral ideal is only part of this, albeit an important one. What was also crucial was a changed reading of our own motivation, wherein the desire to believe appears now as childish temptation. Since all incipient faith is childish in an obvious sense, and (in the Christian case) only evolves beyond this by being child-like in the Gospel sense, this (mis) reading is not difficult to make (SA 563).

The modern claim of "ethics of belief" which creeps into modern secularity is not convincing; rather, it makes belief itself problematic and difficult, and full of doubts. As for the immanent frame itself, one can open it to

---

[390] Taylor uses the expression, 'subtraction story' in his book *A Secular Age*. Basically, subtraction stories amount to the removal of something - namely in the case of a secular age, religion - by asserting that something else came along to take its place – namely in the case of a secular age, the Enlightenment point of view, which privileged the scientific and rationalistic points of view. These points of view held that man, through the power of his reason, and through the methods of science could learn all there is to know about reality. Thus, religion, itself being an account of reality, would be unnecessary. Indeed, proponents of the Enlightenment predicted the demise of religion (SA 22)

[391] *Death of God* (subtraction story): The view that the conditions have arisen in the modern world in which it is impossible, honestly, rationally, without confessions or fudging, or mental reservation, to believe in God. This is to say that there is practically nothing possible beyond the range of human happiness and potentialities.

transcendence, or close it with their own CWS (and allied subtraction stories and pictures for which he/she can get a great deal of help from the modern, secular and humanistic packages).

2.5.4. A Holism of Immanence and Transcendence

Taylor's narration of immanence and transcendence yields an integral account of modern human identity that I call a *Holistic Identity*[392] at the point where the immanent order and its frames are considered together with an *openness* to transcendence. Our holistic identity might be 'cross-pressured' too. But there can be no question of a complete *closure* of transcendence. Now Taylor's conception of 'holism' mainly appears in contrast to 'atomism' and 'reductionism.' Atomistic emphasis is on 'methodological individualism,' whereas the emphasis of 'holism' may be considered as 'collectivism.' Taylor says,

> We could describe the positions on this scale as more or less individualistic and collectivistic. […] different conception of the good life espoused by individuals […] and those who believe that democratic society needs some commonly recognized definition of the good life" (PA 182).

Taylor describes this in his deliberation on 'liberals' and 'communitarians'. Referring to Michael Sandel's book *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice,* Taylor states that "both atomists and holists live together in a society, are linked with different understanding of self and identity: 'unencumbered" versus situated selves." (PA 182). But Taylor also notices the impossibility of such a link since the highly holistic or collectivistic would be hard to combine with an unencumbered identity or a highly individualistic life (Taylor's buffered self) where selves are thickly situated.

---

[392] Description of a reality need not be exclusive of it possible dimensions. Natural sciences explain reality from specifically of perceptual experiences. This is only one kind of experience and its explanation, where explanations cannot be given in terms of single factors (beliefs, desires, and so on) but only in terms of whole systems of such factors interrelated in complex ways. However, the elaboration of the features that identify holistic explanations as such can be debated. Christopher Peacocke, *Holistic Explanation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

Taylor profoundly agrees with Robert Brandon's[393] 'devastating critique' of atomism where he joins with the *holism* of Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty, who insist on a primacy of our *whole grasp of things*. A similar kind of holistic approach can be traceable in Kant's understanding of the transcendental unity of apperception over the elementary bits. Taylor also endorses this *multidimensional holism* by which Wittgenstein and others ultimately related back to Kant, Hegel and Merleau-Ponty. (DC 39-40). Here he places emphasize on the importance of pre-concepts to have a grasp of any concept. A new frame emerges in relation to a previous one. The false thesis of a total break from history and social ties to construct a modern identity is the site of considerable weakness in the one-sided approaches of our times.[394] In his frequent arguments for 'constitutive goods', Taylor identifies and uses resources from any number of the historical frames (e.g., theistic, rational and romantic) as the sources of a rich and well-defined modern identity. In his view, this 'multidimensional holism,' together with its essential 'openness' to 'transcendence,' is unavoidable for the new modern identity that is in the making. For my part, I argue that Taylor's constant emphasis on an "open" immanent order and persistent critique of atomism and natural reductionism, suggests that he embraces the *normativity* of 'transcendence' of some kind. Whether theistic, moralistic, romantic or a hypergood).

What does it mean to be a member of a community, and how do the community or communities in which a person lives play a role in the constitution of that person's identity? How and why does one need to have an openness to *transcendence,* and does that supposedly will make a better frame for self-identity? These concerns are particularly evident in philosophy and not only in the debate in political philosophy between communitarians of both the Left (Taylor) and Right (MacIntyre) and liberal theorists (Rawls). Philosophers of

---

[393] Robert N. Brandon (Ph.D. 1979, Harvard) joined the Duke Faculty in fall of 1979. He holds a joint appointment in Philosophy and Biology. He has published articles in "Philosophy of Science, Studies," in *History and Philosophy of Science*, Biology and Philosophy. His latest work is *Concepts and Methods in Evolutionary Biology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

[394] Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Inoperative Community*, ed. Peter Connor, trans. Peter Connor, Lisa Garbus , Michael Holland, and Simona Sawhney (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 18. The Being of the finite being exposes it to the end of the Being. Hence, Jean-Luc Nancy argues that the "inner experience" of Bataille speak is in no way "interior" or "subjective," but is indissoluable and of the experience of the incommensurable outside." (17- 18). To be exposed' means to be 'posed' in exteriority, according to an exteriority, having to do with an outside in the very intimacy of an inside.

language, following the lead of either Habermas or Wittgenstein have invoked the idea of community in order

to better explain linguistic use and meaning. For all of that, let us not forget that a concern with community is

not limited to philosophy. In an age of increasing individual isolation, people feel the need to belong to some

kind of community with which they can identify.

From the context of the 'malaises of modernity' Taylor thus emerges with a 'multidimensional holism.'[395] I

argue that Tailor's holistic dimension can be compared to his 'moral space' where a self discovers his/her

identity in 'dialogical' self-exploration. Taylor says

> […] the claim is that living within such strongly qualified horizons is constitutive of human agency,
> that stepping outside these limits would be tantamount to stepping outside what we would recognize
> as integral, that is, undamaged human personhood (SS 27)

This is stated as against the reductive thesis of the 'disengaged rationality.' His *moral space* is a 'holistic'

horizon of moral sources. For a holistic or integral modern self-identity we need the appropriate 'fusion of

horizons':

> To know who I am is a species of knowing where I stand. My identity is defined by the commitments
> and identifications which provide the frame or horizon within which I can try to determine from case
> to case what is good, or valuable, or what ought to be done, or what I endorse or oppose. In other
> words, it is the horizon within which I am capable of taking a stand. (SS 27)

2.5.5.   Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions

The moral space of holistic identity has a horizontal dimension and a vertical dimension. This becomes explicit

late in *A Secular Age:*

> I want to examine the illusion of the rational "obviousness" of the closed perspective. My aim is to
> explore the constitution in modernity of what I will call "closed" or "horizontal" worlds. I mean by
> this shapes of our "world" (in Heidegger's sense, that is, the "world" in its meaning for us) which
> leave no place for the "vertical" or "transcendent," but which in one way or another close these off,
> render them inaccessible, or even unthinkable (SA 556).

---

[395] According to my analysis, Taylor uses this term to indicate the multifaceted dimensionality of the self-identity. Different parts of
reality comprise one reality. From numerous historical sources, we have come to an age in which we recognize our own identity and
the identity of the other. This has come about through a dialectical process of self-exploration and self-incorporation.

Taylor considers the modern narratives of self-identity as 'constitutive' of the self-identity which he envisages. Yet he finds unacceptable the modernists claim of rational disengagement and rational autonomy, with an accent on complete 'closure' of a vertical (transcendent) opening. In a sense, the whole Taylor's later work can be taken as an argument for the importance of horizontal frames and vertical frames, subtly and richly defined, in the formation of an integral/holistic modern identity. Needless to say, his analysis of CWS[396] are examples of the horizontal articulations of self- identity. (SA 551-592). But they all fall short in the absence of a 'human flourishing' or 'moving forward' which is the determining force of all those horizontal approaches. According to Taylor, vertical openness to 'transcendence' is a substantial dimension of any conception of self-identity. This verticality can be theistic openness to God, but also, for example, an ultimate ethical principle.

While most of the modern thinkers apparently claim to have achieved their own self-identity and authenticity, Taylor's self-exploration continues to another level of articulation where he emphasizes the importance of transcendence together with immanence, community together with self-identity, and dialogue with monologue. It is not a finished product, as indeed his own life continues with new discoveries and shifting and improving views. In future work, or in future experience, he will surely explore new horizons of modern identity, authenticity and transcendence.

Conclusion

Taylor's understanding of diversity-authenticity-holistic identity has unraveled numerous aspects of the human self-authenticity and its interaction with politics and religion. My re-reading of Gandhi in the following chapter has its main focuses on how Gandhi in his own way had similar ideas as Taylor has and how Gandhi contributed perhaps to some areas of self's search for authenticity which are either absent or very vaguely

---

[396] His analysis and extensive description of CWSs (Closed World Structures), IDs (Intellectual Deviation Stories), MMOs (Modern Moral Orders), and RMNs (Reform Master Narratives) are examples of the horizontal articulations on self-identity. (SA 551-592; 773-776; 159-171,184-185; 773-776).

present/latent in Taylor's works. Here there is no need of putting them into a competition or attempt at a hair-splitting comparison rather one can analyze them for mutually enriching our integrated perspective of modern self. I do this by asking the basic question: Being an Asian, Am I an 'outsider' to Taylor's project which he conceived out of the North-Atlantic understanding of diversity-authenticity-holistic identity? With all his elaboration Taylor admits that he is not competent to 'engage' with the non-western world. Can I use Gandhi as a companion for Taylor, to bring Taylor's modern philosophical insights into the   South Asian Context? Why the 'grant narrative' of Taylor is not rampantly accepted by the predominant West? Probably he is missing something? Does Taylor has access to the core of religion as Gandhi did to bring the 'magic' into the modern world? (cf. Habermas article "What is missing?"). Even "master narratives" like that of Taylor's can be a mere intellectual (instrumental) exercise. Taylor uses Akeel's term "re-enchantment" for a remaking of religion and self does not seem to propose of sound method for its realization. Perhaps the way Taylor wants to re-engage with society, nature and religion could be done better with the model of Gandhi's engagement and disengagement. I see a resistance and reluctance of the Taylor's self to fully engage in to religious and cultural realities which I do not see in Gandhi. 'Godless delusion' of Taylor still gives an ambiguity of the importance of religion in the secular age, though he wants the self to endorse the goods from it. Taylor's reaffirmation of a moral ontology for the modern world is a positive inspiration for the reader. Still where can we find such a moral ontology and how can we find basis for it – I think Gandhi answers them better.

CHAPTER 3: DIVERSITY-AUTHENTICITY-HOLISTIC IDENTITY: GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

As I noted near the end of the first chapter on *Indian secularism*, in this third chapter I now demonstrate how my reading of Charles Taylor has given me new insights for my re-reading of Gandhi for a relevant and alternative understanding of modern moral identity beyond the North Atlantic context to which Taylor restricts himself. Gandhi was an important spiritual and political figure for many decades. Here my focus is not on his honorific titles like *Mahatma (Great soul), Father of the Nation,* and spiritual icon. Rather, I selectively read, analyze and understand him as a philosopher, a politician and a moral person, with a view to bringing out his notions of self-identity, diversity, authenticity, and holistic identity.

Does Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi offers something substantial to our understanding of modern moral identity? Is his understanding of the self and identity still relevant or is it already obsolete? Are there any compelling areas in common to Gandhi and Charles Taylor, who are undoubtedly some of the most prominent names in the modern debates on moral identity? These questions are considered in this chapter. My research on the Western *evolution of secularism* and Taylor's *narrative* of it has led me to read Gandhi's work in a new way. When I read Gandhi and see his testimony from a Taylorian perspective, I see numerous points of convergence which provide ample possibilities for a comparative reading. Still, my primary purpose is not to bring them together, though that is to some degree inevitable, but rather to demonstrate how relevant and necessary it is to bring back Gandhi's thinking and to do so by way of Taylor to our modern debates concerning identity. Even a cursory reading of my previous chapter (Ch.2) on Taylor will definitely make the reading of this chapter (Ch.3) more understandable and relatable to the North Atlantic context; and indeed it should make a good number of important connections unmistakable. Here I wish to bring out how those *frames* with which Taylor has been so much concerned are in a similar way, or at least in some way, firmly present in

Gandhi. In both Taylor and Gandhi there is a deep phenomenology and epistemology of morality that is explicit, together with an opening toward a theology/spirituality that is only implicit in Taylor but rather *explicit* in Gandhi. In short, some of what is in many respects ideally/theoretically in Taylor is realistically/practically evident in Gandhi. My final chapter has expounded these aspects (*cf*. Ch. 4.1.2.).

In proposing to construct a notion of modern identity faithful to Gandhi's vision, I present his understanding of the self together with its diverse dimensions and approaches. Then I bring to light Gandhi's conception of authenticity, and argue for modern moral identity as a holistic and harmonious one demonstrated by the identity conceived, and to a greater extent lived, by Gandhi. Taylor's *immanent frame* is holistic in frame and nature. Gandhi's holistic approach and perspective seems to have everything of the *immanent frame* of Taylor together with a harmonious synchronization in his own life with a *transcendental opening.*[397]

3.1. Human Self: A Gandhian Understanding

Gandhi's understanding of the human self is basically as an *agent - embodied, dialogical* and *engaged.* Here I make no claim that Gandhi had such an explicit understanding of the self in his writings and life. But I do argue that there are enough resources to make such a claim if we re-read Gandhi partly from the perspective of Taylor. I also argue that Taylor's frame of the human self has most of the aspects which we identify in Gandhi's life and writings. Still, Gandhi's self can be considered predominantly as a *porous self*, and thus might not have the *buffered* aspect as understood by Taylor. Still, since an over emphasis on *buffered self* is presented as problematic by Taylor. There is good reason to seek a connection between the two precisely in their resistance to this. Furthermore, in the respective explorations of the different dimensions of human self, I would argue, both Gandhi and Taylor resort to narrative. Both think that the human self cannot be understood

---

[397] Taylor's emphasizes the open-immanent frame as a viable approach to modern moral identity. Gandhi's openness to the Truth, I argue, is in basic argument with this "opening" that Taylor has in view (*cf*. Ch. 2, section on "Open-Immanent Frame.").

without taking into account everything inside and outside the human self. Both Gandhi and Taylor would ultimately agree on the fact that the human self has substantial moral sources, besides being religious, natural, cultural, historical, political, rational and emotional.

As I have shown, Taylor's narration of the genealogy of the modern self appeals to building blocks from the ancient, medieval, modern and contemporary periods of North Atlantic culture. We find broad similarity in Gandhi's approach, which has been influenced by the general Indian understanding of the self, in the making of his own concept and the idea of a human self. I present his influence of the Indian understanding of self before I deal with his own specific understanding of the self.

3.1.1. The Gandhian Understanding of the Self

In exploring Gandhi's understanding of on the human self, perhaps one must to concentrate on the concepton of *Bhagavat Gita* since that is his most beloved book. And indeed, it is possible to trace a relatioship between the Gandhian concept of self and *Gita's* explication of self. The tripartrite understanding of person as the one who knows, feels and acts – *jnata, bhakta*, and *karta* - repeatedly appear in many Indian texts, including the *Bhagavat Gita*.[398] In his commentary on the *Gita* Gandhi thus states,

> Right knowledge is necessary for attaining renunciation. Learned men possess a knowledge of a kind. They may recite the Vedas from memory, yet they may be steeped in self-indulgence. In order that knowledge may not run riot, the author of the Gita has insisted on devotion accompanying it and has given it the first place. Knowledge without devotion will be like a misfire. Therefore, says the Gita, "Have devotion, and knowledge will follow." This devotion is not mere lip worship, it is a wrestling with death. (GAG 129-130).[399]

Of course, this does not exempt Gandhi from clarifying the relation of self at a somewhat more anthropological or even psychological level. Let me follow his conception of body and soul (*atman* and *dehin*), as they

---

[398] Other than *Gita*, Upanishads like *Prasna* (4,9), Maitri (3.2-3) clearly considers *purusha* (man) or atman (self) as an agent (*karta*).

[399] Mahatma Gandhi, *The Gospel of Selfless Action or The Gita According to Gandhi*, trans. Mahadev Desai (Ahmedabad: Navajevan Publishing House, 1946), 129. (Henceforth: GAG and provided within the body of the text. Occasionally together with page numbers, Discourse numbers and section numbers are also given).

eventually unfold into his aspects of self as active and embodied. This will open the way to an understanding of whereupon the influence of the Gandhian self as an agent. The Gandhian self as an agent can be seen as having three aspects/dimensions, which are influenced by *The Bhagawad Gita.* They are: self as an actor/server (*karta)*, self as a knower (*jnata*), and self as a devotee (*bhokta*).

3.1.2.1. Dimensions of Self: *Dehin* and *Atman* (Body and Soul)

It is not easy to reach a distinctive understanding of these two terms in the large and complex range of Indian writings and traditions. On this issue, the Vedantic tradition divides into two main positions: *dvaita (dualism)* and *advaita (non-dualism).* However, it is again seen in different variations like *radical dualism, radical monism,* and so on. Being aware of this profusion of positions, Gandhi can be seen as taking a middle position between monism and dualism. Parel observes that,

> Such a course (a position between dualism and monism) seems to be required for the very intelligibility of self-rule or *swaraj.* On the assumption of the radical dualism or separation, self would not be ruling over self, but over something alien or external (or else be ruled by something alien). On the assumption of radical monism or coincidence, by contrast, the aspect of rule or rulership vanishes from the view. The issue thus hinges on the character of the rule excercised by self over self- where "rule" denote a kind of bridge between or link mediating between *atman* and *dehin.*[400]

It is here that one must return to *The Gita.* It is commonly recognized that *The Gita* also takes a sort of middle path between monism and dualism when it deals with *atman* and *dehin*. The dualism of spirit (*purusha*) and matter (*prakriti*) is proposed by the *Samkhya* School of thinking,[401] then eventually leads to a fusion of the human with the divine in *The Gita*. In the process of fusion the finite human being (*dehin)* merges into the divine (*atman*). The basic teaching of *The Gita* proposes a delineation of the various *yogas* or *margas,* by

---

[400] Anthony Parel, ed. *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule* (New York: Lexington Books: 2000), 110. (Henceforth: Parel, *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule*).

[401] *Samkhya* school of thinking proposes a dualistic theory that the universe is made of two independent realities – *purusha* (spirit or consciousness) and *prakriti* (matter). In the case of human beings these two are bonded together through *desire.* The end of this bondage is *Moksa*. After liberation there is no distinction.

which the finite human self is somehow expected to have reconciliation with the divine (*dehin* with *atman*).[402]

Gandhi drew inspiration from *The Gita* to define his path to the fusion as *karma yoga* (path of action). For his part, Gandhi considered body and mind as a composite and emphasized the importance of both. In his *Constructive Programme* he states,

> *Mens sana in corpore sane* (a sound mind in a sound body)[403] is perhaps the first law for humanity. A healthy mind in a healthy body is a self-evident truth. There is an inevitable connection between mind and body. If we were in possession of healthy minds, we would shed all violence and, naturally obeying the laws of health, we would have healthy bodies without an effort. (CP Section on "Education in Health and Hygene.").[404]

This focus on physical health is of course a key to Gandhi's conception of the embodied self (a conception which, broadly speaking, Taylor defends in his own way).

3.1.2.2. *Dehin*: Embodied Self

For Gandhi, the self is basically an embodied self which engages and feels with nature and society. The Sanskrit for this is *dehin* which means having body, living self, coporeal, living creature, and the spirit or soul enveloped in the body.[405] In his commentary on *The Gita* Gandhi states,

> This renunciation is the central sun, round which devotion, knowledge and the rest revolve like planets. The body has been likened to a prison. There must be action where there is body. Not one embodied being is exempted from labour. And yet all religions proclaim that it is possible for man, by treating the body as the temple of God, to attain freedom. Every action is tainted, be it ever so trivial. How can the body be made the temple of God? In other words how can one be free from action, i.e. from the taint of sin? The Gita has answered the question in decisive language: "By desireless action; by renouncing fruits of action; by dedicating all activities to God, i.e., by surrendering oneself to Him body and soul." (GAG 129).

---

[402] Parel, *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule*, 110.

[403] The phrase is derived from *Satire X* of the Roman poet Juvenal. Actually the phrase is but one element of a more fulsome answer to the question of what it is that is desirable in life.

[404] Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, *Constructive Programme,* in *Wikilivres* section on "Education in Health and Hygiene" accessed on June, 15, 2011, http://wikilivres.info/wiki/Constructive_Programme. (Henceforth: CP, Section).

[405] *Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages* by Sir Monier Monier-Williams, MA., KCIE (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas Publishers Private Limited, 1899), 497.

Having a body itself will mean that the self experiences or feels everything happening around it. Gandhi's e*xperiments with Truth,* developed openly in his *Autobiography.* The importance of physical and bodily existence and thus an aspect of embeddedness is necessary for Gandhi's *experiments.* Douglas Allen states, "Although Gandhi expressed faith in eternal truth, he always reminded himself and his followers that finite beings could only know finite truths."[406] This dimension of Gandhi's vision has not received the attention it deserve, notwithstanding a vast literature on his works. Most of the literature on him concentrates on his his relation to transcendental aspects of religion and morality. But in reality, the the *great soul (Mahatma)* recognizes considerable importance for his embodied existence. This is difficult to miss in his vows of celibacy, vegetarianism, fasting, and experiments with sexuality, all of which attend to an essential embodiment in the pursuit of discipline. In that respect, and without denying his suspicion of the body, one might even propose that discipline of the body and a concern for purity and health is the *only* way to achieve real *swaraj, ahimsa, satyagraha,* and *satya (Truth).* For Gandhi, "It is impossible for unhealthy people to win *swaraj* (self-rule). Therefore we should no longer be guilty of the neglect of the health of our people."(CWMG 72:380).[407]He continues to again say as follows:

> It is easier to conquer the entire world thant to subdue the enemies in our body. And, therefore, for the man who suceeds in this conquest, the former will be easy enough. The self-government which you, I and all others have to attain is in fact this. Need I say more? The point of it all is that you can serve the country only with this body. (CWMG 15: 43).

Of course, scholars have long noted Gandhi's obsession with celibacy, diet, and health, but they have tended to regard these as incidental to his overall political and moral philosophy or as requiring another level of interpretation. As opposed to this, Joseph S. Alter, sets out to offer a reevaluation of Gandhi and his place in

---

[406] Douglas Allen, ed. *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi for 21ˢᵗ Century* (New York: Lexington Books, 2008), 133. (Henceforth: Allen, *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*).
[407] This section is on "Implications of Constructive Program" dated 1940.

Indian history precisely through "what Gandhi said and did with regard to sex, food, and nature cure."[408] His attempt at rehabilitating the significance of the embodied agency of Gandhi is consistent with my claim that Gandhi and Taylor can be read simultaneously to give a deeper narrative of the embodied existence of modern self. Gandhi's sense of the importance of the relationship among bodily discipline, power/knowledge, and truth apparently gives a deeper narrative of an embodied self than does Taylor's account of the embodied/engaged self. I would even expect that Taylor will eventually agree with Gandhi's understanding of the body and its importance, since Taylor fears that the danger of reductionism and individualism of modernity negatively affects the modern embodied self.[409]

For present purpose, we may concentrate on the somatic-bodily dimension of Gandhi's understanding of emobodyment, and its biomoral implications. Naturally, this easily becomes complicated. One is quickly led into a debate over his sexual life, his attitude toward women, and so on. Those aspects can definitely be controversial. One might also be tempted, with some scholars, to distinguish his approach to *satyagraha(truth force)* from his preoccupation with diet, fasting, sex, celibacy, and hygiene. [410] My concern is neither to resolve such issues nor even to get into the details of them. Rather, I just want to focus on the fundamental importance of the *embodied existence of the self*, as a basic dimension of Gandhi's conception of human life and action. This means taking quite seriously even some works that can appear quite mundane, such as his *General*

---

[408] Joseph S. Alter, *Gandhi's Body: Sex, Diet, and the Politics of Nationalism* (*Critical Histories*) (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), xi. (Henceforth: Alter, *Gandhi's Body*).

[409] I have explained in my second chapter (see 2.1) where I have concentrated on Taylor's understanding of the human self/person.

[410] The difficulty of understanding Gandhian integration of the physical and psychological has lead a number of scholars to write on such a synthesis. Erikson (1969); Kakar (1990); Nandy (1980, 1983) address Gandhi's life from the perspective of the psychoanalytic and symbolic interpretations. Sudhir Kakar provides an appropriate psychoanalytic reading of Gandhi's sexuality. See his book *Intimate Relations* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990)

Knowledge About Health (reprinted as *The Health Guide* in 1965) in which evident concerns for bodily health presuppose a connection that we are emobodied being.[411]

3.1.2.2.1. The Physical Body and the Role of Fasting, Vegetarianism, and *Brahmacharya* (Celibacy)

Gandhi assigned tremendous importance to his own physical body. Fasting, Vegetarianism and celibacy are candidly physical/bodily with respect to his interest in harmonizing the mind and soul. Nehru was a strong critic of Gandhi for using "religious" methods like fasting in political life. However, Gandhi's fasting was not just an abstaining from food, and not only political but had more fundamental roots. He said, "A fast to be true must be accompanied by a readiness to receive pure thoughts and determination to resist all Satan's temptations." (HD 103).[412] In his Autobiography he connects this to a specific path and higher goal – desire for truth (*satyagraha*).

> As a *satyagrahi* I knew that I might not fast against them, but ought to leave them free to be influenced not on account of a lapse of the mill-hands' strike alone. My fast was undertaken not on account of them but […] I felt I had a share. (MET 360).

Gandhi felt a *duty* to fast for genuine causes and this expresses the inner current of his link between religion and politics. What of his commitment to vegetarianism? Gandhi was not only himself a pure vegetarian, but also was a great proponent of it. The vow of *Brahmacharya* (celibacy) is another aspect of Gandhi's life which is explicitly a reality of his embodied existence. He claimed that observance of the vow leads to the realization of the ultimate reality (Brahman). He observes,

> Every day of the vow has taken me nearer the knowledge that in *Brahmacharya* lies the protection of the body, the mind and the soul. For *Brahmacharya* was now no process of hard penance, it was a matter of consolation and joy. Everyday revealed a fresh beauty in it. (MET 174).

---

[411] Gandhi's *The Health Guide* was first published in South Africa. Gandhi was influenced by many biological theories on moral norms. Bureau and Hare were prominent among them. Moreover, Henry Salt's *Plea for Vegetarianism* (1886); Howard Williams's *Ethics of Diet* (1883) and Anna Kingsford's *Perfect Way in Diet* (1881) influenced him one way or another.

[412] Mahatma Gandhi, *Hindu Dharma* (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1950), 103. (Henceforth: HD).

I will expand on these notions – fasting, vegetarianism, and *Brahmacharya* – later. For now, let us simply note that they are major, even dominant features of Gandhi's life and way, and presuppose a deep commitment to human life as embodied. We may proceed from here to the question of action or agency. On this point, we can distinguish in Gandhi's work three dimensions: of acting, knowing and devoting.

3.1.2.3. Self-Governance or Self-rule (*Swaraj*): Self as an Agent

Here again we find the deep influence of *the Gita*. For Gandhi, as for *the Gita*, the self as an agent rules himself/herself. This is developed in close association with expression such as *soul-force* or *love-source.* In *Hind Swaraj* we read, "Real home rule is self-rule or self-control the way to it is passive resistance (*stayagraha): that is soul-force or love-force.*"[413]Accordingly for Gandhi, governance of a state must be preceeded by the governance of the self. In order that the self be ruled or governed, there should be a discipline of the body, mind and soul which equip one to be a *satyagrahi*-one who follows *satyagraha.* Here, Gandhi insist that *satyagraha* is not "passive" it is an "active" endevor of disciplining oneself for effective political action. The term *sthitaprajna* which means 'man of steady mind and steady wisdom' which is seen in the *Gita* II. 54 -72, can be undersood in relation to *satyagraha*, where Lord Krishna explicates the qualities of such a person in answer to Arjuna, the warrior. Anthony Parel observes,

> The notion of the self underlying Gandhi's political philosophy is derived from the Gita. The latter draws a fundamental distinction between self as *atman* (the imperishable, eternal, spiritual substratum of the being of every individual) and self as *dehin* (the embodied spatio-temporal self, composed of body, senses, mind and soul). The self that is directly involved in politics-in the pursuit of *swaraj*-is the *dehin.* (HS Xlix).

The ultimate end of *dehin* is self-realization (*moksa*). However, there are intermediate goals or ends which can be seen in its striving towards other *purusharthas* (aims of life)[414] like *artha* (wealth/power)*, kama* (pleasure)*,

---

[413] HS, cited in Parel, *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule*, 110-111.

[414] According to the Indian tradition there are "four aims of life" - *artha, kāma, dharma,* and moksa – which are commonly called *purusharthas.*

and *dharma* (duty-religious, moral, and ethical). But these pursuits of actual life need to be pursued within the framework of *dharma.* The self as an agent (*dehin)* can pursue the *purusharthas* only if it maintains its freedom and excercises discipline over itself and the senses. Hence, the mind becomes the key faculty in Gandhi's notion of political agency. According to his idea of *swaraj,* there is a dual aspect of 'ruling': of the mind over itself and the passions in view of attaining self-realization and of the nation with independence of its own to govern itself. Of course, there is a religious and political dialectics at work. In *Hind Swaraj* Gandhi addresses the extremists, "This (*swaraj)* you would never obtain by force of arms, Brute force is not natural to the Indian soil. You will have, therefore, to rely wholly on soul-force. You must not consider that violence is necessary at any stage for reaching our goal." (HS 112). A self strinving toward the non-violent pursuit of truth necessarily requires a disciplined mind. Once a mind is disciplined a self can engage in the proper pursuits of other purusharthas (property, pleasure, and power). The individual inner realization of *swaraj* eventually evolved on the national level in the Indian people (*praja)*. Hence the rule of the agent (self) became the rule of the nation (India).

The tripartite of the agency of the self as originally seen in *Gita* and tremendously influecd by Gandhi, is presented in the following explication, where it appears this gave most importance to *service/action*.

3.1.2.3.1. The Self as an Agent Engaged in Service (*Karta*)

Again drawing inspiration from the *Gita* itself, Gandhi gave priority to *karma yoga,* the path of action or active service. This does not in any way mean that he drifted away from the other paths like *jnana* (knowledge) and *bhakti* (devotion). In his forward to Margaret Chatterjee's book, John Hick brings together these two tendencies:

> Not that his life and thought can never be separated; for what made Gandhi the center of so powerful a field of spiritual force was the fact that his ideas were always incarnated in his actions. […] What

we witness above all in the phenomenon of Gandhi is religion becoming creative in human life. […] His life was a continuous growth in which he became increasingly dedicated to the service of the higher Reality which he thought of as Truth or God. In response to the claim of Reality upon him he renounced the interests of his private ego and became a servant of mankind, transparent to Truth.[415]

Indeed, Gandhi's understanding of religion and service were closely intertwined. One cannot be without the other. Whether or not this is strictly present in the *Gita,* it can also be understood as a very modern notion that he had already conceived and actualized over long reflection. In his *Autobiography* he states, "If I found myself entirely absorbed in the service of the community, the reason behind it was my desire for self-realization. I made the religion of service my own, as I felt that God could be realized only through service."(MET 132). As much as Gandhi was a *spiritualist,* so much was he an *activist* too. In reality it is hard to believe that he wanted to be identified first of all as a *spiritual figure,* though his life included more than enough spiritual practices to support such a claim. In my view, his spiritual practices were all in preparation for his social activities. Tridip states, "The path of Gita for Gandhi was neither that of contemplation nor of devotion but that of *anasakta* (desireless, unattached) action."[416]

If we agree, then, that was oriented primarily to service and action, we might next ask whether, I too argue that Gandhi can be understood primarily as a man of action (*Karmayogi*), he is therefore close to the modern commitment to individual human activity and its flourishing. If so, there is further basis for bringing Gandhi into contact with Taylor, though Gandhi presents Taylor with an instance of modern individuality that is certainly not self-centered. Gandhi was committed to self-control and self-determination but exactly in service of, or in community with others.

---

[415] John Hick, "Forward," in Margaret Chatterjee *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, ix-x.

[416] Tridip Suhrud, "Gandhi's Key Writings," in *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 75. (Henceforth: Suhrud, "Gandhi's Key Writings").

3.1.2.3.2. The Self as an Agent Enriched by Knowing (*Jnāta*)

Gandhi's never ending desire to know the truth is evident in his formal education and ongoing research into numerous areas of knowledge. As a child he learned several languages like Gujarati, Hindi, and Sanskrit and indeed pursued an education that seemed to include everything except religion. (MET 27). About his childhood and school days he explains that "my books and my lessons were my sole companions."(MET 5). As for his inspiration, it is interesting to note that some of them come from Christians: "Christian friends had whetted my appetite for knowledge, which had become almost insatiable, and they would not leave me in peace, even if I desired to be indifferent."(MET 132).

His intellectual learning was nourished by his reading of *Dharma Vicar,*[417] Max Mueller's *India-What can it teach us,* the translation of *Upanishads* published by the Theosophical Society, Washington Irving's *Life of Mahomet and His Successors,* Carlyle's panegyric on the prophet, and *The Sayings of Zarathustra.* As much as all of these taught him about different religions, still "the desire has never been fulfilled."(MET 133).

It is well known that Gandhi made an intensive study of Tolstoy's books *The Gospels in Brief* and *What to do?* These books helped him to recognize and eventually realize the "infinite possibilities of universal love."(MET 133). Let us recall, in passing, that Taylor has also been interested in *Agape,* which he draws from his Christian-Catholic religious faith. In my fourth chapter I will return to this showed interest.

Gandhi read Ruskin's *Unto this Last* while on a journey. He later mentioned that he could not get any sleep that night and he wanted to change his life accordingly. He later translated the book into Gujarati and called it *Sarvodaya* (the well-being of all). Ruskin's book influenced Gandhi's concept of *soul-force* as a substitute for physical force and changed him as a person. It brought "an instantaneous and practical transformation" in his

---

[417] *Dharma Vicāra* is an ancient book written by Narmad in 1885. It is voluminous Gujarati (Language of Gujarat State of India, Gandhi's mother tongue) prose book on religions.

life. Gandhi learnt that the good of the individual is contained in the good of all by his reading of Ruskin's work.

Gandhi also read Arnold's *Light of Asia,* has deep memories of reading *Ramayana* at home. (MET 127). He read the *Bhagavat* in the Guajarati while he was in Rajkot. Then he came across *Manusmriti*[418] from his father's library. In a different direction, he also remembers that in London a friend read Bentham's *Theory of Utility* to him. About his time in London, he recalls, "I had just begun reading newspapers […]. In India I had never read a newspaper. But here I succeeded in cultivating a liking for them by regular reading. I always glanced over the *Daily News, The Daily Telegraph,* and *The Pall Mall Gazetter."* (MET 41). Raychandbhai's (Gandhi's Jainist spiritual adviser) influence on Gandhi's intellectual and religious ideas and practices were significant. Gandhi states,

> I have tried to meet the heads of various faiths, and I must say that no one else has ever made on me the impression that Raychandbhai did. His words went straight home to me. His intellect compelled as great a regard from me as his moral earnestness, and deep down in me was the conviction that he would never willingly lead me astray and would always confide to me his innermost thoughts. (MET 75).

Gandhi did not consider him as his *Guru – Teacher* in the fullest sense of the term, but he acknowledges him as his guide and helper. After the death of Raychandbhai that place remained vacant in the mind of Gandhi. Gandhi observes, "Only a true *jnani*[419] deserves to be enthroned as Guru. There must, therefore, be ceaseless striving after perfection." (MET 27). In all of this, Gandhi recognizes three important influences which impressed him in an in-depth manner: Raychandbhai by his living contact, Tolstoy by his book *The Kingdom of God is Within You,* and Ruskin's book *Unto this Last*.

Early on, the *Bhagavat Gita* became his most favorite book which he used to read and meditate, daily. He read the *Gita* first in Sir Edwin Arnold's translation as *The Song Celestial.* For Gandhi, the path of the *Gita*

---

[418] *Laws of Manu*, a Hindu law-giver.
[419] One who knows is a seer. Gita's notion of *jnāta* goes very well with Gandhi's notion of *jnāni.*

appeared as neither that of contemplation nor of devotion but of *anasakta* (desireless, unattached) action. This

idea is embodied in the Gita in the image of the *sthithapragnya (*one whose intellect is secure). (GAG 129f).

Tridip Suhrud thus notes that, "[…]Gandhi's experiments and ultimate quest was to know thyself, to attain

moksha, that is, to see God (Truth) face to face."[420]

3.1.2.3.3. The Self as Agent Exposed in Devotion (*Bhakta*)

Gandhi's understanding of the self as an agent is also related to his conception of devotion. The primacy of the

latter, let us note, is not in question in the *Gita.* In *Discourse XI* of the *Gita* is favorite of the *Bhaktas* states as

follows: "But by single-minded devotion, O, Arjuna, I may in this form be known and seen, and truly entered

into, O Parantapa!" (*bhaktya tv ananyaya sakya, aham evam-vidho 'rjuna, jnatum drastum ca tattvena,*

pravestum ca parantapa). GAG 306 XI: 54). His commentary on the *Gita* states,

> […] the Gita's assessment of the devotee's quality is similar to that of the sage. Thus the devotion
> required by the Gita is no soft-hearted effusiveness. It certainly is not blind faith. The devotion of the
> Gita has the least to do with the externals. […]He is the devotee who is jealous of none, who is a
> fount of mercy, who is without egotism, who is selfless, who treats alike cold and heat, happiness and
> misery, who is ever forgiving, […] who treats friend and foe alike, who is untouched by respect or
> disrespect, who is not puffed up by praise, who does not go under when people speak ill of him who
> loves silence and solitude, who has a disciplined reason. (GAG 130, sections: 16, 17).

Gandhi's idea of *devotion* and his expectation of a *devotee* are substantial and comprehensive. The two are

concentrated not just an act or ritual of devotion, but rather, are to everyone as an external reflection of his

gradual realization of maturity of self.

For Gandhi, knowledge and devotion must be pursued together in order not to fall into an intellectual pride.

This is the reason why he says "knowledge without devotion is a misfire."(GAG 129, section16). The path of

knowledge pursued by itself can eventually lead one person into an intellectual self-indulgence which might act

---

[420] Suhrud, "Gandhi's Key Writings," 87.

as a hindrance for his self-realization, rather than of assisting him on that way. Devotion also can end in a "soft-hearted effusiveness" if not balanced properly with knowledge and action.

After some brief reflection on the first two aspects of the self - self as embodied and self as an agent - let me now turn to the third important aspect, self as *dialogical*. The embodied agency of the self is in constant dialogue with his fellow human agents, his surroundings (natural and cultural), and with himself. As we have seen, Taylor's entry into the current of thought before him, and his careful incorporation of past resources, accorded great importance to the history of philosophy. (*cf* aslo Ch. 4.1.1. and 4.1.3.). His ingenuity in engaging and dialoguing with other authors of past and of his own times has significant place in his works and personal life. Gandhi, for his part, never ceased to dialogue with many authors from the west and east. He was also in constant dialogue with a significantly diverse people and their contexts, including the British, South Africans, and his native Indians. I present Gandhi's dialogical self with special focus on his personal dialogic nature of life and his principle of non-violence even at the face of opposing viewpoints.

3.1.2.4. Gandhi: A Dialogic Figure[421]

It is possible to present Gandhi as a figure who is in dialogue with forces within and outside of India. His personal life and works represent a dialogical self in constant 'dialogue' between the many complex strands of his day-Indian and outside India. Unlike the criticism against Gandhi for being so 'traditional' in perspectives, he definitely had a 'forward' looking approach for the future of India which he developed by his own dialectic and critical eye over Indian society especially with regard to the ideals of human rights, egalitarianism, and democracy. Being a subject of the British Colonial Rule in India, Gandhi resented intensely the inferior status imposed upon him which inevitably led him to be highly critical of the domineering attitude of the western

---

[421] Taylor's understanding of *dialogical self* is primarily demonstrated through his systematic and scientific articulations. However, Gandhi can be good example of somebody who represents such a life style in practical life.

culture together with its materialism which he considered as an amoral pursuit. It is certain that Gandhi sought to dialogue with his friends and rivals. I present his dialogical self through the following aspects: Dialogic Style, Dialogue and Tolerance, and Inconclusive Dialogues and Inconsistencies.

3.1.2.4.1. Gandhi's Love for Dialogic Style: Reading, Writing, and Living

Gandhi's favorite book was *the Gita*, which read daily as a spiritual reading for his guidance. The literary style of the *Gita* is basically dialogical. It comprises of eighteen discourses mainly between Lord Krisha and warrior Arjuna. Arguably Gandhi's most important intellectual or academic work is *Hind Swaraj* and it is also written in the genre of *dialogue.* In this book the dialogue takes place between a newspaper editor and a reader[422] in which his dialogue is interwoven with his intellectual *dialogue* with other authors and books from east and west. And so he states,

> These views are mine, and yet not mine. They are mine because I hope to act according to them. They are almost a part of my being. But, yet, they are not mine, because I lay no claim to originality. They have been formed after reading several books. That which I dimly felt received support from these books. (HS 10).

This dialogical nature of his writing is again seen in his autobiography. But these dialogues or debates are more of an inner one. His inner struggle to document life instances in such a way as to make sense of his life, is candid enough in his exposition. Apart from his authorship, Gandhi's life, his political activities, inter-religious approaches, and inter-personal relationship can be viewed as basically *dialectic* in its core.

> In India, he sought to open up a series of dialogues with his many opponents and rivals. In trying to establish a common ground as a basis for an argument, he was often willing to alter his own views if he found them to be inadequate to the situation. He was thus involved in a series of long-running debates with Indian thinkers, such as the leader of the Untouchables B.R.Ambedkar, the Congress socialist Jayprakash Narayan, the Bengali sage Rabindranath Tagore, the left-wing liberal Jawaharlal

---

[422] Gandhi identifies himself as the editor in this book, and the reader is a mixture of people who comprise Indian society. His reason for the adoption of this genre is given, in the foreword, as follows: "To make it easy reading, the chapters are written in the form of a dialogue between the reader and the editor."

Nehru, and Marxists such as M.N.Roy. These debates were sustained over decades, and in many cases both sides moved considerably in their position as a result of the dialogue.[423]

3.1.2.4.2. Dialogues and Ahimsa (Tolerance/non-violence)

The constructive dialogues engaged by Gandhi and his doctrine of Ahimsa (Tolerance/non-violence) are significantly intertwined, which can be a model for our concern in a pluralistic world. This can be understood better as against the enlightenment emphasis of rationality which insists on a generality or indivisible aspect of it (Universal form of rationality) where a consensus can be reached out of a dialogical method. Gandhian dialogue is more tolerant to different voices of reason. Ronald Terchek notes that Gandhi understood different peoples and their different ways of defining rationality. The coercion of universality of one form of rationality over the other is similar to coerce one's view to the other. Gandhi's doctrine of *Ahimsa* will be tolerant/non-violent to such 'alternative rationalities.'[424] Those voices will not be silenced rather be heard and recognized. Hence Gandhi's commitment to dialogues was deeply rooted in his doctrine of non-violence. It is significant for us to note that Taylor also opposes the trickle down approaches enlightenment reason and its claim of rational autonomy. While Taylor has been equally concerned with the intellectual[425] and practical aspects of dialogical self, Gandhi can be seen primarily a dialogical figure who practically engaged in constant dialectics. Taylor presents the issue in "The Dialogical Self": "human beings always have a sense of self […] they situate themselves somewhere in ethical space. Their sense of who they are is defined partly by some identification of what are truly important issues, or standards, or goods, or demands; and correlative to this, by some sense of

---

[423] David Hardiman, *Gandhi in his Time and Ours: The Global Legacy of his Ideas* (Columbia: Columbia University press, 2003, 5-6. (Henceforth: Hardiman, *Gandhi in his Time*).

[424] Ronald J. Tercheck, *Gandhi: Struggling for Autonomy* (Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Lanham, 1998), 7.

[425] Taylor has specific interest in presenting a systematized intellectual presentation of the dialogical self as against the monological self. His practical involvement in dialogue can be seen in his commitment political debates and bargaining for the purpose the harmony of French Speaking Canadians and English Speaking Canadians. (*cf*., also Taylor's article, "Dialogical Self" (Charles Taylor, "The Dialogical Self" in *The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science,Culture* . ed. D. R. Hiley (thaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 304-14.)

where they stand relative to these or where they measure up on them or both".[426] The term in which this space

of issues is structured is historically variable, and the modern horizon is characterized by radical reflexivity.

3.1.2.4.3. Inconclusive Dialogues and Inconsistencies

Gandhi's dialectics did sometimes lead to inconsistency and disconnections. (CWMG 48: 134; YI: Feb. 13,

1930). With all the inconsistencies and some disconnect of his speeches and writings, yet this is virtually

inevitable when the approach is dialogical and the actor is political. Gandhi's personal approach was dialogical.

"Gandhi never sought to provide a grand political theory e.g. an ideological system. He worked out his theory –

his 'truth' – as praxis, and understood that it had to evolve constantly in relation to his and other people's

experience." (CWMG 48: 7). Any sort of fixation seems to be unlikely to his nature. He even resisted the idea

of *Gandhism.* "I love to hear the words: 'Down with Gandhism.' An 'ism' deserves to be destroyed. It is a

useless thing. The real thing is non-violence. It is immortal. It is enough for me if it remains alive. I am eager to

see *Gandhism* wiped out at the earlier date."[427]

Gandhi seems to have demonstrated a lower degree of dialoguing when it comes to his own family members

and to strong atheists like Ramachandra Rao.[428] Undeniably his major streams of life were mostly candid with

his dialogical engagement with religions, political parties, communal activists, extremists, and even his own

enemies. I will return to this matter of his dialogues with world religions, politics, and communal and social

fractions of India. In the meantime let us note that the extraordinary scope and richness of Gandhi's

---

[426] Arto Laitinen, "Charles Taylor and Nicholas H. Smith on Human Constants and Transcendental Arguments," *A Review* (University of Jyväskylä: Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, 2002), 11, accessed November 15, 2012, http://www.academia.edu/173019/Charles_Taylor_and_Nicholas_H._Smith_on_Human_Constants_and_Transcendental_Arguments._A_Review.

[427] Speech at Gandhi Seva Sangh Meetings, Malikanda, Bengal, 22 February 1940, CWMG, Vol. 77, p. 378.

[428] There were also some exceptions to his dialogical openness. For example, Ramanchandra Rao who was an atheist wanted to have a meeting with him in 1940, Gandhi refused since he thought that atheism is a denial of self. However, at a later time Gandhi let him have a meeting and realized that there can be seekers of truth even among the atheists. Gandhi is seen "closing himself off," his predominant dialogical nature when it comes to his own family. Hardiman also observes, "In his own family, he acted the high-handed patriarch, coercing his wife and sons into following the path he decreed as 'true.' He often ran his ashrams in an autocratic manner, disciplining those who did not accept his dictates." (Hardiman, *Gandhi in his Time,* 10-11).

commitments. Taylor's dialogical self is constantly engaging to the people and situations around him and thus necessitates a *narrative method* that seems to parallel with Gandhi's method when, along a different line, he is also engaged with the question of the self. Of course, as I have just shown, Gandhi's thinking and acting are more explicitly dialogical and narrative, yet when unified in a same body of published work, and allowing for some variations in concerns, this seems to be a difference of only limited importance. That means, Taylor's written body of works are systematic and scientific approach to philosophical themes of his interests. However, Gandhi's books and written documents were mostly spontaneous flow of ideas and themes communicated orally and in different forms of writings (letters, commentaries, essays, books, newspapers, and pamphlets).

Let me now trace Gandhi's vision of an *alternative modernity*. Here my focus is on his most philosophical, academic and systematic work, namely, *Hind Swaraj-Indian Home Rule.* Gandhi's 'alternative' approach should not be understood as an isolated vision of a nation that proposes a lonely path of its own. Rather, I argue, he initiates the idea of contextual and indigenous secularisms and together with that multiple possibilities of understanding modernities.

3.2. An 'Alternative'[429] Vision of Freedom and the Nation State: Gandhi's Rootedness in Tradition and his Engagement with Modernity

Gandhi's vision of an alternative idea of freedom and the nation state, and its eventual progress toward a modernity which is indigenous in nature, is the point of departure here. His radical criticisms and a vision of an alternative to the dominant features of modern western civilization have always been a matter of concern for numerous thinkers. However, there is agreement on the fact that it is very difficult to categorize Gandhi as an anti-modernist just because he upheld an indigenous, traditional, idealized, pre-modern (though not without

---

[429] The Gandhian vision of an *alternative* compared to the modern western understanding of state has drawn criticism from within and without India. For example, Nehru had a more western model of state and governance in mind when he adopted more scientific and technological model of progress. During my personal conversation with Prof. Charles Taylor, I asked him what would be the one major criticism he would raise against Gandhi. He replied that 'Gandhi really thought that an *alternative* is possible, however, it did not happen that way.' Still, I argue, that Gandhi's vision of an alternative helps us to think of *alternative modernities* and *secularisms,* that may still lie ahead or are perhaps already close at hand but overlooked.

modern elements), philosophy of simple and harmonious, pre-industrialized, decentralized, villages and nature – all of which oriented, non-violent, spiritual world.[430] The fact that he was not a political philosopher in the formal sense of the term evidently leaves ample room for reading to interpret him is conceptualizing a pre-modern, modern or post-modern[431] understanding of civilization, state and politics. Yet in there his two theoretical works, *Hind Swaraj* and *Constructive Program,* there are many clear contributions to the specific notion of state that he envisioned for India. I argue that the *alternative* conception of an Indian State in a modern India is unique to him, and that it may well have something new to offer to the world in general, as distinct from what is proposed by predominantly Eurocentric conceptions of the state.

I also present aspects from the abovementioned works to demonstrate his unique contribution to the possibility of multiple notions of nation states and modernities. Gandhi wanted a state, specifically distinct from the concept found in the Great Britain or, for example, of Japan. On the question of the "modern," he differs somewhat from Taylor. Going together with this is the fact that the modern Britain of Taylor's experience and the Britain of Gandhi's experience were also quite different.[432] For biographical reasons, Gandhi was deeply with the modern western world before he really formed his own indigenous model of *civic nationalism*.[433] In order to understand the special nature of Gandhi's concept of a modern state, I start with his notion of *Hind Swaraj – Home Rule.*

---

[430] Allen, *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi,* ix.

[431] Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, eds. *Postmodern Gandhi and Other Essays: Gandhi in the World and at Home* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006). The book contends that Gandhi was able to *revitalize* tradition while simultaneously *breaking* it. For the Rudolphs, Gandhi's book *Hind Swaraj* was an opening salvo of the postmodern era and the theory and practice of nonviolent collective action (*Satyagraha)* an early articulation of the postmodern understanding of *situational truth.*

[432] Gandhi's primary encounter with "modern" civilization was in the form of Great Britain, which happened to hold his nation under suppression for almost a century. He adamantly resisted that kind of modernity which suppresses the nations and their civilizations. After the reformation, renaissance and revolutions (USA and France) the world has seen a gradual disappearance of the colonialism proliferated by the Great Britain, Portuguese, Spain, and other countries. This in turn marked the beginning of a different conception of modernity and the emergence of new nation states. I argue that Gandhi would have supported such positive evolutions. Historical events and effects have been more at the center of Taylor's approach to a modernity he shares in his own experience.

[433] *Civic nationalism* is a term introduced by Anthony Parel to explain the Gandhian model of civil state. Anthony Parel, *Gandhi's Philosophy and Quest for Harmony* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 31. (Henceforth: Parel, *Gandhi's Quest for Harmony*).

3.2.1. Two Levels of Meaning – Personal Freedom (Spiritual/Ethical - Inner) and Political Freedom (Outer)

Gandhi understood *Hind Swaraj* in two dimensions – *self-rule* and *state-rule*, that he sometimes uses interchangeably. HS 14). Figuratively speaking, *home* on the micro level is your own self and on the macro level your own nation. I argue that Gandhi's political philosophy was operated from the micro level to the macro level. The national wave initiated by the *Congress Party* for 'Home Rule' for India, is the starting point of *Hind Swaraj.* (HS 13). The same aspiration had already been seen in South Africa too. A nationalistic state (home rule) on the model of Great Britain was not what Gandhi wanted for India. This is why he did not endorse the nationalism of Professor Gokhale, who wanted to have nationalism with the help of the British Raj. Gandhi remarks on Gokhale that "He has constituted himself a great friend of the English; he says that we have to learn a great deal from them, that we have to learn their political wisdom, before we can talk of Home Rule. I am tired of reading his speeches." (HS 15-16).

Hind Swaraj wants *home rule* in both senses – for the self and for the nation. On the one hand it emphasizes the importance of having political home rule (*Swaraj)* for India and on the other hand it emphasizes the importance of having spiritual home rule (*Swaraj)* for the inner self of the individual Indian people. That is the reason why Gandhi says, "One's rule over one's own mind is real Swaraj. The way to it is passive resistance: that is soul-force or love force." (HS 118).[434]

Gandhi's other work, *Constructive Programme,* is a comprehensive program for the growth and development of the theoretical Swaraj which he had already presented in *Hind Swaraj.* The important aspect of this work is its role in demonstrating the importance of non-governmental agencies and organizations in co-operating with the effort of the nation state in building up a *purna swaraj* (full independence).[435] In modern terms these non-

---

[434] The *mind* is shown to be the key faculty in Gandhi's ethics.

[435] Gandhi uses the term *purna swaraj* with the meaning of "full-independence." Still it has to be understood not only as just the political independence but also in all other aspects of human beings.

governmental factors can be understood as *civil society.* His idea of independence and civil disobedience are not in any way ineffective or destructive, but rather constitute a comprehensive *constructive program.* Gandhi's understanding of complete independence is inevitably inclusive of all aspects of the human being. The political is just one among them. He states,

> Complete Independence through truth and non-violence means the independence of *every unit*, be it the humblest of the nation, without distinction of race, color or creed. This independence is never *exclusive*. It is, therefore, wholly compatible with interdependence within or without. Practice will always fall short of the theory,[…]. Therefore, complete Independence will be complete only to the extent of our approach in practice to *truth* and *non-violence*. (CP Intro.).

3.2.3. An Evolving Idea of a State

Gandhi's idea of State was not a static idea, rather it had an *evolving* nature. I argue that this *changing* nature of the concept expresses a struggle to frame his own *alternative* understanding. A series of three concepts convey much of what defines the evolution of his understanding of the state. A). *Hind Swaraj:* His primary understanding of the Indian state is similar to "Home Rule." India has the freedom to rule itself as a state. As we have already seen, Gandhi's understanding is even richer that this is, but it is the point where his idea becomes plainly political. B). *Pūrna Swaraj:* Gandhi defines the state as a nation having "Complete Independence" in his work *Constructive Programme*. Here Gandhi shows greater awareness of the *pluralistic nature* of Indian society and of the significance of recognizing all of them by his *purna swaraj* – full independence. C). *Surajya* or "Good State": This is the final understanding of state according to Gandhi. This concept emerged immediately after the independence of India in 1947, and can be viewed as a Gandhian vision for the future of the Indian state.[436] It is defined by a positive relation to D. D). The Ideal of *Rāma Rājya***:** This ideal notion of state has *the Kingdom of Ram/Rule of Ram* as the ideal. As for the possibility of making the ideal real, Gandhi's thought is interesting: "If all the countries of the world were to become such Dominions,

---

[436] Anthony Parel, ed. "Gandhi and State" in the *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 154. According to him, chronologically, Gandhi's concept of state was developed between 1909 and 1947. (Henceforth: Parel, "Gandhi and State").

that would be a different matter and the *Rāmarājya* could be brought about."[437] The ideal is thus truly an ideal, perhaps to a degree close to that of the Christian concept of *Kingdom of God on earth.* Gandhi's devotion to Rama and his dedication to the recital of *Rāmanāma* were not strange to anyone familiar with his life and writings. He famously complained in a prayer meeting that "Today I look around and find *Rāmarājya* nowhere."[438] In the kingdom of Rama there were:

a.   Rights alike of prince and pauper
b.   Sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority
c.   Rule over self
d.   The kingdom of Righteousness (*Dharma*) on earth.[439]

Leaving aside its dependence on the religiously charged Hindu symbol, *Rama*, which easily becomes grounds for misunderstanding and misgivings, the intention was plainly to keep in view an 'overarching' ideal and target to be pursued.[440] Here, Taylor's notion of 'hypergood' can be a point of reference for a comparative reference.

Gandhi's unfolding nature of the concept "state" is insightful. The transition goes as follows: 1) Self-rule –2) Home-rule – 3) Complete Independence – 4) Good State. His concept of a state seemed to be unfolding from the "inside out" and without leaving behind earlier stages, but instead including them increasingly as time and situation call for. Here we may think that Gandhi's approach incorporates a *plurality of goods* into the individual and national identity such as we have already seen Taylor envision for the "moral space."

---

[437] Raghavan Iyer, ed. *The Essential Writings of Mahatma Gandhi* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Twentieth Edition, 2010), 409. (Iyer, *The Essential Writings*).

[438] Iyer, *The Essential Writings*, 410.

[439] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 17.

[440] Margaret Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity: Religious Pluralism Revisited* (New Delhi and Chicago: Promilla and co Publishers, 2005), 160-162. (Henceforth: Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity*).

3.2.4. **The Gandhian Vision of an Indian State**

Gandhi's vision of an Indian state can be seen as a significant contribution to the development of the modern understanding of states and modernity. He was against the idea of ethnic nationalism and theocratic governance for the state in India. In *Hind Swaraj* Gandhi makes it clear that he is against any sort of a coercive homogenizing tendency of the state. There were numerous trends in India with regard to the kind of state India would be. Some wanted it to be similar to the Canadians and the South Africans. Yet there were others who wanted to "copy the English people."(HS 27-28). However, Gandhi was adamant to propose an *alternative* swaraj when he said, "It is difficult for me to understand the true nature of Swaraj as it seems to you to be easy. I shall, therefore, for the time being, content myself with endeavoring to show that what you call Swaraj is not truly Swaraj."(HS 29).

What is behind all of this? It seems clear that Gandhi foresaw the danger of a modern state with its political swaraj crossing its own limits, overreaching the independence of the individual swaraj.[441] We recall that Taylor rightly warning against the danger of *instrumental reason* and its understanding of politics, and observing that the nation - state unfortunately misses many deep realities in the lives of individuals. Gandhi speaks in a similar way of 'soulless states as a machine.' Parel observes that, what "[…] Gandhi found objectionable in the modern state was its lack of understanding of the significance of the spiritual soul for political activities. He upheld the view that human beings were body-soul composites and the soul was an active center of individual freedom and self-determination."[442]

Modern western states give more, sometimes even too much emphasis for the aspect reason. This can be understood as an organic development of the alienation of the soul from the modern state as initiated by

---

[441] Parel, "Gandhi and the State," 157.

[442] Parel, "Gandhi and the State," 157.

Machiavelli. This trend was followed by Thomas Hobbes. His *Leviathan* gives us the classical example of the modern political man without a soul. The importance Gandhi gave to *soul-force* together with *body-force* or *brute-force* deserves our attention. These ideas oppose, but are threatened by the assertion of *national interests (reason of state)* as against *individual interest.* Gandhi's opposition to avert 'national interest' theory is explicit in *Hind Swaraj*. His position can be grasped from the point of view of 'means and ends.'(HS 79). *Self-rule,* Gandhi's starting point in political theory, *Self -rule* essentially involves the spiritual and ethical aspect of the person. What he cannot support in "national interest" is the possibility of aggressive coercion of rational ideas and measures that try to exercise control over the individuals against their free will and interests. Gandhi's *satyagraha* is perhaps the heart of this thinking: "Passive resistance is a method of securing rights by personal suffering; it is the reverse of resistance by arms. When I refuse to do a thing that is repugnant to my conscience, I use soul-force." HS 90).

Though Gandhi wanted to have an ethically sound and politically independent nation state, he never envisioned a theocratic nation state for India. However, M. A. Jinnah and V. D. Savarkar pressed for such a religion based state. Parel rightly observes,

> Gandhi's opposition to a religion-based state was grounded in his conception of the respective ends of religion and state. The ultimate end of religion was the pursuit and final attainment of spiritual liberation or moksha, while that of the state was the attainment of material well-being in the spheres of economics and politics (*artha*).[443]

Gandhi regarded the state as the indispensable agent and protector of the fundamental rights of citizens. His *Declaration of Independence (Pūrna Swaraj)'* (1930), his *Resolution on Fundamental Rights and Economic Changes* (1931), and his *Constructive Programme* (1945) are all relevant for an understanding of his vision of an Indian state. The first work reiterates the reasons why Indians should have a sovereign state. Primarily it is the *collective right* of the people of India. The second work further explicates the premises of the first work and

---

[443] Parel, "Gandhi and the State," 160.

continues to give more details on how India can be transformed socially and politically. The third work, *Constructive Programme,* brings to light the idea of *purana swaraj* in which he proposes eighteen areas where civil society can co-operate with the state in ensuring the prosperity and complete independence of the nation. Gandhi's state would ensure economic and political freedom for all citizens. Moreover, the state is the guardian of order and security in society. "His moral idealism did not require the sacrifice of political realism. In fact, he tried to combine the two."[444] And originally, it also represented most of what we have in our modern understanding of nation state.

3.2.5. Gandhian Prospects for Multiple Modernities and Secularism (s)

The influence of Western political thinking on the rest of the world has been massive and intensive, at least during the past two centuries. It is mainly due to the political, economic, and intellectual dominance of the west that it has attracted many non-western countries. In my view, European and British colonization were another coercive intrusion into the politics, economy, and culture of numerous third world countries. Imported ideas and frames of political structures and social ideas clashed with those existing civilizations. At least some of the ablest non-western intellectuals raised their voices against such trends, but have better may others who endorsed western ideas and practices of politics and governance, and perhaps in many occasions blindly, without fully analyzing the pros and cons of such incorporations into the local culture and custom. In the absence of sufficient critical dialogue with other traditions, many the western political insights might end up as irrelevant, insufficient and narrow. Gandhian political thinking promises an ongoing openness to what may be well worth preserving. He was surely well-informed, after many and varied encounters with the Western understanding of politics, after his three years living and studying in London, twenty years of life in South Africa, and decades in India dialoguing and confronting British colonialism with a view of gaining

---

[444] Parel, "Gandhi and the State," 164.

independence for India. He surely pioneered prospects for an indigenous/alternative political thinking which in some way incorporated relevant aspects from the Western political and intellectual traditions, and not without the test of time and place. Bikhu Parekh states,

> He was one of the first non-Western thinkers of the modern age to develop a political theory grounded in the unique experiences and articulated in terms of the indigenous philosophical vocabulary of his country. […] From a distinctly community-based Indian perspective, he highlighted some of the disturbing features of the modern state, detected its internal contradictions, and explored an alternative to it.[445]

British Raj considered themselves as possessing the best civilization in the world. They argued that they had brought to India the unique and most precious gift of civilization.[446] Hence their civilization was to be considered as universal, and necessary for other nations around the world. There is no mistaking the *homogenizing* tendency of imperialism strongly criticized by Taylor in his *Politics of Recognition.* In contrast, Habermas constantly supported homogenization in his *Discourse Ethics.* (*cf.*, 2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.2, and 2.3.3.). Taylor's understanding of a 'politics of equal respect' is not compatible with the Habermasian idea of a 'politics of equal rights.' In the process of discourse ethics individual differences are intellectually forced or cohered to surrender for a collective ideal. Taylor fears that an individual is losing something of his identity in transit.

Most of those arguments in favor of the "legacies" of the Western world do not seem to impress Gandhi who adamantly approached colonialism as an evil since that involves enslavement of individuals and nations. Positive influences of the British *Raj* are limited in scope compared to the harm they have done to the colonized - socially, psychologically, culturally, economically and morally. Hence Gandhi definitely stood for an alternative conception of nation-state, modernity and secularity for India.

---

[445] Bhikhu C. Parekh, *Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 3. (Henceforth: Bhikhu, *Political Philosophy*).

[446] Francis Hutchins, *The Illustration of Permanence: British Imperialism in India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), cited in Bhikhu, *Political Philosophy*, ch.1.

3.2.6. Indigeneity of Self and State: Modern Debate

Needless to say, Gandhi was strong proponent of *Indigeneity* in the making of own self and state. His experiences and exposures in London and long years of life in South Africa did not in change his substantial conviction of himself as an Indian and his conception of Indian nationalism. How are we inclined to understand this today? There is post-secular, post-national, and post-religious trends of thoughts in the modern world, currently lead especially by Jürgen Habermas, which envision a kind of *leveling* of our understanding of self, state and religion. Taylor criticizes these tendencies as an attempt to *homogenize* the differences rather than to *recognize* them with a new vision of politics. He speaks from his own experiences in Canada where English Canadians and French Canadians have been debating their differences for years to find a multicultural consensus to live and act together as a nation. Gandhi was influenced significantly by British colonization and British modernity, and very specifically in making his own detour from the mainstream western conception of nation state to develop one which was basically *Indian* in every respect. His basic inspiration, selection of terms, and interpretations of them were all taken from the Indigeneity of the Indian sub-continent. It is useful to recall, for a moment, the history of the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007 after almost 25 years in the drafting process. This UN declaration was in many ways a collective achievement of the aspirations of the indigenous

people across the world. Perhaps Gandhi's contribution and example in this regard is unique, and anyway to a great extent successful. One of the major criticisms of an indigenous construct of nation-state is that it hinders national unity. Yet Gandhi's construct could unify India only because of his rootedness in *Indianness* – socially, culturally, and spiritually. As such, he is a powerful challenge to the neoliberal understanding of Indigenous politics.

Politics of Indigeneity[447] is a modern approach to politics that to counters attempts to negate the rights envisaged in the UN Declaration. In terms of its history, Sita and Hughes speak of a 'second wave indigeneity' as against the neoliberal attempt to ignore indigeneity on the way to a cosmopolitan, post-national, universal state, citizenship and selfhood. D. B. Rose emphasizes the nature of identity and indigeneity as a flux or process where there is no *static purity status*,[448] but rather an ongoing embellishment in our encounter with others and through our 'qualitative demonstrations.' According to him, the question "who are you?" cannot be answered satisfactorily in words. He continues, "[…] the question requires qualitative demonstrations. Answers emerge in the lived experience of relationships developed in shared time and place. Ultimately, answers are a sharing of perceptions, attitudes, experiences, and, I think, compassion."[449]I think that Gandhi's life and writings can be a great example for such emerging ideals and identity of a politics of Indigenity. It also seems to me that emphasis on indigeneity re-affirms the importance of a religious aspect in the making of an identity that challenges the liberal and neoliberal approaches not only to modern politics but also to self-identity. In Gandhi's work, these two challenges go hand-in-hand.

3.3. Unity in Diversity: The Gandhian *Marg* (Way) or Model for Recognizing Plurality

Modern pluralistic or diverse culture has demanded for a method or dynamism of unity. Arguably religious diversity is the most challenging aspect of human life that aspires for an inter-religious perspective where people of different believes can co-exist peacefully and act for common good politically. Gandhian way of recognizing plurality, especially in the religious aspect is relevant for a world that in many respects resist

---

[447] Sita Venkateswar and Emma Hughes eds. *The Politics of Indigeneity: Dialogues and Reflections on the Indigenous activism* (London: Zed Books, 2011). (Henceforth: Venkateswar and Hughes, *The Politics of Indigeneity*). This book elaborates with field studies and dialogues with experts, on the nature, growth, achievements and future of the reality of indigeneity and indigenous activism around the world (South America, New Zealand, Africa, and Asia).

[448] Our understanding of *indigeneity* need not be a static dogmatic one (pure static conception), rather, it can be a flexible one which is open to incorporate new dimension in to the existing core conception.

[449] D.B. Rose, *Dingo Makes Us Human: Life and Land in an Aboriginal Australian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) cited in Venkateswar and Hughes, *The Politics of Indigeneity*, 2.

religious involvement in the pretext of political neutrality. His approach to cultural pluralism, especially religious diversity is significant for a post-metaphysical and post-religious perspective of our times. Gandhi's Hinduism is an evolving one. Intrinsically tolerant nature of Hinduism works well for Gandhi's purpose of recognizing all other religions as different *Margas* (ways) to the *Satya* (Truth).

Indian pluralism in many ways is unique since it possesses a degree and a complexity apparently not experienced elsewhere (*cf.*, ch. 1.2).[450] Even when Gandhi was a little boy growing up in his village he nurtured a positive attitude towards the diversity of castes and creed. His father and mother welcomed people of different religions and castes to his home. These early experiences seem to mature within him, and in his ongoing life and writings. What we know as Taylor's *politics of recognition* in thus many respects appears much earlier in the writings and the political activities of Gandhi. Not that this is without fierce controversy. Perhaps a Hindu fanatic murdered him for his recognition of the Muslims. His recognition of the caste system instead of its abolition is still a point of contention. While Taylor's theory of recognition was arguably framed from his own personal encounter with the multiculturalism of Canada (French Canadians and English Canadians), Gandhi's theory of recognition was framed from the religious, cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and caste-related pluralism that has defined life on the Indian sub-continent for centuries. It is interesting to note that the concept of multiculturalism become prominent first in Canada,[451] the reality of multiculturalism had long since been familiar in India and in many other places in the world.

---

[450] Amartya Sen is a renowned Indian economist and philosopher, who is presently a professor at Harvard University. His article on *Indian Pluralism* is the point of reference here.

[451] In fact, the Swiss were the first ones to use the term "multiculturalism" in a systemic way. Switzerland is a country with four spoken languages and different religions. In 1957, they introduced the term multiculturalism to identity their country (www.wikipedia.nl/multiculturalisme). Since 1971, the application of the term has changed from different languages/religions in a country to a multicultural country which also openly accepts migrants and outside cultures. The government of Canada introduced multiculturalism to connect opposite cultures with minority cultures in Canada. This was the opposite of English speaking inhabitants versus the minority French speaking inhabitants. After Canada, other countries like the U.K. and the Netherlands, introduced multiculturalism in the policy of their governments, where different cultures can be accepted with one country. ("Multiculturalism," in *Wikipedia* accessed November 14, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiculturalism).

As Gandhi clearly saw, the antiquity and complexity of pluralism in India especially, in its extraordinary richness, had to be considered original to the cultures and people was indeed a challenge for the full unification of the nation. Gandhi's attempt at unification comes out of his deeper consciousness of the depth and disparity proper to real diversity. Unity in diversity is a highly phenomenological concept which is primarily founded in the recognition of plurality. An in-depth phenomenological analysis of a particular reality can shed light to its commonality to other things together with a deep awareness of it particularities. Recognition of plurality inevitably gives significant importance to such particularities of the individual realities. Margaret Chatterjee observes, "Religious pluralism does not pose for him philosophical problems about rival truth claims, because his adherence to the ancient Hindu and Jain belief in the fragmentariness of all men's visions of the truth."[452]

3.3.1. Evolution of Gandhi's Religious Thought – Formative Period

I have already presented Gandhi's 'alternative' political vision which has its own distinctness and diverse nature. Now it is time to analyze his unique approach and contribution to the field of religious pluralism. Here emphasis is on how religious diversity provides him with resources for an attempt at a unity and personal authenticity in the pursuit of truth. Gandhi's approach to the religious pluralism of India has been characterized as ways viz., universalist, eclectic, and inclusivistic. Each of these terms does convey certain aspects of his religious thought and approach. Yet none of them can contain his approach in its entirety. In my view, Gandhi's own religion and his approach to other religions was defined essentially by a *search for Truth* or *pursuit of life* rather than by a purely theological debate over connected or conflicting concepts.[453] Let me try to foreground this tendency in a brief picture of India itself.

---

[452] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 8.

[453] Dr. S. Radhakrishnan demonstrated Hinduism 'as a way of life' through his writings that will include its lack of interest in any sort of 'creedal format' or 'dogmatic' norms.

For thousands of years the religions of India, being both diverse and creative, have contributed to a rich cultural tapestry. India has given birth to a number of religions, such as Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, and Sikhism, and because of this, India is called the cradle of world religions. But in addition to those abovementioned indigenous religions, India houses millions of other people who follow other religions such as Islam, Christianity, and Zoroastrianism. India therefore has a unique and incredibly multifaceted religious environment and hence is a meeting place of all of the world religions, and indeed a *sitz im leben* for any student of comparative religion. Indian democracy, culture, art, language, and so on has in some way or other demonstrated multiple religious aspects and values.[454] Indeed, religion was considered as the prime symbol of Indian culture by Arnold Gottfried Spengler and Arnold J. Toynbee[455] who stated that religion is the spirit of Indian civilization.[456]

Gandhi has been understood predominantly as a religious/spiritual figure nationally and globally. Does this do complete justice to what he really is/was for India and for the international world? Evidently his religious perspectives and perceptions were distinct from the traditional[457] sense of the term. (MET 18). Gandhi himself states, "The Gandhies were Vaishnavas.[458] My parents were particularly staunch Vaishnavas. They would

---

[454] Just observe an example of the present political leaders to understand how pluralistic they are in their religious affiliation: The Prime Minister of India is a Sikh, the President of India is a Hindu, The Vice President of India is a Muslim and the chairperson of the ruling United Progressive Alliance (UPA) is a Christian.

[455] Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History, 1934–1961* (Oxford University Press 1946) was a synthesis of world history, a *metahistory* based on universal rhythms of rise, flowering and decline, which examined history from a global perspective.

[456] The Indic Civilization of Toynbee corresponds with ancient India. S.C. Bhattacharya, "Toynbee on Ancient India," in *Journal of Indian History*, XLIV (1966): 367-96.

[457] Generally people who are considered as *religious* are those who have demonstrated an unusual aptitude and commitment to a particular religion to which they are affiliated. They steadily develop their spirituality by predominantly tuning their lives in accordance with that particular religion. Gandhi does not fit this description.

[458] Vaishnavism - वैष्णव धर्म, is a tradition of Hinduism, distinguished from other schools by its worship of Vishnu, or his associated Avatars such as Rama and Krishna, as the original and supreme God. This worship in different perspectives or historical traditions addresses God under the names of Narayana, Krishna, Vāsudeva or more often "Vishnu", and their associated avatars. Its beliefs and practices, especially the concepts of Bhakti and Bhakti Yoga, are based largely on the Upanishads, and associated with the Vedas and *Puranic* texts such as the Bhagavad Gita, and Bhagavata Puranas ("Vaishnavism," in *Wikipedia* accessed April 3, 2012, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vaishnavism).

regularly visit the *Haveli.*[459] The family had even its own temples. Jainism was strong in Gujarat, and its influence on him was felt everywhere and on all occasions."(MET 4).[460] None of these seemed to compel and to make Gandhi deeply involved in religious practices in his childhood. Although Gandhi followed his parents to visit *Haveli,* that "never appealed" to him. (MET 27). However, his mother's religious influence on him was evidently deepest especially in his childhood. His mother was 'deeply religious' but his father had 'very little religious training' as recollected by Gandhi in his autobiography. She visited temples and abstained from food as part of her rigorous religious commitment. (MET 4). Gandhi had clear memory of reciting *Rāmanāma* to get away from the fear of ghosts and spirits the inspiration of which came from a family servant. He also remembers Ladha Maharaj, a great devotee of Rama, reading *Ramayana* before his father while he was ill and bedridden. Much later he said, "Today I regard the *Ramayana* of Tulsidas as the greatest book in all devotional literature."(MET 28).

When the Gandhies came to Rajkot, little Gandhi also got a wider perspective of religion. He states, "I got an early grounding in toleration for all branches of Hinduism and sister religions."(MET 28). Now his parents visited not only Vaishnava temple, but also Shiva's and Rama's temples. The young Gandhi remembers that,

> Jain monks also would pay frequent visits to my father, and would even go out of their way to accept food from us – non-Jains. […] He had, besides, Musalman[461] and Parsi[462] friends, who would talk to him about their own faiths, and he would listen to them *always with respect*, and often with interest. Being his nurse, I often had a chance to be present at these talks. These many things combined to *inculcate in me a toleration for all faiths*. (MET 28).

Apparently, Gandhi's mother's influence on religion slowly gave way to his father's inter-religious respect and recognition, which of course become evident in his own evolving religious perspective and eclecticism.

---

[459] A Vaishnava temple which the Gandhis used to visit.

[460] Gandhi was born in Oct. 2, 1869, in a Vaishnava family of the Vallabhacharya (Vallabhacharya is one of the five main Acharyas of the Hindu Religion. The other four are Shankaracharya, Ramanujacharya, Madhavacharya and Nimbarkacharya. He propagated the philosophy of *Shuddhadvaita* which forms the basis of *Pushtimarg* (the path of grace), a version of *Bhakti Marg*. His mother, Putali Bai, belonged to the *Pranāmi* sect founded by Mehraj Thakore. Gandhi also visited *pranāmi* temples together with his mother.

[461] A Muslim is also called a "Musalman."

[462] Parsies are Zorastrians who came from Persia.

However, Christianity was an exception since he heard that some Christian missionaries were intolerant in their missionary approach. Gandhi states, "I developed a sort of dislike for it (Christianity). And for a reason. In those days Christian missionaries used to stand in a corner of near the high school and hold forth, pouring abuse on Hindus and their gods. I could not endure this." (MET 29). All of these expressions helped him to learn to *be tolerant* to other religions. But none of them helped him to *have living faith in God*. Rather his reading of *Manusmriti* someway inclined him to atheism; his views on diet were contradicted by *Manusmriti*.[463] But he recognized that a deep rooted conviction nonetheless came to him, "that morality is the basis of all things, and that truth is the substance of all morality. Truth became my sole objective. It began to grow in magnitude every day, and my definition of it also has been ever widening."(MET 29).

After being in London, his association with two theosophists became significant in his religious life since they introduced him to the *The Song of the Celestial,* a translation of *Bhagavad Gita* by Sir Edwin Arnold. The *Gita* eventually became the single most important book for his thoughts and actions. The verses of the *Gita* in the second chapter, he cites as follows: "If one ponders on objects of the sense, there springs attraction; from attraction desire, desire flames to fierce passion, passion breeds recklessness; then the memory - all betrayed - lets noble purpose go, and saps the mind, till purpose, mind and man are all done." These words *struck a very deep impression* in his mind. (MET 57) Later on he read *The Light of Asia* by the same author. His theosophist friends advised him to join in their society but he declined since he never spent time to learn and practice his own religion and so did not want to belong to any other. Later on he stated, "[…] I should not think of embracing another religion before I had fully understood my own." (MET 101). Almost at the same time Christian friend inspired him to read the Bible. For Gandhi, the Old Testament books were not as impressive as those of the New Testament:

---

[463] Manusmriti supported meat-eating, which was against Gandhi's religious practices and dietetic realization.

> The New Testament produced a different impression, especially the Sermon on the Mount which went straight to my heart. I compared it with the Gita. The verses 'But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man take away thy coat let him have thy cloaks too,' delighted me beyond measure. (MET 58).

Any religion that exalts *renunciation* appealed to him most powerful.

Yet as much as Gandhi had known about religions by his readings and reflections, so much he discovered *the futility of mere religious knowledge* without *religious experience.* This was also part of his experience in London, when he realized that, "Only richer experience can help me to a fuller understanding."(MET 61). In 1893 when he reached South Africa his religious knowledge and experience were superficial, though the flame had been awakened in London. In Pretoria he met with Christian missionaries whose main purpose was to persuade people to embrace Christianity. Gandhi could never do with such attempts at religious persuasion either in South Africa or in India, though got encouragement from his Indian Hindu friends especially Raychandbhai,[464] when he was under pressure from the Christian missionaries in South Africa.

3.3.3. Gandhi's 'Hindu Privilege'[465]

The foregoing sketch shows that Gandhi's Gujarati background may be seen as something of an anticipation, and perhaps even a *microcosm* of his evolving religious conceptions and attitudes. Let me know restrict myself to the *given* religious privileges of Gandhi as a Hindu, whereupon we can follow its evolution into something quite distinctive for him.

As I have already enunciated in the previous section, Gandhi was born to a particular kind of Vaishnavism that was special to the Gujarati region of India. Jainism also had been extensive and powerful in his hometown and so it is not unexpected that his father invited and dialogued with people of different religions. Such religious

---

[464] Raychandbhai was only two years older than Gandhi and was from Bombay. The qualities which Gandhi admired in Raychandbhai were the qualities he was himself trying to develop. As I have noted, he is one among the three people (together with Tolstoy and Ruskin) who influenced him most. Gandhi considered Raychandbhai as nearest to being his Guru.

[465] Being a Hindu made it possible or privileged Gandhi in understanding and constructing his own unique kind of universalism, eclecticism and pluralism. *cf., also* Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity*, 17.

differences and dialogues are indigenous to Hinduism and to a greater extent throughout India. I argue that the greatest privileges of Hinduism are its *non-institutional nature* and freedom to worship different deities according to the aptitude and likeness of the devotees. Gandhi observed,

> It is the good fortune or the misfortune of Hinduism that it has no official creed. In order therefore to protect myself against any misunderstanding I have said, Truth and non-violence is my creed. If I were asked to define the Hindu creed I should simply say: search after Truth through non-violent means. (HD 4; YI 4.24.1924).

The appeal of Hinduism was this freedom of the individual which does not necessarily force them to believe or accept any doctrine or creed as authoritative instruction of an institution, thereby allowing him to make of it what his temperament wished, while allowing others to embrace it in quite other forms derived from their own reason and moral instinct.[466]

A sort of *individual freedom* and *flexibility,* within Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism, seemed to influence and impress Gandhi more than any other religion. Perhaps this makes Gandhi, as a 20th century Hindu, an instance of what Charles Taylor has in mind when following the transition of religions from a *non-reflective* to a *reflective* mode (SA: 3ff; see my section ch. 2.3.3). Leaving aside the historical dimension of Taylor's argument, it may seem that individualistic and reflective accents of modern religious belief do square with the conclusions that Gandhi is of that type. As for Gandhi's universalism and eclecticism, we need to look no further than his own statements:

> I am not a literalist; therefore I try to understand the *spirit* of the various scriptures of the world. I apply the test of *satya* (Truth) and *ahimsa* (nonviolence) laid down by these very scriptures for their interpretation. I reject what is inconsistent with the test, and I appropriate all that is consistent with it. (CWMG YI 8.27.1925).

---

[466] Akeel Bilgrami, "Gandhi's Religion and Its Relation to Politics", in *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi,* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2011), 93-94. (Henceforth: Bilgrami, "Gandhi's Religion and Politics").

Truth and nonviolence being his emphasis, Gandhi delved deep into different scriptures of different religions with an utmost commitment to squeeze out their *spirit.* This can be understood as his 'real message' beyond any literal expressions.

Another aspect of Hinduism is its *all-inclusive* nature. Some scholars make refer to this as *universalism,* others call it as *eclecticism,* and still certain others call it as *religious pluralism.* To my reading all these terms are in one way or other related, at latest as applies to the person of Gandhi:

> In my opinion the beauty of Hinduism lies in its all-embracing inclusiveness.[467] What the divine author of the *Mahabharata* said of his great creation is equally true of Hinduism. What of substance is contained in any other religion is *always* (Italics is mine) to be found in Hinduism. (HD 4 YI 9.17.1925).

For all that, Gandhi was never interested in a rational debate on religion or comparative aspects of religion. He strongly believed that "Faith does not admit of telling. It has to be lived and then it becomes self-propagating."(HD 5). Gandhi was asked by an American friend, "Why are you a Hindu?" In response, he always emphasized the importance of *living* one's faith as follows:

> I have ventured at several missionary meetings to tell English and American missionaries that if they could have refrained from 'telling' India about Christ and had merely lived the life enjoined upon them by the Sermon on the Mount, India instead of suspecting them would have appreciated their living in the midst of her children and directly profited by their presence. (HD 5, YI 20.10.1927).

---

[467] Apparently, the Rig Vedic hymn *Ekam Sat, Viprah bahudha vadanti* (The Real/True [*Sat*] is One [*ekam*]. (*Rig Veda* 1-164-146). The twice-born [*vipra*] call It [*vadanti*] variously [*bahudha*) which seems to have some influence here in the *all-inclusiveness* of Gandhi. I draw this conclusion on the basis of his general acceptance and belief in the traditional aspects of Hinduism. He does agree that he is a *Sanatani* Hindu who intrinsically has to believe in all of these Hindu scriptures, which he did (*cf.*, HD 7). The Vedic verse continues as follows: The twice-born [*vipra*] call It [*vadanti*] variously [*bahudha*]: Agni, Yama, Matarisvan, Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Garutman. The illumined sages of India have called the One Reality, the *Ekam Evam Advityam Brahman*, by the many names found in the Vedas. Even though many names are used, the Reality spoken about in the Vedas is one. S. Radhakrishnan reflects on an 'evolving' concept of God in the Vedas where it moves from naturalistic polytheism to monotheism and then to monistic tendencies. Accordingly *Rig Veda* x.89 has naturalistic polytheistic expression and *Rig Veda* x.90 has more monotheistic tendencies. Then when it reaches *Rig Veda* I.164 it has monistic tendencies. (Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and Charles A Moore, eds. *A Sourcebook in Indian Philosophy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), 16-25). Certainly there are parts of the *Gita* that affirm the validity of the various paths by which human beings seek God. Perhaps Gandhi was influenced by both the Vedas and the Gita in developing his own concept of God as Truth (*Satya*).

For Gandhi Hinduism was best suited for his personal moral instincts and political activities. Indian pluralities and diversities amply reiterated the importance of Hinduism for him. Considering his own reading, reflection and encounters with numerous other religions, he concludes:

> On examination I have found it (Hinduism) to be the most tolerant of all religions known to me. Its freedom from dogma makes a forcible appeal to me inasmuch as it gives the votary the largest scope for self-expression. Not being an exclusive religion, it enables the followers of that faith not merely to respect all the other religions, but it also enables them to admire and assimilate whatever may be good in the other faiths. Non-violence is common to all religions, but it has found that highest expression and application in Hinduism (I do not regard Jainism and Buddhism as separate from Hinduism). Hinduism believes in the oneness not of merely all human life but in the oneness of all that lives. (HD 5-6 YI 20. 10. 1927)

And so then belief in Hinduism that was initially his family heritage, was embraced after long and persistent tests and as the outcome of a carefully examined, deliberate choice for his moral life and political activities.

3.3.3.1. 'High Hinduism'[468] and Gandhi's Hinduism

Though Gandhi's Hindu belief was fundamentally traditional yet he was creatively modern. One can even observe that he visualized Hinduism and realized it in 'his way.' He being a *bania* (grocers and business) class definitely was not so comfortable with the 'high Hinduism' of the highest class Brahmins. His Hinduism was an integral, inclusive of all castes and even good aspects of all other religions. He believed in the 'spirit' of all the basic Hindu scriptures but seems not to have believed them as 'divinely originated.' By way of 'confession,' he,

> I call myself a Sanatani Hindu, because I believe in the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Puranas, and all that goes by the name of Hindu scripture, and therefore in *avataras* and rebirth; I believe in the *varnashrama dharma* in a sense, in my opinion strictly Vedic but not in its presently popular crude sense; I believe in the protection of cow … I do not disbelieve in *mūrti puja*. (HD 7 YI 6.10.1921).

---

[468] High Hinduism means those who radically and traditionally believe in the Vedas, Upanishads and Puranas and are not flexible enough to have modern interpretations of it. Gandhi was free from such a restricted approach to Hinduism since 'he did not believe in the exclusive divinity of the Vedas.'(HD 7).

But then goes on to emphasize that "my belief in the Hindu scripture does not require me to accept every word and every verse as divinely inspired. Nor do I claim to have any first-hand knowledge of these wonderful books. But, I do claim to know and feel the essential truth of the essential teachings of scriptures."(HD 7). While rejecting exclusive divinity of the Vedas he added that he believes the Bible, the Quran, and the *Zend Avesta* to be as much divinely inspired as the Vedas. And within Hinduism, he stressed the freedom of interpretation where Shankaracarya, Ramanuja, and other *shastries* can be regarded as examples. His measure is clear enough: "I decline to be bound by any interpretation, however learned it may be, if it is repugnant to reason or moral sense."(HD 7). He wanted the maximum *individual freedom* for each person to feel and reason out one's own faith. This I argue as an explicitly *modern* aspect of Gandhi's religious approach. His own rootedness in the ancient traditions and scriptures of Hinduism never prevented him from living by them in his own way and in his own times.

3.3.3.2. *Dharma* (Righteousness): Tripartite Meaning – Religion, Ethics and Duty

It is time now to address the religious inclusivism of India, more to our purpose and of Gandhi. This is fundamentally a matter of the concept of *dharma,* which I have already taken up in the context of examining the "philosophical background of secularism in India." (*cf.*, 2. .3). Here my purpose is to present my claim that the concept *dharma* was crucial for Gandhi to frame his own religious thinking.

Though the word *dharma* is sometimes used as an equivalent to 'religion,' there are different dimensions of *dharma* which the word *religion* may not intrinsically contain. Surely it is an ethico-religious term with many facets. Etymologically, the term *dharma* comes from *dhṛ,* which means "to hold," or "to maintain," especially the individual and society which in turn uphold it: and which also "supports or maintains the regulatory order

of the universe" in a manner analogous to Law or Natural Law.[469] The concept originally derives from India's

ancient legal and religious texts,[470] which suggest that there is a divinely instituted natural, cosmic order of

things (ṛta) and that justice, social harmony and human happiness require human beings to discern and live in a

manner appropriate to the requirements of that order.[471] Evidently there are two aspects here - natural and in the

sense of normative. Hence, *dharma* can be understood both as an ontological concept and also as a social

concept. *Sanātana-dharma,* or eternal religion, makes up its ontological aspect. *Dharma* within *Purusharthas*

(*artha* (wealth)*, kama* (pleasure) *dharma* (duty), and *moksa* (liberation)) demonstrates that it functions together

the other three which are undeniably relevant and important for the earthly and spiritual life of a person. These

varying meanings and understandings of *dharma* open up multi-faceted possibilities of understanding religion,

ethics, and duty in a manner that might well become useful resources for our modern debates over the

collaboration of politics and religion in a predominantly plural and multicultural world.

Perhaps these notions speak to western emphasis on *rights,* as against *duty.*[472] *Dharma* focuses mostly on the

ethical and religious duty, proper to one's calling. From the point of view of *right* we can frame the defense of

dharma involved in the "righting of injustices"[473] (bringing back the ṛta (order) of the world) by restoring the

balance which was disturbed by the ignorance or selfishness of human beings. There are four different

divisions of *dharmas* the understanding of which can be useful in this context. It is significant for the Hindu

tradition that *dharma* can be understood in both *singular* and *plural* forms. While the singular *Dharma* can be

understood as the all-encompassing ṛta of this world and the other world, *dharmas* in plural is understood and

---

[469] Here I simply bring together multiple dictionary results.

[470] Initially there were the *Sruti* and *Smriti* (spoken and memorized) traditions which is said to be called as *Sanatana – Dharma.* Eventually these lived traditions were written down in the form of the Vedas which were further interpreted by rishis and sages into Brahmanas, Aranyakas and Upanishads. Between 6-12th Century there were legal and *purānic* deliberations of *dharma* which were in the forms of *Manusmriti, Mahabharata,* and *Ramayana*.

[471] "Dharma" in *Wikipedia* accessed March 9, 2012, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/dharma.

[472] Habermas' emphasis on *right* rather than duty is criticized by eastern scholars. Taylor has accused Habermas of using reason in a more 'instrumental' than 'reflective' way.

[473] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought,* 19.

classified in a different way in the Hindu tradition. They are generally called *sādhārana* (Ordinary) *dharmas.*

They are:

a.   *Varṇa-dharmas :* Duties relating to four castes (stations in life) – *Brāhmana, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya,* and *Śūdra*

b.   *Āśrama-dharmas:* Duties associated with the four stages of life viz., *brahmacarya, garhasthya, vānaprastha,* and *sannyasa*

c.   *Naimittika-dharmas:* Obligatory duties for special occasions.

d.   *Guṇa-dharma:* Duties of a King to protect his subjects[474]

All of these diverse religious and ethical duties are centered on the singular *Dharma.* That means, plurality of

the expressions of *dharmas* some way or other are descending form the universal *dharma* – cosmic *dharma.*

This is a significant privilege, I argue, which Gandhi enjoyed while he visualized and articulated his own

religious, ethical, and political ideas. Perhaps Gandhi's understanding of the relative and absolute *truths* can get

some lead from this resources.

3.3.3.3. *Swadharma* and *Gita*: Modern Concept of Reflective Religion

Gandhi firmly believed that the spirit of any person inspires one to pursue his *swadharma*, his own faith

respecting the faiths of others. This was something foundational in him which eventually caused him to totally

reject the idea of *religious conversion.* There should be an awareness of the plurality of *dharmas* in order to

distinctly identify one's individual *dharma.* This eventually lead one to envision, reflects, pursue, and realize

one's own *dharma* – *swadharma.* Chatterjee also states, "The idea of *swadharma,* of doing what it was one's

proper business to do, set limits to ambition and enabled a man to develop his potentialities. But it requires

discrimination and intelligence to discover what one's *swadharma* is."[475]From the universal *dharma, a*

particular *dharma* evolves. Once again, Gandhi will have found an excellent example in the *Bhagavad Gita.*

For Gandhi, the *Mahabharata*, to which the *Gita* belongs, is allegorical and the *Gita* especially teaches *ahimsa*

---

[474] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought,* 19. (*cf., also* ch. 1. 2.1.3.)

[475] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought,* 19.

(or that renunciation is impossible without *ahimsa*) and so the attitude of *anāsakti* (the spirit of renunciation or selflessness) is the basis of *Karma* (duty, action). Furthermore, the idea of the *avatar* indicates man's wish to become like God, rather than indicate God's descent to man. "The *Gita* contains the gospel of work, the gospel of *Bhakti* or devotion, and the gospel of *Jnāna* or knowledge. Life should be a harmonious whole of these three. But the key to all these is 'the doctrine of *anāsakti'* (selflessness)" (*cf.*, MC., 36-39). The modern understanding of individual pursuit does not, more often, consider this inter-relatedness of different aspects in the pursuit of human flourishing. The gospel of work proposed by the *Gita* seems as a predominant emphasis of modern secular pursuits, which is not necessarily related to any devotion or deep desire for knowledge. A self with an awareness of *swadharma* (individual duty) can force itself into such restricted understanding of itself, by isolating itself from other perspectives, that can be understood as self-narrowing or limiting itself.

3.3.4. Eclecticism/Syncretism/Universalism[476]: An Inclusive Approach to Religions – The Transformative Period

Gandhi was not only influenced by other religions, he also adopted aspects from them into his own outlook and thinking. Given what we have already seen of his relationship to traditional and modern life, whether religious, moral, or political, this suggests learning from his example as we look forward an understanding of plurality and society.

If Gandhi's primary religious influence was Hinduism, his secondary influence was definitely Jainism. Recall his childhood affinity with Jainism in Gujarat, and the fact that Raichandbhai, who was his religious adviser and teacher, was a Jain. Later in life, Gandhi found the Jain theory of *anekāntavāda (*the many-sidedness of reality) convincing since he too believed in the fragmentariness of our understanding of truth. Basically,

---

[476] Margaret Chatterjee views that Gandhi's universalistic view apparently has influences of his encounter with the *Ethical Society* who culled positive aspects from various religions. (Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity,* 29).

Jainism also has a *pluralistic view* of truth, life, and self. It should be noted that Gandhi saw Jainism as an outgrowth of Hinduism.

Gandhi's relation to Buddhism is less decisive but profound. While he was in London, he read *The Light of Asia* in which Arnold Edwin explains about the spirit of renunciation and compassion of Buddha. There, Buddha advocates the rejection of animal sacrifice. The Buddhist understanding of *Nirvāna* insisted upon the 'need to extinguish the base in us.' The goal of denying one's ego and reducing oneself to Zero certainly resonates in Gandhi. The Mahayana teaching of the 'liberation of one is tied to the liberation of all' also impressed him. The dynamism of gentleness and love, unlike idle meditation, is noticed by Gandhi both in Buddha and in Jesus.[477] Sikhism was also considered as a Hindu sect by Gandhi. His argument in favor of this claim is that the "Sikh Gurus were Hindus" and that Guru Gobind Singh was "one of the greatest defenders of Hinduism."(MGCW 28: 263). It appears that Gandhi wished for Sikhs to renounce some parts of their religion and culture that he felt prevented them from being considered as a sect within Hinduism and a unit of Indian Nationalism, one of the main obstacles to which was the Sikhs and their institution of the *Khalsa Panth*.[478] This institutional frame was viewed skeptically by Gandhi who was a member of a predominantly non-institutional Hinduism.

Gandhi's association with Islam was deep and extensive. Perhaps his Muslim support was misinterpreted by at least a group of radical Hindus, which eventually resulted in his death. His first relationship with Muslims was from his own hometown in Rajkot about which he states, "He (father) had Musalman and Parsi friends, who

---

[477] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought,* 34.

[478] Khālsā is the 11th and final temporal-Guru/leader of the Sikhs. It refers to the collective body of Singhs/Kaurs) represented by 5 beloved-ones selected by the people. The Khalsa was inaugurated on March 30, 1699, by Guru Gobind Singh, the tenth Sikh Guru. It was then that the temporal leadership was passed on from and by Guru Gobind Singh to the Khalsa and thence it became Guru Khalsa. During the next 9 years of his life, Guru Gobind Singh remained the Commander-in-chief of the Khalsa. It can be concluded the Khalsa is the 11th body of the Guru Granth Sahib with Guru Nanak. The Khalsa is also the name of *nation of the sikhs*. The Khalsa is responsibile for all executive, military and civil authority. The meaning of Khalsa translates as "Sovereign"/"Free." ("Khalsa," in *Wikipedia* accessed on June 10, 2011, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khalsa). It is explicit why Gandhi had reservations about the Sikhs, since they apparently sought an independent state with a theocratic frame. He wanted a unified India.

would talk to him about their own faiths, and he would listen to them *always with respect* (Italics is mine) and

often with interest." (MET 28). Gujarat being a center of trade and commerce, it demonstrated considerable

openness to diverse religions. His reading of the book *The Wisdom of the East* first introduced him to a few

'golden sayings of the Islam' which was taken from the Koran. Later on he encountered merchants, Sufis, and

others in South Africa. There were numerous Muslim associations in India like Ali brothers, Ansari, Jinnah,

Hakim Ajmal Khan, Zakir Hussain, Suhrawardy, Maulana Azad, and Khan Abdul Gahffar Khan. All of them

were part of the national movement. Gandhi spoke the duty of a Hindu to a Muslim as follows:

> His duty is to befriend him as man, to share his joys and sorrows and help him in distress. He will
> then have the right to expect similar treatment from his Muslim neighbor and will probably get the
> expected response. Supposing the Hindus are in a majority in a village with a sprinkling of Muslims
> in their midst, the duty of the majority towards the few Muslim neighbors is increased manifold, so
> much so that *the few will not feel that their religion makes any difference in the behavior* (Italics is
> mine) of the Hindus towards them. (HD 281 HN 7.6.1947).

At such moments, from within his Hinduism, Gandhi definitely moves towards a politics of recognition where

religious identity (whether majority or minority) is not the most important factor in being anthropocentric and

egalitarian in approach to the members of one's own state or nation. (*cf.,* 3.3.).

Gandhi's first impressions of Christianity were probably the worst experience of religion which in his

hometown in Gujarat. Whereas he liked Jainism and Buddhism, he had definite suspicions about Christianity:

> Only Christianity was at that time an exception. I developed a sort of dislikes for it. And for a reason.
> In those days Christian missionaries used to stand in a corner near the high school and hold forth,
> pouring abuse on Hindus and their gods. I could not endure this. I must have stood there to hear them
> once only, but that was enough to dissuade me from repeating the experiment. (MET 28-29)

These negative impressions slowly dissolved when he was in London where he started his learning of the New

Testament. Together with that he also met with Quakers and other Christians who gave him a distinctive

awareness of Christianity, Christians, and Christ. I have already noted the impact of the *Sermon on the Mount*

on Gandhi (*cf.*, 3.3.2.). Undoubtedly Gandhi was impressed and influenced by Christ, especially with respect to

the idea of *renunciation* and *compassion.* He compared Buddha and Christ in this regard. In South Africa he had the opportunity to come into close contact with group of Evangelical Christians. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Gandhi eventually had trouble to understand 'why a man's salvation should depend on accepting Christ as one's personal savior.' On a closer look, it is evident that Gandhi could not understand the *Divine Sonship of Jesus Christ.* The difference between Hindu *avatars* and Christian incarnation is highly theological,[479] but in any case, it should be recalled that Gandhi had a rather allegorical understanding of the former. Along with this, he seemed also to be repelled by the 'haranguing style of non-conformist sermonizing,' since religion for him was not a matter of talking but of *doing*.[480]The concepts of 'atonement' and 'grace' also created a theological dilemma in the mind of Gandhi. As an admirer of the *Gita,* for him man advances in perfection essentially through a *mārga* or path, and not by an imitation of God. If one goes by the 'one man for all' theology of atonement of sins and imperfections, one seems close to cancelling the notion *swadharma* which Gandhi could not accept.

Gandhi was strongly against the idea of *conversion* from one religion to another. The missionary approach of Christianity was not something he liked. As he constantly emphasized, religion is a matter of living not a matter of preaching or teaching. To his *ashramite* he said: "We have in the Ashram today several faiths represented. No proselytizing is practiced or permitted. We recognize that all these faiths are true and divinely inspired [...]."(HD 258 YI 2.20.1930). He also said in answering to C.F. Andrews[481] that, "But I do say that if a person really needs a change of faith I should not stand in his way." (HD 134 HN 11.28.1936).

---

[479] Hindus have 10 avatars of Vishnu who himself is a primordial avatar of the ultimate God Brahman. The basic difference between the avatars and incarnation are that the Hindu avatars are time-bound (when a particular mission is accomplished the role and relevance of that avatar is over) but the incarnation of Jesus as the son of God and its effects and relevance are forever, as discussed in Hindu religious texts.

[480] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 43.

[481] C. F. Andrews was an English priest of the Church of England and a Christian missionary and social reformer in India. He was an educator and participant in the campaign for Indian independence, and became a close friend and associate of Mahatma Gandhi. He

Between 1909 and 1910 Gandhi and Tolstoy communicated with each other, and his understanding of the New Testament deepened through Tolstoy's work *The Kingdom of God is within you*, which resonated with his ideas of *inner perfection, truth,* and *love.'* At his prayer meetings Gandhi sometimes gave discourses on the Bible. In November 1926 he wrote a series of articles on the "Sermon on the Mount" in *Young India.* In a significant statement made by the end of his life he said: "Jesus Christ might be looked upon as belonging to Christians only, but he did not belong to any community, inasmuch as the lessons that Jesus Christ gave belonged to the whole world." (HD 517 HN 1.26.1947). He also said in a later letter that:

> There is in Hinduism room enough for Jesus, as there is Mohammad, Zoroaster, and Moses. For me the different religions are beautiful flowers from the same garden, or they are branches of the same majestic tree. Therefore they are equally true, though being received and interpreted through human instruments equally imperfect. […] "Warring creeds" is a blasphemous expression. (MET 135 HN1.30.1937).

It is undeniable that Gandhi read and spoke about Christianity and Jesus Christ more extensively than most other modern Hindus. He was impressed and inspired by the serving mentality of Jesus. He also was inspired by the baptism of Jesus and the manifestation of his humility, fasting and temptation for self-purification and so on. This led him to accept something like the 'universality of Jesus' as follows:

> Jesus expressed, as no other could, the spirit and will of God, it is the sense that I see Him as the Son of God. And because the life of Jesus has the significance and the transcendence to which I have alluded, I believe that He belongs not solely to Christianity, but to the entire world, to all races and people.[482]

Gandhi's Jewish influences come mainly through his Jewish friends in London, South Africa, and India. His association with Judaism was not as extensive and in-depth in comparison to Christianity; but all of his Jewish friends had long-lasting contact with him. And undeniably they did find many ideas in common. For example, they argued on criticism of modern civilization and rationalistic-universalistic ethics. It was in the second year

---

was instrumental in convincing Gandhi to return to India from South Africa, where Gandhi had been a leading light in its Indian civil rights struggle.

[482] "Gandhiji, Christ and Christianity," in *The Modern Review*, Oct. 1941, 406 accessed June 12, 2012, http://christianpersecution.in/node/3362.

of his stay in London that two theosophist brothers introduced him to religious books like *The Song Celestial,* and *The Light of Asia.* They also introduced him to Annie Besant and Madame Blavatsky in the Theosophical society. His friends inspired him to join the society but he declined with the feeling that 'with his meager knowledge of his own religion he does not belong to any religious body.' After reading Blavatsky's book *Key to Theosophy* he stated that "This book stimulated in me the desire to read books on Hinduism, and disabused me of the notion fostered by the missionaries that Hinduism was rife with superstition."(1920: 58). Gandhi also read the Old Testament, especially the *Book of Genesis;* but he did not commit himself to reading more of it since it was not something within his interests. This Jewish/theosophical relationship continued even in Ahmedabad and Bombay. Blavatsky's[483] thinking reflects the influence of the *evolutionary ethos* which had an influence on Gandhi since he stressed that truth can only be approximated, but fully realized. The stress in Blavatsky's writings and Annie Basant's[484] speeches on *truth* also might have some influence on his universalist ethics that drew Gandhi to his Jewish friends. Chatterjee states,

> His (Gandhi's) Jewish friends of the South African days shared with him a *universalistic Ethic* (italics is mine) which seemed to them all deeply consonant with the inner core of religion minus its accrescences. The pull of this kind of universalism actually worked in an opposite direction to that of national allegiance or commitment to a particular religious tradition. Its roots had much to do with the belief of Gandhi and his friends in the need to criticize one's own tradition.[485]

3.3.5. Multiculturalism: A General Sketch

In various ways, I have been suggesting that Gandhi's thinking has affinities with and promises new resources for reflection on multiculturalism. Before reading Gandhi explicitly in that way, I propose to briefly sketch our present day understanding of multiculturalism. It can be understood as the recognition of diverse cultural entities in a given demographic context with a view of providing them equal status and privileges. (for some

---

[483] Helena Petrovna Blavatsky was a theosophist, writer and traveler.

[484] Annie Besant was a prominent British Theosophist, women's rights activist, writer and orator and supporter of Irish and Indian self-rule.

[485] Margaret Chatterjee, *Gandhi and His Jewish Friends* (London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1992), xiii. (Henceforth: Chatterjee, *Gandhi and His Jewish Friends*).

history, see above section: 3.3 note : 88, Swiss-Canadian uses). The term is discussed more in politics in the modern times where it is used for a wide variety of meanings, ranging from the advocacy of equal respect to the various cultures in a society, to a policy of promoting the maintenance of cultural diversity, and policies in which people of various ethnic and religious groups are acknowledged and defined. *Assimilationalism or homogenization* would evidently be the opposite of multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism is a body of thought in political philosophy about the proper way to respond to cultural and religious diversity. Mere toleration of group differences is said to fall short of treating members of minority groups as equal citizens; recognition and positive accommodation of group differences are required through "group-differentiated rights," a term coined by Will Kymlicka (1995). Multiculturalism is closely associated with "identity politics," "the politics of difference," and "the politics of recognition," all of which share a commitment to revaluing disrespected identities and changing dominant patterns of representation and communication that marginalize certain groups. The evident economic disadvantage-and plight-of minority groups has increased the importance of this in the economic and political spheres more than ever. (Taylor 1992, Young 1990, Gutmann 2003). But then it demands remedies for economic and political disadvantages that people suffer as a result of their minority status. Multiculturalism is also a matter of economic interests and political power. Now multiculturalism is contested between communitarians and a liberal egalitarians. This is initiated by the communitarian critique of liberalism. Liberals take an individualistic position on ethics and a good life. They give primacy to individual rights and liberties over community life and collective goods. At least a few of them take an extreme position by which they believe that one can and should account for social actions and social goods in terms of properties of the constituent individuals and individual goods. They are called "atomists" by Charles Taylor. The target of the communitarian critique of liberalism is not so much liberal ethics as liberal social ontology. Communitarians reject the idea that the individual exists prior to the

community, and that the value of social goods can be reduced to their contribution to individual well-being. They instead embrace *ontological holism*, which views social goods as "irreducibly social" (Taylor 1995).[486] This holist view of collective identities and cultures underlies Taylor's normative case for a multicultural "politics of recognition" (1992).[487] Diverse cultural identities and languages are irreducibly social goods, which should be presumed to be of equal worth. Recognition of the equal worth of diverse cultures requires replacing the traditional liberal regime of identical liberties and opportunities for all citizens with a scheme of special rights for minority cultural groups.[488] New interpretations together with these positions there is another outlook on multiculturalism which goes *beyond* the liberalism position. Philosophers who take the postcolonial perspective are those mainly proposing this view. The basic argument goes as follows: "The case for tribal sovereignty rests not simply on premises about the value of tribal culture and membership, but also on what is owed to Native peoples for the historical injustices perpetrated against them. Reckoning with history is crucial." [489] Those who argue in favor of *indigenous sovereignty* emphasize the importance of understanding indigenous claims against the historical background of the denial of equal sovereign status for indigenous groups, the dispossession of their lands, and the destruction of their cultural practices. This background calls into question the legitimacy of the state's authority over *aboriginal* peoples and provides a prima facie case for special rights and protections for indigenous groups, including the right of self-government.[490]A postcolonial perspective also seeks to develop models of constitutional and political dialogue that recognize *culturally distinct* ways of speaking and acting. Still there are liberal and nonliberal arguments on the same issue around the world. Bikhu Parekh argues, liberal theory cannot provide an impartial framework governing relations

---

[486] Charles Taylor, , "Irreducibly Social Goods,", in *Philosophical Arguments* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995).

[487] Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition," in *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, ed. A. Gutmann (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

[488] "Multiculturalism," in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy accessed March 16, 2012, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/multiculturalism/.

[489] "Multiculturalism," in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy accessed March 18, 2012, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/multiculturalism/.

[490] "Multiculturalism," in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy accessed March 18, 2012, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/multiculturalism/.

between different cultural communities.[491] He argues instead for a more open model of intercultural dialogue in which a liberal society's constitutional and legal values serve as the initial starting point for cross-cultural dialogue while also being open to contestation.

3.3.5.1. A Re-reading of Gandhi through Multiculturalism

The term *multiculturalism* was not being used at the time of Gandhi, though of course the reality of multiculturalism was everywhere in India. He used various terms like *diversity, pluralism, communalism* and *cultural differences* which are significant for our analysis of him as part of the modern multiculturalism. Gandhi's use of these words can be seen as demonstrating his concern, respect and recognition of what we recognize as multiculturalism. He understands religion and politics as intertwined, and perhaps indissociable. I have earlier enumerated Gandhi's attempt at multi-religious unity and harmony (cf. 3.3.2ff). Here I now argue that his careful reading, understanding and recognition of other religions was ultimately to *unify India* for a *nationalistic political action* against the British and eventually to form a *unified Indian state* which has most of what *multiculturalism* stands for. I will begin this passage by presenting the Gandhian engagement and recognition of the cultural diversity of India which is spread out mainly in her multi-caste, multi-lingual, and multi-ethnic demographics. Then I view the communitarian approach to multiculturalism that eventually evolves into an Indian nationalism under the leadership of Gandhi where a possible unity in diversity is achieved in the areas of religion, politics and economy.

3.3.5.2. Gandhian Intercultural Transfers and Recognition of Multiculturalism

Whatever its Hindu roots and modern context, Gandhi's approach to multicultural reality seems born from ethical concerns. He had fought the doctrine of superiority in South Africa and was also against the

---

[491] Bikkhu Parekh, *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain* (UK: Profile Books, 2000).

brahmanas[492] who claimed themselves as the superior caste by reason of their birth in India. He stated that, "I consider that it is unmanly for any person to claim superiority over a fellow-being." (MET 360). However, Gandhi supported some aspects of the *varna-ashrama* system of India which he calls the *idealistic varnasharam.* He explains it as follows:

> Whilst I have said that all men and women are born equal, I do not wish therefore to suggest that qualities are not inherited; but on the contrary I believe that just as everyone inherits a particular form so does he inherit the particular characteristics and qualities of his progenitors, and to make this admission is to conserve one's energy. […] It is this doctrine of *Varnashrama Dharma* which I have always accepted. (HD 361 YI 9.29.1927).

Gandhi felt that accepting this sort of an idealistic *varna* system will help human beings to balance between one's energy and one's material ambitions and to have the freedom to pursue one's spiritual evolution. For him, caste was not anything more than *hereditary traditional* aspect of a calling in one's life (predetermination of color and profession,[493] an immutable law of nature like Newton's law of gravitation) (HD 204). He knew the distortion of the original meaning of caste system as the wrong assumption of associating different degrees of dignity according to the differences of one's castes, and this he never supported. Gandhi disliked the use of the term *caste* since he associated it as the wrong way of practicing *varna ashrama dharma.* Apparently he saw a *constructive* meaning and usage of a *varna* system for a society.[494] This was certainly not unproblematic in the eyes of some. As we have seen, he was criticized, especially by Ambedkar, who became the greatest proponent of the *outcastes/untouchables.*

---

[492] *Brahmanas* are the highest among the four castes in the *varna (caste or color)* system of India. The other three are *kshetriyas, vaisyas,* and *shudras.*

[493] Gandhi was truly conservative in a traditional and professional manner. He states, "The inherited qualities can always be strengthened and new ones cultivated." He also remarked that in the purest state of varna there are no restrictions like prohibition of interdining and intermarriages between varnas. Though he got the principle of varna from Manusmriti he did not agree on the applications of it as it was explicated there and as appealing to him. Manusmiti contains a lot of injustices especially to women and lower castes.(HD 368-370)

[494] It is useful to compare Plato's understanding of three types of souls in his *Republic*. They were rational, spirited and appetitive in natures. Each of them was expected to be in *harmony* with themselves (reason, courage and desire) and to the polis in general. Though these divisions can be seen as a restraint for individuals in particular, it can also be seen in a constructive structure to have a harmonious polity of a balanced nature. Similarly Gandhi also seems to agree on the inner aspect of the *varna* system useful to construct a peaceful society of self-contentment. If everybody is content with their own caste and profession, society could be maintaining law and order. However, modern concept of egalitarianism is at risk in such a vision of the society.

Unsurprisingly by now, Gandhi exalts the *Bhagavad-Gita* as the source of his understanding of *varnas*. In the *Gita* unlike *Manusmriti*[495] one gets the principle of *varna* but not the directives for application which appealed to Gandhi. Even though the *Gita* speaks of the relationship of *varna*, guna and karma, according to Gandhi all those aspects are some way or other related to one's birth (HD 370). Superiority in the hierarchy of *varnas* means that they have capacity for superior service, but not superior status. Gandhi considered people of all *varnas* as equal, and he had an inclusive approach to inter-caste endeavors. He was a supporter of *varna dharma* where the duty of each *varna* by birth was emphasized. It is important to note that each dharma is equal in being dharma. Gandhi considered all professions as equal in dignity, which led him to accept the basic idea of the *varna* system. However, he was always opposed to discrimination against the "*Untouchables*" whom he called *"Harijans."* His attempt to resolve the problem of the *harijans* by combining them into the Hindu *varna* system will have incurred more criticism, than most things he did. Perhaps it is instructive to note that Gandhi himself was considered as an outcaste because of his London education and experiences. About this he says, "[…] I never had occasion to be troubled by the caste; nay, I have experienced nothing but affection and generosity from the general body of the section that still regards me as ex-communicated."(HD 76).

If *casteism* was one of the deeply rooted aspects of multiculturalism in India, the second aspect definitely is communalism. Gandhi considered it as the greatest problem in uniting the Indian population. What does communalism mean here? In the general sense, the term refers to a 'strong allegiance to one's own ethnic group rather than to society as a whole.'[496] But in the Indian subcontinent, the term communalism has taken on a very different meaning, namely one that pertains to religion. India being a cradle of world religions (Hinduism,

---

[495] The Law Book of Manu in which one finds the original explanation of the *varna system* of Hinduism.
[496] "Communalism," in *wiktionary* accessed March 23, 2012, http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/communalism

Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Islam, Parsies, Judaism and Christianity), communalism entails an attitude centered on communal/ethnic groups defined by on religious affinities.

I have now presented some background for the dialectical engagement by Gandhi of all these religions and their communal manifestations. The engagement was not merely a *spiritual* one but also *political*, including for his own self-realization and self-flourishing (*cf.*, 3.3.3.3). Strictly as a question of success or at least a project, his inter-communal relations may well be seen as a model for a multicultural approach to religions. Among the various communal groups, Muslims were the one group I can identify especially vexed, since Gandhi's efforts to unify them as part of India gave him the greatest trouble for the longest time and ultimately ended up with a negative result as evidenced by the partition of Pakistan. It should not be forgotten that his engagement of communal groups started in 1891, with his association with Abdullah Sheth who had large Muslim followers in South Africa, and the Hindu-Muslim transfer which was continued in India. Gandhi's ashram incorporated Muslims and he engaged in genuine dialogues with Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who was the prime most Muslim leader of the time. In his *Autobiography,* Gandhi acknowledged that his South African experiences had convinced him that it would be the issue of Hindu/Muslim unity that would put *ahimsa* (non-violence) to its severest test in his non-violent resistance for freedom in India. He advanced, in many respects, harmonizing the Muslim minority. Nevertheless, the task of complete unification of the different communal groups still remains as an unfinished task. Gandhian Ashrams were excellent examples of multicultural respect and recognition where people of different religions, castes and communal affinities lived together, ate together, and prayed together. These common prayers were not based primarily on 'acts of worship,' but rather on an evangelical model of the coming together of multi-faith individuals to unite themselves for political action by way of *satyagraha.*[497]

---

[497] Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenges of Religious Diversity*, 152.

Other aspects of cultural diversity were regionalism and linguism. Gandhi had to deal with the regionalism of

Tamilians, Gujaratis, Parsis, and various other groups in South Africa and also in India to secure their support

for his grand idea of *satyagraha*. Unlike communalism, regionalism has more to do with the particular region

one belongs to and the particular language that particular group spoke, then it does with on ethics or religion

centered on certain beliefs. Post-Independence historians have stressed the fact that Gandhi's efforts for

national unification was made difficult by the divide-and-rule strategy of the British Raj, especially in places

like Bengal where Bengalis were concerned about the indispensability of the colonial presence for peace and

order in India. Gandhi was convinced of the need for a secular state for India especially due to her multicultural

conditions. But it is important to articulate that for him it was not difficult to integrate his religious life with

expressiveness in the service of the secular ends. As Chatterjee observes, "Gandhi seemed to expect a degree of

human development which even today is still far from us."[498](2005:164). Gandhi's political pedagogy was to

show humanity that it is possible to bring people together across the differences of community, caste and creed.

Such concepts like *swaraj, swadeshi,* and *satyagraha* can never be attained if the society is not founded on self-

respect for themselves and for all different communities, language groups, regions, and religions. The greatness

of a civilization and a people can be traced from their multicultural co-existence. John Stuart Mill also

emphasized this 'ability to contain diversity' as a sign of a civilized community.[499] Gandhi denounced any sort

of provincialism that hindered the national unity. He was a passionate believer in the ability of human beings to

co-exist and live in harmony. This can be contrasted with the attitude of Jinnah,[500] who considered India as a

---

[498] Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenges of Religious Diversity*, 164.

[499] Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenges of Religious Diversity,* 168.

[500] Muhammad Ali Jinnah was a twentieth-century lawyer, politician and statesman who is known as the founder of Pakistan. He is popularly and officially known in Pakistan as "Great Leader. Jinnah served as leader of the All-India Muslim League from 1913 until Pakistan's independence on 14 August 1947. He rose to prominence in the Indian National Congress initially expounding ideas of Hindu-Muslim unity and helping shape the 1916 *Lucknow Pact* between the Muslim League and the Indian National Congress; he also became a key leader in the All India Home Rule League. He proposed a fourteen-point constitutional reform plan to safeguard the political rights of Muslims in a self-governing India. Jinnah later advocated the two-nation theory, embracing the goal of creating a separate Muslim state as per the Lahore Resolution ("Muhammad Ali Jinnah," in *Wikipedia* accessed April 26, 2012, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muhammad_Ali_Jinnah).

sub-continent of nationalities, since the Muslim minority never merged totally into the Hindu majority or any

other minorities. Jinnah rejected the modern concept of multiculturalism within a single nation, and thereby

ushered in the theocratic frame of Pakistan.

Gandhi was definitely challenged and in many respects cherished by the ethno-racial, linguistic, religious,

regional, and economic diversity. He was adamant about to the nourishing and promotion of diversity. He

cherished pluralism with utmost tolerance and respect for fundamental human rights. Speaking on the occasion

of the centenary of "Satyagraha" Desmond Tutu spoke very much in a Gandhian way, asking:

> When will we ever learn that the most effective way of dealing with differences, with conflict, with disagreement is not through force, not by annihilating the others? But it is through forgiveness, through negotiation, through compromise, through trying to see the point of view of the other, recognizing and respecting the essential, irreducible human spirit which is common to us all.[501]

Gandhi can be seen as elevating the notion of multiculturalism into a higher level by his perspective on the

inclusion of those realities *beyond* pure social, historical, and political dimensions of the multicultural nature of

the societies. This may be clearest in some of his strongest rhetoric: "I am not anti-English; I am not anti-

British; I am not anti-any Government; but I am anti-untruth, anti-humbug, and anti-injustice. So long as

Government spells injustice, it may regard me as its enemy, implacable enemy."[502]Analyzing Gandhi's

dialogical relationship between South Africa and India Essop Pahad brings to light a model approach to

diversity.

> In avoiding the traps of cultural relativism and ethnocentrism, we need to develop a language of perspicuous contrasts where critical reflection, learning from others and debating differences in a non-judgmental way are based on principled positions and on the attainment of the ends of equality, democracy and social justice.[503]

---

[501] Anand Sharma, gen. ed., *Gandhian Way: Peace, Non-violence, and Empowerment* (New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 2007), 44. (Henceforth: Sharma, *Gandhian Way*).

[502] Sharma, *Gandhian Way*, 202.

[503] Essop Pahad, "Dialogue between Cultures: Understanding the Contributions of India and South Africa" in *Gandhian Way* (New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 2007), 200.

Gandhi never ceased to appreciate and celebrate differences, which is true not only in the matters of religions but also in every aspects of societal life. The Indian national context in general and the Gujarat state context in particular were conducive to his aspiration to respect and recognize differences of the "other."

3.3.6. Liberal Political Approach to Multiculturalism Vs. Genuine Recognition of Cultural Diversities

Can we have different approaches to multiculturalism? If liberal political approach takes a negative turn, is it possible to have an approach of genuine recognition of diversities? Gandhi and Taylor can draw some useful directions. The history of purely political approach to multiculturalism in the West seems to demonstrate its own limits to unite people of different religions, nationalities, ethnicities and language into the mainstream nationalism to which they presently belong due to the processes of immigration or naturalization. Countries like Germany, France and Britain have already expressed their trouble with 'political (liberal) multiculturalism.'[504] In a speech delivered in Munich, the British Prime Minister, David Cameron referred to multiculturalism while he addressed the growing Islamic terrorism within Britain and abroad:

> What I am about to say is drawn from the British experience, but I believe there are general lessons for us all. In the UK, some young men find it hard to identify with the traditional Islam practiced at home by their parents, whose customs can seem staid when transplanted to modern Western countries. But these young men also find it hard to identify with Britain too, because we have allowed the weakening of our collective identity. Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream. We've failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong. We've even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run completely counter to our values.[505]

Former French president Nicolas Sarkozy joined David Cameron in condemning multiculturalism as a failure. These views of French and British leaders came just months after German Chancellor Angela Merkel said that multiculturalism in Germany had failed. Sarkozy told the French people: 'We have been too concerned about

---

[504] I use 'political multiculturalism' to emphasize the purely rational or national approach to the cultural diversities as a *political* policy to incorporate them into the mainstream nation state. I argue that the reality of cultural diversity and identity is deeper than such a rational project can ever comprehend and incorporate.

[505] David Cameron, "PM's speech at Munich Security Conference," in *BBC* accessed March 27, 2012, http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference/.

the identity of the person who was arriving and not enough about the identity of the country that was receiving him. […]'The French national community cannot accept a change in its lifestyle, equality between men and women and freedom for little girls to go to school.'[506]

Failed practices of multiculturalism need not be the failure of multiculturalism itself. Perhaps such failures should permit us to analyze the way we do multiculturalism. Taylor and Gandhi emphasize the importance of genuine recognition in bringing out constructive multiculturalism. Of course Gandhi cannot be presented here as a perfect model of successful multicultural achievements applicable to the rest of the world. Gandhi's genuine attempts were not totally successful, since the question of the Moslems in India had been an unresolved and remained as a constant difficulty, and even at some point was a disaster. The leaders of the UK, France, Germany, Australia, and Spain face similar issue of national integration where Islamic extremism is the one key issue for them to deal with. Here we may ask only, did Gandhi do a better job in uniting cultural diversities than modern liberal political multiculturalism have managed? Perhaps both of these approaches never succeed completely, but Gandhi did unite many other segments of Indian society in a significant way. Still, let us remember that Gandhi's approach to multiculturalism was not primarily political method of homogenizing, but rather one that was basically rooted in his recognition of the equality of all human beings by nature which is a comparable aspect also in Taylor. And this in turn rooted in his ontology of morality and Truth, which finally was fundamentally developed out of a metaphysical openness to the spiritual experiments and experiences.

There is one more consideration. Whereas Gandhi can be considered as a champion of 'conflict resolution' with his unique method of *ahimsa* (nonviolence), in India. The modern concept of "state"[507] and the concept of

---

[506]Nicholas Sarkozy, "Multiculturalism Failed," in *Daily Mail* accessed March 27, 2012, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1355961/Nicolas-Sarkozy-joins-David-Cameron-Angela-Merkel-view-multiculturalism-failed.html.

[507] State is an organized sovereign political entity under a government.

"nation"[508] may seem invested with special difficulty in the way of complete success of that project. *The Treaty of Westphalia* (1648)[509] initiated a notion of *state* that is inherently uncomfortable with the idea of *cultural diversity*. The lower the range of the cultural diversity, the more comfortable the state is. From here there is easy passage to standardizing uniform and homogenous citizenship.[510] Alongside this, Oomen states, "Nation, in contrast to state, is basically diversifying; it is incessantly in search of roots. Roots, to be meaningful, will have to be specific and to be specified. […] This is utterly against the homogenizing orientation of the state."[511]

Gandhi did not have such a conception of "state" in his mind and so he *enjoyed* the differences[512] and genuinely recognized them for unification in view of a *unified nation*. But the matter of differences vis-à-vis state has proven resistant. Taylor's criticism against homogenization also is relevant comparison for this research.

3.4. Gandhi's Quest for Authenticity and his Method of *Experiments with Truth*

Gandhi was constantly a *sataygrahi* (seeker of truth or practioner of *satyagraha*). His never ending *experiments with truth* were a means to *authenticate* the truths he found. Taylor's notion of *strong evaluation* deploys something similar, though he draws the concept of authenticity from the romantic tradition. According to Taylor, the concept of authenticity is the brainchild of romanticism though in our modern times many reductionist thinkers have stripped the concept of its fundamental relationship with community, nature and God. Gandhi's concept of authenticity is basically an expression of his own *authentic personal life* and a *message* that is not fundamentally different from what Taylor ascribes to the *original* concept of authenticity. In Taylor, the process of attaining and affirming authenticity evolves through the three stages of the

---

[508] The word nation came to English from the Old French word nacion, which in turn originates from the Latin word natio (nātīō) literally meaning "that which has been born." A nation may refer to a community of people who share a common language, culture, ethnicity, descent, or history. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nation accessed on 06.11.12). The word *nation* seems to have more comprehensive meaning compared to the term *state* which concentrate mainly on the political authority and governance of the people.

[509] "Peace of Westphalia," in *Wikipedia* accessed June 11, 2012, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peace_of_Westphalia.

[510] C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 32.

[511] T. K. Oommen, "New Nationalism and Collective rights: the case of South Asia," in *Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Minority Rights* eds. Stephen May, Tariq Modood and Judith Squires (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 121.

[512] Margaret Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity*, 11.

understanding of *good*(s), standardizing them by the method of stronger evaluation, and affirmation by articulation. Gandhi, a *satyagrahi* (seeker of truth)*,* had an understanding of Truth and truths, confirmed them out of his *experiments,* and articulated them by his life - thoughts, words, and actions. Taylor's concept of *good* and Gandhi's concept of *truth* seem to be similar, at least analogous, since both these concepts are evolved out the moral frame works. In order to better understand this, I propose to explore the origin, content, and practice of *satyagraha,* in order to clarify its epistemological and political aspects.

3.4.1. The Concept of *Satyagraha*[513] (Firmness of Desire for Truth): Birth of a 'Revolutionary' Theory

Gandhi's concept of *satyagraha* evolved from practices and inaugurated first in South Africa, and pursued, even culminated in India. This concept is original, creative and revolutionary in nature. It is based on the simple weapons of truth and non-violence and aims to unleash an indomitable moral force which, as history records, not only raised among Indians powerful aspirations of freedom from colonial oppression, suppression and social injustice, but also inspired millions around the world in their quest for freedom, justice, and a life of dignity.

Gandhi's philosophy of *satyagraha* provides the foundation for social, economic and political progress with a proper moral direction and anchor. The term *satyagraha*[514] is understood variously as soul-*force* or *firmness of* truth. The concept of *satyagraha* can be understood as the most philosophical and most influential concept of Gandhi's life, works and actions. According to the philosophy, supporting it, practitioners of *satyagraha* should achieve correct insight into the real nature of an evil situation by observing nonviolence of the mind, by seeking truth in a spirit of peace and love, and by undergoing a rigorous process of self-scrutiny.[515] In so doing, the *satyagrahi* individually resort to personal experiments in search of *self-purification* which is the

---

[513] The core principle of Satyagraha is holding on to truth, performing love-force or soul-force, presenting firmness in a good cause to create a change for better (CWMG 20: 39; 34: 93).

[514] The word satyagraha has different meanings like, soul-force, love-force, truth-force, firmness of truth, insistence on truth, zeal for truth, passive resistance, non-violent resistance, and civil resistance.

[515] "Satyagraha," in *Britannica* accessed April 5, 2012, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/525247/satyagraha.

preliminary preparation for the method of *satyagraha.* (MET 266). Here one may think of the method of *strong evaluations* which Taylor conceives as the process of prioritizing goods on the basis of their *qualitative distinctions.* Both Gandhi and Taylor thus envision a process of prioritization and focus as standard for a grounded pursuit of goods that will ensure the common benefit of society. Of course, Gandhi's distinctive spiritual articulation provides for a somewhat better definition of goods, than one finds Taylor's accounts, for whom the *order of goods* relies finally on the individual choice.

3.4.1.1. Evolution of the Revolutionary Idea of *Truth-Force/Love-Force*

The genealogy of the ideology of *satyagraha* can be traced to the childhood background of Gandhi in his hometown in Gujarat, where the *Vaishnava tradition* of the Hindus gave importance to the practice of ahimsa (non-violence) and enduring suffering for a noble cause, rather than aggressively fighting for it. This initial root in non-violence and a positive value for suffering was eventually deepened by his reading of the *Bhagavad Gita* and the New Testament while he was in London. He started to read the books of Tolstoy only after being in South Africa. Judith Brown observes rightly that, "[…] when Indians in South Africa resorted to passive resistance they did so as the *natural reaction* (italics are mine) to their situation of a weak group without other forms of leverage, rather than as the direct result of any of the ideas Gandhi had been studying or of his personal contacts with contemporary exponents of passive resistance."[516] It was on September 11, 1906 that young Gandhi started his peaceful resistance against discrimination, oppression and injustice at a public meeting in Johannesburg, South Africa. (SSA 68).[517] His experiences with discrimination and racial insults in South Africa enabled him to make a victim/oppressed-centered political theory which was morally,

---

[516] Judith M. Brown, *Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics 1915-1922* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 6-7. (Henceforth: J.M. Brown, *Gandhi's Rise to Power*). This account is important to demonstrate that Satyagraha is an original contribution of Gandhi. Tolstoy had similar ideas in his writings to which Gandhi had access only after he started satyagraha in South Africa.

[517] Mohandas K. Gandhi, *Satyagraha in South Africa* trans. Valji Govindji Desai (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1928), 68 (Henceforth: SSA provided within the body of the text). *Cf.,* also http://arvindguptatoys.com/arvindgupta/gandhisouthafrica.pdf.

epistemologically and spiritually grounded. Unlike philosophers who are mostly inspired and influenced by other intellectual traditions,[518] Gandhi's philosophy, especially the philosophy of civil resistance/non-violent resistance, was thus framed largely by his own *direct* experience of rejection and discrimination.[519]

In his *Autobiography,* Gandhi has three sections on *Satyagraha* which give a general outline of the eventual emergence of the theory and practice of *satyagraha.* They are *The Birth of Satyagraha*, *Domestic Satyagraha*, and *Miniature Satyagraha*. Gandhi states that "The principle of *satyagraha* came into being before that name was invented." (MET 266). His experiments with *Brahmacharya* (vow of chastity) culminated in the origin of *satyagraha.* This concept was translated as "passive resistance," which Gandhi felt was *narrowly construed,* (SSA 73f). since it gives an impression that it is a 'weapon of the weak' who can operate on the basis of their hatred with a method of violence. The best word was originated by his own nephew, Maganlal Gandhi, who coined it as *sadagraha* (*Sat*: truth; *Āgraha*: Firmness). Gandhi changed the word *sadāgraha* to *satyagraha*.[520] Although both have the same meaning Gandhi felt the latter sounded better. The origin and history of this concept has to be traced back from his life and activities in South Africa where he wrote about the purpose of the book *Satyagraha in South Africa* as follows*:* "My object in writing the present volume is that the nation might know how Satyagraha, for which I live, for which I desire to live and for which I believe I am equally prepared to die, originated and how it was practiced on a large scale."(SSA 62).

---

[518] Predominant philosophies can apparently be traced back to its predecessors. For example, Plato's philosophy is influenced by his teacher Socrates. Plato had clear influence on Augustine and so on. The influence of Hegel's philosophy on Karl Marx is also evident. Gandhi's originality of thinking is significant.

[519] Gandhi had various first hand experiences of discriminations. He was thrown out of a train in the middle of a cold night for daring to travel first class with a ticket. A swearing conductor dragged him down from a coach. He was kicked into the gutter by a sentry for daring to walk past Paul Krugger's house in Pretoria. Gandhi was arrested in Transvaal for protesting against the registration Act of 1900 and kept in a cell with common criminals. He was stoned and kicked by a racist white mob in Durban. In London he saw the pitiable conditions of the working class and in South Africa he observed the inhuman treatment of the blacks and was deeply pained by the treatment of the Zulu warriors and prisoners. All of these experiences made him intensely sensitive to all forms of oppression and exploitation and made him a champion of those sections of society.

[520] The term originated in a competition in the news-sheet Indian Opinion in South Africa in 1906[5]. It was an adaptation by Gandhi as one of the entries in that competition. "Satyagraha" is a Tatpuruṣa compound of the Sanskrit words *satya* (meaning "truth") and *Agraha* ("insistence", or "holding firmly to"). *Cf.,* also his Autobiography (MET 266).

The second stage of the growth of *satyagraha* can be seen in the *Domestic Satyagraha* section of his autobiography, where he insists on diet, especially salt and pulses (The edible seeds of certain pod-bearing plants, such as peas and beans). When salt was denied in the prison he took it as a privilege to improve his self-restraint. (MET 272-3). Gandhi speaks about the relationship between fasting (diet) and *brahmacharya* (celibacy) as follows:

> Though I have made out an intimate connection between diet and Brahmacharya, it is certain that mind is the principal thing. A mind consciously unclean cannot be cleansed by fasting. Modifications in diet have no effect on it. The concupiscence of the mind cannot be rooted out except by intense self-examination. […]. But there an intimate connection between mind and the body, and the carnal mind always lusts for delicacies and luxuries. (MET 275).

Self-purification and self-discipline were required of each *satyagrahi,* each practioner of *satyagraha*. His domestic experiments in diet, fasting and *Brahmacharya* significantly helped them to grow in the ideal of *satyagraha.* Gandhi's wife, Kasturba, also joined the suit. Hence as a predominantly pragmatist, Gandhi adopted an idealist perspective and formulated situations in which this new idea can be practiced. He eventually enriched the idea with his further readings and reflections; identified what type of people would be appropriate for the successful practice of it; and very carefully distinguished it from other pragmatist political weapons which were mostly based on violent means. Gandhi began to practice this new method in the *micro level* (miniature *satyagrahas*) and eventually into the *macro level* of the national political context. The idea of *satyagraha* and the related concept of ahimsa make Gandhi a champion of conflict resolution which Judith Brown characterizes as follows: "He (Gandhi) believed that non-violence was the only way to resolve any sort of conflict, from the smallest in his ashram to the greatest contest with imperial rule."[521]

3.4.1.2. Essentials of *Satyagraha* (Truth/Love Force)

---

[521] Judith M. Brown "Gandhi as a Nationalist Leader, 1915-1948" in *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi* eds. Judith M. Brown and Anthony Parel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) 55. (Henceforth: Brown, "Gandhi as a Nationalist Leader")

In order to understand Gandhi's political and spiritual values, which were simultaneously 'active and reflective,'[522] it is important to penetrate some of the inner dynamism and inner contents of this seminal idea of *satyagraha*. Jagdish Sharma calls him as a 'sage in revolt,'[523] and indeed we know that his personal life and his philosophy were intimately related. Evincing all of this Gandhi defines the essential aspects of *Satyagraha* as follows:

> Truth (*satya*) implies love, and firmness (*āgraha*) engenders and therefore serves as a synonym for force. I thus began to call the Indian movement *Satyagraha*, that is to say, the Force which is born of Truth and Love or non-violence, and gave up the use of the phrase "passive resistance"[…] (SSA 72).

There are basically two aspects within the concept of *satyagraha* viz., *satya* (truth) and *āgraha* (firmness). However, the concept *satya* also has its implied concepts like 'love or non-violence' (*ahimsa*). Undoubtedly, Gandhi's search for truth must be placed at the heart of everything he did and accomplished including *satyagraha*. But together with *ahimsa* Gandhi also associates two other concepts in the practice of *satyagraha* viz., *tapasya* (self-suffering) and the theory of the justification as *means and ends*. Let us look more closely at them.

3.4.2. Relationship between *Satya* and *Ahimsa*: Nonviolence is the Means and Truth is the End

Gandhi's concepts of Truth and Nonviolence are so closely related that one might understand associated concepts like *agraha, Tapasya*, and the theory of justification of means and ends as their simple variants. He says as much in the *Ashram Vows*:

> It is perhaps clear […] that without *ahimsa* it is not possible to seek and find Truth. *Ahimsa* and Truth are so intertwined that it is practically impossible to disentangle and separate them. They are like the two sides of a coin, or rather of a smooth unstamped metallic disc. […] Nevertheless *ahimsa* is the means; Truth is the end. Means to be means must always be within our reach, and so *ahimsa* is our

---

[522] Mark Juergensmeyer, "Shoring Up the Saint: Some Suggestions for Improving Satyagraha," in *Gandhi's Significance for Today* eds. John Hick and Lamont C. Hempel (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989), 37. (Henceforth: Juergensmeyer, "Shoring Up the Saint").

[523] Jagdish Saran Sharma, *Mahatma Gandhi: A Descriptive Biography* (Delhi: S. Chand &Co., 1968), 119.

supreme duty. If we take care of the means, we are bound to reach the end sooner or later. (HD 251, Section on *Ahimsa/Love* in *Ashram Vows*).

Concerning Truth he tells us,

> The word *Satya* (Truth) is derived from *Sat*, which means 'being.' Nothing is or exists in reality except Truth. That is why *Sat* or Truth is perhaps the most important name of God. In fact it is more correct to say that Truth is God, than to say that God is Truth. (HD 247)

In his Sabarmati Ashram, Gandhi insisted on the practice of truth in thought, in speech, and in action. In order to achieve this end he promoted 1). the concepts of *abhyāsa* (single-minded devotion) and *vairāgya* (indifference to all other interests in life), yet again from his favorite book, *Bhagavad Gita*. Gandhi understood knowledge, devotion and action as the means to Truth. He observed that "where there is Truth, there is also knowledge which is true. Where there is no Truth, there can be no true knowledge." (HD 247). The inherent power of Truth lies 'latent until it is embodied in the actions as well as the thoughts of a human being'[524] which means Truth finds its expression in action. In all of this, he seems to integrate the three major Hindu understandings of the ways of realization of Truth – *Jnāna*, *Bhakti*, and *Karma yogas*. In his commentary of the *Gita* Gandhi states, "According to common notions, a mere learned man will pass as a pandit. He need not perform any service. He will regard as bondage even to lift a little lota. Where one test of knowledge is non-liability for service, there is no room for such mundane work as the lifting of a lota."(GAG 130, section 19). Evidently, Gandhi gave more importance to action/service for his self-realization. For him, knowledge and devotion should help one to be well positioned to serve humanity by "selfless action," since "No one has attained his goal without action." (GAG 131, section 20; *cf*., also my ch. 3.1.2.3ff).

2). The concept *Tapas* (Self-Suffering) is also focused on the quest for Truth or another means to find Truth. He viewed that, "[…] the quest of Truth involves *tapas* – self-suffering, sometimes even unto death. There can

---

[524] Iyer, *The Essential Writings of Gandhi*, 152.

be no place in it for even a trace of self-interest. In such selfless search for Truth nobody can lose his bearings for long." (HD 248).

3). *Āgraha*/Firmness or Desire comes in the context of conflicting desires of the human condition. Gandhi certainly not envisions a world devoid of desires. Rather, perhaps in tune with Taylor, he seeks to prioritize desires in favor of a deep *firmness (āgraha).* This has implications for social and political interaction. Gandhi's understanding of human beings assumed that there are varying perceptions of relative truths and goods. Hence there will always be differences of opinion and orientation of desires between people. The issue for Gandhi was not to avoid conflicting desires, but rather to make the human agent an effective and firm fighter for 'overarching'[525] goods. And so, *āgraha* must also be understood as *force.* For Gandhi, *satyagraha* is a movement that in one way or other shows the nature of *āgraha* which is on the move and never static. According to Mark Juergensmeyer,

> The term (*satyagraha* as movement) was meant to be applied not to some static situation, or to an ontological state, but to a form of action. It is action to be done in the context of conflict, which is why *satyagraha* is often described as a method of fighting […] not so much a method of resolving fights as one of waging them […] he often seek to encourage engagement, especially when silence would imply consent to an ongoing form of injustice. […] Like Hobbes and Marx, he saw this persistent state of conflict as the greatest challenge facing socially responsible individuals and institutions.[526]

It is interesting to observe how Gandhi and Marx were different in their approach and attitude toward conflicting situations of the society. In Marx the conflict was supposed to be resolved by the 'dogma of class struggle' as resolution that emerges out of a 'synthesis' not out of a 'compromise.' This dialectic does not work for Gandhi. The method loses its lasting validity when it is entangled in historicism. Here no solution or compromise comes out of it. Rather, problems remain, but change form or expression.[527] Gandhi's economic, political, and ethical insights signify a basic (hopeful, optimistic) conviction that human beings are by nature

---

[525] This term is from Charles Taylor's *Sources of the Selves.*
[526] Juergensmeyer, "Shoring Up the Saint" 38.
[527] Joan Bondurant, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 192ff.

capable of achieving genuine morality, and hence make society morally better. His concept of *satyagraha* based on non-violence and love is fundamental to this endeavor.

3.4.3. Authenticity and "Experiments with Truth": From Plurality to Authentic *Truth*

Gandhi's "experiments with truth" implicate the more western themes of pursuit of authenticity. Gandhi's experiments were to train himself and his followers as *satyagrahis*- practioners of *satyagraha*. Near the end of his autobiography, Gandhi sums up:

> I set a high value on my experiments. I do not know whether I have been able to do justice to them. I can only say that I have spared no pains to give a faithful narrative. To describe *truth* (Italics is mine), as it has appeared to me, and in the exact manner in which I have arrived at it, has been my ceaseless effort. (MET 419).

Just after this, he adds, "My uniform experience has convinced me that there is no other God than *Truth* (Italics is mine). […] the only means for the realization of *Truth* (Italics is mine) is *Ahimsa."*(MET 419). Here the two forms of truth – with small and capital letters (Truth and truth) – imply a path, and ascending scale of priorities of "experiments" and authentic articulation. Most of Gandhi's "experiments" where enumerated and instructed is *ashramites* in Samarmati, and which were expounded as "Principles for *Satyagrahis*." For him, *satyagraha* was not merely a political tactic to resolve social and political issues but also as a universal solvent for injustice and harm. He felt that it was equally applicable to a large-scale political struggle and to one-on-one interpersonal conflicts and that it should be taught to everyone.[528] The foundation of the Sabarmati Ashram[529]

---

[528] Gandhi, M.K. "The Theory and Practice of Satyagraha" in *Indian Opinion* 1914; Young India, February 4, 1920, *cf.,* also http://www.fredsakademiet.dk/library/satyagraha.pdf.

[529] Upon returning from South Africa on January 9, 1915, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was in search for a place to settle himself and a small group of relatives and associates who were with him in the African struggle. His political views still unformed, Gandhi chose Ahmedabad in the West Indian state of Gujarat for three reasons, "being a Gujarati, I'll serve my country best through the use of the Gujarati language. As Ahmedabad was the center of the handloom in early days, the work of the spinning wheel (charkha) could be done in a better way, I believed. Being the capital of Gujarat its wealthy persons will also make a larger contribution, I hoped." The land was far from the city of Ahmedabad, surrounded by a jungle full of snakes, and situated along the steep rugged cliffs of the Sabarmati River. Nearby, was a British Prison filled with the sounds of iron chains of the inmates engaged in manual labor. Thunder, lightning, and heavy rains marked the day of Gandhi's final decision. He said, 'This is the right place for our activities to carry on the search for Truth and develop Fearlessness – for, on one side, are the iron bolts of the foreigners, and on the

was mostly to train followers in *satyagraha*. Gandhi insisted that members follow a set of principles that in one way or other reflect his own "experiments with truth." They were nonviolence (*ahimsa*), Chastity (*brahmacharya*) - this includes celibacy and the subordination of other sensual desires to the primary devotion to truth - non-stealing, non-possession, body-labor or bread-labor, fasting (vegetarianism and dietetics); control of the palate, vow of fearlessness, equal respect for all religions, commitments to the ideals of *swaraj*, *swadeshi*, and *sarvodaya*, education through the vernaculars, and freedom from untouchability.[530]

Again, all of these vows and disciplines were focused on the basic concept *satyagraha.* The discipline, a path implying commitment, joins easily with the idea of *swaraj* with respect to its personal and political applications. Recall that *Swaraj,* for Gandhi, is meant primarily as *self-rule* and secondarily as *Home Rule for India.* Similarly, *satyagraha*, together with all its trajectories of experiments, also has a personal authentication but also a public use and demonstration of it as a political weapon of non-violence. The vows were promulgated and practiced by the Gandhian Ashrams in view of preparing them personally and *domestically* before they practiced it *politically.* Gandhi insisted 'well tried disciplines' in the pursuit of truth, which mainly focused on the practice of yoga, meditation, prayer, silence and restrictive diet. Vows of nonviolence, chastity, and non-possession were insisted in the Ashram in general. He stated that "we have at the present moment everybody claiming the right of conscience without going through any discipline whatsoever that there are so many untruths being delivered to a bewildered world."[531]

The issue of subjectivity and objectivity of truth has been debated for centuries. Gandhi's insistence on the emphasis on objectivity of subjective truth claims can be a challenge for our modern day debates on truth. His 'experiments with truth' clearly demonstrate the importance of 'objective factuality' and the 'empirical

---

other, thunderbolts of Mother Nature." ("History of Ashrams," in *The Sabarmati Ashram* accessed April 10, 2012, http://www.indcast.com/ms/ASHRAM%20HISTORY.htm).

[530] Iyer, *The Essential Writings of Gandhi*, 281-298.

[531] Hick, *Gandhi's Significance for Today*, 100.

component' in truth together with perception and ideological claims. Gandhi's conviction is captured well by Rex Ambler: "[…] there can be no doubt that any insight gained had be tested, and that the crucial test was always how it worked out in practice. This, essentially, is what he meant by '*experiments* with Truth' […]."[532]

3.4.4. Authentication of Nonviolent Political Action

Gandhi's understanding of politics included a refusal to separate it from life in its entirety. This means recognizing, and living by, values in everyday life that also inform political praxis. Gandhi measured progress, in personal life and in politics, in terms of genuine human happiness. But this does not signal an endorsement of utilitarianism (pursuing the greatest good of the greatest number), nor much sympathy for the modern interest in affluence measured by development. Rather,

> […]he wanted a social order which would secure the greatest good of *all,* i.e., SARVODAYA. He wanted a society in which every man would have equal status, opportunity and freedom to develop. He wanted a simple society in which economic progress and social justice would go together.[533]

How does he *authenticate* this idea as a model for any future political theory and praxis? According to Rex Amber, "[…] the political techniques of satyagraha are made intelligible by Gandhi in terms of the inevitable relativity of our perception of Truth. *Satyagraha* is a form of action appropriate to the dual character of Truth as *one in essence* (Italics is mine) but diverse in practice."[534] His attempt at conflict resolution was based fundamentally on a sense of the *essence of truth* as it is present in the minds of others, which he eventually brought to light through a practical mode of personal and collective action. Here the concept of *ahimsa* (nonviolence or love) becomes important, as the dynamism by which *means* and *ends* should be justified in our pursuit of truth.

---

[532] Hick, *Gandhi's Significance for Today*, 100.

[533] Maraji Desai, "Gandhiji and the Destiny of Man", in *Mahatma Gandhi 100 Years,* ed. S. Radhakrishnan (New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1968), 65 (Henceforth: Radhakrishnan, *Gandhi 100 Years*)

[534] Rex Ambler, "Gandhi's Concept of Truth" in *Gandhi's Significance for Today: The Elusive Legacy*, ed. John Hick and Lamont C. Hempel (London, Macmillan, 1989), 90-108. (Henceforth: Amber, "Gandhi's Concept of Truth").

Taylor's "The Politics of Recognition," while it does *recognize* the heterogeneity of multicultural modern societies, does not seem to get to quite the depth of Gandhi since latter has the privilege of lived experience of it in South Africa and India. While Gandhi tries to emphasize the *truth/love force* of human self, Taylor apparently tries to *recognize* the human agent, with his/her cultural differences. Perhaps Taylor's positions are defined by a concern to remain strictly realistic and in that sense practical.[535] In contrast, Gandhi's position is evidently idealistic, that according to an idealism that is practical. It is rooted in the highest religious ideals, but is thoroughly practical insofar as it challenges the purely rationalistic political theories that propose 'global' or 'universal' ethos without any authentication in a practice.

By extension from his practical idealism, Gandhi can also be understood as a humanist with regard to the intensity and extent to which he sought and served Truth in humanity. Nevertheless, to perceive truth and profess it was more a matter of courage than of intelligence for him. His humanism takes confidence in the universal reality of Truth and its power to disclose itself through the perception and profession of the ordinary people.[536] The emphasis on "Truth" of means and ends makes Gandhi distinct from most western political thinkers. Machiavelli also envisioned a secular, humanistic, naturalistic morality. He, also, had a *public morality* besides his pragmatic emphasis.[537] But the "murderous Machiavelli" who appeared as the "teacher of evil"[538] is a stunning contrast with Gandhi, who reiterated the purity of both means and ends. The former could easily break the eggs when he chose to make an omelet, but the latter will change his decision to make an omelet because it hurts the eggs. The former will think that ruthless methods are necessary to provide good results; the latter will avoid such good results that come out of such ruthless means. Gandhi's means inevitably

---

[535] The appreciation of Gandhi by Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, philosopher and former President of India, was written as the Introduction to *All Men Are Brothers*, a selection of *Mahatma's Writings* first published by Unesco in 1958, and reprinted in a new edition to mark the centenary of Gandhi's birth on October 2, 1869.

[536] Ambler, "Gandhi's Concept of Truth," 90.

[537] Isaiah Berlin, "The Originality of Machiavelli"*, in Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1979), 50-51, 58-60. (Henceforth: Berlin, "The Originality of Machiavelli").

[538] Berlin, "The Originality of Machiavelli," 28-35.

were nonviolent and his end ultimately was to realize truth. His political method *satyagraha* meant an authentication of nonviolent power legitimized by its adherence to truth.

On often hears charges of absolutism or fanaticism in people who base their actions on higher religious and ethical norms. Gandhi can be exempted from such accusations. He once wrote:

> My own conscious claim is very simple and emphatic. I am a humble but very earnest seeker after truth. And in my search, I take all fellow-seekers in uttermost confidence so that I may know my mistakes and correct them. I confess that I have often erred in my estimates and judgments. (CWMG 45: 335-36).

Gandhi always believed that swaraj gained through violent means will inevitably give only violent independence. He said, "There is not a separation between means and ends. Indeed, the Creator has given us control (that too very limited) over means, none over the end. Realization of the goal is in exact proportion to that of the means. This is a proportion that admits no exception."(CWMG 24: 396).

3.5. Holistic Identity and Harmony of Life: A Gandhian Integration

We have already studied in some detail Taylors' *immanent frame,* as a model for moral identity that includes provision for an openness to the *transcendent.* Gandhi's position is amenable to this only so long as one does not overemphasize his stature as a 'spiritual, religious, and national figure,' that is to say, so long as, one bears in minds his achievement in the simple range of philosophy and morality. In short, one must attend especially to the outcome of a position that manages to incorporate and integrate a remarkable plurality of goods from perspective quite distinct from his own. To be sure, Gandhi is a spiritual thinker, but it is not that his spirituality determines his thinking so much as the thinking unfolds in a manner that remains essentially open to it.

Taylor and Gandhi are, each in his own way, scattered and incomplete in their development of many central ideas, especially in the areas of selfhood, identity and politics. What unity there is can be grasped in Taylor's

consistency of purpose in his writings, and the consistency in Gandhi's writings with his own life.[539] In other

words, Taylor's predominantly intellectual construct and Gandhi's predominantly *experiential* construct do not

seem to differ in their ultimate intent and in giving insight to the readers.

Let me now turn to some features of this unity in the work Gandhi that flows from his experience and sense of

purpose. I will focus on harmony and holism, and once again begin from some Indian background which has a

long tradition and practice of a vision of an encompassing unity of reality.

3.5.1. Unified Perspective of life in the Indian Tradition

Gandhi's *Hindu Privilege* (cf. 3.3.3.) is formative of his concept of the harmony of human life with all its

plural dimensions and goods. Some of the major concepts that emerged from Hindu traditions like *dharma* and

satya with their *inclusive* and *tolerant* understanding and approach have shaped not only his ideas, but first his

very life and practices. Now if we seek a philosophical account of these concepts and attitudes, we must

remember that in India, the Hindu religion and Hindu philosophy (which is in turn Indian philosophy) are

inseparably related. In India "fundamental religious conceptions have been accepted as the first principles of

philosophy," hence the "task of the Indian philosopher is not to synthesize human wisdom but to enquire into

the true nature of relationship between Soul and God, the two vital elements of the Universe."[540] Bearing this in

mind, let us attend to the holism explicit in Gandhi's work.

3.5.2. Gandhi's Holistic Approach to Reality and Identity

---

[539] Here I have no intention to demonstrate that Taylor was not *doing* anything socially, politically, and culturally, which he really did and which I understand while I participated in the International Conference in Montreal in relation to his 80th Birthday. Taylor's influence in Canada is significant especially in the Canadian struggle to incorporate linguistic and cultural diversity. Still it is explicit that Gandhi's religious and political writings were byproducts of his life experiments.

[540] S. N. Balasundaram, "The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi," in *Gandhi: Theory and Practice – Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance* ed. S.C. Biswas (Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Studies, 1969), 425 (Henceforth: Balasundaram, "The Philosophy of Mahatmas Gandhi").

The Greek term *holos* (whole) is a philosophic concept in which an entity is seen as more than the sum of its parts. To be more exact, parts of a whole are in *intimate interconnection*, such that they cannot exist or be understood *independently* of the whole.[541] The foundational principle of 'holism' is seen originally in Aristotle's *Metaphysics* as, "For all things that have more than one part, and of which the sum is not like a heap, but a whole that is something over and above the parts, have something that is responsible for them."[542] i.e., 'the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.' Holism is prominent in current approaches to psychology, biology, nursing, medicine, and other fields.[543]

But its use in anthropology is especially relevant here. The holistic approach to anthropology supports a "four-field" approach to better understand a human person. Those four fields are physical, archaeological, linguistic, and cultural aspects of human beings. It basically considers the features of all human beings across times and places and with all dimensions like biophysical, sociopolitical, economic, cultural, psychological, and so on. Alfred Adler believed that the 'individual – with one's own thinking, feeling, and action - must be understood within the larger wholes of society. Edgar Morin, a French philosopher and sociobiologist, is another example of a holist who spoke about *transdisciplinary* approaches.[544] There is a distinctive understanding of holism as a theory or holism as an ideology. The former is phenomenal wholism. There are divisions like totalistic wholism and individuated wholism,[545] and some form of a holism is seen in Plato and Aristotle. The German idealist Hegel, who significantly influenced Taylor in his philosophical approach to human agency and history, also

---

[541] "Holism," in *Wikipedia* accessed April 16, 2012, wikipedia.org/wiki/Holism.

[542] Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book VIII (Book H) Chapter 6: 1045a: 8-10, trans. Joe Sachs (New Mexico: Green Lion Press, 1999), 163-164.

[543] The history of the word "holism" is diverse and extensive. The South African statesman Jan Smuts used it in 1926 in his book *Holism and Evolution,* which was basically connected to the tendency of nature to form wholes that are greater than the sum of the parts of the creative evolution. As a French Protestant missionary he used the holistic approach in his ethnological studies. Scientific holism holds that the behavior of a system cannot be perfectly predicted. There is an irreducibility reality due to the interconnectivity. Holism in medicine appears as psychosomatic approaches to medicine. Ayurveda is an example of holistic medicine from the India context.("Wholism," in *Webstatsdomain.com* accessed April 16, 2012, http://www.webstatsdomain.com/domains/wholism.askdefine.com/).

[544]"Wholism," in *Webstatsdomain.com* accessed April 16, 2012, http://www.webstatsdomain.com/domains/wholism.askdefine.com/

[545] Sal P. Restivo, *The Social Relations of Physics, Mysticism and Mathematics* (Boston: D Reidel Publishing Company, 1985), 116.

has affinity to a sort of holism explicit in his pantheistic approach to the absolute reality. Taylor expresses this holism of Hegel as he analyzes the most central 'problem' or theme of Hegel which in turn happened to be the problem for which the thinkers of our time are also searching for a solution. "It concerned the nature of human subjectivity and its relation to the world. It was a problem uniting two seemingly indispensable images of man, which on one level had deep affinities with each other, and yet could not but appear utterly incompatible."(HL 3).[546]

In all of this, Gandhi – and Taylor – is holists especially insofar as opposed to any reductionism or individualism. We have already see Taylor's resistance to the damaging impact of *materialistic reductionism, individualism,* and *instrumental* use of reason. (*cf.*, ch. 2.2ff). Gandhi also explicitly attacks materialism and industrialism when they are moral and spiritual meanings. (*cf.*, ch.1.2.5ff). What Gandhi and Taylor share in this respect is a sense of the importance of adopting a *communitarian/collective* approach to reality, as richer and more constructive approach to developing the social and political dimensions of human action and interaction. This social-political commitment to holism seems consistent with an existential-experiential commitment to personal harmony.

3.5.2.1. Holism of satya (truth) and Satya (Truth): Relative and Absolute Aspects of Truth

In his autobiography he states,

> […] for me truth is the sovereign principle, which includes numerous other principles. This truth is not only truthfulness in word, but truthfulness in thought also, and not only the relative truth of our conception, but the Absolute Truth, the Eternal Principle, that is God. […] But I worship God as Truth only. I have not yet found Him, but I am seeking after Him. […] But as long as I have not realized this Absolute Truth, so long as must I hold by the relative truth as I have conceived it. (MET XI)

Here we see the *rational* synthesis that Gandhi develops of the relative truths he encountered in his experiences. This synthesis is achieved in an orientation towards an Absolute Truth (God) as the cumulative

---

[546] Charles Taylor, *Hegel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 3. (Henceforth: HL).

result of all the *relative truths.* This *openness* to an Absolute is, of course, reminiscent of the *open immanent frame* we have encountered in Taylors *A Secular Age* (SA 595ff; *cf.,* also ch. 2.5.2.1.). Let us look more closely at this feature of Gandhi's work that passes so closely to Taylor's.

As Gandhi views it "The word *satya* (Truth) is derived from *sat,* which means 'to be', 'to exist'. Only God is, in every way the same through all time. […] Truth cannot exist without love. Truth includes non-violence, *Brahmacharya,* non-stealing and other rules."[547] It is clear that *sat* is not only a cognitive affair but also the goal of all human undertakings. John Hick comments:

> Gandhi taught that truth is God. This very naturally puzzles the philosophically educated Westerner who is likely to think of the truth as the sum of all true propositions […] the heart of *satya,* Truth is *sat,* reality, the real, the true, the ultimate. Indeed Gandhi treated *Satya* and *sat* as synonymous […].[548]

Perhaps it helps to recall that Truth is also understood by Gandhi as the *source of all moral laws* which are running through the universe, which in turn hold the universe together, and which is thus the source of dharma:

> There is an indefinable mysterious power that pervades everything, I feel it, though I do not see it. […] it transcends the senses. […] everything around me is every changing, ever dying, there is underlying all that change a living power that is changeless, that holds all together." (YI 10. 11.1928).

This understanding to truth as relative and absolute is as old as Hinduism itself. In Gandhi's work, it proposes for our consideration of the *fragmentary nature of truth* itself. The fact that no human being can realize Absolute Truth in its fullness, while imprisoned in the mortal body is itself a humbling experience. I believe that the best way one can pursue truth is to follow the fragmentary light of truth in one's own self. Hence one can have closer access to one's own *relative truth.* Since everybody has their own *fragmentary truth* or *relative truth* in oneself, Gandhi's view of truth must oppose itself to *violence* of any kind as violence done ultimately to truth. *Satyagraha* thus appears as a form of action appropriate to the dual character of Truth as one in essence but diverse in practice. As Rex Amber puts it,

---

[547] Iyer, *The Essential writings of Gandhi*, 225-26; *cf.,* also "What is Truth," in *Navajivan*, November 20, 1921.

[548] Hick, *Gandhi's Significance for Today,* 85-86.

[…] in order to win a greater understanding or realization of Truth, a person or group must recognize the partiality of their own perception of truth even in the process of insisting on it. This means that no perception of truth must be fashioned or defended in a dogmatic manner. The opponent must be listened to and expected to yield his or her truth too. Such openness by others, especially in cases of conflict or oppression, requires quite extraordinary courage, humility and goodwill. That is why all confrontations in the name of Truth have to be nonviolent, for violence would immediately close the door to dialogue and mutual regard.[549]

3.5.2.2. Unity and Oneness of All

The Gandhian holistic approach has a unified perspective on God, nature, and man, that is deeply rooted in the ancient scriptures of India, especially *The Vedas* and *Upanishads*. The four *Upanishadic* statements, which are also called *Mahavakyas,* [550]indicate the ultimate unity of the individual (*Atman*) with God (Brahman).[551]Gandhi's relation to them is not clear, yet we do see significant agreement between his understanding of the unity of God and man and what we see in the Upanishads. He has thus stated, for example, that, "I believe in absolute oneness of God and therefore also of humanity […] I believe in the essential unity of man and for that matter all that lives."[552] It is well known that Hindu thinking is founded on the belief and understanding that the human self (*atman*) is a spark of the divine which eventually liberates itself from the aspects of *maya* (world of illusion) by his/her own *karma,* becoming free of limitation and merging with the source of life (*Brahman*). Gandhi's Hindu privilege is perhaps nowhere more evident than when agreeing with this vision: "The chief value of Hinduism lies in holding the actual belief that ALL life (not only human beings, but also all sentient beings) is one, i.e. all life coming from One Universal Source."(HD 39, HN 12.26.1936). Let us look at this more closely.

---

[549] Amber, "Gandhi's Concept of Truth," 102.

[550] The Mahavakyas (महावाक्य) are "The Great Sayings" of the Upanishads, the foundational texts of Vedanta. Though there are many Mahavakyas, four of them, one from each of the four Vedas, are often mentioned as "the Mahavakyas."

[551] The four *Mahavakyas* are: 1. *prajñānam brahma* - "Consciousness is Brahman" (*Aitareya Upanishad* 3.3 of the *Rig Veda*), 2. *ayam ātmā brahma* - "This Self (Atman) is Brahman" (*Mandukya* Upanishad 1.2 of the *Atharva Veda*), 3. *tat tvam asi* - "Thou art That" (*Chandogya* Upanishad 6.8.7 of the *Sama* Veda), and 4. *aham brahmāsmi* - "I am Brahman" (*Brhadaranyaka* Upanishad 1.4.10 of the *Yajur* Veda). S. Radhakrishnan, ed. and trans. *The Principal Upanishads* (New York: Humanity Books, 1992), 523, 695, 458, and 168. (Henceforth: Radhakrishnan, *The Principal Upanishads*).

[552] Terrence J. Ryne, *Gandhi and Jesus*: *The Saving Power of Nonviolence* (New York: Orbis Books, 2008), 45. (Henceforth: Ryne, *Gandhi and Jesus*).

The influence of the *Isha Upanishad* on Gandhi can be seen in his interpretation of one of its *mantra* which for him 'contained the whole essence of Hinduism,' and its *Golden Key*. The original *mantra* is:

ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वं यत्किं च जगत्यां जगत I

तेन त्यक्तेन भुंजीथा: मा गृध: कस्यस्विद् धनम् I (Isha Up. I.1)[553]

He translates the *mantra* as follows: […] all this that we see in this great universe is pervaded by God. Renounce it and enjoy it. […]. Do not covet anybody's wealth or possession. All the other *mantras* of that ancient Upanishad are commentary or an attempt to give us full meaning of the first *mantra."* (HD 41-42, HN 1.30.1937). For Gandhi, this *mantra* appears to lie even deeper than the basic aspects of the *Gita*, since he apparently considered the *Gita* as an exemplary elaboration on this *mantra.* Indeed, the *mantra* has all the scope of a guiding principle for humanity itself.

> It (the *Ishopanishad* view) seems to me (Gandhi) to satisfy the cravings of the socialist and the communist, of the philosopher and the economist. I venture to suggest to all who do not belong to the Hindu faith that it satisfies their cravings also. And if it is true - and I hold it to be true - you need not take anything in Hinduism which is inconsistent with or contrary to the meaning of this *mantra*. (HD 42).

But there is more. The unity of all lives which Hinduism thus has in view, also extends salvation to all God's creatures. The oneness of all lives enjoins a care for all lives that express itself in many diverse philosophies, but which is truly respected only when one not only refrains from all violence but does so as the essential principle of the search for truth. There is, in short, complete agreement between non-violence, a life of truth, and self-realization. Srimati Kamala thus writes,

> We can only understand how to make the peace Gandhi sought by seeing Gandhi himself as an *Advaitist* – as one totally committed to belief in the absolute oneness of all that lives – this may seem abstract or impractical at first, but it is not. In fact, it is the very essence of all that Gandhi thought and lived.[554]

---

[553] S. Radhakrishnan, ed. and trans. *The Principal Upanishads* (New York: Humanity Books, 1992), 567.

[554] Srimati Kamala, "Gandhi's Holistic Vision" in *Mahatma Gandhi 125 Years* ed. B.R. Nanda (New Delhi: Indian Council For Cultural Relations, 1995), 159.

Readers who come to Gandhi with an understanding of the philosophy of Hegel, and of the manner in which Charles Taylor draws on it, will be struck by certain connections between these respective approaches to unity and oneness. Hegel rejected "the fundamentally atomistic conception of the object," arguing that "individual objects exist as partial expressions/manifestations of indivisible substance-universals, which cannot be reduced to a set of properties or attributes; he therefore holds that the object should be treated as an ontologically primary whole."[555] This has an appreciable impact on Taylor's communitarian approach to self and society:

> If the aspirations to radical freedom and to integral expressive unity with nature are to be totally fulfilled together, if man is to be at one with nature in himself and in the cosmos while being most fully a self-determining subject, then it is necessary first, that my basic natural inclination spontaneously be to morality and freedom; and more than this, since I am a dependent part of a larger order or nature, it is necessary that this whole order within and without tend of itself towards spiritual goals, tend to realize a form in which it can unite with subjective freedom. If I am to remain a spiritual being and yet not be opposed to nature in my interchange with it, then this interchange must be communion in which I enter into relation with some spiritual being or force. (HL 39).

Here we are reminded that Taylor rejects any pantheism that may be found in Hegel, since he wanted to preserve 'radical autonomy' for human subjectivity. And so his account of human subjectivity turns not to pantheism, but instead a variant of the Renaissance idea of man as microcosm. "Man is not merely a part of the universe; in another way he reflects the whole, the spirit which expresses itself in the external reality of nature which comes to conscious expression in man." (HL 43).

 In short, both Hegel and Taylor, or at least Taylor and Hegel as he reads him, argue for a unitary or holistic approach to the relation between the spirit (*Geist*) which unfolds itself in nature and its fullest, autonomous self-expression in human freedom. 'This unity is essential since man's basic identity is as a *vehicle of spirit.* (HL 44). Hence, self-realization must have a place for reason if man is to be the vehicle of a cosmic spirit and yet retain his autonomy. According to Taylor, "[…] Hegel will insist that the ultimate synthesis should

---

[555] Robert Stern, *Hegel, Kant and the Structure of the Object* (London: Rutledge Chapman Hall, 1990), 40. In Taylor's version, the "the universe" is supposed to be "posited by Geist" or by an all-encompassing "cosmic spirit" (HL 87ff.).

incorporate division as well as unity" (HL 48). Now this is perhaps where Hindu holism may be considered, but it is unclear whether Hegel (or Taylor) will quite envisaged holism the same way.[556] The Hindu view of holism apparently has a similar *dissolution* into the Ultimate Reality where one goes beyond both 'division and unity.'[557] Radhakrishnan states that,

> The *Jiva* (self) under the influence of *maya* (ignorance) looks upon itself as an independent agent and enjoyer until release is gained. Knowledge of *Sakti* is the path to salvation which is dissolution in the bliss effulgence of the Supreme. It is said that 'for him who realizes that all things are Brahman, there is neither yoga nor worship. *Jivanmukti* or liberation in this life is admitted."[558]

3.5.3. Gandhian Harmony in Life

We know that the English word *harmony* is derived from the Greek ἁρμονία (harmonía), meaning "joint, agreement, concord", and more deeply from the verb ἁρμόζω (harmozo), "to fit together, to join."[559] As rather standard dictionary defines "harmony" as the "order or congruity of parts to their whole or to one another."[560] Philosophers think quickly of Plato's *Republic,* which finds Socrates arguing that "Justice is harmony." (*Republic* Book 4, 434c). Later, it is also contended that "Justice is doing one's own job." (*Republic,* Book 4, 443b).[561] Whether as a virtue or as a form of action justice involves a proper congruity of parts of the soul, parts of a task, parts of the city, etc. Whatever is the case, the harmony in question is deep, elusive, and yet within

---

[556] I do not want the reader to get an impression that there can be a deep comparison between Hindu vision of holism and Hegel's view of synthesis. Those who know Hegel will immediately know the fact that he retains thesis and anti-thesis, even after the synthesis. Perhaps Hindu liberation seems liberating one from thesis, anti-thesis, and even from synthesis in the ultimate dissolution with the Absolute Brahman.

[557] Gandhi's concept of truths and the Truth (*S/staya*) can be relevant here. Temporal truths are articulated and authenticated by the autonomous self in relation to the all-pervading Truth. I argue that the 'radical subjectivity' is also preserved intact in Gandhi too since self-realization ultimately is brought out by his own *karma* and *dhama*. Ultimately all the "truths" find their unity in the Truth. This view is fundamentally a Hindu view of unity.

[558] Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy Vol 2,* 688. *Cf.,* also *Mahanirvana Tantra,* xiv.123.

[559] "Harmonia," Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, in *A Greek-English Lexicon,* at Perseus and Harmony The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology in English Language accessed April 16, 2012, http://www.oup.com/online/us/oro/?view=usa.

[560] "Harmony," in *The Free Dictionary* accessed April 16, 2012, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/harmony.

[561] Plato, *The Republic,* Trans. By G.M.A. Grube in *Plato Complete Works* ed. By John M. Cooper (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1997), 971ff. Justice is both an Individual and social or political reality here. Justice of the polis depends on the harmony of the person and society where one depends on the other. The souls being divided into three: rational, spirited, and appetitive (rulers, soldiers, and farmers or craftsman) necessitated a harmony of each of those divisions in themselves and another harmony of them all together in the common polis. Hence there are micro and macro levels of justice (harmony) though there is ultimately only one Justice (Harmony).

our reach. Anthony Parel suggests something like this is present in the thinking and acting of Gandhi, who moreover always had in view two great aims:

> The first was to demonstrate through his life and work that there was a basic *harmony* (Italics is mine) underlying all the fundamental human strivings – the strivings of wealth, power, pleasure, ethical goodness, beauty, and spiritual transcendence. In so far as they were grounded in the quest for truth and freedom, there was unity in their diversity. […] His second aim was to forge a moral link between the contemplative life and the modern secular life as it was lived in the fields of economics and politics.[562]

Whether a philosophical holism responds to philosophies of fragmentation or to the influence of economic and political theories on soul, life, the vision it wishes to (re) awaken, a vision much in common to Taylor and to Gandhi, has in vie values that may be considered properly spiritual. With Gandhi in mind, Parel states, "Modern secularism seemed to be bent on making the same mistake that ancient spirituality had made. The mistake was to assume that the secular and spiritual aspirations could be pursued only at each other's expense."[563]Against that mistake, Gandhi's attempt at a harmonizing of the spheres of religion (spiritual), ethics, politics, economics, and aesthetics is meant to eradicate "the malaises of modern secularism"(MM. 1), which arise with spiritual values are left at the margin of life.

Of course, the Gandhian attempt at harmony was not in the first instance a philosophical project; rather it was a manner of life by which he could live-in-harmony with God-nature-society. Gandhi's Hindu and Jainist religious background convinced him of the fragmentariness of truth, but in a manner that enabled him to see partial truth in everything and everybody around him. Chatterjee sums up as follows:

> Religious pluralism is considered by Gandhi in connection with the practical exigencies of living together peacefully. […] that the discussion of religious truth is not a mere theoretical matter but has

---

[562] Parel, *Gandhi's Quest for Harmony*, ix.

[563] Parel, *Gandhi's Quest for Harmony*, ix

direct bearing on how men behave towards each other […] the whole question is in fact intimately related to whether men of different persuasions can *live* together in harmony or not.[564]

3.5.3.1. Harmony of the Spiritual and the Temporal

Gandhi believed that it was possible to merge the temporal and the spiritual into a coherent philosophy that did not leave them to stand as if mutually exclusive. In defense of this position, he had to address himself to the shortcomings of modern western politics as mainly articulated by political giants like Hobbes, Mill, and Bentham. Gandhi was convinced that the only way to bring harmony into this life is by bridging the gap between the secular and the spiritual in a manner that oppose itself to a western tendency to treat them as contradictory and conflicting.

This political philosophy is very much related to Gandhi's religious philosophy. It centers on his search for truth and service to humanity. An important aspect of his political philosophy was the harmony and simultaneous pursuit of the purusharthas*: artha, Kama, dharma,* and *moksha,* which are also known as the *aims of life.* This basic Hindu theory was accepted by Gandhi according to his concept of "duty (*dharma*). Gandhi states that, "[…] civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man *the path of duty*. Performance of duty and observance of morality are convertible terms. To observe morality is to attain mastery over our mind and our passions. So doing, we know ourselves" (CWMG 10: 279). Enough has been seen here of Gandhi's life for us to see immediately that the four "aims of life" fittingly and harmoniously bridge the spiritual (ethic, morality, and religion) and the temporal (economics, politics, and aesthetic) aspects of his life. It is there, in the unity of a life, that Gandhi's practical and political philosophy presents its most forceful challenge to the modern day emphasis on *separating* the secular and spiritual.[565] He has stated that the search for the absolute Truth led him to politics, and through politics he could also make progress in the pursuit of truth. With the help

---

[564] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 8.

[565] Parel, *Gandhi's Quest for Harmony*, i.

of the *Gita*, Gandhi understood that while *artha* by itself might come in service of violent means for political and economic purposes, the theory of *purusharthas* reiterates that its pursuit is not completely *autonomous* and must be pursued in the context of the other three principles. This, moreover, is undoubtedly the basis for the existential position from which Gandhi engaged in politics and service, i.e., within the broader Hindu frame of *dharma* which to be sure can be understood as *more things than one.*[566] In any event, the perspective is complex and rich. The temporal aspects of *artha* and *Kama* do not contradict the more spiritual aspects of *dharma* and *moksa.* There is between them a dynamic inter(intra) action and yet also coherent and harmonious. Through the life and works of Gandhi the theory of *purusharthas* receive new expression. As Parel rightly puts it, "That theory is not something that is imposed on his philosophy but something that underpins it."[567] Anyone who analyzes the political and economic undertakings of Gandhi can understand the inner current of *artha* as operative in them. So, too, can the concept of *dharma* be seen influences in his understanding of duty, religion and ethics/morality. His experiments with celibacy (Brahmacharya) and sexuality, control of the palate, and vegetarianism amply demonstrate the intent of *Kama* in his life. Finally, Gandhi's conception of 'liberating' or 'transcending' nature is surely influenced above all the *Bhagavat Gita*, and perhaps most decisively with tis the concept of *moksa.* He found everything he needed for his pursuit of *moksa* in the *Gita*. (CWMG 41-94). And ultimately, all other pursuits are harmonized and culminated in the pursuit of *moksa* or liberation.

Without the unity brought by the pursuit of *moksa,* all aspects and pursuits in Gandhi's worked might otherwise be little more than be partial with respect to one another. After all, the diversity that we have found among Gandhi's sources and thought-patterns seriously impacted his personal life and practical philosophy. Rather, he exhibits a challenging model for how an individual my coherently harmonize an amazing range of dimensions

---

[566] Gandhi's personal life is described as "being more things than one" by Parel. I use the expression in a different way to indicate the different meaning implicit in the term *dharma.*

[567] Parel, *Gandhi's Quest for Harmony,* 26.

of one human life. Perhaps we may appeal to Gadamer's expression of a "fusion of horizons,"[568] favored so much by Taylor.

3.5.3.2. Harmony of Words and Actions

Rarely has one individual had the remarkable influence on people as Gandhi did, across the world, both during and since his life time. Both in South Africa and in India he thrived as a "man of action."[569] He showed that *action* in the full sense accomplish more than the brute "physical action" that includes violence. While most revolutions involved violence and physical confrontation to gain independence, he adopted a nonviolent form of action, the core of which was the 'mental action' of self-discipline, firmness of truth and love. This enabled his actions to speak more loudly that his words, for example, his adoption of the Spinning wheel and the Salt Lake March in 1930.[570] This may be what he truly had in mind when he stated, "Human speech is inadequate to express the reality."[571]There is, in short, a harmony of thought, words and actions in Gandhi's pursuit of truth-one that cannot be reduced to the speculative pursuit of epistemological and metaphysical truth. Gandhi rejected any form of religion or pursuit of truth that does not have any concrete influence on people. For him truth was a matter of living and acting rather than a thought process or an abstraction. He stated,

> The realization of the Self, or Self-knowledge is not possible until one has achieved unity with all living beings - has become one with God. To accomplish such a unity implies deliberate sharing of the sharing of others and the eradication of such suffering. […]. No one has ever attained moksha by means of learning whereas many a soul did and does attain its salvation through service. […] Self-realization I hold to be impossible without service of and identification with the poorest. (CWMG, 28:385, 30:66, 31:511).

---

[568] "Fusion of horizons" (*Horizontverschmelzung*) is a term originally used by Gadamer. Taylor also uses it in his *Sources of the Self.*

[569] Prashad Ganesh, "Whiggism in India," in *Political Quarterly,* September (1966): 412-431.

[570] Spinning wheel acts as a symbol. While Gandhi he is spinning his acts itself communicates a message which is far more intense that his words. The politics of spinning both as a visual symbol and as a symbolic practice can useful metaphors. Gandhi's use of the spinning wheel was one of the most significant unifying elements of the nationalist movement in India. Spinning was seen as an economic and political activity that could bring together the diverse population of South Asia, and allow the formerly elite nationalist movement to connect to the broader Indian population. *Salt Lake March* also has similar impact.

[571] Iyer, *The Essential Writings of Gandhi*, 173.

Truth, he insists, cannot be found by any method of abstraction or hypothesis. "Truth in the narrow epistemological sense is only part of the wider meaning of *satya*. Truth is latent until it is embodied in action. For Gandhi, truth is to be discovered and created, found and enacted. Truth comes to the fore through corrective experimentation."[572]

This rich sense of action lies behind Gandhi's confidence in the power of self-transformation. He believed that transforming oneself was the first step in transforming society. We have already seen a sketch of how the eleven Gandhian vows were instrumental in transforming his own self into an authentic self. (*cf.*, Ch. 3.2.2.1; 3.4.3.). We have also examined the close relation between senses of *swaraj, swadeshi,* and *seva* (service). (*cf.*, Ch. I.2.5; 3.2). Gandhi stated, "True religion and true morality are inseparably bound up with each other. Religion is to morality what water is to the seed that is sown in the soil."(MET 49). Morality needs a nurturing background which should be religion. Hence, for Gandhi religion and morality must go together and one cannot exist without the other. Gandhi insists the importance of religion and morality in the social transformation of humanity.

3.5.4. Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of Identity

It is my contention that the Gandhian intellectual holism and conception of a practical harmony of life are important for a constructive approach to modern self-identity. Gandhi emphasizes the importance of practicality and realizability of any conceptions of self-identity and Truth over and above any purely rational and theoretical conceptions. We find in his work a commitment to the 'horizontal' and 'vertical' dimensions of human existence and identity that is especially relevant for modern times. By 'verticality' I mean his transcendental openness to Truth-God; by 'horizontality' I mean his immanent extension into numerous empirical aspects of life, whether religious, ethics, aesthetic, political, and economical. Each of his earthly

---

[572] Ryne, *Gandhi and Jesus*, 48.

pursuits can be viewed as having its own 'specific autonomy and authentication.'[573] Yet his vertical openness to the transcendental Truth always prevents him from 'Absolutizing' the relative truths situated horizontality. This 'spiritual' dimension is thus especially important for avoiding what Taylor has identified as materialist reduction and atomism, where everything is to material conditions and in the process severed or isolated from all else.

The Gandhian model of verticality and horizontality is quite unique in style and structure. Firstly, this is a viable and flexible model for the modern world since there is no fundamentalism or fanaticism involved in its pursuit. Moreover, his vertical and horizontal openness is not biased or one-sided. I argue that that Gandhi is model is unique just because he 'lived it' and demonstrated an example for the generations to pursue it. Action speaks stronger than words. One further notes the exceptional richness of a position able to understand and assimilate aspects even from different religions. In terms of his own life story, it is clear that his openness to Truth-God, as he comes to understand it, free him from the limitations of the historical practice of Hinduism[574] to which he was affiliated since birth. This suggests that our modern emphasis on *reflective religion* might benefit from the highly reflective nature of Gandhian religion. Out of his religious and ethical reflections he re-defined the concept of God as "Truth."(HD 66). But unlike usual modern approaches, which for Gandhi are an affair only of *theoretical reflection,* his own approach is centered on *practical experimentation for self-realization.* Gandhi states, "Perhaps the root cause of the perplexity arises from a lack of the *real* (Italics is

---

[573] I borrow this term from Anthony Parel. He uses the term 'specific autonomy' in reference to the four aims of life (*purusharthas*); each of them can be seen as having specific autonomy, even though they are different in their degrees of autonomies. Parel, *Gandhi's Quest for Harmony*, 11.

[574] Gandhi did not accept the interpretations of Sankara, Ramanuja or Madhva as such; rather he understood Hindu scriptures in his own way. He also did not agree to the highly *brahminical* practices of the *Varna* system where they degraded human dignity on the basis of a caste system. I argue that Gandhi transcended all those constraints of historicity.

mine) understanding of what God is. God is not a person.[575] He transcends description. He is the Law-maker, the Law and the Executor."(HD 70). What then is Gandhi willing to say about God?

> To me God is Truth and Love; God is ethics and morality; God is fearlessness. God is the source and life and yet He is above and beyond all these. God is conscience. He is even the atheism of the atheist. For in His boundless love God permits the atheist to live. He is the searcher of hearts. He transcends speech and reason. […] He is a personal God to those who need His personal presence. He is embodied to those who need His touch. […] He is the purest essence. […] He is all things to all men. He is in us and yet above and beyond us. (HD 61).

One has no difficulty recognizing multiple dimensions of such a God: theological (God is love, source of life, conscience, searcher of hearts, transcends speech and reason, personal God, purest essence, and so on), the philosophical (God is truth, searcher), physiological (God is embodied), ethical and moral. Let us now recall that Taylor's *A Secular Age* also deals with the aspects of immanence and transcendence, and indeed holds forth the possibility of an *open immanent frame.*(*cf.*, ch. 2.5.2.) That said, he does seem reluctant to explore that "openness" all the way to an essential link with 'verticality.' In other words, since Taylor abstains from exploring the dynamism and contents of 'transcendence' (verticality), his project of modern moral identity is begging the question a defined conclusion. For this added step we need the resources offered us by the work of someone like Gandhi. Let us now turn to this last step to make some convergence and conclusions.

Conclusion

I have presented a broader outline of Gandhi's understanding on diversity, authenticity and holistic identity. His deep commitment to politics, ethics, and religion has also been demonstrated in order to make a comparison and contrast with Taylor and his similar concerns. Of course, my primary purpose is not merely to put them together, but rather to make them converse in search of a synthesis that does not fail to distinguish

---

[575] Gandhi seems to go beyond the anthropocentric conceptions of God. God cannot even be confined to the best understanding of an exemplary person. Hence, he wants to understand God as Truth which transcends everything and at the same which is the source of everything. For him good without God is not conceivable. Ethics should also be founded on transcendental principles of the Truth (God).

important differences. Only in this way can their "conversation" truly serve future work. In any case, there is ample cause to substantiate an underlying agreement with respect to their political and moral perspectives, together with a clear sense of their correlative manner of problematizing religion, and indeed their own encounters with it. In my fourth chapter, I attempt this sort of conversation between them.

CHAPTER 4: CONVERGENCES AND DIFFERENCES OF TAYLOR AND GANDHI: *AGAPIC* (UNCONDITIONAL LOVE) AND *AHIMSIC* (NONVIOLENT) EPOCHS FOR THE PURSUIT OF *SATYA* (TRUTH)

Introduction

In this fourth and final chapter I present some of the findings of my reading of Taylor and Gandhi with a focus on discovering aspects that permit a fusion of horizons in the making of modern moral identity. Both of them have written extensively on topics or questions that diverge and converge on similar concerns. My focus on specific areas where I believe we find clear convergences and important differences. The fear of an engulfing influence of western materialism and industrialism, specifically of Great Britain, was the background against which Gandhi brought to light his alternative conception of a self-identity with a specifically moral definition. For him, the term *irreligious* is inter-changeable with immorality. Religion itself was basically, as he understood it, was for the moral good, and thus frames moral life in the society. With his footing in the North-Atlantic context, Taylor has a similar fear, but without any specific 'outside threat' as Great Britain, of the influence and articulations of materialistic, naturalistic, and atomistic trends that definitely has roots in the scientific development and enlightenment thinking. He sees a decline of religion, especially Christianity with which he is mostly associated, together with a decline in our understanding of self-identity. Gandhi's criticism of western civilization, to some degree, then, is on the basis this decline of religion which he sees as a decline of the culture in general.[576] The first fear is about what we might call a loss of meaning which Taylor associates with the fading of moral horizons. A second concern is with the eclipse of ends that he sees in the face of rampant instrumental reason. And a third concern is with a loss of freedom.[577] I argue "these fears"- or else: "this last fear" identifiable both in Gandhi and Taylor, is a constructive one which makes them proactive rather

---

[576] Iyer, *The Essential Writings of Gandhi*, 165. Gandhi wrote, "The more I observe, the greater is the dissatisfaction with the modern life."

[577] MM 1-11, Taylor elaborates three malaises of modernity as individualism, instrumentalism, and a political structure of both. All these somehow or other causes his tripartite fears.

than reactive both in writing and in conducting their lives. The way they responded to their fears can be understood both as a common ground to understand them and also to distinguish what differentiate their fears.

Here I present their convergences and differences in three points. My first point shed light to the connections and similarities in their approaches, articulations and contributions. My second point presents some of the differences and contrasts between their perspectives. My third point puts forward some syntheses that might contribute to the ongoing construction of modern moral identity.

4.1.: Connections and Comparisons

Gandhi and Taylor can be read from a number of distinct perspectives. For example, they can be read as political philosophers, moral philosophers, and religious thinkers. In my research I have tried to focus on their conception and vision of self-identity against the background of materialism and secularism. Neither of them claims to have achieved a finished product of thought out their writings and activities. However, they never failed to articulate their findings and positions in a rather convincing manner. Here I present some areas of connections and comparisons which will help to find a bridge between their worlds of ideas. Basically I focus on their emphases on moral sources, collective or communitarian perspective, ambivalence of the secular and the spiritual, method of narrativity, cross pressures of spheres, metaphysical necessity of holism, and their understanding of truth, non-violence, and agape.

4.1.1. Emphasize on *Moral Sources* for a Phenomenology and Ontology of Morality

Taylor's *Sources of the Self* has an outer source and inner source. Self, understood as being in a moral space, is inevitably intertwined with such sources. The way human being understand the concept of 'good' and the way they are related to the 'outer' moral source which is bigger than an individual self, is significant for Taylor. "Selfhood and the good, "Taylor states, "or in another way selfhood and morality, turn out to be inextricably

intertwined themes." (SS 3). The first part of the book brings out the connection between self and the *inescapable frameworks* of moral sources. However, the second part of the book begins by 'plunging into the history and analysis of the modern identity of the self itself.' Taylor's ontology of morality, I argue, is illumined by his commitment to the reality of 'inescapable frameworks' of moral sources in which a human self is situated. In this existential milieu, a self is not capable of defining itself without retrieving and narrating the bigger picture of moral sources to which s/he is embedded and engaged. Taylor regrets that the connection between the *outer* sources and self has been given *a narrow* definition in most of contemporary moral philosophy. He says, "This moral philosophy has tended to focus on what it is right to do rather than on what it is good to be, on defining the content of obligation rather than the nature of the good life; and it has not conceptual place left for a notion of good as the object of our love or allegiance […]."(SS 3). There is a necessary and universal foundation of morality which Taylor intends to articulate in order to reaffirm what he views as losing ground to modern, limited definitions of self-identity. "We are dealing here with moral intuitions which are uncommonly deep, powerful, and universal."(SS 4). Taylor contends that while we feel certain moral intuitions at depth approaching what we might call instinct, in fact moral life extends even beyond instinct to a relation with transcendental being. He thus argues that "a moral reaction is an ascent to, an affirmation of, a given ontology of the human."(SS 5). The ascent of morality goes beyond its rational, sociobiological, psychological, and natural scientific explanations since there will always be an *inarticulacy* which proper to its very nature. Taylor warns that,

> […] it doesn't follow from this that moral ontology is a pure fiction, as naturalists often assume. Rather we *should* (italics is mine) treat our deepest moral instincts, our ineradicable sense that human life is to be respected, as our mode of access to the world in which ontological claims are discernible and can be rationally argued about and sifted. (SS 8).

The use of *should* in the foregoing statement indicate the way Taylor persuades his readers of positions to which is committed. Hence any definition and narration of human self, for Taylor, should seriously consider its

moral and spiritual intuitions as the *background picture.* His concept of *strong evaluation* of goods to differentiate and distinguish them *qualitatively* also is done in this broader background of the ontological foundations of morality. A phenomenology of a moral realism which was, is, and will be, arguable is explicit in Taylor's work.

In his book *Ethical Religion* Gandhi seems to share Taylor's willingness to root moral life and action in a transcendental relation, and even to therefore use morality and religion interchangeably. In the chapter entitled "Morality as Religion," he writes:

> The common idea is that morality and religion are distinct things; still this chapter seeks to consider morality as a religion. Some readers may think the writer guilty of confusion. That reproach may come from two sides from those who regard religion as more than morality, and from others who thinks that, where there is morality, there is no need for religion. Yet the author's intention is to show their close relationship. The societies spreading ethical religion or religious ethics believe in religion through morality. (ER Section on *Morality as Religion*).

Here again we see an appeal to the *inescapable background* out of which 'good' customs and practices developed and preserved through history. There are *religious* people involved in *immoral* deeds and *irreligious* people involved in *moral* deeds. Hence, the question is to define good from a necessary and universal ontology of morality by which to relate action to value and transcendence. Gandhi states,

> Morality was in the beginning simply the customary conduct of a community, settled ways of acting that men living together naturally fell into. By a natural process the good customs tended to survive and the bad ones to die out, since, if the bad ones did not die out, they would weaken the community and lead to its extinction. Even today we see this process at work. It is neither morality nor religion if people observe good customs more or less unthinkingly. However, most of what passes for morality in the world today consists, as pointed out above, of good customs. (ER Section on *Morality as Religion*).

One thus sees that Gandhi has strongly emphasized the historical progression of the concept of *good/morality* to which Taylor has later also drawn attention. Of course, Taylor takes up the concept of morality independently, as compared to Gandhi who takes it in relation to the genuine spirit of religion contrasted with

superficial religions; genuine religion can be an abode and resource for house of all those *goodness/morality* customarily existed, developed and survived through the history. However, Gandhi's phenomenology of morality was also capable of understanding the moral realism independently of religion. He tells us, "But at long last a time does when men begin to tread the path of morality consciously, deliberately with a determined will, regardless of gain or loss, of life or death, without turning to look back, ready to sacrifice been permeated with true morality."(ER on *Morality as Religion*). Still Gandhi does clearly distinguish between morality and religion which for example he says that the seed of morality is watered by religion and without water it withers and ultimately perishes and so, "it will be seen that true or ideal morality ought to include true religion." (ER on *Morality as* Religion). Much more so than Taylor, Gandhi's concept of Truth and its interchangeability with the concept of God makes it easier for Gandhi to distinguish between morality and religion while nonetheless refusing any real contradiction between them. Taylor still has some struggle to give us a better ontology of morality, whereas Gandhi simply progress one. Abbey states, "Although the moral source external to human persons which Taylor aims to disclose may be something like Nature, it remains unsettlingly unclear how independent his moral philosophy ultimately is of Christian religion."[578]

All of the above notwithstanding, it does seem that Taylor's commitment to religion is not far from Gandhi's position. Clearly Taylor takes up the task of convincing the intellectual world of the necessity of seeing *beyond* human confinements[579] to reach a have better understanding of the *sovereignty of good.* And this engages him with behaviorist psychology, philosophical psychology, philosophical anthropology and philosophical theology. His book *The Explanation of Behaviour* deal with such psychological methods and their application

---

[578] Fergus Kerr, "The Self and the Good: Taylor's Moral Ontology," in *Charles Taylor* ed. Ruth Abbey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 84. (Henceforth: Kerr, "The Self and the Good,").

[579] Heavily anthropocentric definitions narrow down the horizon of human beings. Taylor contends that philosophy since Enlightenment has been defined increasingly by these perspectives that occlude richer and deeper perspectives.

which helps him to make his own critique of the atomistic, mechanistic, non-teleological explanations of human behavior. All these were to be understood as background for his *grand-narrative* of a moral ontology.

His work *A Secular Age* has developed a narration of the conditions of secularity in relation to the conditions of religion, especially Christianity. After explaining the external *sources of the self*, demonstrating the *new reflective forms* of religion, it is suggested that we may return to religion and God in a new way, in order to make ultimately find the real foundation of good and indeed morality itself. It is indubitable that all the world religions are in solidarity with substantial moral principles. Hence, the themes of morality and religion go hand in hand in Gandhi and Taylor. The decline of one, somehow will always have an impact on the other. Some modern secularists tend to exclude religion from the public sphere, even when they endorse basic moral principles that someway come out of religions. It should be a point of serious concern for the modern world in order to substantiate their own positions. In Taylor's view, this may well *narrow* our definitions of morality and the self-as well as, of course, religion.

4.1.2. Gandhi's Collective Action and Taylor's Communitarian Approach

Conceptions of the human self as an individual agent and of society as capable of collective action are obviously crucial for ethical and political endeavors. The concept self as an individual has been subject to much reflection with particular attention to factors like motive, intention, consequences, values, and beliefs. However, the impact of the culture or collective existence on those individual factors has perhaps not received sufficient attention. Taylor opines that in the pre-axial period conceived by Max Weber, people were more connected to God, nature and society, and that distance was progressively opened by an intensification of the concept of individualization. The latter can be seen as a product of renaissance, reformation, counter-reformation, and enlightenment. The scientific and philosophical advancement depicted the isolated self as capable of being independent, mature, and disengaged from former engagements – that is to say, from God,

nature, and community. The emergence of utilitarianism which is highly individualistic in nature, can be seen to epitomize this trend as it peaked during the 19th century. This presents a challenge for collective action since the individual looks mostly for his/her own pleasure and usefulness. Chatterjee understands this as follows: "Difficult as it was to make the transition from individualism to altruism the social legislators who were inspired by Bentham believed that it could be done. This was all very well if a society had men like Shaftesbury or a Howard in it but hardly workable if society were not so fortunate."[580]

Arguable against these background one can analyze the Gandhian concentration on collective action (*satyagraha*) and Taylor's development of a communitarian approach to action. Gandhian collective action, I argue, was defined strongly against the utilitarian perspective, since it focuses not achieving the highest number of goals for the most people but instead on the need, and a capacity, to endure the maximum amount of pain for the attainment of truth. This can be understood both as a social goal for the common good of all and as a means of personal purification.[581] Against the communist theme of violent means to achieve the ideal of socialism, Gandhi proposed non-violent method of satyagraha for freedom and the building of nation state. The most explicit examples of satyagraha as collective action can be seen in his national movements where the leverage of action was political instead of being economic or social,[582] mainly in the agitation against the Rowlett Act[583] and the Salt March.[584] It is important to note that collective action proposed by Gandhi was

---

[580] Margaret Chatterjee, "Gandhi-ji's Conception of Collective Action," in *Gandhi: Theory and Practice Vol. II: Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance* gen. ed. Niharranjan Ray (Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1969), 79. (Henceforth: Chatterjee, "Gandhi-ji's Conception of Collective Action,").

[581] Gandhi's integral approach to politics and religion is clear in his dual articulation of the benefit of enduring pain. Ultimately it is oriented to one's own self-realization. However, that does prevent one from being able to endure pain for the common good of all.

[582] Economic and social movements are also 'collective action.' However, Gandhi's satyagraha and its political orientation has wider or deeper realms compared to mere 'economic' or 'social' advantage. Regardless of the profit and success satyagraha is beneficial to the satyagrahi.

[583] The Rowlatt Act passed by the British in colonial India in March 1919, indefinitely extending "emergency measures" (of the Defence of India Regulations Act) enacted during the First World War in order to control public unrest and root out conspiracy. Passed on the recommendations of the Rowlatt Committee, named for its president, British judge Sir Sidney Rowlatt, this act effectively authorized the government to imprison for a maximum period of two years, without trial, any person suspected of terrorism living in the Raj. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, among other Indian leaders, was extremely critical of the Act and argued that not everyone should get punishment in response to isolated political crimes. The Act annoyed many Indian leaders and the

always well-thought out and prepared well in advance.[585] His Ashrams were places were aspirants were trained

to be good *Satyagrahis*, and he observed that, "[…] non-violence in action cannot be sustained unless it goes

hand in hand with non-violence in thought."[586]Satyagraha can be understood as having in-depth moral and

spiritual impacts on the individual besides its political and economic impact. It was also educative of the value

of non-violence to a higher degree.

Gandhi's concept of *sarvadoya* (welfare of all) had his vision and imagination of a total reconstruction and

transformation of Indian society in the context of the contemporary world situation. This idea, together with

Hind Swaraj, is basic to his way of life. Ray states, "*Sarvodaya* is a total view of life and human society,

comprising individual and collective life as much as in social, economic, and political affairs as in moral,

religious, and spiritual."[587]*Sarvodaya*, as much as any other idea of Gandhi's, can be understood as something

contra-distinguishable against the current utilitarian concept of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Moreover, the moral-spiritual base of the idea insists on the purity of the means and ends, which communism

or any socialist agenda does not acknowledge.

Now I shift to Taylor in order to compare his communitarian perspective to that of Gandhi's collective action.

Taylor's status as a communitarian philosopher is due to some dimensions of his narrative approach. He

basically engages in communitarian critique of modern emphasis on individuality. His attack on reductionism,

---

public, which caused the government to implement repressive measures. Gandhi and others found that constitutional opposition to the measure was fruitless, so on April 6, a "hartal" was organized where Indians would suspend all business and fast as a sign of their hatred for the legislation. This event is known as the Rowlatt satyagraha. ("Rowlett Act," in *Wikipedia* accessed June 31, 2012, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rowlatt_Act).

[584] The Salt March, also known as the Salt Satyagraha began with the Dandi March on March 12, 1930, and was an important part of the Indian independence movement. It was a direct action campaign of tax resistance and nonviolent protest against the British salt monopoly in colonial India, and triggered the wider Civil Disobedience Movement. This was the most significant organized challenge to British authority since the Non-cooperation movement of 1920–22, and directly followed the Purna Swaraj declaration of independence by the Indian National Congress on January 26, 1930. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (commonly called Mahatma Gandhi) led the Dandi march from his base, Sabarmati Ashram near Ahmedabad, to the sea coast near the village of Dandi.

[585] Here I emphasis that Gandhi was not just a spiritualist or ethicist. He was also deep thinker.

[586] Mahatma Gandhi, *The Wit and Wisdom of Gandhi-Selections*, ed. Homer A. Jack (New York: Dover Publications, 1951), 102.

[587] Niharranjan Ray, gen. ed. "Introduction," in *Gandhi: Theory and Practice Vol. II: Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance* (Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1969), 5. (Henceforth: Ray, "Introduction,").

individualism, and atomism demonstrate that his emphasis on narrative identity inevitably appeals to, and uncovers a dimension of tradition and community. Liberal democratic policies basically inspired by Hobbes and Locke gave priority to freedom and fulfillment of the individual over against the concern of the community or else defined the latter in a manner that builds on the former. Taylor states that such theorists, "[…] have left us a legacy of political thinking in which the notion of rights plays a central part in the justification of political structures and action."(PHS 187).[588] The primacy of the individual renders the human self a "bearer of rights" which eventually can move further in the atomistic direction where the society is composed of disconnected individuals, each with inalienable and privileged rights. Kerr observes,

> Taylor appeals to Aristotle's conception of human beings as social and political animals, to the extent that we are not self-sufficient outside a polis – in the sense, then, that free autonomous moral agents achieve and maintain their identity only in subjecting themselves willingly to the common good within a certain kind of shared culture.[589]

The Canadian linguistic multicultural context is one important influence on Taylor's communitarian mode of thinking. Surely India would be more pluralistic culturally, linguistically, and religiously than Taylor's Canada. It is counter-intuitive to think that both were communitarians and liberals at the same time, yet Gandhi in his time, and Taylor in his, did see things beyond his own culture and upbringing. Both were deeply 'liberal' in the matters of any essential liberties of the individuals and societies. However, they will define such liberties only from the wider horizon of the common good. Taylor puts it as follow: "[…] the identity of the autonomous, self-determining individual requires a social matrix."(PHS 209). Such a collective orientation is not hard to find in the Gandhian method of nonviolent resistance for the freedom of India, where he mobilized the whole nation, instilling in them a deeper sense of nationalism and patriotism against the negative powers of colonization.

---

[588] Charles Taylor, "Atomism," in *Philosophy and Human Sciences, Philosophical Papers 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 187.
[589] Kerr, "The Self and the Good," 88.

4.1.3. **Ambivalence of the Secular and the Spiritual: Mutuality of Reason and Religion**

There is an ambivalence of the secular and spiritual in both Taylor and Gandhi, which shows up frequently though never quite compromises the prominence of the spiritual. Both thinkers emphasize the importance of reason and religion as inescapable elements of the human condition. Human society seems to be spiritually (or psychologically) incomplete without some integration. Interestingly, this was the position of William James, more than a century ago - 1902 in *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, when he stated, "Evidently, then, the science and the religion are both of them genuine keys for unlocking the world's treasure-house to him who can use either of them practically. Just as evidently neither is exhaustive or exclusive of the other's simultaneous use."[590]

As we have seen, Gandhi does not deeply differentiate between *religion* and morality do many modern scholars engaged in rational debate. Instead, he appeals to three resources for discussing religion: reason, faith, and commonsense. He considers the second of them to be the heart of it, and for never believed in the power of rational argument to convince one of religious truth. For him reason never quite touches the *deepest roots* of the human psyche when religious allegiance becomes possible.[591] His Indian cultural context is simply at work here, in this outline of the sources of an identity where the secular and sacred are closely intertwined. Chatterjee states,

> His personal experience of living in a society where the distinction between sacred and profane was a somewhat unnatural one, and where people of very different ethnic types and ways of life were actually living side by side, gave him a unique advantage in thinking out what the shape of a future community might be like.[592]

---

[590] William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (Maryland: Manor Publications, 2008), 95.
[591] Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity*, 34.
[592] Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity*, 10.

Gandhi touched on the point of contact between his conception of religion and selfhood and political identity, at different instances of his life. He always tried to achieve a *spiritualized politics* which is not to be confused with *theocratic politics*. Personal moral values of the politician and their impact and influence in the making of a modern society were major concerns here. He underscored:

> In my opinion unity will come not by mechanical means but by change of heart and attitude on the part of the leaders of public opinion. I do not conceive religion as one of the many activities of mankind. The same activity may be either governed by the spirit of religion or irreligion. There is no such thing for me therefore as leaving politics for religion. For me, every, the tiniest, activity is governed by what I consider to be my religion.[593]

Gandhi's religion and his understanding of the principles of morality are inseparable.[594] Immorality is what he means by irreligion which is explicit in his work *Hind Swaraj*. Religion is the proper foundation of morality and irreligion is the foundation of immorality. The way he organized his life around a working harmony of the different fields is arguably with the help of the four *purusharthas,* which intrinsically include aspects of the secular (political, economic, ethical aesthetic) and the spiritual pursuits of life. But it is not just a matter of morality alone rather ultimately it is a matter of self-realization. (See my discussion at Chapter 3.5.). The distinction between secular and spiritual demonstrate human orientation from the immanent to the transcendental. The ambivalence of the spiritual and secular in all the spheres of life lies in these inter-relatedness. The fact that Gandhi loved the *Bhagavad Gita* as his favorite book is itself indicative of his emphasis on an empirically and politically active life on earth together with its emphasis of self-realization. Parel states it as follows:

---

[593] Iyer, *The Essential Writings of Gandhi*, 125. A Letter written on May 30, 1932.

[594] Gandhi is not just an ethicist rather he constantly emphasized the need of religion for the growth and development of moral and ethical principles.

Gandhi wanted to avoid the Scylla of doctrinaire secularism and the Charybdis of traditional asceticism. He wanted a course that would affirm the values of the world and *purusharthas*, on the one hand, and those of world – transcending spiritually open to every human being, on the other.[595]

There is a *balanced middle* between the political and spiritual which Gandhi's pursuit of life inspires one to accomplish. In time of political turmoil, ideological schism, and religious fanaticism, Gandhi appeared to be a *secular* person with deeply *spiritual* insights who put forward his own political and economic ideas together with great ideals of religious pluralism for the building of a new India. His style was integral, his aim was harmony, his pursuit was for truth, his life was for service, and his life goal was to attain self-realization.

Taylor's navigation between the secular and spiritual is identifiable in his numerous works, most clearly in his *The Varieties of Religion Today* and but also in the *Sources of the Self* and *A Secular Age.* In *The Varieties of Religion Today*, *after* analyzing the Jamesian position of religion he comes out with his own take on it, setting forth his account of the contemporary religious situation, using a genealogical method to show how it has grown out of previous religious dispensations in European history. Relying implicitly on a conceptual apparatus heavily indebted to the masters of twentieth-century sociological theory, he aspires to construct a grand narrative that will cast new light on the secularization of the public sphere. Somewhat in the way we have also see in *A Secular Age*, the story begins in the Middle Ages, in an enchanted world. God's presence in the world is reflected in the sorts of sacred places and times familiar to readers of Mircea Eliade's *The Sacred and the Profane*, wherein the sacred king expresses the connection between the political order and the divine. When the Weberian "disenchantment of the world" occurs, sacred meanings are no longer expressed directly in the universe around us, but are withdrawn into distrust principles. Thus, the natural world of Newtonian science still provides evidence of a divine design, and a moral order designed by God remains normative for the social world. In this moral order, articulated by Locke and transmitted to us through Rousseau and Marx,

---

[595] Parel, *Gandhi's Philosophy and Quest for Harmony*, 177.

human individuals are meant to associate in society for the sake of mutual service for mutual benefit.[596] This sort of narrative presents us with the ambivalence of the secular and spiritual that is Taylor's interest in recent works. As his title in this smaller book indicates, he is inspired by William James' method of analyzing the individual turn of religious experiences. But he insists, more than James, that the spiritual quest of modern man has not become totally individualistic; remnants of a collective search and a shared fulfillment are still visible. James missed this in his analysis. (VR 111). May be with the word 'experience' James had a rather modest purpose than Taylor.

Perhaps this signals a Catholic sympathy in Taylor, since his narratives of nature, religion, and ultimately the self resist the idea that religion and religious self do not also have a dimension of community and exteriority. Of course, this could also show that influence of his continued appreciation of Hegel. An outcome of his narrative that probably is close to his Catholicism than to his Hegelianism is his frank but open attitude toward non-believers. The following few lives are confessional, yet also the conclusion one reaches when a narrative of modernity undoes universal characterization of life and meaning. Taylor's narrative affirms, or at least recognizes plurality and uncertainty. And so he writes,

> I may find it inconceivable that I would abandon my faith, but there are others, including possibly some very close to me, whose way of living I cannot in all honesty just dismiss as depraved, or blind, or unworthy, who have not faith (at least not in God, or the transcendent). (SA 3).

This passage obviously expresses some ambivalence concerning what we call the spiritual and the secular. Taylor is not *convinced* by the extreme secular narrative of the modern enlightenment thinkers who happen to be either *knockers or boosters* with a one-sided position. Though he himself does not have a crisis of faith, he does try to understand the reality of unbelief, and the fact that makes belief appear *conditional*. More deeply, this calls for serious pursuit of the spiritual inseparably from an acceptance of the secular. An old adage

---

[596] Charles Taylor, *The Varieties of Religion Today: William James Re-visited* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 61ff. (Henceforth: VR).

receives new force: God is still very much present in the world, if only one knows how to look for him. The first step is to call for an unbiased outlook and open mindedness on the part of modern thinkers, so that one may see a bigger picture of reality that itself modernity sees. This is the effort of *Sources of the Self,* which takes the added step of identifying moral sources which he sometimes call moral inquiry or inescapable frames. Such a moral inquiry, along with a certain aesthetic sensibility, will help the modern believers, much more than will traditional theology, to harmonize between the secular and the spiritual. If this causes, or admits, some disturbance within the life of faith, it also challenges and tries to overcome the violence of simple definitions lie we find in "separation" or "elimination" theories of religion. Taylor calls us to "heal the division within us that disengaged reason has created, setting thinking in opposition to feeling or instinct or intuition." (SA 9).

This concern with violent simplifications can also be seen in Taylor's communitarianism, which challenges the individualism that can be indifferent to the concerns of the larger society. He also appeals to postmodernist thinkers who trust less in the power of philosophy to prove the existence of truth than in the power of language to persuade us of the possibility of belief.[597] He observes that what were once *naïve* forms of religion have become *reflective* in our times, when the distinction between the immanent and transcendental, or the natural and supernatural, is clearly identified in a manner that permits people to choose one or the other in a way that was quite unthinkable in former times. In these and other cases, a distinction is first recognized before an integral harmony is sought. As we have seen, this frank *integral pluralism*[598] is also be found in Gandhi's thinking and action, though of course neither modernity nor secularity are quite the same in India as in Taylor's North-Atlantic.

---

[597] John Patrick Diggins, "The Godless Delusion," *Review of A Secular Age*, by Charles Taylor, *New York Times*, December 16, 2007, Book Review, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/16/books/review/Diggins-t.html?pagewanted=all.

[598] Fred Dallmayr, *Integral Pluralism: Beyond Culture Wars* (Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2010).

4.1.4. Method of Narrativity: Everything Considered

A narrative method is mostly a late modern approach to speech, writing, and thinking which focus on the *recounting* as a constructive format which describes a sequence of events. Both Taylor and Gandhi constantly prevent any tendency of totalizing their pursuits or discussion on important issues. This can be seen as a significant aspect of their writings and activities as basically open to the method of narrativity. The dialogical nature of narrative method, I argue, is an inevitable aspect of any modern construct of self-identity since the world is more diversified and plural than ever. Together with the aesthetic aspect in it there are deeper epistemological implicit in it as well. Bell states that, "Narrative inquiry rests on the epistemological assumption that we as human beings make sense of random experience by the imposition of story structures."[599] This method of narration and inquiry has undoubtedly made significant contributions to the social sciences because of its "open-ended, experiential and quest-like qualities."[600] The narrative notion and understanding of self-identity is not a making of individuals, but rather considers them to be developed and shaped by socio-cultural and historical conventions and practices. Hence, the details of story-structures and story-contents and their implications reveal much about the social, cultural, and historical context in which the narrator exists. Narrative inquiry is essentially an inter - connected activity where one level of meaning evolved from another former level of meaning, and where stories that people tell are often at the surface of a more complex underlying story. The very nature of narrativity and the way it brings potential contextual information, make narrative method beneficial to several human sciences namely: philosophy, sociology, psychology, and anthropology.

---

[599] J.S. Bell, "Narrative Inquiry: More Than Just Telling Stories," in *TESOL Quarterly* 36 (2002): 207–213.

[600] C. Conle, "Narrative inquiry: Research tool and medium for professional development," in *European Journal of Teacher Education* 23 (2000): 49–62.

Taylor can be considered as using the method of narrativity in bringing out the genealogy of the modern self-identity by his own unique method of *retrieval*[601] which I argue as interchangeable with *recounting* (*narrare*).[602] Taylor's project of retrieval of the genealogy of modern identity is done extensive research and narration of numerous resources of the past. He attempt seems to be to incorporate maximum possible number of streams of thinking with a view considering everything, in order to construct an integral notion of self-identity. Hegelian background of the historicity of self and its never ending expansion to all the way to universal spirit also has significant influence on Taylor. Hence, one can view the connectivity of historicity and narrativity; text and context in Taylor's exposition of an ever evolving modern selfhood. Taylor also shares concerns with Gadamer, which is specifically clear when he endorses the concept of a *fusion of horizons.*[603] Also like Gadamer, he does not isolate the speculative pursuits of philosophy from everyday speech. Gadamer stated that "Even in the everyday speech there is an element of speculative reflection, "[…] words do not reflect being but express a relation to the whole of being."[604] Hence every utterance of a word is an event of language that touches ontological, normative, and epistemological sphere simultaneously. Arguably, Taylor has similar

---

[601] Taylor's *Sources of the Self* is a book that "attempts to define the modern identity in describing its genesis." (SS x). He says, "Understanding modernity aright is an exercise in retrieval."(SS xi).

[602] Until recently, we were more familiar with this emphasis in the work of Paul Ricoeur. Richard Kearney, a renowned student and scholar of Ricoeur, considers both Ricoeur and Taylor have similar concerns on the issue of language and narrative. He says, "Ricoeur's stance on narrative identity receives support from a number of contemporary quarters including recent works by Charles Taylor, Alasdair Macintyre and Seyla Benhabib." (Richard Kearney, "Narrative Imagination: Between Ethics and Poetics," In *Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action*, ed. Richard Kearney (California.: Sage Publications, 1996), 173–90.). Taylor says, "I find myself in substantial agreement with Ricoeur insofar as I grasp the major trajectory of his thought."(Meili Steelef, "Ricoeur Versus Taylor on Language and Narrative," in *Metaphilosophy* 34 (2003).Footnoted on page 425).

[603] Gadamer defines horizon as follows: Every finite present has its limitations. We define the concept of "situation" by saying that it represents a standpoint that limits the possibility of vision. Hence essential part of the concept of situation is the concept of "horizon." The horizon is the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point [...] A person who has no horizon is a man who does not seen far enough and hence overvalues what is nearest to him. On the other hand, "to have an horizon" means not being limited to what is nearby, but to being able to see beyond it [...] Working out of the hermeneutical situation means the achievement of the right horizon of inquiry for the questions evoked by the encounter with tradition. (Gadamer Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method* (New York: Continuum, 1997), 302) and Taylor endorses the idea of "fusion of horizon" in defining one's identity (SS 27). *Cf.,* also Charles Taylor, "Gadamer on the Human Sciences," in *The Cambridge Companion to Gadamer*, ed. Robert J. Dostal (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002): 126-142.

[604] Hans-Georg-Gadamer, *Truth and Method*. 2nd revised ed. and trans. Garrett Barden and John Cumming and trans. revised Joel Weinsheimer and Donald Marshal (New York: Continuum, 1994), 469.

perspectives on language and its rootedness. For example, in response to Habermas' *Theory of Communicative Action* and his method of 'discourse ethics' Taylor remarks as follows:

> A discourse theory of language has enormous, beneficial consequences for a theory of society in both theoretical and politico-moral terms. Yet the benefits are partially gambled away by opting for both procedural ethics and the distinction this entails between three logically independent dimensions of rationality. As a result, the notion of practical reason is distorted; in particular, the central role of language plays as a means of disclosing new terrain remains hidden. Language as such is situated in a separate domain of rationality: in its expressive dimension it solely serves a knowledge of self and presentation of self, and contributes nothing to determining what is normatively right. […] this limitation is a severe mistake. Language plays an indispensable role as an expressive medium in the overall domain of practical reason.[605]

Taylor is concerned about the "semantic dimension" of language which he draws from Herder's intuition that language makes possible a different kind of consciousness, which Herder calls as *reflective* (*besonnen*). In this context Taylor observes that 'prelinguistic' beings can react to the things that surround them. But language enables us to grasp something *as* what it is. However animals can have "right" response to an object where rightness means "appropriate to its (nonlinguistic) purposes." Language has an aspect of rightness where one uses the right word for a right object. But one cannot give an account of this rightness in terms of extralinguistic purposes. (PA 103).

There is no perfect or finished definition or frame, especially in one's narrative of identity. For Taylor, the modern self is always an emerging or evolving self. This continuum demands a never ending narrativity and thus constant articulation of self-identity.[606] But it also convinces Taylor of the inevitability of *inarticulacy* which escapes narration as it moves or evolves. (SS 53ff). Yet these are definitely some *inescapable frameworks* which should be part of the any attempt at narration of the self. Among these are the notions of

---

[605] Charles Taylor, "Language and Society," in *Jurgen Habermas* ed*s. David Rasmussen and James Swindal (California: Sage Publications, 2001), 134.

[606] Modern philosophy approaches 'personal identity' as a *diachronic* issue. The *synchronic* problem is grounded in the question of what features or traits characterize a given person at one time. Identity is an issue for both continental philosophy and analytic philosophy. There are different approaches based on bodily substance (Eric Olson and Derek Parfit), mental substance (Descartes), continuity of consciousness (Locke), bundle theory (Hume), and no-self theory (James Giles). Taylor would defend 'identity' being reduced to any of these positions.

good the existence of self in moral space. (SS 3ff). When Taylor invokes these, we can see that he roots his approach to modern identity in a transcendental sphere, which also permits him to discredit the predominant individualistic, proceduralistic, and formalistic definitions of self that have been so influential in the western world.

Gandhi too has a narrative style and method in explaining the self-identity which can be traced from his written and spoken proposals. His masterpiece work *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments With Truth* is self-explanatory of his method of narrating a "story" which has *political field*, *spiritual field,* and *practical applications*. Gandhi states,

> […] I should certainly like to *narrate* (Italics is mine) my experiments in the spiritual field which are known only to myself, and from which I have derived such power as I possess for working in the political field. […] I am far from claiming any finality or infallibility about my conclusions. (MET: x). […] The experiments *narrated* (Italics is mine) should be regarded as illustrations, in the light of which everyone may carry on his own experiments according to his own inclination and capacity. I trust that this limited extent the illustrations will be really helpful. (MET xii).

Gandhi's other major works mainly *Satyagraha in South Africa* and *Hind Swaraj* are also expressive of his narrative style. While the former has the story of the birth of *satyagraha* with its historical account of the struggle for dignity and equality of the Indian people in South Africa, the latter is a dialogue between Indian civilization and modern Western civilization. This also narrates the differences between those who seen ends as justification of means and those who see means and ends as inevitably related. My basic argument in bringing the method of narrativity is that it helps Gandhi, as it helps Taylor, to be flexible to navigate through the different streams and perspectives of life without proposing any conclusive statement.

Chatterjee observes that Gandhi, as writer of these works, was misrepresented mainly in two ways: Firstly, as an anti-intellectual, especially by the Marxist who wanted to fit him into their intellectual model by of dialectic process. But 'the place of reason in our religious thinking' was beyond the concern of communism. Gandhi's

intellectualism and spiritualism are intertwined, not because he is anti-intellectual rather because of the nature of reality/truth itself. Secondly, Gandhi was criticized on the basis that his thinking and writings are full of inconsistencies.[607] To access this necessarily calls for detailed analysis, and also takes us close to his concrete "factual" approach. But I consider these two aspects together as indicative of his particular interest in arguing on the basis of a narrative of facts. That said, it is clear that there is a tendency toward generating a *metanarrative (Grand Narrative),*[608] both in Gandhi and in Taylor, together with a significant awareness of the *relative* and even *subjective* nature of any narrative. And to anticipate a political concern, it is true that when grand narratives clash, the virtues of tolerance are too often discounted.[609]   I argue that the way Taylor and Gandhi depend of a *grand narrative* was not to idealize their own position as the best and conclusive one, but rather to demonstrate the partiality and one-sidedness of modern *subtraction stories,*[610]- i.e., stories which make exclusivist claim of absoluteness while in reality they have only relative value. Taylor's constantly criticizes such claims of modernity in general and secularity in particular. The accusation of inconsistencies in the writings and positions of Gandhi can be understood from the perspective of his ever-changing narrative of the experiments with truth. He did not have the tendency to absolutize his own discovery of truth, rather continued to his pursuit of "experimentation" and narration until his last breath. Moreover, when one reasons out religious realities, or any other fundamental aspects of life, naturally there will be some ambiguities and inconsistencies due to the nature of reality one deals with. Predominant proponents of the method of narrativity acknowledge that narration involves re-interpretation. The evolving or emerging concept of self-identity can be seen in both

---

[607] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 29. Chatterjee states, "Searching for the '*logic* of religious language' may be an interesting intellectual exercise, but it can be very unreliable guide to the structures of religious experience."

[608] A metanarrative (from Meta grand narrative), in critical theory and particularly postmodernism, is an abstract idea that is thought to be as against what is really perceived.

[609] Grand narratives of Christianity, Hinduism, or Islam and their own strong positions can be seen as clashing around the world, as for example, in the clash of war on Terrorism and its implicit war on the Al-Qaida group with their narrative of jihadist theory of Islam. Gandhi's theory and practice of tolerance would not permit him to emphasize a grand narrative if that causes a class of narratives. Arguably, his inclusive perspective of religions can be explained from this perspective. (*cf*., Ch. 3.3.4).

[610] SA 22, 26-29, 267-68, 569-579. Modern individualism, materialistic science, and exclusive humanistic thinking are example of such stories.

the Taylorian and Gandhian understanding of the concept of self-identity and self-realization. Gandhi was also concerned with the rational aspects of articulation too in the pursuit of defining self and moving towards self-realization. "Gandhi felt himself to be *addressed* by events and he responded in tune with the dictate of an inner voice; but it was a voice fully informed by his *rational assessment* (Italics is mine) of the situation. Or, using another metaphor, reason was for him a finely honed instrument purified in the course of vigorous discipline."[611]

On my understanding both Taylor and Gandhi adopt a method of *narrativity* which enables them to unfold and trace the *evolving nature* of reality. This narration mostly goes beyond narrow constraints and biases in order to protect the possibility of a metaphysical foundation, ontology of morality, and finally an openness to the transcendental truth, which is make religious reflection necessary and even important.

4.1.5. **"Cross-Pressure" of Spheres and Dialectical Resolutions for Recognition and Harmony**

In modern times, new experiences and conceptions of self arise mainly from religion and politics. Taylor and Gandhi, each in his own way, seem to recognize the pressure that this exerts on us. According to Taylor, the modern self is cross-pressured by the presence of a plurality of goods. In his terms, we face many *Closed World Structures*[612]- structures that restrict our grasp of a thing - that assume and claim some sort of an *immanent frame*. One such frame is the idea of the rational agent of modern epistemology, which rests on self-supporting epistemic claims – or, in other words, which is thought to be autonomous in its understanding, and therefore free of any predetermining moral commitments. Another form of immanent frame is the idea that religion is childish, blind and illusory, when compared with the reflective self-responsible subject advocated by modernity. These two frames converge in a call to maturity: "The connection between materialist science and

---

[611] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 30.
[612] CWS – Closed World Structures: SA: 251. These are especially forceful in secularized society.

humanist affirmation comes because you have to be a mature, courageous being to face these facts." (SA 562).

For Taylor, and as many others have noticed, this way of thinking puts unbelief together with modern exclusive humanism, so that only the unbeliever is courageous enough to take up his responsibilities before the hard facts of life. Now for Taylor, what is interesting and problematic about *Closed World Structures (CWS)* is that they do not really argue their world views, so much as "function as unchallenged axioms"(SA 590). This alone gives reasons for doubt, and in any cause they turn out to be *full of holes* in their presuppositions. (SA 562).

Living in the immanent frame "The whole culture experiences cross pressures, between the draw of the narratives of closed immanence on one side, and the sense of their inadequacy on the other"(SA 595). Hence the peculiarity of our modern age: Materialists respond to the aesthetic experience of poetry. Theists agree with the Modern Moral Order and its agenda of universal human rights and welfare. Romantics "react against the disciplined, buffered self"(SA 609) that seems to sacrifice something essential with regard to feelings and bodily existence. To resolve those modern cross pressures and dilemmas, Taylor proposes a "maximal demand" that we define our moral aspirations in terms that do not "crush, mutilate or deny what is essential to our humanity."(SA 640). And our humanity, as he proposes, does aspire to wholeness and transcendence, yet also tries to "fully respect ordinary human flourishing."(SA 641).

Gandhi's also had to go through cross pressures of his own culture which Taylor candidly analyzed from his context. Indian cultural context of Gandhi had 'closed structures' of castes, languages, and religions. The ethnic plurality of India is intrinsically capable developing 'closed structures.' As we have already seen, in this case, like others, what Taylor defines in theory, Gandhi had to learn from many personal experiences. His cross pressures were cultural (caste, language, and religion), political (British imperialism and modernity), and spiritual (relative and absolute truth) which he experienced in his personal life and in his political activity in both South Africa and India. Unlike Taylor, Gandhi attempted to 'open up' such 'closed structures' by his own

openness. Taylor does not seem to have a project of resolving the issue of closed structures or to alleviate the pressure that comes out of it. However, both can be seen as similar with respect to their awareness and experience of cross pressures. Gandhi's cross pressure between materialistic and mechanistic modernity of Great Britain and his own moralistic and spiritualistic activism is not a strange phenomenon for any close reader of *Hind Swaraj*.

His Hindu identity did not prevent him from an openly inter-religious stance since his personal understanding of Hinduism did not include the exclusivism that can come from fundamentalist relations to texts. And he was also influenced in important ways by Jain and Vaishnava Bhakti currents. Indian communal groups and its closed structures have been cross pressing each other for years. Gandhi visualized that nationalism could be possible only by reducing the cross pressures. We may say that this led him to address cross pressures with a rich syncretism, if we can resist the strictly negative connotation of that word. All of this may have made him more *skeptical* of the Western Civilizations, in that the latter tend to view religion more exclusively rather than inclusively.[613]

As for actual dialogue, Gandhi conducted it on three levels or areas which in many respects would help to alleviate the *cross pressures* around him. Those areas were also cultural, political, and spiritual. In the political, he dialogued with extremism and imperialism, concerns that of course still challenge us today. In the area of culture, he dialogued on the very nature of civilization itself. After all, what "makes" civilization? This included particular engagement with modern civilization, whose 'irreligious/immoral' stance he opposed with his own version in *Hindu swaraj*. At the spiritual level, he of course, insisted on a dialogue concerning truth – both relative and absolute. Does his considerations of truth was merely spiritual/beyond empirical? It is possible be understand how Gandhi insists on an 'integral necessary relationship between the relative and

---

[613] Akeel Bilgrami, "Gandhi's Religion and Its Relation to Politics," 107.

absolute truth,' which makes it possible for him to be genuinely committed to both his political and spiritual activities. For Gandhi, "the relative is our only access to the absolute."[614] Gandhi hesitates to speak about human self totally transcending ethical, political, other relative dichotomies, including inter-subjective relations. Hence one can say that his considerations of truth 'ultimately' and not 'merely' were spiritual. These three modes of dialoguing, furthermore, were intertwined. And so, as Rajiv Vora puts it,

> He taught us to value our own identity-each individual's identity – as well as national and universal. These two must harmoniously reconcile because every individual has an inner quest to transcend one's self interest, self-identity and unite with the entire humanity. That is the spiritual self of an individual and this is also equally universal.[615]

In fact, Gandhi's conception of dialogue cannot be separated from his conception of value. True dialogue is founded on and extends the recognition of universal and local values. The doctrine of *satyagraha* (truth and firmness) actually promotes the universality and particularity of values at its heart. Only dialogue can overcome differences of understanding through persuasion and demonstration rather than by imposition. The result of dialogue is not the disappearances, but a greater appreciation of the richness that differences offer. Gandhi's insistence that we do this with utmost tolerance and respect exemplifies the point of Taylor's emphasis on recognition. And as the theory of recognition always reminds us, both physical and rational violence negatively affect any attempt at dialogue. This is one of the deepest reasons for Taylor's objection to the over emphasis of rational articulation in modern life. One sided assertions of a purely rational position can inflict "rational violence." Any sort of coerced dialogue invariably fails. Gandhi registers this principle by making respect for diversity go hand in hand with the culture of tolerance, whereas today we find that some

---

[614] Douglas Allen, "Gandhi, Contemporary Political Thinking, and Self-Other Relationship," in Richard L. Johnson ed. *Gandhi's Experiments with Truth: Essential Writings by and about Mahatma Gandhi* (USA: Lexington Books, 2006), 329.

[615] Rajiv Vora, "Gandhi's Dialogue on Civilization," in *Gandhian Way: Peace, Non-violence and Empowerment: Celebrating Hundred Years of 'Satyagraha' (1906-2006)* ed. Anand Sharma (New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 2007), 215-216.

political movements manipulate national, ethnic or religious identities in order to use them for short-term political gain.[616]

4.1.6. Transcendental/Metaphysical Necessity of Holism

In complementary ways, Taylor and Gandhi ground their dialogical approach to culture and politics in a vision that is ultimately spiritual. More specifically, they frame moral distinctions and even moral space where politics and culture meet in action – in metaphysics of holism and in a holism of the spiritual. Taylor in particular thus speaks of a space that is structured by two mutually irreducible dimensions: the horizontal and vertical, in which of course the latter entails a relation of trust in something higher, that enables one trust, "to overcome fear by offering oneself to it; responding with love and forgiveness, thereby tapping a source of goodness, and healing."(SA 708). The former horizontal dimension accounts for just action, "a point of resolution, the fair award" (SA 706).

Gandhi's link between *dharma* and *moksha* correlates well with this vision. Let us remember that for him political liberation, national liberation, and self-liberation are all a matter of continuous process. [617] In that process, as what defines it as a consistent path, there is a constant orientation to his self-realization through *moksa*, which involves a vertical dimension of trusting openness. Yet at the same time, Gandhi's action and service oriented life was horizontally oriented to the common good of society. Drawing these two lines together, he states, "All other forces are static, while God is the life Force, immanent and at the same time transcendent."[618] We could go further, and note that the extraordinary humility observed in his life was no doubt due to a deep awareness of the relativity of perspective precisely on his way to liberation and service.

---

[616] João Cravinho, "True Dialogue - Acceptance of the Universal and Local Values," in *Gandhian Way: Peace, Non-violence and Empowerment: Celebrating Hundred Years of 'Satyagraha' (1906-2006)* ed. Anand Sharma (New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 2007), 227.

[617] Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity*, 36.

[618] Iyer, *The Essential Writings of Gandhi*, 162.

Only in relation to the Absolute, he argued, does everything we do on earth get its meaning. "Personal service when it merges into universal service is the only service worth doing."[619]

Parenthetically, this may be the moment to suggest that William James has been an important influence on both Gandhi and Taylor. Of course, Taylor has made this unmistakable with his book *Varieties of Religion Today: William James Revisited* (2000). Chatterjee confirms that Gandhi also read William James' *The Varieties of Religious Experience*.[620] In that line, one can draw some similar concerns especially in their positions on religion and politics. Gandhi's stress on experience along with special interest in the allegorical understanding of the *Gita* is indicative of such an influence. James' distinguished between 'institutional religion' and 'personal religion.' Institutional religion refers to the religious group or organization, and plays an important part in a society's culture. Personal religion, in which the individual has a mystical or an extra-ordinary experience which can be gained regardless of the culture. This emphasis of James on personal understanding and personal religious experience seems to be sufficiently explicit in the life and writings of Gandhi. His *experiments with truth*, rigorous practice of diet and fasting for spiritual realization, and his own understanding of Hindu scriptures are supportive of the influence of James in him.

And so, Gandhi is closest to the elements of James that Taylor also mentions in *Varieties of Religions*. It is the Jamesian view of religion seen as primarily "something that individuals experience" (VR 4). There are two aspects of this view that deserve attention. One is its individualism: religion resides chiefly in the individual, not in corporate life. The other is its experientialism: the real locus of religion is in feeling and action, not in doctrinal formulations. Jamesian religion is a matter of inward personal devotion rather than outward conformity to norms of ritual or orthodoxy. Taylor suggests that this take on religion "is very much at home in modern culture" and, indeed, "can seem entirely understandable, even axiomatic, to lots of people" (VR 9-13).

---

[619] Iyer, *The Essential Writings of Gandhi*, 418.
[620] Margaret C., 2005: 36.

However, Taylor sees that this view of religion is limited and can be a source of distortion in three ways. First, it neglects the collective connection prominent in some religions by which ecclesiastical life mediates between the religious object and the believer. Second, it also fails to appreciate the collective connection established by the sacramentality emphasized in Catholic traditions. And third, it excludes theology from the center of religious life.

In the final chapter of *Verities of Religion,* Taylor tries to regain those lost aspects of Jamesean perspective of religion which he thinks as something important about our new religious predicament. The first is the extent to which many people still find their spiritual homes in the collective connections of churches, even though their religious loyalties are unhooked from the sacralized societies (for eg., of the national civil religions of neo-Durkheimian order). The second point is the continuing importance of religious markers of ethnic or historical identity in societies forced to defend their integrity against external oppression. And the third point is the way in which many people respond to religious experience by searching for exacting spiritual disciplines of meditation or prayer. (VR 116).

4.1.7. **Gandhi's *Truth* and *Non-violence* and Taylor's *Agape*- New Horizons of Philosophy and Religion**

It is not difficult to understand the emergence of the dialectics of individualism and pluralism in this "Jamesian" elements or form of thought. If self is genuinely independent, there will be plurality of truth claims. Gandhi is obviously intent on sufficient flexibility to recognize individual interpretation, experiments, and assertion of truths; his insistence on *experiential notion* of truth makes such truths *genuine* for him.[621] Such liberties are not strange to Taylor. It is a cultural feature of Taylor's project to open up the minds of modern

---

[621] Gandhi did not want to sequester the relevance of one's religious and moral conviction to oneself, just because their truth was a matter of their own personal experience rather than truth of a doctrine. On the other hand, he did believe in "narrating" such experiments and experiences with truths, which he obviously did, in order to influence others by them. However, he did not believe in the logical arguments of religious truths in view of changing people's lives. Examples of life were much more powerful in this respect, he believed, than engaging in rational arguments.

thinkers to a consciousness of the plurality of (relative) truths. He thus shares with Gandhi a resistance to any attempt at absolutizing particular truths. If genuine truths come out of genuine experiences, as Gandhi argues, than it is theoretically possible to have a plurality of truths in general, each experiential truth is encountered on the way to the one ultimate truth.[622] When a plurality of truths is at play in the moral space, as when two people disagree, inevitably there should be a dynamism to resolve it. Here truth and nonviolence/love come into play, where a plurality of truth-claims would otherwise make it impossible to live together. One needs ahimsa/agape, both in reason and practice, to co-exist in a multicultural world of a plurality of goods. Bilgrami rightly states, "It is here, I think, that ahimsa first enters as a very fundamental religious ideal for him (Gandhi), and then pervades his entire religious and political life."[623]The religious sources of ahimsa and its strategic use in politics via *satyagraha* could hardly be more relevant for our times.[624]

Taylor makes a similar move when he appeals to the concept of *agape* retrieved from the Judeo - Christian religious tradition with which he is affiliated, (he likewise sometimes appeals also to Christian concept *hope*).[625] Whether it is ahimsa or agape, we are presented with an attitude with deep religious roots that enable us to welcome a plurality of goods, sources, and narrations. Still there can a distinction the way one is ahimsic or agapic. One can be non-violent to somebody without being selflessly loving that person. On the other hand it seems that unconditional love is inevitably nonviolent. We are also thus encouraged to seek *commonality* among plural perspectives, with the aim of taking in all truths/goods without destroying them, but instead giving them a metaphysical or transcendental clarification that can ground all individual assertions. What Taylor says of agape, Gandhi might have said of ahimsa:

---

[622] Obviously this is a big philosophical issue – are these simply varied truths, or one truth with various formulations, or competing truths.

[623] Bilgrami, "Gandhi's Religion and Its Relation to Politics," 98.

[624] Taylor's third zone comes out of his critique of instrumentalism. Apparently there is a religious way which accepts plurality of goods. However, religious people are not always serious about rationality, since they can be exclusively concerned with revelations. Taylor, for his part, tries to do justice to both by his *third zone*.

[625] Taylor ends his masterpiece work *Sources of the Self* with an acknowledgement of such a hope.

These sources are plural, as we saw. But they have in common that they all offer positive underpinning of this kind. The original Christian notion of *agape* is of a love that God has for humans which is connected with their goodness as creatures. Human beings participate through grace in this love. There is a divine affirmation of the creature, which is captured in the repeated phrase in Genesis 1 about each stage of the creation, "and God saw that it was good". *Agape* is inseparable from such a "seeing-good."(SS 515-16).

Here the *agape* is made possible by human beings 'participation in it through grace.' However, Gandhi did not believe in "grace" and the concept of "mercy" which can be seen as another distinction between ahimsa and agape. Taylor's defense of Christian agape has a historical-narrative dimension. He proposes it against modern sources of moral standards, such as naturalism and secular humanism, which he considers mostly useless since in the end they are only instrumentalist and proceduralist struggling to find substantial source for their position. The question still is whether they have ways of seeing-good which are still credible to us, which are powerful enough to sustain these standards? Because, as Taylor argues, "High standards need strong sources." (SS 516). Of course, they do have universal concepts like benevolence, patience, toleration, justice, and freedom, but they are not *strong enough* to substantiate them. Appeal is generally made to modern humanism, but the latter has received its universal concepts and ideals from *grand narratives* especially of our religious traditions, which they reject without recognizing any debt. So when Taylor advocates for agape, he intend to demonstrate it as something rejected and forgotten by secular humanists though they are indebted to it or to similar universal concepts from religious traditions. On one hand, the concept is foreign to modern humanism. On the other hand, it does give a better frame for modern humanism with the moral challenges and meaning of life as we experience it.

Some of the same *Agapic epoch* that Taylor wants to resurrect in Europe and North America, can also be seen in Gandhi's life and writings. Gandhi had great admiration for the New Testament and especially the Sermon on the Mount. In his reading and describing about Christian influences Gandhi does not seem to understand it as a dogmatic reality. The historicity of Jesus does not have any revelatory inspiration for him. As Chatterjee

states, "What Gandhi finds in Jesus is the embodiment of universal love."[626] This can remind us of Tolstoy's

relation to Jesus, which was centered on *universal love*, and in fact Gandhi was much influenced by Tolstoy's

The Kingdom of God is Within You (he read it in 1894). Chatterjee argues that Tolstoy's *Law of Love*

influenced Gandhi to go beyond fear, distrust and disparities,[627] hence to go beyond mere *toleration*. Gandhi's

passionate faith and reason unpack potentials for practicing a new attitude toward a politically and religiously

plural society for our modern times. Precisely the rationality of religious truths/dogma interested him

considerably less. To a considerable degree, reasoning had to be in tune with the experience of ordinary people,

and rationality had to be a help to their needs as they attempted to live good lives.

4.2. Dilemmas in the Dialectics Between Gandhi and Taylor

None of the points of contact or parallel lines that I have identified in the work of Gandhi and Taylor can take

away the fact that there are important differences. Some of them are obvious and may be superficial. In the

beginning of my plan of reading Gandhi and Taylor for a new construct of a modern moral identity, a reader

observed that they are like "oranges and apples." His remark came from the contrast that Taylor is largely a

professor in the academic world and on the other hand Gandhi an activist and political figure. It is true that

there are contrasts in many respects. Gandhi was an Indian and Taylor is a Canadian; Gandhi was a Hindu and

Taylor is a Christian; Gandhi is remembered as a towering spiritual authority and Taylor is one of the most

famous intellectual figures of our times. Gandhi was a strong critic of the western civilization and Taylor is a

product of the western civilization; Gandhi was passionate about his religious life and Taylor is more

passionate about his philosophical and political aspects of life as compared to his religious beliefs; Gandhi was

a pre-modern person with many modern ideas and Taylor is a modern person with many post-modern, post-

---

[626] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 54.
[627] Chatterjee, *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity*, 37.

analytic, and post-religious concerns. They lived in different times, spoke different languages and worked in different cultural contexts. Let us look some more closely at some of this.

4.2.1. **Milieu of Modernity – Differences of Time and Place**

We may start from the fact that Gandhi can be understood as a "traditional" person who had a "nationalistic" interest in everything he did, whereas, Taylor can be understood as a "modern" person attempting to draw on both traditional and modern resources for defining a rich "modern moral identity." Yet this difference need not mean that comparatively Gandhi is simply out of step with us today. As I hope to have shown by now, Gandhi's position, which we see in his action as much as in his writing, is not an 'old skin,' but rather in a 'new skin' capable of holding problems that we face today. Moreover, whenever we feel a need to adapt his position, we should remember that he himself reiterated that whatever he wrote, said and did, needed to be seen in a context of the time, for the contexts show that he was capable of changing his opinions and positions as experience required. This openness may already be modern, but it is also capable of addressing modernity. His autobiography's *Farewell* states "Lastly, my conclusions from my current experiments can hardly as yet be regard as decisive." (MET 419). The conclusion of *one narrative,* it seems, already foresees new narrations in which important lessons remain active.

As for Taylor, we already know that he always *narrates* with *retrieval* from the past that is conducted with a view to the future. We also know that he is remarkably open with giving up every basis for clarity and action. And we know that his commitment to a new, richer narrative does not rule out important changes or perhaps even corrections in the future, as new experiences or concerns may lead us to new retrievals.

4.2.2. Differences of Emphasis, Articulations, and Purposes

These are other differences. Gandhi, it may seem, tends to sacralize the secular, whereas Taylor's orientation seems to be toward a spirituality that recognizes and does justice to the secular. Gandhi depended heavily on his religious tradition, practices, and experience to infuse his private life. In other words, his private life and his political action were oriented toward a transformative sacrality. This makes him an example of what Richard Kearney means by "sacramental-praxis," as a model for doing political activity with a religious foundation.[628] If so, Gandhi may be close to Thomas More only with respect to the way they integrated spiritual and political life.[629] It also means that in his thinking and in his writing, he resorts to a *descending method* of narration, where religious and moral flavor that comes from the Absolute eventually makes the secular *relatively sacred*. Taylor, in contrast, seems to develop an *ascending method* of narration, where the secular feels itself limited and limiting in its secularity, and searches for something that will make its *flourishing* meaningful and transcendental. His appreciation of the *secular immanent frame* does not prevent him from exploring an openness toward *transcendental* realities. His emphasis on the secular, on the one hand, exalts its merits and achievements, but on the other hand, reveals its lack of foundations in universally explaining concepts or meta-ethical concerns. As, above all a philosopher, Taylor looks for an intellectual contribution to the modern world, and perhaps therefore hesitates at the prospect of a developing a robustly religious ontology and phenomenology. Gandhi never had this reservation or hesitation, and spoke out often, many times prophetically, about his morality, and in fact that they rest on religion. Taylor has a bit of an excuse since his context is predominantly secular compared to the context of Gandhi which was predominantly religious. It is true that Gandhi's Hindu privilege and his access to the concept of *dharma* can be understood as compatible to secular values though they were not framed as against/as a response to a secular background that of Taylor.

---

[628] Richard Kearney, *Anatheism: Returning to God After God*, *Insurrections: Critical Studies in Religion, Politics, and Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).

[629] He was among other things a politician extremely intolerant to religious dissent.

Gandhi was not seeking to develop an ontology and phenomenology of morality, rather a re-reading of Gandhi after reading Taylor makes it clear to us that Gandhi has resources to support a ontology and phenomenology which Taylor carefully and deliberately brings about.

What Bilgrami has called a "de-sacralized nature,"[630]thus seems at the heart of both concerns, though they approach it from different directions. Both seem to have in view some complex relationship of "transcendent" and "immanent." This is developed with special care in *Catholic modernity,* where Taylor re-interprets the Gospel in order to stress its plural, secular, and worldly emphasis in order to make the secular some way open to the sacred. Of course, these emphases and accents ultimately dissolve into metaphysical or transcendental considerations. Hence there is the need of a "stronger metaphysical foundation" of orientation to highest goods in order to standardize the plurality of physical and secular goods around us. This holds for both the *ascending* and *descending* methods, mentioned earlier.

4.2.3. Moral Realism and Practical Idealism[631] : Two Models for a Frame of Modern Secular Identity

Taylor undertook his narrative of a *comprehensive* theory of morality and self-identity by way of retrievals made within a wider range of *moral sources* than modern secular reason tends to accept. There are numerous *narrower* and one-sided theories of morality and self-identity. Most of these are, according to Taylor, erroneous, biased and unconvincing. Still, whatever its practical implications, the project of Taylor is basically *an intellectual* one. His grand narratives can take the reader into numerous streams and strata of human intellectual, moral, and religious developments and even through their declines. His effort, and also his skill concentrate on making a reader engage authors, themes, and concerns in a different way. Perhaps it is possible only to be entertained or educated by this. Taylor's goal is for it to transform one's outlook and action.

---

[630] Bilgrami, "Gandhi's Religion and Its Relation to Politics," 109ff.
[631] Gandhi once said, "I am not a visionary, I claim to be a practical idealist." (YI, 11-8-1920)

When one turns from Taylor to Gandhi, one sees enacted many of the elevated moral, cultural, political and religious concepts the philosopher has retrieved and proposed for our consideration. Here the contrast is between intellectual/rational theories of ethics for modern self-identity, and a realistic or pragmatic exposition of similar ethical concepts in one's own life. And of course, what can be articulated with intellectual precision is often quite inarticulate of the moral life of the person attempting to live by it. This is far from questioning Taylor's capacity to measure up to his own concepts, but only to underline Gandhi's spiritual and public interest in being *an example* of what he said. What I am simply state here is that Gandhi lives out what Taylor is theorizing.

The tension between rational moral concepts and concrete action is a Kantian theme. I would say that when Kant states that when *I choose for myself, I generate a principle for everyone to follow,* he basically leads us forward an attempt to reconcile personal experience and choice with a principle of universal relevance that might not be either convincing or satisfactory at the level of moral life, even if it is rationally consistent. Much of Taylor's work can be considered to respond to exactly this danger where *rationality* and its *autonomy* is solely the decisive factor of human moral aspirations. A rationally "generated" morality is not convincing since it is again mechanistic and proceduristic in the way it uses reason. Taylor's self is more connected and inter-dependent compared to the autonomous self of Kant. Likewise, but now at a practical level, Gandhi's notion of *satya* and *satyagraha* seems to offer us a better way of universalizing morality by showing us how to internalize personal choices in a religious understanding that can be conducted into the public realm. In Gandhi we find an *example* of what Taylor attempts to describe, and neither can be reduced to only a defense of *rational principle.* Gandhi would reframe Kant's moral statement in a form something like *when I choose for myself, I set an example for everyone*. When one sets an example one is not purposely generating a principle.[632] And as a pragmatist Gandhi can be justified for his exemplary life. Was he worried about the grounding of

---

[632] Bilgrami, "Gandhi's Religion and Its Relation to Politics," 100-101.

morality as Kant did? Or else, was he simply assuming that morality, a given, is exemplified in each life? Presumably, *Dharma* being a known concept is more about morality also for Gandhi. Still one can rationally reflect on the implication, the motive and the principle of such a 'general concept' to one's own life. Kantian problematic has been a concern of Taylor which never been one of Gandhi. Still this does permit us to see how Gandhi approaches it in a quite different and more convincing way. We can further state that even if it appears as a principle for somebody, unless and until one assimilates it into oneself, it has not been rationalized in a realistic, lived manner.

Chatterjee also considers Gandhi's morality to be close to that of Kant, though with an important final difference. It may have been this that confused Nehru, who at any rate did not seem to think that Gandhi's fusion of an exemplary life and action with political goals could be rational, since it rested on religious principles (recall our earlier notion of sacramental praxis). Basically, what I present here is that both Gandhi and Taylor are at an uncomfortable distance from Kant.

Indeed, Gandhi can rarely be seen not connecting religion and moral life. Truth and goodness in the highest sense are experienced first at the level of the individual, in his/her consciousness, which cannot be absolutized. This is where Kant sought to apply the moral law, according to the dictates of practical reason. For Gandhi, as we have seen, the individual is the site of a spiritual relation that makes the highest level of goodness and truth possible for the individual. For Taylor, it is the site rather of agape. In all three cases, however, there unfold the possibility of universal humanism. Gandhi and Taylor see a root of that humanism deeper than anything pure reason could reach.

4.2.4. **Mutuality and Alterations**: **Autonomy, Authenticity, and Holistic Harmony**

Both Taylor and Gandhi give importance to the autonomy of the self and state. Freedom of the Individual and the state is never far from their minds. Taylor's *Politics of Recognition* distinguishes equal dignity and recognition of difference. The former concerns (self) autonomy and the latter concerns (self) authenticity. The distinction is important, for liberal politics ignores many differences in order to make autonomy possible and Taylor opposes the concept autonomy. However, he does not handle this distinction between "equal dignity" and "recognition of difference" with complete consistency. As Maeve Cooke has observed,

> [...] there is an unacknowledged tension in Taylor's essay[633] between the ideals of autonomy and authenticity, and these results in contradictions and confusions in his account of the politics of difference. Furthermore, Taylor's reading of the politics of difference is marred by his failure to distinguish sufficiently carefully between various interpretations of the demand for recognition of specific identity.[634]

The tension leans unresolved an ongoing ambiguity between his plurality of goods and their authentic articulation. In turn, this opens the way for a society of individuals fighting each other for the subjective achievement, articulation, and claims in favor of what one takes as goo from one's own perspective. In view of this, Taylor seeks a method of *standardization* that recognizes *qualitative distinctions* between goods and which would be grounded in an ontology that transcends particular contexts and sets of values. Like Gandhi, Taylor is attentive to *inescapable frameworks* for meaning and value which are deeper and greater than the range in which the self defines its own identity. His approach is of course *narrative*, and aimed at opening practical links to transcendental conditions. Here again, the challenge and the promise of Taylor's project might best approached through some reflections on what Gandhi has attempted.

---

[633] Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition," in Multiculturalism and the "Politics of Recognition," ed. Amy Gutmann (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 1-112.

[634] Maeve Cooke, "Authenticity and Autonomy: Taylor, Habermas, and the Politics of Recognition" in *Political Theory*, 25 (1997): 256-258.

If so, the key might be Gandhi's nuanced understanding of self-rule, which seems to develop something like the modern notion of autonomy into an affirmation of transcendent dimensions for it. This notion is not easy to track because he speaks of the self-rule (*swaraj*) of both individual and nations.[635] Gandhi gives priority to authenticity, of which autonomy is a tool. Yet in both cases – or in any movement toward autonomy: national, political, economic, spiritual – Gandhi is oriented finally to self-realization. But at that point, the idea of autonomy, of self-rule, ceases to be strictly political and instead becomes metaphysical where both autonomy and authenticity becomes means to his self-realization in the sense that he has better access to the Truth. Here one gets the deep roots what Gandhi means by "self-rule" which again appears quite close to what the *Bhagavat Gita* means by *sthitha-prajna* which refers to a self-ruling, spiritually free person.[636] But this is achieved not through others and not by freeing oneself from others but instead by performing – or entering into agreement with – one's own *dharma* and *karma*.[637] This notion is fully wholistic and integral, as is the freedom it entails. Parel states, "Full human development, he (Gandhi) insisted, called for the development of all aspects of freedom. To pursue one aspect of freedom without simultaneously pursuing the other aspects was to distort the meaning of freedom and to interfere with the process of human development."[638]

This sheds crucial light on what is often thought to be a weakness in any Gandhian political theory – or perhaps even proof that such theory is impossible. In fact, this is Gandhi' greatest strength as a theorist: his defense of the poor, oppressed and downtrodden was always based on "his own reasons,"[639] and not on any external

---

[635] CWMG: 20: 99 (1958-1994), cited in *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule* ed. Parel, 2000, 1. As we have already seen, the word *swaraj* comes from the Sanskrit words *swa* and *raj,* which means "self" and "rule." *Swarajya* means "independent nation."

[636] *Bhagavat Gita*: vv. 54-72.

[637] The Enlightenment affirmation of the autonomy of human rationality and individuality does not necessarily signal a deeper personal experience the self. Perhaps it is only a "rational" construct.

[638] Parel, *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule*, 18.

[639] See Judith Brown, "Gandhi and Human Rights: In Search of Truth Humanity," in *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule* ed. Anthony Parel (New York: Lexington Books, 2000), 87-102. She explains that Gandhi was convinced of the capability of human beings in discovering the truth about themselves and society. Through self-knowledge and self-rule they discover the fact that they belong to a moral universe not of their own making where rights remain correlated to duties.

political theory such as one finds in the liberal theories of the modern west.[640] In part because he was not a theorist or academician. His fights for rights never deviated from his awareness of the concept of duty and responsibility to himself and to society, and never from a religious or moral root for their foundations. This should be kept in mind, when for example, Gandhi states that,

> Civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty. Performance of duty and observance of morality (*niti*) are convertible terms. To observe morality is to attain mastery over our mind and our passions, so doing, we know ourselves. (HS 67).

In summary, then, Gandhi's understanding of authenticity, unlike that of Taylor, is not a child of the Romantic Period but rather an offshoot of his assimilation of self-rule with self-realization, on which he depended heavily in his *experiments with truth*. (*cf.*, Chapter 3.4 and 3.5 for detailed analyses of his process of authentication). In simple terms, we might say that Taylor's understanding of *authenticity* does not reach to the level of Gandhi's *self-realization*, but Gandhi's practice of self-rule is inclusive of Taylor's notion of authenticity. Arguably both draw nearly the same conclusions. Taylor does not seems to have much interest in autonomy or rule of reason since he focuses more on the evolving nature of reality rather than to conclusively define it. Still his abandonment of autonomy was not for a higher realization rather for a higher and inclusive intellectual perspective. Obviously that helps Taylor to expand his agapic recognition to larger horizons realities. Gandhi's notion of self-rule (autonomy of self and nation) apparently develops out of his cultural context and experience of colonization. Once he is free personally and as a nation he pursues his own authenticity by means of the experiments on celibacy, nonviolence, simplicity, vegetarianism, and truth. At some point he grows up to the level of even abandoning both autonomy and even authenticity not for any intellectual theorizing but for his

---

[640] Denis Dalton, "Gandhi's Originality" in *Ibid*, ed. Anthony Parel (New York: Lexington Books 2000), 63-87. He goes far in demonstrate how Gandhi's pursuit of swaraj justifies both means and ends in comparison to the political theories of Marx, Trotsky, Emma Goldman, Saul Alinsky, Jacques Maritain, Aldous Huxley, and John Dewey.

own self-realization.[641] Such a movement taken by detachment can also understood as a deliberate decision of his self (self-rule). Hence ultimately he states, "The spirit of renunciation should rule all the activities of life."[642]

4.2.5. Dilemmas of Elusive and Encompassing Epiphanies of Religions

There is an elusiveness about Taylor's relation to religion, not only because for many year he did not speak about his Catholicism in his philosophical works, but also because in the later works, when he does mention Christianity, he seems to/want to defend it without either retrieving or articulating the fundamentals. For example, when he analyses the *Unquiet Frontiers of Modernity*, he shows that we moderns follow the Romantic in our search for fullness, yet seem to miss the deeper and richer religious heritage still available behind Romanticism. Likewise, he tells us that we have replaced the old "higher time" with autobiography, history, and commemoration, and that "Our age is very far from settling into a comfortable unbelief." (SA 725-727). But against unbelief, he presents not a range of dogmas but instead a selection of recent spiritual conversions or "epiphanic" experiences in recent, mainly Catholic artists and writers, including Vaclav Havel, Ivan Illich, Charles Peguy, and Gerard Manley Hopkins. These expressions are thought to be the evidence of what defines religious beings. 'In our religious lives we are responding to a transcendent reality.'(SA 768) Yet under modern conditions, this religious striving takes on a distinct form: our seeking for "fullness" is our response to transcendental reality. This general elusiveness lead many readers understand Taylor as a proponent of secularism. It also leads others to understand his works as a modern Christian apologetic/Catholic philosophy. Taylor's hesitation to deal with catholic doctrines and dogmas within his major philosophical works has perhaps nothing to do with his personal affinity to the same. In reality, his vision of Catholicism is

---

[641] Chatterjee unravels a deeper possibility of understanding Gandhi's use of terms 'self-realization' and 'God-realization.' This can be understood as the distinction between *ātman/Brahman* identity and their realizations. (Chatterjee, Gandhi's Religious Thought, 108).

[642] Iyer, *The Essential Writings of Gandhi,* 382.

does not permit him to elaborate on those aspects of Catholicism. Apparently he is in a dilemma between the individualism and experientialism of William James and his own philosophical emphasis on collective existence and experiences of humanity. Taylor wants to be part of the reflective religious experience of secular modernity without losing the positive aspects of community affinity.

One could go further with this. It is unclear, for example, if he strongly believes in the *unique revelatory* aspect of Catholicism. Some of his writings suggest that he is not entirely at home with his Roman Catholicism. On one occasion, he expresses little sympathy for the role of official apologist of the contemporary Roman Catholic Church. (PA 198). In the *Sources of the Self,* he repeatedly celebrates the Protestant affirmation *of ordinary life as a notable achievement* of Western culture, and claims that there is no comparable notion in Roman Catholicism. More positively, it seems clear that his belief is linked with a sense of something he wants to describe as God's love (*Agape*). Moreover, he seems convinced that God and agape can serve as important elements of a transcendental, inescapable frame for the affirmation of the world and human beings. In a reflective moment he writes, "The issue is: what kind of affirmation can one make? I don't want to prejudge this. I have a hunch that there is a scale of affirmation of humanity by God which cannot be matched by humans rejecting God. But I am far from having proof."[643] This means that the elusiveness of his own confessional identity in his philosophical texts goes together with his philosophical interest in developing his own Christian/Catholic philosophy as an explanatory background for his account of human being, meaning, and value.

There is in Gandhi a different kind of elusiveness concerning religion. His frequent "over-religious" articulations make it hard for the ordinary reader to distinguish and understand his separate contributions to the areas of the religion, morality, and politics. Yet many consider him especially as a moralist and a political

---

[643] Charles Taylor, "Reply and re-articulation," in *Philosophy in an Age of Pluralism*, 226.

activist, while others strongly emphasis his spirituality. We have already seen that there can be not opposition between Gandhi's asceticism and his activism since they are in fact both features/aspects of self-realization. Yet this does not address another, perhaps deeper question about the religious sources of those notions. One might ask, without knowing a great deal about Gandhi, whether self-realization can be pursued equally in political activity or in exclusive religious asceticism. This might press this point further by insisting that activity and asceticism are truly different, and observing, however, that spiritual elevation can occur nearly anywhere and anytime at all – including in situations in which one must be extremely active, as for example, Maximillian Kolbe or Edith Stein was in the concentration camps in Poland. [644] Gandhi seems to understand that difference in favor of our integral spiritual vision. This presents him from asking about the real relationship between diverse ways to God, and about a God who call different people in different ways. In the end he justifies all of this by assimilating God with "Truth," though that is seen objective and lifeless. Does he try to avoid a theological explanation of his religious faith by presenting an apparently philosophical term for God? Gandhi is also vague about which kind of Hindu he is; he doesn't affirm any specific lineage, worships in no temples, rarely draws on scriptures other than the Gita or as revelatory. This would be similarity to Taylor.

Both Taylor and Gandhi keep an *open-space* for religion, which neither systematically reflected nor clearly articulated. In both case, some indeterminacy about one's confessional identity seems to go together with admitting religion into a public, secular discourse, and indeed with preserving an open space for religion there. In is uncertain whether this means only that some, may doctrinal elements of religion cannot be admitted to secular discourse (Taylor?), or that religion can play a strongly positive role in secular discourse by going beyond doctrinal particularity (Gandhi?). This important question deserves lengthy, separate attention. As above, neither is strongly institutional in his commitments. Both are individualists in the religious realm.

---

[644] St. Maximillian Kolbe renounced his life for a co-prisoner. Even in prison, his "self-rule" was not hampered. Edith Stein, who was a philosopher and a saint, passed through the different levels of spiritual realization before she reached the final one of her death in the Gas Chamber. She was inspired by St. Theresa of Avila's Interior Castles.

What Taylor offers in this discussion, and what I accept from him, is the idea that a morality founded on the autonomy of human nature is in need of a *better* metaphysical foundation than the purely human one, in part because such a restrictive foundation inevitably limits our "standard of evaluation" (of goods). "Good without God"[645] does not satisfy Taylor. Nor does Gandhi accept it, though he does reason somewhat differently than Taylor. In his *Ethical Religion* he states,

> Some believe that morality is not something quite essential. Others think that there is no relation between religion and morality. But an examination of the world's religions shows that, without morality, religion cannot subsist. True morality covers religion for the most part. Anyone who observes the laws of morality for their own sake and not for any selfish end can be regarded as religious.[646]

Here Gandhi indicates how one can ascend from morality to religion. And also, Religious people can descend their religion by moral expressions. This view of religion and morality give enough resources for our secular reflection on both. However, Gandhi ultimately insists on religion as the real source of morality. Taylor also would base his moral good in a metaphysical hyper good to which they are constitutive.

4.3. Conversions and Convergences for a New World Order

In this final section of my dissertation, I propose to think through some of the questions and conclusions encountered in the hypothetical dialogue between Gandhi and Taylor, moving towards some proposals for our contemporary world. My aim will be to develop from these works, especially in relation to one another, new determinations about politics and religion in tune with the signs of our times. Taylor, being a living philosopher can definitely help to make some conversions of such misrepresentations of Gandhi as a mere 'traditionalist,' 'spiritualist.' 'activist,' and 'emotionalist.' After re-reading Gandhi with the background of Taylor, I present a few aspects from which Indians and others from around world can still learn from Gandhi

---

[645] Greg M. Esptein, *Good Without God: What a Billion Nonreligious People Do Believe* (New York: HarperCollins, 2010).

[646] M.K. Gandhi, "Eithics/Morality," in *Ethical Religion* accessed on June 21, 2012, http://www.mkgandhi.org/ethical/ideal_morality.htm.

for our modern, post-modern, secular, and post-secular thought pattern of philosophical, political, and religious perspectives. Here I propose three conversions and three convergences as prospects that emerge out of my comparative reading of Taylor and Gandhi.

4.3.1. Conversions

I have come to propose three conversions on the basis of analysis and reflection of the philosophies of Taylor and Gandhi. The first one is specifically a proposal and plea for India and the rest of it is generally presented for consideration of all.

4.3.1.1. From "Vulgar Gandhism" to the Vitality of Gandhism

Among the traditionalists and the conservatives in India, there are intellectuals who hesitate to consider Gandhi and his vision as anything more than a traditional one. They depict him mainly as a spiritual figure, moralist, and a political leader. Progressive political thinkers from India refer to such a restrictive understanding Gandhi as "Vulgar Gandhism." This view insists on keeping Gandhi within the confinements of Indian tradition and of Gandhi's own milieu. Such a – widespread - understanding of Gandhi as a spiritual figure diminishes the aspect of his thinking that probes politics, culture, and religion a great depth. My reading of Taylor helped me to retrieve these aspects of thinker in Gandhi. Obviously Taylor has brought the importance of rational reflection on religion and morality back to the intellectual forum. That does not mean that Gandhi and Taylor are the same, but rather, that Taylor enables us to appreciate and explore Gandhi in a fresh light, for our times. This also helps us to bring Gandhi, together with his religious and moral reflection, back into our own considerations. Gandhi, to a great extent, has been ignored because of his supposed 'over-emphasis' on religious and moral issues. Modernity and secularism, together with its emphasis on humanism, trend toward on morality devoid of religious roots or devoid of a proper metaphysics. By presenting Gandhi together with Taylor, I provide a possibility for bringing them together into a conversation on religion, morality, and politics. I hope to have taken proper care to be as

philosophical as possible in this dialogue. I hope Indian scholars will bring Gandhi into a contemporary frame with the help of philosophers like Taylor. Let Gandhi grow beyond his time and beyond Indian intellectual confinements. Hence I make a plea to the Indian intellectuals to give a new attention to Gandhi, since he is a generally ignored. He is still worth reading and reflecting.

4.3.1.2. **From Modernity to Multiple/Alternative Modernities**

I have introduced Gandhi as the *pioneer* of the alternative approaches to modernity and secularism in my third chapter (3.2.5). Here I want to make my argument in favor it, with the help of a few challenges and demands of the world we live today. Gandhi's inter-cultural and bilingual articulations of a political theory have more components of a *global political theory* which apparently is a predicament of a world increasingly interdependent in numerous ways. One of the unique aspects of Gandhian political theory is that he never been a political theorist in predominant western fashion[647] rather he *theorized politics on the basis of his experiences.*[648] He demonstrated that "not every movement for independence is national, not every national struggle is nationalist and that not every nationalist movement need articulate itself in the language of European rather than home-grown theories of nationalism."[649] Drawing inspiration from the *non-violence (ahimsa)* of the Indian tradition he found an alternative to the *violence (himsa)* in the modern society. Gandhi strongly experienced that racism, economic exploitation, colonialism, and power politics had exerted their brutality morally, socially and psychologically both to its masters and victims. He revitalized and rejuvenated the strengths of the underprivileged to uplift them morally and politically. He was convinced that much of the

---

[647] In the Western world any philosopher can be a political philosopher or theorists without being a politician or practitioner. This was so unlikely to a person like Gandhi.

[648] Most of Gandhi's political methods and theories he initially rehearsed and practiced in South Africa. For example, *satyagraha.*

[649] Bhikhu, Political Philosophy, 3.

violence came out of the predominant materialistic conception of man.[650] However, he endorsed a moral/spiritual conception of man with an inclusivistic attitude.

Taylor's fear of the individualistic emphasis of the human self over against the communitarian aspect can be identifiable in Gandhi's vision of human self, society, and politics. Gandhi's political view of an alternative is basically grounded in the idea of *revitalizing* the degenerated Indian society by giving them hope of *swaraj* (self-rule/state-rule), inside-out. This view is primarily a moral awakening of the self about their lack of freedom in pursuing their own aspirations and then it is also an awakening of the Indian people, as a society about their common cause national freedom or independence. Each nation, as proposed by Gandhi, deserves their own moral, economic, and political freedom. He saw these aspects of freedom being denied by the British imperial power. To him, modern civilization was more centered on the material or earthly aspect of human being, compared with the soul or spirit centered conception of man in the ancient period. Gandhi felt that such a conception of man was necessarily flawed because it lacked moral and spiritual depth. Hence, Gandhi proposed his own indigenous vision of an alternative modernity and secularism inclusive of traditional resources of morality and politics.

Gandhi's particular Indian emphasis made it difficult for him to give an adequate account of the rise of scientific achievement, human sciences together with the organizational abilities of life, and also industrial achievements together with its impact on modern society. He can be argued as dropping those externals of civilization in order to preserve the internal spirit of the civilization. Gandhi's Micro-Perspective (restricted to the Indian context) and Taylor's Macro-Perspectives (North-Atlantic and beyond) can be mutually uplifting. The heterogeneity of the society is kept against the abstract homogenizing uniformity attempts by erasing the

---

[650] The emergence of sciences and the influence of enlightenment thinking have in many ways made human beings think of themselves in terms of more materialistic and rationalistic nature. This has pushed the spiritual emphasis of the medieval ages out of the center. Gandhi was a strong critic of the moral distortions of the Western world, which he assessed as something that came out of the materialistic approach to human life.

difference by a politics of recognition. Nehru and Ambedkar tried to eradicate it in the pretext of hierarchical aspects.

4.3.1.3. From Exclusive Secularism to Inclusive Secularism

Western secularism has developed from the context of Christianity. Historical instances like renaissance, reformation, counter-reformation, and enlightenment effected the disintegration of Catholicism in the Europe. The evolution of secularism as a movement against the existing religion can be traced back to this particular context. This unique context and the particular form of secularism (Anti-religious or exclusive secularism) cannot be attributed any other context in the world. Here I open up the possibility and prospect of secularism(s) against the background of European model of secularism.

One of the major focuses of my dissertation in chapter 1.2 was to present a sketch of the origin and development of the Indian version of secularism which I traced from the intellectual history of India. Encounter with a single religion can never be a reason to speak about the origin and development of secularism in India. In India, I argue, secular constitution was formulated in order to equally recognize all the religions. India has cradled many religions in her own womb, for example, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism. National debates and political discourses in India have given significant importance to the issue of minority and majority, especially on the basis of their religious affinity. Constitutional reservations and special recognition of minorities can be seen as a problem and at the same as a prospect of Indian secularism. The principle of recognition is better taken care of in India though its limits have to be acknowledged. Taylor would be happy to see how in the Indian context the aspect of recognition applied to different ethnic, linguistic, and religious groups.

Western liberal notion of secularism tend to move to a purely humanistic, naturalistic, rationalistic, and finally individualistic direction, without seriously caring for the religious needs of the people. I am not convinced of the potentiality of western secularism to meet the religious needs or expectations of the people since it originated as an anti-religious movement. Here I propose a conversion of 'exclusive secularism' to an 'inclusive secularism.' Decline of religion has not convinced secularist of the complete elimination of it. On the other hand, religion (at least some form of it) has tremendous influence on the majority of the human population. I think inclusive mode of secularism can use the benefit of rethinking about religion in a new way. Here I make a plea to the Western model of secularism to consider the Indian model to explore its prospects together with other relevant visions of its prominent pioneer-Gandhi.

4.3.2. Convergences

In this final section, I propose three major convergences which I draw from my reading of Taylor and re-reading of Gandhi. They are prospects for both for human flourishing – both secular and spiritual.

4.3.2.1. A Post-Secular Turn to a Post-Religious Affirmation of Religion

For much of this work, I have been intent on introducing Gandhi and Taylor as pioneers of a new, more critical relation to modernity and secularism (and intent on examining the meaning of "secularism" in the North Atlantic and India). Much of this investigation has concentrated on politics, but not without taking notice of the religious dimensions of Gandhi and Taylor. I propose to focus on what may be the implications of their thinking for religion itself, in secular life and reason around the world.

Contemporary social, political, and religious thought includes a growing number voices claiming that secularism, especially in the western world, has come to an end and hence we are passing to a new stage. Habermas, in this line, has emphasized the need for a perspective capable of mutuality. He states "Both

religious and secular mentalities must be open to a complementary learning process if we are to balance shared citizenship and cultural difference."[651] Thoughts like this seem to concede that the modern claims for "secular religion"[652] and "civil religion"[653] have proven unable to diminish or redefine the importance of traditional religion around the world. In fact, as Habermas rightly states, "As the well-to-do, developed societies become progressively more secular, a world society is becoming increasingly religious as a result of higher birth rates in the poorer developing countries."[654] We have seen at great length that Taylor is well positioned to describe and dissect the encounter of secularism with religions. On the one hand he brings out "how we got here," and on the other hand he suggests "where we need to go." I hope to have shown that Taylor's suggestion of a new modern moral identity in fact goes beyond the tenets of secularism; to that extent, he too is a post-secular thinker. But for Taylor, secularism brought home a *more reflective religion.* Moreover, it called the traditional religions to give more emphasis to the *ordinary life of the faithful* and their *worldly human flourishing* together with their spiritual orientation in a life after death. We might also say, with great care, that he is thus post-religious, in so far as he interprets and re-affirms religion in a new way, after a long process of dialectics between the secular and the spiritual, and has accepted that abandonment of a time and a way of life in which traditional religion is taken for granted as the ultimate frame of all meaning. The transition of a cultural context from traditionally religious to predominantly secular does not seem to take place globally since around the world more people are religious than secular. Hence a contextual or multiple modernities can be key terms to explain the historical development and transition of a country especially in the fields of religion and politics. In that line, India need not be fully secular in the fashion of western modern nations in order to deal with issues of

---

[651] Jürgen Habermas, "Secularism's Crisis of Faith: Notes on Post-Secular Society" in *New perspectives quarterly* 25 (2008): 17-29. (Henceforth: Habermas, "Secularism's Crisis of Faith,")

[652] 'Secular religion' is a term used to describe ideas, theories or philosophies which involve *no spiritual* component yet still claim to possess qualities similar to those of a religion.

[653] In the 18th century, with the growing secularization due to the Age of Enlightenment, Rousseau called for a 'civil religion' based on the duties of the citizen, to provide a non-metaphysical alternative to traditional religion.

[654] Habermas, "Secularism's Crisis of Faith," 6.

religion and politics. Heterogeneity of modernity and secularisms open up the possibility of comparative readings of different indigenous development of secularisms, modernity, and religious beliefs.

A great deal of this development has concerned the relationship of morality and religion, and this is of course also true of Taylors' place in that discussion. The thesis of "Morality without religion"[655] has occupied many thinkers for a long time. From the dawn of philosophical thought, there has been a tendency to attempt to free philosophy from theology and myth, on the understanding that the latter served only to support moral development until intellectual maturity no longer needs them. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, all sought to put religion in its place in order to make room for true thinking. Other philosophers followed suit especially in the area of ethics, thinking that choices made in faith are not fully self-responsible. *The Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals* and *Religion Within the Bounds of Reason Alone* are important examples of this trend. Kant's concepts of *maxim, motive, duty,* and *categorical imperative* are all expressive of a notion of autonomy thought to be central to authentic morality. Of course, it has never been certain that Kant's project is successful, and in general the debate between proponents of the religious foundation of morality and morality without religious guidance remain unresolved.

Now, a post-secular outlook enters into positive dialogue with religion, knowing the pathos and positives of religion, though without pretending to simply dissolve the complementarily of the secular and the spiritual' that has motivated much of the present dissertation. Perhaps this is clearer in Taylor's work. But there is an implicit awareness of or may be anticipation of, the spiritual-secular ambivalence in Gandhi's willingness to use the terms use the terms "religion" and "morality" as if interchangeable. At important moments, "religion" seems to have a deep and fundamental meaning, inspiring, as we have seen, the action in which it is enacted:

---

[655] Certain kinds of *Morality without religion* designates the aspect of philosophy that deals with morality outside of religious traditions. Modern examples include humanism, freethinking, and most versions of consequentialism. Ancient roots of the same trend can be seen in Skepticism, Epicureanism, Stoicism, and the *charvaka* school of thinking in India. For most such outlooks "Man is the measure of all things." This position also can be identified as *morality without a God.*

> Religion is dear to me, and my first complaint is that India becoming irreligious (a people without *dharma* (this is mine)). Here I am not thinking of Hindu, the Mohamedan, or the Zoroastrian religion, but of that religion which underlies all religions.[656] We are turning away from God. (HS 42)

Gandhi's notion of religion has gone beyond particular traditions, castes and tribes. This notion of a "religion which underlies all religions" frames true action in the moral and political sense, but is or could be always embodied in and through particular traditions that are in the world. This dimension of in-the-world gives religion a secular dynamic that is in tension with its spiritual dynamic. This tension might explain some of Gandhi's willingness to shift from one emphasis to another. It also works strongly against arguments suggesting that he was anti-secular and more spiritual which would also diminish our sense of what he truly has to offer us as we look ahead. Chatterjee has got it right when she states that,

> […] Gandhi was not, as a religious thinker, fighting a battle against the inroads of secularism as many theologians feel they are doing today. Gandhi was in fact throughout his life concerned with very secular goals, first early in his career, the securing of civil rights for Indian settlers in South Africa, and back in his own country, from 1915 onwards, the gaining of national independence for India.[657]

Gandhi was not even, strictly speaking, flatly opposed to atheists, since he eventually found a desire for truth in many of them. He acknowledged that he read enough of Charles Bradlaugh's work on atheism and secularism while he was in London. Gandhi attended the funeral of him which he could not help admiring and this also made him to think that even atheists are some way in the track to truth. But they did not have any effect on him since, as he says it, "I had already crossed the Sahara (desert) of atheism."[658]Annie Besant, who was a follower of Gandhi, was an atheist in the beginning but later on she wrote a book called, *How I Became a Theosophist*. Gandhi also read this book regardless of its atheistic connections. Gandhi extensiveness of the understanding of God is exclusive enough to include almost everything as we see it in his following statement:

---

[656] "[…] religion which underlies all religions": It is a very important concept in Gandhi's political philosophy. Throughout his book *Hind Swaraj* religion can be seen as understood in two senses: as a sect or organized religion and as an ethic which is grounded in some metaphysic. (HS 42).

[657] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 4-5.

[658] Iyer, The Essential Writings of Gandhi, 68 (*Navjivan*, April 18, 1926).

God is that indefinable something which we all feel but which we do not know. To me God is Truth and Love, God is ethics and morality. God is fearlessness, God is the source of light and life and yet. He is above and beyond all these. God is conscience. He is even the atheism of the atheist. He transcends speech and reason. He is a personal God to those who need His touch. He is purest essence. He simply Is to those who have faith. He is long suffering. He is patient but He is also terrible. He is the greatest democrat the world knows. He is the greatest tyrant ever known. We are not, He alone Is (YI 5-3-25, 81).

Gandhi's conversation with another atheist Goparaju Ramachandra Rao was also insightful. Gandhi, being a practical man was, deeply concerned about the way atheists conducted their lives, though they theoretically spoke differently about God. However, he did write and speak forcefully against materialism and untruth. We see such rhetoric mainly in his *Hind Swaraj.* To a considerable degree, this book can be read as a Gandhian critique of modernity, industrialization and spiritless secularism. And this is the real point: while there is a secular dimension or dynamics of the life that is founded in true religion, and an ethical expression of that religion wherever secular goals are pursued with a view to the Good, there is also a materialistic secularism that has to be critically opened to genuine religion and ethics.

Gandhi thus has a more forceful argument for religion than does Taylor, for whom religion is more of an unmistakable – and important – source, than an immediate practical necessity. Taylor's tendency to even go beyond Christianity and particularly Catholicism will place him a parallel to Gandhi's vision of religion that underlies all religions. In simple terms, while Gandhi gives the impression of looking to religion for the one conception of goodness that can save us, Taylor readily sees "good" even where "God" seems not to come into the picture. Gandhi will tolerate people those who do charitable things, but personally he needs God as the source of all goods. His linking of religion and morality cannot be reduced to any of them. They should go hand in hand. This has come under critical pressure in the late modernity, as challenges to metaphysical foundations are often posed at the same time as challenges to religion. Yet in recent decades, so-called post-metaphysical thinking seems to find room for a positive assessment of religion.

As I understand, there is an ongoing 'anti-foundationalism' in Taylor as he continues to retrieve and narrate his story which also can function as a legitimization of his post-metaphysical turn. It is well-known that the late modern attacks on metaphysics aim mainly at the metaphysics that proposes to found all meaning, including religious meaning. Taylor shares many of the reservations of people who make this attack. In the essay "Overcoming Epistemology," he opposes a mode of philosophy which he calls "foundationalism." For him, the mistake lies in a metaphysics that wrongly assumes that "knowledge is ... correct representation of an independent reality." (PA 1-19). Human knowing cannot be a disengaged from the life, the activity of reason. He states, "Foundationalism is undermined because you can't go on digging under our ordinary representations to uncover further, more basic representations. What you get underlying our representations of the world […] is not further representation but rather a certain grasp of the world that we have as agents in it."(PA 1-19). This, of course, is the problem with an epistemology resting on the subject/object ontology initiated by Descartes. Against Descartes' meditative disengagement from the external world (Meditations I-II), Taylor understands epistemology as the study of the *mediation* of the subject and object. Human knowing cannot be a disengaged activity of reason. I argue that Taylor's post-metaphysical strand of thinking can be found in this shift away from Descartes. But this shift aims not to denounce all epistemology or metaphysics as such, but instead to unfold a narrative approach to both. Dreyfus is thus only half-right when he observes that Taylor challenges all epistemology in order "to present and defend an opposed view, a view that denies that the inner/outer dichotomy in any form correctly describes our basic relation to reality."[659] With going directly back to a more the tradition, Taylor is, in a way, urging us past the Platonic Good and the metaphysics of the ordered Whole (Aristotle, Aquinas). I think this is an instance for us to see how Taylor makes a case for the dependence of any epistemology and any metaphysics on the thinking and meaning-giving of a subject who acts in a context that is historical, cultural, linguistic, and more. This is significant for our modern secular context and our

---

[659] Hurbert L. Dreyfus, "Taylor's (Anti-) Epistemology" in *Charles Taylor* ed. By Ruth Abbey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 52. (Henceforth: Deryfus, "Taylor's (Anti-) Epistemology").

process of defining self-identity. In his *Sources of the Self*, where Taylor exhibits a post-metaphysical view and yet an inclination toward at sympathy with theism. There he states,

> I am obviously not neutral in posing these questions. Even though I have refrained (partly out of delicacy, but largely out of lack of arguments) from answering them, the reader suspects that my hunch lies towards the affirmative, that I do think naturalist humanism defective in these respects-or, perhaps better put, that great as the power of naturalist sources might be, the potential of a certain theistic perspective is incomparably greater ... But I recognize that pointed questions could be put in the other direction as well, directed at theistic views. My aim has been not to score points but to identify this range of questions which might sustain our rather massive professed commitments to benevolence and justice. (SS 517-518).

At this point, I argue that one may say that the specific sense in which Taylor's thinking is post-metaphysical represents the necessary link between his understanding of the transcendental frameworks of morality and his own personal theistic commitment to Catholicism. It also explains why he can involve his Catholicism, as the mediating context for his own thinking, without dealing directly with the concept of Christian God or of Jesus. This justification will be of a single piece with his objection to overly abstract moral "inescapable frames" theory: life is ambiguous, including philosophical life, because it is always conditioned by of meaning and an endless dialogue between oneself and them, as well as between oneself and others.

It is useful for us to note the relationship between and the dialectics of the post-metaphysical thinking and post-religious thinking where both try to see the complementarity as against their contrastive aspects. I understand Taylor also as a post-metaphysical thinker because of his strong stand against the enlightenment claims of individual autonomy and its universalizing tendencies. His post-metaphysical approach, as I argue, makes him to go against certain kind of foundationalism which proposes totalizing visions of social, scientific or historical reality. He does not agree with such legitimization by some metaphysical construct and their universalization. Instead, he prefers local and contextual narratives, where he makes the self more engaged to make his post-metaphysical claims of ontology *convincing*. Though he was against metaphysical foundations, on the contrary

he has great concern for a metaphysical and transcendental foundation of ontology and morality which is explicit from his argument for *inescapable frameworks* and his conception of dialogical selfhood.

4.3.2.2. A Post-Metaphysical Re-Interpretation of Gandhi

Gandhi was understood and interpreted in numerous ways as pre-modern, modern, anti-modern, and post-modern. Here I present my argument to posit the claim that Gandhi's can also be interpreted as having a post-metaphysical religious perspective. As I have presented the arguments in favor of a post-metaphysical religious thinking of Taylor, especially on the basis of his anti-foundationalism, transcendental framework of morality, and the dialogical aspect of the self, here I want to similar arguments to substantiate Gandhi's post-metaphysical religious thinking.

I argue that the way Gandhi gave priority to the *non-rational* is significant for a post-metaphysical transition. His interest and commitment to religion does not seem to come down to his interest in traditional religion of his time. Of course, as I myself have already argued at length, in order to understand Gandhi one should have some understanding of the traditional Indian context which was predominantly resonant with what in the west is called pre-modern. Nevertheless, it would a terrible mistake if one understands Gandhi merely as traditionalist and pre-modern, since Gandhi always sought to free his thinking from the limits of his time and place. We should also be on guard against concluding from his use of terms like Reality, Truth, God, and Self or Soul that his religion is somehow foundational, in the metaphysical sense. As we have seen, Gandhi's use of such terms and of traditional resources serves mainly to articulate original idea for example, the uses of traditional terms like *swaraj, swadeshi, sarvodaya* – reconstructed in a way that points beyond systems, foundations, and so on. As we have also seen, these notions frame a social theory in which moral identity involves dimensions of openness to action truly in the world, and of a spiritual vision not enclosed entirely in the world. Moreover,

when he took this attitude with regard to western philosophy, it was especially modern rationalism that he resisted:

> […] Gandhi is critical of the dominant philosophical traditions with its overwhelming privileging of reason and the rational. For Gandhi, one cannot define the rational as the real. Most past and twentieth-century philosophy, for Gandhi, is a kind of oppressive, unjustified, rationalistic reductionism that presents a narrow, impoverished, cognitive view of human existence and reality.[660]

I also argue that Gandhi's ethical and ontological formulations of 'means' and 'ends' relationship has 'transcendental inescapable aspects.' His nonviolence and its civic virtue can be seen as a convergence of a reformed liberal perspective for a post-modern and post-metaphysical period by its incorporation of 'communitarian values.' Here Gandhi affirms the autonomy and integrity of individuals together with commitment to the common good of people.[661] His ethics mediates both his religion and his politics. The relationship between religion, ethics, and politics to tradition, modernity, and contemporary world, I argue, is the foundational dilemma and problematic of modern debates on secularism and modern moral identity. Gandhi's approach can provide valuable contribution to making the ontology of religion and morality relevant for today.

To sum up, a post-metaphysical and post-religious conception of the person goes hand in hand with the proposal of moral identity and moral action with a capacity to truly engage and transform secular life.

4.3.2.3. A Non-Violent World Order of Truth, Love, and Service: Proposal for a World-View of Peaceful Co-Existence

In this final section I propose a world order and world view which I think integral and relevant for our modern world. It is, according to me, significant to consider a model which is maximally inclusive compared to many minimalistic (atomistic) perspectives. The understanding of religion, morality, and politics as essentially complementary aspects of life, seems to be fading from modern consciousness and indeed the modern world.

---

[660] Allen, "Introduction," x-xi.
[661] Nicholas Gier, "Nonviolence as a Civic Virtue: Gandhi and Reformed Liberalism" in … 121-141.

Yet nothing has actually disproven the thought that "the pursuit of truth, love and service" is substantially different from "religion, morality, and politics." Both Gandhi and Taylor can be pointers and pioneers in the constant pursuit of Truth, to privilege peace and reject violence in all our activities, to respect diverse viewpoints, and to practice the philosophy of Non-violence to win over the forces of violence and injustice through tolerance, empathy and love. This project ultimately has to be brought out by a synthesis of many factors. In fact, 'a non-violent' method only can bring us together which lies behind the core of Gandhian program by which he has changed modern consciousness globally arguably more dramatically than any other approach. Is that program still meaningful? Is there a non-violent quest for peace that one can look forward to as a real plausible option? Can we realistically envision a nuclear free world order?

According to my view, a peaceful world-order can be brought out by a combination the principles of *non-violence* and *of recognitio*n. These principles has inevitable relation to our pursuit of truth, love and service and hence to our perspectives on religion, morality, and politics. Hence, truth, love, and service avoid harm, promote compassion, and in the name of truth try to keep us in relation with a genuine religious perspective. Taylor's commitment to the concept of 'incommensurability' permits him to consider different cultures and intellectual traditions with a respect and unbiased attitude which can open up 'closed' readings of non-western intellectuals in view of abstracting positive aspects from the western intellectual tradition. More specifically, I think this should open the eyes of anti-western and anti-modern thinkers of India to have an integral frame of modern moral identity for India. This is also an occasion for me to suggest how reading of western philosophers like Taylor can be immensely useful for understanding contextual secularity and self-identity.

One obstacle to the vision of 'contextual' vision has been, since Gandhi's own lifetime, the temptation of state religion. We can admit that this is sometimes a problem today, decades later. No careful reader of Gandhi can pretend not to find in his writing that he wishes so much *high* religious consciousness and still aspires to an

argument for the *low* religion of theocracy. Gandhi did not want an India that would be only a Hindu state. This makes him an opponent of *Hindutva*, a view which believes that a *hinuduization* of India will solve its problems. In their (proponents of *hindutva* view) case one suspects that "religion" and "religious" language are used for strictly political purposes (we should remember that Gandhi would never even separate them). For example, proponents of *hindutva* define Indian politics in terms of Hinduism, which in reality is similar to theocracy. For them even Indian national identity is associated to *Hinduness.* Some of them will go to the extreme to define secularism also in terms of Hindu religion, stating that what is indigenous to a nation is what it means by secular. (c*f.* 1.2.5.2. Pseudo-Secularism: Its Ideology and Proponents). Gandhi never been blamed for politicizing religion though he was criticized for spiritualizing politics.[662] This misuse of religion is still with us, as many political debates show. In Gandhi's own lifetime, the great example was the partition of India and Pakistan. Luis Fisher noticed the paradox: "The irreligious Jinnah wished to build a religious state. Gandhi, wholly religious, wanted a secular state."[663] Positively Jinnah can be seen as one who takes religious differences seriously which Gandhi did not. However, there are enough evidences from his personal life and political activities to proof that his insistence on religious difference has very little to do with his genuine religious spirit.[664] It is undeniable that Jinnah's intentions were highly political, and served in that way to provoke the constitution of an independent Pakistan. Gandhi believed in the human capacity to unite with patient effort, but Jinnah insisted on division. "Gandhi wanted to use the cement of nationalism to make it one; Jinnah wanted to use the dynamite of religion to make it two."[665] For Jinnah, as for many politicians today, religion, and a religious identity founded in a way that isolates and extends, requiring division. For Gandhi, religion is a matter of spiritual practices for 'training in the use of soul-force, a turning of the search-light

---

[662] Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, criticized Gandhi for spiritualizing politics since he believed in a purely secularized politics.

[663] Louis Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* (New York: Collier Books, 1962), 401.

[664] Fischer has made it convincingly clear in his chapter comparing "Gandhi and Jinnah," Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* chapter 40, 397-404.

[665] Fischer, *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*, 402.

inwards, and a yearning of the heart.[666] Of course, Gandhi's notion of 'religion – the religion under all religions – can also be a divider though its scope in the dialogue between political and religion significantly explicit. The goal was to become a better and fitter instrument of service. When politics distances itself from genuine service of humanity, there is an erosion of the meaning not only of politics but also of religion and morality.

Unlike Gandhi, Taylor deals with a distinctive brand of pluralism and multiculturalism, as the context in which to bring out a moral realism capable of strong evaluation, grounded in rich frameworks, articulated by distinctive narrative, promoting hypergoods, and by defining constitutive goods. I consider his understanding of the human self with its ontological and historical dimensions is not only interesting; it remains relevant. The new world order which I envision endorses, together with Taylor, a 'communitarian' political approach which would account for the particularities of self-identities as against the liberal focus on *negative liberty*. Of course, this idea of loving and recognizing everybody in a 'traditional way' and yet living in a 'modern liberal society' of positive liberty has practical complications. Only situated freedom is capable of reconciling pluralism and holism. It is thus the only model of freedom appropriate to the increasingly differentiated, multicultural condition of modern societies. Only situated freedom saves us from the alienation that belongs to liberal atomism.[667] I think that any political liberalism that tries to 'depreciate or even crush diversity and individuality'[668] and thus undermines democratic freedom itself should be re-evaluated and re-defined. Here too, a non-violence in thought, words and actions is required for a convergence into a world order of peaceful co-existence.

---

[666] Chatterjee, *Gandhi's Religious Thought*, 12.

[667] Nicholas H. Smith, *Charles Taylor: Meaning, Morals, and Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press Ltd., 2002), 143.

[668] Taylor attributes immense importance to changing self-interpretations and the way they are influenced by cultures. Yet he does not let that interpretation go all the way down, because he also insists on rather enduring and universal features of selfhood even with their different particular interpretations. He also rejects the antagonism between liberalism and communitarianism. In his epistemology there is a combination of critique of foundationalism and a realist approach to natural sciences.

Conclusion

The wide range of themes and topics common to Gandhi and Taylor makes any attempt to study them a 'tough road to travel.' For me this has been a challenge for my own pursuit of truth, which always has an aspiration for new horizons and a fusion of different ones. Both Gandhi and Taylor have inspired thousands and perhaps millions in their pursuit of the meaning of an authentic self and its relative achievements. While Taylor's scholarly comprehension and acuteness excite the reader, Gandhi's emphatic articulation and demonstration of the importance of *experiential* aspects of truth also call powerfully to us. The way each navigates between, and thus normalizes what is otherwise great ambivalence between the secular and the spiritual, immanent and transcendental, relative and absolute, religion and politics, give us much that is important to consider in a new, richer way. The genuineness of their pursuits and the realism they express have the power to inspire generations to come, since there are solid foundations on which they base their thoughts. Perhaps they are most inspiring for us today for integrating the secular and spiritual, which we accept as conditions of our being.

I myself have been deeply impressed by the way they recognize both of them. Gandhi's life and teaching continue to influence the world, especially through nonviolent resistance to forces rampant everywhere. It may be that no intellectual will ever again do quite what Gandhi was able to accomplish, and it may be that one great example is enough. But we still need to re-read and re-define such figures for our times. Here Taylor can help us. I think he can be a good interlocutor to have a conversation between the west and India for a constructive program for the future. He is a prolific writer and a skilled academician whose work in politics may make him unusually sympathetic to Gandhi. Only time will prove the lasting worth of any philosopher and his works. Thomism no longer dominates as it once did. Post-modern thinking has already receded. Secularism has been tested and is still being tested. Post-secular, post-religious, and post-metaphysical transitions hint at limitations within secularism. Regardless of these erosions, changes, and transgressions, it is my belief that

Gandhi and Taylor will continue to influence us, since they did not limit themselves to mere parts, but rather tried to bring the greatest number of parts into a whole. Something of this effort will remain, even if other features become obsolete.

GLOSSARY OF SANSKRIT WORDS

adharma	irreligion, immorality
advaita	branch of Vedanta philosophy emphasizing unity of the individual and God
advaitist	a believer in non-duality
ahimsa	non-violence
anāsakti	non-attachment
aparigraha	non-possession
artha	wealth/power, one of the four ends of human life
ashrama	One of the four stages of life of Hinduism
ashramite	member of an ashram
asteya	non-stealing
atmakatha	autobiography
ātman	the permanent self-underlying human person, spiritual foundation of the person
avarna	casteless
avatara	an incarnation
bania	merchant caste
bhakta	a devotee
bhakti	devotion to God, one of the three ways of attaining moksa
bhaktiyoga	the path of devotion
brahmachāri	one who practices celibacy (celibate)
brahmacharya	celibacy
Brahman	the ultimate reality
Chandāla	an outcaste, a member of low caste
Charkha	a spinning wheel
Cit/chit	knowledge

Dalits	the oppressed, low caste
dehin	the embodied self
dharma	duty, natural moral law; religion as ethics and religion as sect
dvaitism	doctrine of duality
Guru	a teacher; a religious preceptor
Harijan	child of God, name given by Gandhi for Untouchables
himsa	violence
Hindutva	an aggressive sense of Hindu identity, emphasize the formation of a Hindu State
Isopanishad	one of the *Upanishad*
Jnānayoga	the path of knowledge; one of the three ways of attaining moksa
Jnāni	a man of knowledge
kāma	pleasure
karma yoga	the path of action; one of the three ways of attaining moksa
khādi	homespun cloth
lokasamgraha	the welfare of the world, mentioned in *Gita*
mahātma'	great soul' honorific title
mantra	a sacred text used for repetition and meditation
Manusmŗiti	ancient Hindu law-book written by Manu
mokṣha	spiritual liberation, salvation, emancipation, freedom from birth
Mosque	a Muslim place of worship
praja	nation
Purānas	books of Hindu mythology
pūrna swaraj	full-independence
purushārthas	the aims of life
Rāj	rule (British Raj)

Rāmanāma	name of Rama (God, one of the incarnations)
Rāmarājya	kingdom/rule of Ram
Ramāyana	name of a Hindu Epic
sanatani	orthodox Hindu
Sanātani	ancient, eternal
Sanātna dharma	eternal religion, orthodox religion
sarvodaya	welfare of all
Sat	truth, that which exists
satya	truth
satyāgraha	firmness in adhering to truth
satyāgrahi	one who practices satyagraha
Savarnas	upper caste
shāstra	scripture
shruti	the Vedas
shūdra	one of the four *varnas*, lowest caste
smṛiti	a code of laws; a law book
stithapragnya	person of stable wisdom, a man of steady mind
Surājya	the good state
swadeṣhi	pertaining to one's own country
swadharma	one's own duty
swarāj	self-rule, self-government
Syadvada	an assertion of probability in philosophy, a form of skepticism finds in Jainism
syadvadi	a believer in *Syadvada*
tapas	penance
tapasya	religious austerity

Upaniṣhads   ancient philosophical writings of Hiduism

vairāgya   aversion to the world; passionlessness

Vaishnava   a devotee of Vishu, (preserver) one of the incarnations of Brahman

Vaishnavism   a Hindu sect

varna   the ideal unit of a functionally divided Hindu society

varnadharma   duty enjoined by caste rules

varnāshrama dharma   the caste system

Vedas   scriptures of the Hindus

Vedic   belonging to the *Vedas*

Index of Terms: Clarifications

Ashrama: In Hinduism, human life is believed to comprise four stages. These are called "ashramas" and every man should ideally go through each of these stages:

- The First Ashrama – *Brahmacharya* or the Student Stage
- The Second Ashrama – *Grihastha* or the Householder Stage
- The Third Ashrama – *Vanaprastha* or the Hermit Stage
- The Fourth Ashrama – *Sannyasa* or the Wandering Ascetic Stage

Authenticity: By 'authenticity' I mean the vertical foundations of a self by which it specifically asserts itself or its worth as a moral or ethical being. Such selves are authentic in relation to their 'over-arching' goods and their vertical orientations. Taylor's "inwardness" includes a vertical movement towards God too (Malaise of Modernity 26).

Authenticity: For Taylor, authenticity is a child of Romantic period. The inner of the previous self of disengaged rationality and morality, is being stripped of the moral content here. This Romantic self tries to explore its own inner worth by exploring and expressing his/her creative imagination. Modern self is still in the making of or framing of its authentic self-identity.

Axial Age, Pre-Axial Age and Post-Axial Age (Age of Revolution): Taylor is influenced by Jaspers identification of "Axial Age" and he furthered the analysis backward to "pre-axial period" and forward to "post-axial period –Age of Revolution." Taylor's 'communitarian turn' of philosophical hermeneutics has effectively used these divisions. *Cf. The Great Disembedding.*

British Raj: (*rāj* (राज), literally means "reign." This was the British rule in the Indian subcontinent between 1858 and 1947; it can also refer to the period of dominion, and even the region under the rule. The region, commonly called India in contemporary usage, included areas directly administered by the United Kingdom, as well as the princely states ruled by individual rulers under the paramountcy of the British Crown. After 1876, the resulting political union was officially called **the Indian Empire** and issued passports under that name. The system of governance was instituted in 1858, when the rule of the **British East India Company** was transferred to the Crown in the person of Queen Victoria (and who, in 1876, was proclaimed Empress of India), and lasted until 1947, when the British Indian Empire was partitioned into two sovereign dominion states, the *Union of India* (later the Republic of India) and the *Dominion of Pakistan* (later the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, the eastern half of which, still later, became the People's Republic of Bangladesh). The eastern part of the Indian Empire became the separate colony of Burma in 1937, and this gained independence in 1948.

Commensurability: Commensurability (contrast with incommensurability) is a concept in the philosophy of science. Scientific theories are described as commensurable if one can compare them to determine which is more accurate; if theories are incommensurable, there is no way in which one can compare them to each other in order to determine which is more accurate. Taylor makes use of the concept to emphasize the notion of 'recognition of plurality.'

Communalism: can be understood as social organizations on communal basis: loyalty to a sociopolitical grouping based on religious or ethnic affiliation. In the Indian subcontinent, the term *communalism* has taken on a very different meaning, namely that of a religion—and, more specifically, ethnically-based sectarianism. In the history of India there were occasions they promoted communal violence, instigated by political interests. (Online Dictionary and Wikipedia)

Communitarianism: Taylor (as well as Alasdair MacIntyre, Michael Walzer, Michael Sandel, and Gad Barzilai) is associated with a communitarian critique of liberal theory's understanding of the "self." Communitarians, including Taylor, emphasize the importance of social institutions in the development of individual meaning and identity. In his 1991 Massey Lecture, "The Malaise of Modernity," Taylor argued that political theorists, from John Locke and Thomas Hobbes to John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin, have neglected the way in which individuals arise within the context supplied by societies. A more realistic understanding of the "self" recognizes the social background against which life choices gain importance and meaning. wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Taylor_(philosopher) accessed on 06.21.2011.

Constitutive Goods: For Taylor, plurality of goods around a human person functions as 'constitutive' to his whole frame of goods. None of the individually can claim to be 'the good' rather, all of them comprise together forms the good of a person.

 Deism: Deism is knowledge of God based on the application of our reason on the designs/laws found throughout Nature. The designs presuppose a Designer. It is therefore a natural religion and is not a "revealed" religion. The natural religion/philosophy frees those who embrace it from the inconsistencies of superstition and the negativity of fear that are so strongly represented in all of the "revealed" religions such as Judaism, Christianity and Islam. (www.deism.com/deism_defined.htm accessed on 06.03.2011)

Dharma (Sanskrit: धर्म dhárma, Pali: धम्म dhamma; lit. *that which upholds or supports*) means *Law* or *Natural Law* (as in *the natural order of things*) and is a concept of central importance in Indian philosophy and religion. In the context of Hinduism, it refers to one's personal obligations, calling and duties,[1] and a Hindu's *dharma* is affected by the person's age, caste, class, occupation, and gender.[2] In modern Indian languages it can refer simply to a person's religion, depending on the context. The idea of *dharma* as duty or propriety derives from an idea found in India's ancient legal and religious texts that there is a divinely instituted natural order of things (rta) and justice, social harmony and human happiness require that human beings discern and live in a manner appropriate to the requirements of that order. According to the various Indian religions, such as Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, and Sikhism, beings that live in accordance with *dharma* proceed more quickly toward *dharma yukam*, *moksha* or *nirvana* (personal liberation). This chapter has a section on *dharma* which furthers this concept. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dharma).

Dharma-nirpeshata (धर्मनिरपेक्षता)*:* This is the Hindi equivalent word for 'secular.' Scholars differ in their interpretation of the meaning of this expression: Indifference to religions, neutrality to religions, equality of religions, and indifference to traditional caste based religions, etc are a few among them. Dr. R.S. Misra, Benares Hindu University, understood it as *keeping apart from dharma.*

Disenchantment: Originally the term 'disenchantment' was used by Karl Jaspers. The Pre-axial period people were closed connected to community, cosmos and gods. It can be explained as 'enchanted' world. German philosopher Karl Jaspers coined the term the *axial age* or *axial period* (Ger. Achsenzeit, "axistime") to describe the period from 800 to 200 BCE, during which, according to Jaspers, similar revolutionary thinking appeared in China, India, and the Occident. The period is also sometimes referred to as the axis age.

Diversity/Plurality: For Taylor sources of the self are naturally 'diverse/plural.' Human agent encounters and dialogues with these diverse/plural moral sources and incorporates them appropriately into their self-identity. A retrieval of history, which contains the genealogy of our originality, is necessitated.

Diversity: By 'diversity' I mean the horizontality of the self where the self has a plurality of realities. The self needs to make its own evaluations in order to determine the appropriate horizon.

Fundamentalism: is strict adherence to specific theological doctrines usually understood as a reaction against Modernist theology. The term "fundamentalism" was originally coined by its supporters to describe a specific package of theological beliefs that developed into a movement within the Protestant community of the United States in the early part of the 20th century, and that had its roots in the Fundamentalist–Modernist Controversy of that time. The term usually has a religious connotation indicating unwavering attachment to a set of irreducible beliefs. "Fundamentalism" is sometimes used as a pejorative term, particularly when combined with other epithets.. The relationship between communalism and fundamentalism is important for my research since communal violence is the most important crisis of modern India. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fundamentalism).

Hedonism: is derived from the Greek hedone, meaning 'sweetness', 'joy', or 'delight', and refers to theories about the nature and function of pleasure. Originally, hedone was the sort of sweetness that could be appreciated by taste or smell; then hearing was involved; finally, it was applied metaphorically to any pleasant sensation or emotion. The word's history reminds us that much pleasure is rooted in physical needs and desires. 'Psychological hedonism' attempts to explain human conduct, claiming that people are motivated solely by the desire for the maximum degree of pleasure, and invariably act on the stronger of conflicting desires. (Oxford Companion to Body: Hedonism online version, accessed on 06.03. 2011.

Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule is a book written by Mohandas K. Gandhi in 1909. It is a book in which he expresses his views on Swaraj, Modern Civilization, Mechanisation etc. Mohandas Gandhi wrote this book while traveling from London to South Africa onboard SS *Kildonan Castle* between November 13 and November 22, 1909. In the book Gandhi gives a diagnosis for the problems of humanity in modern times, the causes, and his remedy. Gandhi's Hind Swaraj takes the form of a dialogue between two characters, *The Reader* and *The Editor*. I have analyzed this book in my research. (Wikipedea.org/Indian Home Rule)

Hindutva: (हिन्दुत्व, "Hinduness"). This word was coined by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar in his 1923 pamphlet entitled *Hindutva: Who is a Hindu?* It is used to describe movements advocating Hindu nationalism or hinduization of India. Members of the movement are called *Hindutvavādis* In India, an umbrella organization called the Sangh Parivar champions the concept of *Hindutva*. The *Sangh* comprises organizations such as the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), Bajrang Dal, and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. This ideology has existed since the early 20th century, forged by Veer Savarkar, but came to prominence in Indian politics in the late 1980s. (Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar: Hindutva, Bharati Sahitya Sadan, Delhi 1989 (1923).

Historical and Philosophical Foundation: A brief presentation of the history of the gradual emergence of 'secularism,' hopefully will serve as a background for the whole thesis. Modern self's *Sitz im Leben* is 'secular' in nature, which used to be 'spiritual.' That being affirmed, I think of working on the specificities of the self in Charles Taylor and M.K.Gandhi.

Holistic Identity: The notion that identity is constituted of the plurality of goods (moral, religious, rational, artistic, emotional, social, and the like). The sum of the 'parts' make the 'whole.' Holistic identity is proposed as a model for the modern identity.

Holistic Identity: 'Holistic Identity' means, the balanced array of the pluralistic realities (goods) in a single person, which are properly harmonized, integrated and balanced in a meaningful way. Taylor visualizes such an identity, whereas to a considerable extent Gandhi actually realized it.

Human Person/Self: Taylor considers a human person/self as an embodied agent. His bodied existence naturally connects him to the other agents and nature. Hence, human person realizes or finds his identity in a 'dialogical' relationship.

Humanism: Any philosophic view that holds that mankind's well-being and happiness in this lifetime are primary and that the good of all humanity is the highest ethical goal. Twentieth-century humanists tend to reject all beliefs in the supernatural, relying instead on scientific methods and reason. The term is also used to refer to Renaissance thinkers, especially in the fifteenth century in Italy, who emphasized knowledge and learning not based on religious sources. (http://mb-soft.com/believe/txo/philterm.htm).

Hypergoods: According to one's framework, some goods are (hypergood) are 'incomparably' more important than other goods. These goods are 'over-arching' goods which move one person to a particular orientation. Some people are more religious because their hypergood is a God. For some other their hypergood is 'Marxist ideology' so they happened to be more 'socialistic' in orientation.

Identity: the state or fact of remaining the same one or ones, as under varying aspects or conditions. Or the condition of being oneself or itself, and not another. It is the state or fact of being the same one as described. Another way to define identity is the sense of self, providing sameness and continuity in personality over time. Late Latin *identitās*, equivalent to Latin *ident* (idem) repeatedly, again and again. My focus is to describe and analyze the importance and influence of 'narratives' in the development of self-identity.

Identity: Everybody has an identity (inborn) which is in potentiality to be renewed, refreshed and even reformed in relation to the social, cultural, intellectual and religious realities. My concern is to analyze and expose such possibilities to figure out a concept of 'secular self-identity,' from the predominantly 'religious self-identity' of the past.

Individualism: Modern self of mechanistic/instrumental reason is individualistic as against community oriented. Taylor sees it as malaise to the modern identity.

Instrumental Rationality: In social and critical theory, instrumental reasoning is often seen as a specific form of rationality fusing on the most efficient or cost-effective means to achieve a specific end, but not in itself reflecting on the value of that end. Thus, to the extent that rationality is concerned with critically evaluating actions, instrumental rationality tends to focus on the 'hows' of an action, rather than its 'whys'. The footnote above shows how Jurgen Habermas divides reason into three kinds. www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instrumental_rationality+Instrumental+Reason accessed on 06.03.2011.

Majoritarianism: is a traditional political philosophy or agenda which asserts that a majority (sometimes categorized by religion, language, social class or some other identifying factor) of the population is entitled to a certain degree of primacy in society, and has the right to make decisions that affect the society. This traditional view has come under growing criticism and democracies have increasingly included constraints in what the parliamentary majority can do, in order to protect citizens' fundamental rights. In India Hindus is the majority group. They exert a lot of influence on the Governmental policies. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Majoritarianism).

Materialism: The theory that holds that the nature of the world is dependent on matter, or that matter is the only fundamental substance; thus, spirit and mind either do not exist or are manifestations of matter. Material emphasis seems to be one among the features of secularism in its initial stages. The materialist school *Cārvāka* is my starting point of the narration of secularism in India.

Maurya Empire and Dynasty: The **Maurya Empire** was a geographically extensive Iron Age historical power in ancient India, ruled by the **Mauryan dynasty** from 321 to 185 BC. Originating from the kingdom of Magadha in the Indo-Gangetic plains (modern Bihar, eastern Uttar Pradesh and Bengal) in the eastern side of the Indian subcontinent, the empire had its capital city at Pataliputra (modern Patna).[1][2] The Empire was founded in 322 BC by Chandragupta Maurya, who had overthrown the Nanda Dynasty and rapidly expanded his power westwards across central and western India taking advantage of the disruptions of local powers in the wake of the withdrawal westward by Alexander the Great's Greek and Persian armies. By 320 BC the empire had fully occupied Northwestern India, defeating and conquering the satraps left by Alexander. (wiki/Maurya_Empire).

Metaphysics: Apparently, there are two kinds of metaphysics: those were initiated by Plato and Aristotle. The former projected it to the 'world of ideas or forms' and latter named it as 'first philosophy' since he regarded it as an investigation of 'Being as Being.' However, both of them had 'perception or appearance' (*doxa*)' as their starting point. Similarly, my interest is to start from the horizontal expressions of authenticity and diversity in view of ascending to a vertical metaphysical perspective. It is precisely a 'vertical openness' to the ultimate reality, in view of drawing enough foundations for an authentic selfhood. Kant stated the 'theoretical impossibility' of metaphysical, however, he too agreed on such possibilities when it comes to the 'practical reason.'

Minoritarianism: is a neologism for a political structure or process in which a minority segment of a population has a certain degree of primacy in that entity's decision making. Minoritarianism or more commonly, the tyranny of the minority, is most often applied disparagingly to processes in which a minority is able to block legislative changes through supermajority threshold requirements. For example, if a 2/3 vote in favor is required to enact a new law, a minority of greater than 1/3 is said to have "minoritarian" powers. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minoritarianism). Minoritarianism may also be used to describe some cases where appeasement of minorities by vote bank politics is practiced. For example, Indian Muslims enjoy disproportionate influence when every political party across the spectrum wishes to obtain the votes of that minority.

Modernity: typically refers to a post-traditional, post-medieval historical period, one marked by the move from feudalism (or agrarianism) toward capitalism, industrialization, secularization, rationalization, the nation-state and its constituent institutions and forms of surveillance (Barker 2005, 444 cited in Wikipedia). That which is modern now will be pre-modern soon. The 'modern' is an oscillating term that seems to moving in accordance with 'the present time.' I have used this term to show the inter-related nature of it with identity, secularity, secularization and secularism.

Modernity: One of the themes of and projects of Charles Taylor, is to provide a 'frame' of a modern identity. He has his own difference of understanding on the predominant reductionist approaches to the making of the modern identity. Taylor analyzes 'modernity' and 'identity' in many of his articles. He would argue that disengaged conception of modernity and human identity has crippled the self in many ways.

Mughal Empire and Dynasty: The **Mughal Empire** was an imperial power from the Indian Subcontinent. The Mughal emperors were descendants of the Timurids. It began in 1526, at the height of their power in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, they controlled most of the Indian Subcontinent- extending from Bengal in the east to Balochistan in the west, Kashmir in the north to the Kaveri basin in the south. Its population at that time has been estimated as between 110 and 150 million, over a territory of more than 3.2 million square kilometers (1.2 million square miles). The "*classic period*" of the empire started in 1556 with the accession of Jalaluddin Mohammad Akbar, better known as Akbar the Great. Under the rule of Akbar the Great, India enjoyed much cultural and economic progress as well as religious harmony. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mughal_Empire).

Nationalism: a sentiment based on common cultural characteristics that binds a population and often produces a policy of national independence or separatism. It is also understood as a loyalty or devotion to one's country viz., patriotism (World English Dictionary). **Nationalism** is a political ideology that involves a strong identification of a group of individuals with a political entity defined in national terms, i.e. a nation. In the 'modernist' image of the nation, it is nationalism that creates national identity. There are various definitions for what constitutes a nation, however, which leads to several different strands of nationalism. It can be a belief that citizenship in a state should be limited to one ethnic, cultural, religious, or identity group, or that multinationality in a single state should necessarily comprise the right to express and exercise national identity even by minorities (Anthony Smith and Will Kymlicka).

Nova Effect: (Astronomy) a variable star that undergoes a cataclysmic eruption, observed as a sudden large increase in brightness with a subsequent decline over months or years; it is a closed binary system with one component a white dwarf; a star that suddenly becomes much brighter and then gradually returns to its original brightness over a period of weeks to years. Taylor describes an important aspect of the modern conditions of belief by saying that "we are now living in a spiritual super-nova, a kind of galloping pluralism on the spiritual plane." This is what he terms the nova effect, which he sees as originating in the establishment of a viable exclusive humanism. The development of secularity in Taylor's third sense (a world of diverse belief) passes through several stages: the first was the development of exclusive humanism as an alternative to Christianity in Western society; the second was the diversification this triggered as the different. The multiple critiques leveled at orthodox religion, Deism, and the new humanism, and their cross-polemics, end up generating a number of new positions.

Pluralism: The view that there are more than two kinds of fundamental, irreducible realities in the universe, or that there are many separate and independent levels of reality. (http://mb-soft.com/believe/txo/philterm.htm)

Political Neutrality: It is one among the projects of 'secularism.' It is an approach predominantly used by secularists in their approach towards religions, for the better functioning of political system. In the 'merely political' matters 'neutrality' does not seem to be an issue.

Procedural Rationality: It is opposite to what is known as "substantive rationality" where reason is considered to have a substantive unity. Arguably Kant is the greatest proponent of such a 'autonomy' of reason where reason becomes the universal principle of one's moral-practical, theoretical, and aesthetical reasoning. In contrast, procedural reasoning breaks this substantive unity. Jürgen Habermas is apparently the greatest proponent of the 'dissolution' of reason in the modern society. He argues that reason has to be strictly "formal or procedural" and divides it into: Cognitive – instrumental reason, moral-practical reason, and aesthetic reason. Wikipedia.org/wiki/Reason#Substantive_and_formal_reason accessed on 06.03.2011.

Pseudo-Secularism: is the state of implicit non-secular trends in the face of pledged secularism. The term is used by groups who perceive a double standard exhibited within the established secular governing policy towards culturally different groups. The first recorded use of the term was in the book *Philosophy and Action of the R. S. S. for the Hind Swaraj*, by Anthony Elenjimattam.

Pure Secularism: It is an ideal envisaged mainly by the hardcore secular thinkers. Pure secularism and holistic identity are not alternatives or interchangeable. Since there is no 'pure secularism existing in reality (at this point of time), I attempt to propose a model of secularism, where the 'material emphasis of secularism' is not most important aspect of it, rather just one among the factors in it. Still 'secularism' whether it is 'pure' or 'impure' is not going to be the 'whole' but only 'part of the whole.'

Secular and Sacred: The development of secularism in the West has always been against the 'spiritual' or religious background. Self is the 'common ground' where both secular and sacred realities confront and conflict or befriend and conglomerate. Coming together of the selves in a "public Sphere" as "civil citizens" is the next step in the process. Self-integration is expected to move forward to social integration.

Secularism as a political system and as a philosophical system: Secularism is an emerging modern theory which has roots in the philosophical, political, cultural, social and religious history of mankind. My interest will be on both (political and philosophical), with primary focus on the latter (philosophical). Part of me like to view it as a developing branch of political philosophy. These two are closely knit together.

Secularism: Secularism is the belief that government or other entities should exist separately from religion and/or religious beliefs. The term 'secular' developed in the Latin Christendom as against 'spiritual.'

Secularism: Secularism is the principle of separation between government institutions and the persons mandated to represent the State from religious institutions and religious dignitaries. In one sense, secularism may assert the right to be free from religious rule and teachings, and the right to freedom from governmental imposition of religion upon the people within a state that is neutral on matters of belief. (Wikipedia). This is an ideology developed in the Western world. In different parts of the world scholars define it contextually. However secularism has been intrinsically related to the inter-relationship of religion and politics.

Secularity: Taylor understand 'secularity' in three different meaning: Secularity 1: The expulsion of religion from sphere after sphere of public life; Secularity 2: The decline of religious belief and practice. Many excellent books have been written on these two

aspects of secularization. But Taylor's focus in this book is on what he calls Secularity 3: "The conditions of experience of and search for the spiritual" that make it possible to speak of ours as a "secular age."

Secularization or Secularisation: is the transformation of a society from close identification with religious values and institutions toward non-religious (or "irreligious") values and secular institutions. *Secularization thesis* refers to the belief that as societies "progress", particularly through modernization and rationalization, religion loses its authority in all aspects of social life and governance. Social theorists such as Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, Max Weber, and Émile Durkheim, postulated that the modernization of society would include a decline in levels of religiosity.

Secularization: Taylor's book *A Secular Age* is a narration of the process of secularization of the North-Atlantic area of the world. He mainly emphasizes the change between a time of history where 'not believing' was unthinkable to another time where 'believing' became problematic. He sees it as the process of secularization.

Sturm und Drang : This expressions are literally mean "Storm and Urge", although usually translated as "Storm and Stress," is a proto-Romantic movement in German literature and music taking place from the late 1760s through the early 1780s, in which individual subjectivity and, in particular, extremes of emotion were given free expression in reaction to the perceived constraints of rationalism imposed by the Enlightenment and associated aesthetic movements (www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sturm_und_Drang, accessed on 06.03.2011).

Syncretism: The Oxford English Dictionary first attests the word *syncretism* in English in 1618. It derives from modern Latin *syncretismus*, drawing on Greek συγκρητισμός (*synkretismos*), meaning "Cretan federation." The Greek word occurs in Plutarch's (1st century AD) essay on "Fraternal Love" in his *Moralia* (2.490b). He cites the example of the Cretans, who reconciled their differences and came together in alliance when faced with external dangers. "And that is their so-called *Syncretism.*" Syncretism is the combining of different beliefs, often while melding practices of various schools of thought. The term means "combining." Syncretism may involve the merger and analogising of several originally discrete traditions, especially in the theology and mythology of religion, thus asserting an underlying unity and allowing for an inclusive approach to other faiths (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Syncretism).

Varna: refers to the categorization of the Hindu society by four castes, hypothesized by the Brahmins and their sacred texts. This quadruple division is not to be confused with *Jāti* or even the much finer division of the contemporary caste system in India. The four *varnas*, or *chatur varna,* are mentioned in ancient texts in the following (stratified) order, from top to bottom,

- The *Brahmins*: scholars, teachers, priests and sages.
- The *Kshatriya*: kings, soldiers, and rulers.
- The *Vaishyas*: merchants, cattle herders and agriculturists
- The S*hudras*: labourers, craftsmen and artisans

Yoga: The *Yoga Sutras* of Patanjali is an Indian scripture and foundational text of Yoga. It forms part of the corpus of Sutra literature dating to India's Mauryan period. There mainly three yogas: jnana yoga, bhakti yoga, and karma yoga. The section on "*Dharma* and *Bhagavat Gita*" has more details on this topic.

Selected Bibliography

Primary Sources by Years

Books by Charles Taylor

Taylor, Charles. *The Explanation of Behaviour*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

---------------- . *The Pattern of Politics* . Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1970.

---------------- . *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

---------------- . *Hegel and Modern Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

---------------- . *Social Theory As Practice.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983.

---------------- . *Human Agency and Language: Philosophical Papers 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

---------------- . *Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,   1985.

---------------- . *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

---------------- . *The Malaise of Modernity*. Concord, Ontario: Anansi, 1991. Republished as *The Ethics of Authenticity*.   Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

---------------- . *Multiculturalism and 'The Politics of Recognition'*, ed. by Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

---------------- . *Development in Thailand* (Bangkok and Montreal: International Centre for Human Rights and Development, 1994.

---------------- . *Philosophical Arguments.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

---------------- . *A Catholic Modernity? Charles Taylor's Marianist Award Lecture, with responses by William M. Shea, Rosemary Luling Haughton, George Marsden, and Jean Bethke Elshtain*, James L. Heft, ed. Oxford University Press, 1999.

---------------- . *Varieties of Religion Today: William James Revisited* . Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2002.

---------------- . *Modern Social Imaginaries.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

---------------- . *A Secular Age*. Cambridge: Belnap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

----------------- . *Dilemmas and Connections: Selected Essays*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011.

Articles by Charles Taylor

Taylor, Charles. "Can Political Philosophy be Neutral?." in *Universities and Left Review* 1 (Spring 1957): 68-70.

----------------- . "Socialism and the Intellectuals." in *Universities and Left Review* 2 (Summer 1957): 18-19.

----------------- . "The Politics of Emigration." in *Universities and Left Review* 2 (Summer 1957): 75-6.

----------------- . "Marxism and Humanism." In *New Reasoner* 2 (Autumn 1957): 92-8.

----------------- . "What's Wrong with Capitalism?." in *New Left Review* 2 (Mar./Apr. 1960): 5-11.

----------------- . "Changes of Quality." in *New Left Review* 4 (July/Aug. 1960): 3-5.

----------------- . "Clericalism." in *Downside Review* 78/252 (1960): 167-80.

----------------- . "Nationalism and the Political Intelligentsia: A Case Study." in *Queen's Quarterly* 72 (1965): 150-68.

----------------- . "Alternatives to Continentalism." *Canadian Dimension* 3/5 (July-Aug. 1966): 12-15.

----------------- . "Neutrality in Political Science." in *Philosophy, Politics and Society, Third Series*. eds. By Peter Laslett and W. G. Runciman, 25-57. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.

----------------- ."Psychological Behaviorism." in *Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Vol. 6*. Ed., Paul Edwards, 516-520. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

----------------- . "Mind-Body Identity, a Side Issue?." in *Philosophical Review* 76 (1967): 201-13.

----------------- . "Teleological Explanation: A Reply to Denis Noble." in *Analysis* 27 (1967): 141-3.

----------------- . "Nationalism and Independence." in *Canadian Dimension*. 4/3 (Mar.-Apr. 1967): 4-12.

----------------- . "Review of Signs and The Primacy of Perception by Maurice Merleau-Ponty." in *Philosophical Review* 76 (1967): 113-17.

----------------- . "From Marxism to the Dialogue Society," in *From Culture to Revolution: The Slant Symposium* 1967. Eds. Terry Eagleton and Brian Wicker, 148-81. London: Sheed and Ward, 1968.

----------------- . "Two Issues About Materialism." [A Review of A Materialist Theory of Mind by D. M. Armstrong]. in *Philosophical Quarterly* 19 (1969): 73-9.

----------------- . "A Socialist Perspective on the 70's."in *Canadian Dimension* 5/8 (Feb. 1969): 36-43.

----------------- . "The 'America' Issue." in *Canadian Dimension* 6/6 (Dec. 1969/Jan. 1970): 6-7.

---------------- . "The Explanation of Purposive Behaviour." in *The Behavioural Sciences*. eds. by Robert Borger and Frank Cioffi, 49-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

---------------- . "Explaining Action." in *Inquiry* 13 (1970): 54-89.

---------------- . "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man." in *Review of Metaphysics* 25 (1971): 3-51.

---------------- . "Review of Psychological Explanation: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Psychology by Jerry Fodor." in *Philosophical Review* 80 (1971): 108-13.

---------------- . "The Agony of Economic Man." in *Essays on the Left: Essays in Honour of T. C. Douglas*. eds. by Laurier LaPierre et al, 221-35. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971.

---------------- . "The Opening Arguments of the Phenomenology." in *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*. ed., by Alasdair MacIntyre, 151-187. New York: Doubleday, 1972.

---------------- . "A Response to MacIntyre." in *Philosophic Exchange* 1 (1972): 15-20.

---------------- . "Peaceful Coexistence in Psychology." in *Social Research* 40 (1973): 55-82.

---------------- . "Neutrality in the University." in *Neutrality and Impartiality: The University and Political Commitment*. ed., by Alan Montefiore, 128-148. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

---------------- . "Responsibility for Self." in *The Identities of Persons*. ed., by Amélie Rorty, 281-299. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

---------------- . "What Is Human Agency?" in *The Self: Psychological and Philosophical Issues*. ed., by Theodore Mischel, 103-135. Oxford: Blackwell, 1977.

---------------- . "Language and Human Nature." in Alan B. Plaunt Memorial Lecture . Ottawa: Carleton University, 1978.

---------------- . "The Validity of Transcendental Arguments." in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 79 (1978-79): 151-65.

---------------- . "What is Wrong with Negative Liberty?." in *The Idea of Freedom: Essays in Honor of Isaiah Berlin*, ed. by Alan Rayan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

---------------- . "Action as Expression." in *Intention and Intentionality: Essays in Honour of G. E. M. Anscombe*. eds., by Cora Diamond and Jenny Teichman, 73-89. N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979.

---------------- . "Atomism." in *Powers, Possessions and Freedom: Essays in Honour of C. B. Macpherson*. ed., by Alkis Kontos, 39-61. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

---------------- . "The Philosophy of the Social Sciences." in *Political Theory and Political Education*. ed., by Melvin Richter, 76-93. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

---------------- . "Understanding in Human Science" in *Review of Metaphysics* 34 (1980): 25-38.

---------------- . "A Discussion." (with Richard Rorty and Hubert L. Dreyfus). in *Review of Metaphysics* 34 (1980): 47-55.

---------------- . "Theories of Meaning." (Dawes Hicks Lecture in Philosophy). In *Proceedings of the British Academy* 66 (1980): 283-327.

---------------- . "Growth, Legitimacy and the Modern Identity." in *Praxis International* 1 (1981): 111-25.

---------------- . "Consciousness." in *Explaining Human Behaviour: Consciousness, Human Action and Social Structure*. ed., by Paul F. Secord, 35-51. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982.

---------------- . "The Diversity of Goods." in *Utilitarianism and Beyond*. eds., by Amartya Sen and Bernard Williams, 129-144. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

---------------- . "Rationality." in *Rationality and Relativism*. eds., by Martin Hollis and Steven Lukes, 87-105. Oxford: Blackwell, 1982.

---------------- . "Political Theory and Practice," in *Social Theory and Political Practice*. ed., by Christopher Lloyd, 61-85. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

---------------- . "Dwellers in Egocentric Space." [Review of The Varieties of Reference by Gareth Evans]. In *Times Literary Supplement, Mar*. 11 1983, 230.

---------------- . "Kant's Theory of Freedom." in *Conceptions of Liberty in Political Philosophy*. eds., by John N. Gray and Zbigniew Pelczynski, 100-121. London: Athlone Press, 1984.

---------------- . "Philosophy and its History." in *Philosophy in History*. Eds., by Richard Rorty, J. B. Schneewind and Quentin Skinner, 17-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

---------------- . "Politics and Ethics: An Interview." [A discussion involving Foucault, Taylor and others] in *The Foucault Reader, Paul Rabinow*. NY: Pantheon, 1984.

---------------- . "Foucault on Freedom and Truth." in *Political Theory* 12 (1984): 152-83.

---------------- . "Hegel, History and Politics." in *Liberalism and Its Critics*. ed., by Michael Sandel. New York: New York University Press, 1984.

---------------- . "Aristotle or Nietzsche." [Review of After Virtue by Alasdair MacIntyre]. in *Partisan Review* 51(2) (1984): 301-6.

---------------- . "Design for Living." [Review of The Thread of Life by Richard Wollheim]. in *New York Review of Books* (Nov. 22 1984): 51-5.

---------------- . "The Person." in *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy, History*. eds., by Michael Carrithers, Steven Collins and Steven Lukes, 257-281. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

---------------- . "Alternative Futures: Legitimacy, Identity, and Alienation in Late Twentieth Century Canada." in *Constitutionalism, Citizenship, and Society in Canada*. eds., by Alan Cairns and Cynthia Williams, 183-229. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

---------------- . "Connolly, Foucault and Truth." in *Political Theory* 13 (1985): 377-85.

---------------- . "Uncompromising Realist." [Review of The View from Nowhere by Thomas Nagel]. In *Times Literary Supplement* Sept. 5 (1986): 962.

---------------- . "Lost Belonging on the Road to Progress." in *Listener* Mar. 20 (1986): 16-7.

---------------- . "Overcoming Epistemology." in *After Philosophy: End or Transformation?* eds., by Kenneth Baynes, James Bohman, Thomas McCarthy, 464-488. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1987.

 ---------------- . "Social Science in Relation to Practice." in *Social Science*, 72 (1987): 110-12.

---------------- . "The Hermeneutics of Conflict." in *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and his Critics*. ed., by James Tully, 218-228. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1988.

---------------- . "The Moral Topography of the Self." in *Hermeneutics and Psychological Theory*. eds., by Stanley Messer, Louis Sass and Robert Woolfolk, 298-320. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988.

---------------- . "Contributions to "Symposium: Religion and Politics." in *Compass* 6 (Nov 1988): 5-23.

---------------- . "Critical Notice of The Fragility of Goodness by Martha Nussbaum." in *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 18 (1988): 805-14.

---------------- . "Cross-Purposes: The Liberal-Communitarian Debate." in *Liberalism and the Moral Life*. ed., by Nancy L. Rosenblum, 159-182. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

---------------- . "The Rushdie Controversy." in *Public Culture* 2 (1989): 118-22.

---------------- . "Taylor and Foucault on Power and Freedom: A Reply." in *Political Studies* 37 (1989): 277-81.

---------------- . "Philosophy of Mind." in *The Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers, second edition*. eds., by J. O. Urmson and Jonathan Rée, 235-237. London and Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

---------------- . "Comparison, History, Truth." in *Myth and Philosophy, Frank E. Reynolds and David Tracy.* N. Y.: State University of New York Press, 1990,

---------------- . "Religion in a Free Society." in *Articles of Faith, Articles of Peace, James Davison Hunter and of Guinness*. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1990.

---------------- . "Invoking Civil Society." in *Working Paper*. Chicago: Center for Psychosocial Studies, 1990.

---------------- . "Irreducibly Social Goods." in *Rationality, Individualism and Public Policy, Geoffrey Brennan and Cliff Walsh*. eds., Canberra: Australian National University, 1990.

---------------- . "Modes of Civil Society." in *Public Culture* 3 (1990): 95-118.

---------------- . "Rorty in the Epistemological Tradition." in *Reading Rorty, Alan Malachowski*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

---------------- . "Our Therapeutic Age." in *Compass* 8 (Nov. 1990): 6-10.

---------------- . "The Dialogical Self." in *The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, culture* ed. D. R. Hiley, J. G. Bohman, and R. Shusterman. New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.

---------------- . "The Deep Challenge of Dualism." in *Quebec: State and Society, second* ed., Alain-G. Gagnon, 82-95. Toronto: Nelson, 1993.

---------------- . "Embodied Agency and Background in Heidegger." in *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*. ed., by Charles B. Guignon, 317-336. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

---------------- . "Nietzsche's Legacy." in *Lonergan Review* 2 (1993): 171-87.

---------------- . "Modernity and the Rise of the Public Sphere." in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, 14*. ed., by Grethe B. Peterson, 203-260. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993.

---------------- . "The Dangers of Soft Despotism." in *The Responsive Community* 3 (1993): 22-31.

---------------- . "Why Democracy Needs Patriotism." in *Boston Review* 19 (1994).

---------------- . "The Modern Identity." in *Communitarianism: A New Public Ethics, Markate Daly*. ed., 55-71. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1994.

---------------- . "Reply to Commentators." in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54 (1994): 203-13.

---------------- . "Charles Taylor Replies." in *Philosophy in an Age of Pluralism: The Philosophy of Charles Taylor in Question*. ed., by James Tully, 213-257. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

---------------- . "Can Liberalism Be Communitarian?." in *Critical Review* 8 (1994): 257-62.

---------------- . "Human Rights, Human Differences." in *Compass* 12 (July/Aug. 1994): 18-19.

---------------- . "Iris Murdoch and Moral Philosophy." in *Iris Murdoch and the Search for Human Goodness*. eds., Maria Antonaccio and William Schweiker, 3-28. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

---------------- . "Deep Diversity and the Future of Canada." in *Can Canada Survive? Under What Terms and Conditions?* ed., by David M. Hayne, 29-35. Transactions of the the Royal Society of Canada, sixth series, 7 (1996).

---------------- . "Communitarianism, Taylor-made - An Interview with Charles Taylor." [Interview with Ruth Abbey]. In *Australian Quarterly* 68/1 (1996): 1-10.

---------------- . "Review of Multicultural Citizenship by Will Kymlicka" in *American Political Science Review* 90 (1996): 408.

---------------- . "Nationalism and Modernity." in *The Morality of Nationalism*. eds., Robert McKim and Jeff McMahan, 31-55. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

---------------- . "Leading a Life." in *Incommensurability, Incomparability, and Practical Reasoning*. ed., Ruth Chang, 170-183. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1997.

---------------- . "The Distance between the Citizen and the State." in Twenty-first Century 40 (Apr. 1997): 4-20.

----------------- . "Living With Difference." in *Debating Democracy's Discontent: Essays on American Politics, Law, and Public Philosophy*. eds., Anita L. Allen and Milton C. Regan, Jr., 212-226. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

---------------- . "Modes of Secularism." in *Secularism and Its Critics*. ed. by Rejeev Bhargava, 31-54. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

---------------- . "Comment on Jürgen Habermas' 'From Kant to Hegel and Back Again'." in *European Journal of Philosophy* 7/2 (1999): 158-63.

 ---------------- . "Democratic Exclusion (and its Remedies?) The John Ambrose Stack Memorial Lecture." in *Citizenship, Diversity, and Pluralism: Canadian and Comparative Perspectives*. eds., Alan C. Cairns et al., 265-287. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

---------------- . "In Defence of Positive Freedom." in *Political Thought*. eds., Rosen, Michael and Jonathon Wolff. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

---------------- . "Taylor-made Selves." [Interview with Alexandra Klaushofer]. in *The Philosophers' Magazine* 12 (Autumn 2000): 37-40.

---------------- . "Religion Today." in *Transit*, 19 (2000).

 ---------------- . "Modernity and Difference." in *Without Guarantees: In Honour of Stuart Hall*. eds., Paul Gilroy, Lawrence Grossberg and Angela McRobbie, London and New York: Verso, 2000.

---------------- . "Plurality of Goods." in *The Legacy of Isaiah Berlin*. eds., Ronald Dworkin, Mark Lilla and Robert S. Silvers, 113-120. New York Review of Books, 2001.

---------------- . "Democracy, Inclusive and Exclusive." in *Meaning and Modernity: Religion, Polity, and Self*. eds., Richard Madsen et al. University of California Press, 2001.

---------------- . "Modern Social Imaginaries." in *Public Culture*, 14/1 (Winter 2002).

---------------- . "What it Means to Be Secular." [Interview with Bruce Ellis Benson]. in *Books and Culture* 8/4 (July/August 2002): 36.

---------------- . "On Identity, Alienation and the Consequences of September 11th." [Interview with Hartmut Rosa and Arto Laitinen]. in *Perspectives on the Philosophy of Charles Taylo*r. eds., Arto Laitinen and Nicholas H. Smith, 165-195. Helsinki: Societas Philosophica Fennica, 2002.

---------------- . "Foundationalism and the Inner-Outer Distinction." in *Reading McDowell: On Mind and World*. ed., Nicholas H. Smith, London: Routledge, 2003.

---------------- . "Ethics and ontology." in *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 100 (2003): 305-320.

---------------- . "Merleau-Ponty and the epistemological picture." in *The Cambrdige Companion to Merleau-Ponty*. eds., Taylor Carman and Mark Hansen, 26-49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

----------------- . "Religion and Modern Identity Struggles." in *Islam in Public: Turkey, Iran and Europe*, eds., Nilufer Gole and Ludwig Amman, 481-524. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press, 2006.

----------------- . "What is Secularity?" in *Transcending Boundaries in Philosophy and Theology: Reason, Meaning, and Experience*. eds., KevinVanhoozer and Martin Warner, 97-130. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

----------------- . "On Social Imaginaries." in *Traversing the Imaginary: Richard Kearney and the Postmodern Challenge*. eds., Peter Gratton and John Panteleimon Manoussakis, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007.

----------------- . "The Future of the Religious Past." in *Religion: Beyond a Concept*. ed., Hent de Vries. Fordham University Press, 2007.

----------------- . "Challenging Issues About the Secular Age." in *Modern Theology* 26, no. 3 (2010): 404-416.

----------------- . "Charles Taylor's Response to a Roundtable Discussion of His Book A Secular Age." in *Political Theology* 11, no. 2 (March 2010): 299-300.

----------------- . "Language Not Mysterious?" in *Reading Brandom: On Making It Explicit*. eds., Bernhard Weiss and Jeremy Wanderer, 32-47. London: Routledge, 2010.

----------------- . "The Meaning of Secularism." in *The Hedgehog Review*, 12.3 (2010): 23-34.

----------------- . "Solidarity in a Pluralist Age." in *Project Syndicate*, 27 (September 2010).

----------------- . "How to Define Secularism." Presented at the Colloquium in Legal, Political and Social Philosophy, New York University School of Law, 11 November 2010.

----------------- . "Religion Is Not the Problem." in *Commonweal* 138, no. 4 (February 25, 2011): 17-21.

----------------- . "Recovering the Sacred." in *Inquiry* 54, no. 2 (April 2011): 113-125.

----------------- . "Why we need a radical redefinition of secularism." In *The Power of Religion in the Public Sphere*, ed., by Judith Butler. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

----------------- . "Dialogue" [with Jürgen Habermas]. In *The Power of Religion in the Public Sphere*, ed., by Judith Butler. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

----------------- . "Disenchantment-Reenchantment." in *The Joy of Secularism: 11 Essays for How We Live Now* ed., George Levine, 57-73. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Books by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi

Gandhi, M.K. *A Guide to health*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan, 1967; Madras: S. Ganesan, 1921. *cf.,* also web link: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/A_Guide_to_Health; http://wikilivres.info/wiki/Key_to_Health.

----------------- . *Ethical Religion*. Madras. S. Ganesan, 1922. c*f.,* also web link: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Ethical_Religion.

---------------- . *An Autobiography Or The Story of my Experiments with Truth.* Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1927.

----------------. *Satyagraha in South Africa* . trans. V.G. Desai. Ahmedabad: Navjivan, 1928. c*f.,* also web link: http://arvindguptatoys.com/arvindgupta/gandhisouthafrica.pdf.

---------------- . *Hind Swaraj.* Ahmedabad: Navjivan, 1938. Also available in *CWMG*, vol. x.

---------------- . *Constructive Programme : Its Meaning and Place.* Ahmedabad: Navjivan, 1941.

---------------- . *The Gospel of Selfless Action or The Gita According to Gandhi*. trans. Mahadev Desai. Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1946. *Cf,* also web link: http://wikilivres.info/wiki/The_Gita_According_to_Gandhi

---------------- . *Hindu Dharma.* Ahmedabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1950.

---------------- . *The Wit and Wisdom of Gandhi-Selections*. ed. Homer A. Jack. New York: Dover Publications, 1951.

---------------- . *The Removal of Untouchability*. Compiled and ed. B. Kumarappa. Ahmadabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1954.

---------------- . *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* 90 vols. New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India. Navjivan, 1958-84. *cf.,* also web link: http://www.gandhiserve.org/cwmg/cwmg.html.

---------------- . *Truth is God.* Compiled by R. K. Prabhu. Ahamadabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1955.
---------------- . *Discourses on the Gita*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan, 1960.

---------------- . *The moral and Political Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*. ed. R.N. Iyer. Vol. i: *Civilization, Politics, and Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986; vol. ii: *Truth and Non-Violence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986; vol. iii: *Non-Violent Resistance and Social Transformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

---------------- . *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings* Ed. Anthony Parel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---------------- . *The Essential Writings of Mahatma Gandhi.* ed. R,N. Iyer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

---------------- . *Hindu Dharma.* Mumbai: Orient Paperbacks, 2003.

---------------- . *The Essential Writings*. ed. Judith M. Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Journals Edited by M.K.Gandhi

M.K.Gandhi. ed. *Indian Opinion*. Natal: South Africa, 1903-14.

----------------- . ed. *Young India*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan, 1919-1932.

----------------- . ed. *Navjivan*. India: Ahmedabad, 1919-1931.

----------------- . ed. *Harijan*. India: Ahmedabad, 1933-1948.

Select Secondary Sources – Alphabetical Order

Books

Abbey, Ruth. *Charles Taylor*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

----------------- . ed. *Contemporary Philosophy in Focus: Charles Taylor*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Acharya, Madhva. *The Sarva-darsana-samgraha*: *Review of the Different Systems of Indian Philosophy,* trans. E. B. Cowell, M.A and A.E. Gough, M.A. London: Trubner & Co., and Ludgate Hill, 1882.

Adam, Thomas. *Intercultural Transfers and the Making of the Modern World, 1800-2000.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Adams, Jad. *Gandhi: The True Man Behind Modern India.* New York: Pegasus Books, 2011.

Alam, Javeed. *India: Living with Modernity.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Ali Engineer, Asghar. *Future of Secularism in India*, CSSS Archive, 2003.

Allen, Douglas. ed. *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi for the Twenty-first Century*. NY: Lexington Books, 2008.

Alter, Joseph S. *Gandhi's Body: Sex, Diet, and the Politics of Nationalism- Critical Histories.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Anjaria, J.J. *The Nature and Grounds of Political Obligation in the Hindu State.* Calcutta: Green and Company, 1935.

Aristotle. *Metaphysics* Book VIII (Book H) Chapter 6: 1045a: 8-10. trans. Joe Sachs. New Mexico: Green Lion Press, 1999.

Azad, Talal. *Formation of the Secular: Christianity, Islam and Modernity.* California: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Banerjee, Sikata. *Warriors in Politics: Hindu Nationalism, Violence, and the Shiv Sena in India.* US: Westview Press, A Member of the Perseus Books Group, 2000.

Baxi, Upendra and Parekh, Bhikhu. eds. *Crisis and Change in Contemporary India.* New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1995.

Bhargava, Rajeev. *Secularism and Its Critics.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

----------------- . *The Promise of Indian Secularism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

----------------- and Helmut Reifeld. eds. *Civil Society, Public Sphere and Citizenship: Dialogue and Perceptions.* New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2005.

Bhim Rao, Ambedkar. *Annihilation of Caste, With a Reply to Mahatma Gandhi.* Bombay: B.R. Kadrekarj Publishers, 1937.

Biswas, S.C. ed. *Gandhi: Theory and Practice: Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance.* Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1969.

Bondurant, Joan V. *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Brown, Judith M. and Anthony Parel. eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Gandhi.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

----------------- . *Gandhi's Rise to Power: Indian Politics 1915-192*2. London: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Bruce, Steve. ed. *Religion and Modernization.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Casanova, Jose. *Public Religions in the Modern World.* Chicago: University Press, 1994.

Chabot, Sean. *Transnational Roots of the Civil Rights Movements.* New York: Lexington Books, 2012.

Chatterjee, Nandini. *The Making of Indian Secularism: Empire, Law and Christianity 1830-1960.* UK: Palgrave Macmillan publ. Lmt., 2011.

Chatterjee, Margaret. *Gandhi's Religious Thought.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.

----------------- . ed. *Contemporary Indian Philosophy Series II*. London: Humanities Press Inc., 1974.

----------------- . *The Language of Philosophy.* Boston: Matinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1981.

----------------- . *Gandhi's Religious Thought*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.

---------------- . *Gandhi and the Challenge of Religious Diversity: Religious Pluralism Revisited.* New Delhi and Chicago: Promilla and co Publishers, 2005.

---------------- . *Studies in Modern Jewish and Hindu Thought.* Oxford: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1997.

---------------- . ed. *Gandhi and His Jewish Friends*. London: Macmillan Academic and Professional Ltd., 1992.

Chatterji, P.C. *Secular Values for Secular India.* New Delhi: Paul's Press, 1984.

Cliteur, Paul. *The Secular Outlook: In Defense of Moral and Political Secularism.* UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Connolly, William E. *Why I am not a Secularist?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Copleston, Frederick. *A History of Philosophy Vol.6*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.

Cortright, David. *Gandhi and Beyond: Nonviolence for a New Political Age.* London: Paradigm Publishers, 2009.

Davids, T.W. Rhys. *Dialogues of the Buddha.* London: Oxford University Press, 1921.

Dallmayr, Fred and G.N. Devy. eds. *Between Tradition and Modernity: India's Search for Identity, A Twentieth Century Anthology*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1998.

Dallmayr, Fred. *Integral Pluralism: Beyond Culture Wars*. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2010.

Dingwaney Needham, Anuradha and Rejeswari Sunder Rajan. eds. *The Crisis of Secularism in India.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007.

Doniger, Wendy. *The Hindus: An Alternative History.* New York: The Penguin Books, 2009.

Easwaram, Eknath. *Gandhi The Man: The story of His Transformation*. USA: Nilgiri Press, 1997.

---------------- . *Gandhi the Man: How One Man Changed Himself to Change the World.* Canada: Nilgiri Press, 2011.

Erikson, Erik H. *Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company. Inc., 1969.

Esptein, Greg M. *Good Without God: What a Billion Nonreligious People Do Believe.* New York: Harper Collins, 2010.

Fischer, Louis. *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi.* New York: Collier Books, 1962.

---------------- . *Gandhi: His Life and Message for the World.* USA: Penguin Books Inc., 1954.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. 2nd revised ed. Trans. by Garrett Barden and John Cumming, Translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald Marshal. New York: Continuum, 1994.

Gan, Holmes L. *Nonviolence in Theory and Practice.* Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc. 2005.

Gandhi, Gopalkrishna. Compiled. *The Oxford India Gandhi: Essential Writings.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Ghosh, Vijaya. ed., *Tirtha*. New Delhi: CMC LTD., 1992.

Gosh, B.N. *Gandhian Political Economy: Principles, Practices and Policy.* England: Ashgate Publishing House, 2007.

Gupta, Laxminarayan. *History of Modern Indian Culture*. Agra: Prem Book Depo, 1973.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Postmetaphysical Thinking: Philosophical Essays*. trans. William Mark Hohengarten. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

----------------- and Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI). *The Dialectics of Secularization: on Reason and Religion*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005.

Hardiman, David. *Gandhi in his Time and Ours: The Global Legacy of his Ideas.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Hibbard, Scott W. *Religious Politics and Secular States: Egypt, India, and the United States.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.

Hick and Askari. eds. *The Experince of Religious Diverity.* England: Gower Publishing Company, 1985.

Hick, John and Hempel, Lamont. eds. *Gandhi's Significance for Today*. London: Macmillan, 1989.

----------------- . ed. *Truth and Dialogue: The Relationship between World Religions.* London: Sheldon Press, 1974.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan.* ed. Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Hislope, Robert and Mughan, Anthony. eds. *Introduction to Comparative Politics: The State and Its Challenges.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hitchcock, James. *What is Secular Humanism?: Why Humanism Became Secular and How it is Changing our World.* Michigan: Servant Books, 1982.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Hutchins, Francis. *The Illustration of Permanence: British Imperialism in Indian.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

James, William. *Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*. Maryland: Manor Publications, 2008.

Jayal, Nirja Gopal. *Democracy and the State: Welfare, Secularism and Development in Contemporary India.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Jeffrey Jocobsohn, Gary. *The Wheel of Law: India's Secularism in Comparative Constitutional Context.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Kabir, Humanyun. *The Indian Heritage.* Bombay: Asis Publishing House, 1955.

Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals.* ed. Mary Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Kearney, Richard. *Debates in Continental Philosophy: Conversation with Contemporary Thinkers.* New York: Fordham University Press, 2004.

----------------- . *Anatheism: Returning to God After God*. Insurrections: Critical Studies in Religion, Politics, and Culture. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Kurtz, Paul. *What is Secular Humanism?* New York: Prometheus Books, 2007.

Lelyveld, Joseph. *Great Soul: Mahatma Gandhi and His Struggles with India.* New York: Alfred A. Knope Press, 2011.

Lindley, Mark. *Gandhi and Humanism.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Macaulay, T.B. *Speeches, with the Minute on Indian Education*, ed. G.M. Young. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.

MacIntyre. Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* . Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.

Madan, T.N. *Modern Myths, Locked Minds.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Mahajan, Gurpreet and D.L. Sheth. eds. *Minority Identities and the Nation-State.* Oxford: University Press, 1999.

Mahajan, Vidyadhar. *Muslim-Kalin Bharat: Muslim Rule in India*. Delhi: S. Chand & Co. Ltd., 1979.

Mahajan, V.D. *Modern Indian History 1919-1982*. New Delhi: S. Chand, 1980.

Marsiligio of Padua. *Defensor Pacis.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Massey, James. *Minorities in a Democracy: The Indian Experience.* New Delhi: Manohar Publications, 1999.

McKim, Robert. *Religious Ambiguity and Religious Diversity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Meyer, David S, Nancy Whittier, & Belinda Robnett. eds. *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Mills, Wright C. *The Sociological Imagination.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Mirsepassi, Ali. *Political Islam, Iran, and The Enlightenment: The Philosophies of Hope and Despair.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Moon, Penderel. *Gandhi and Modern India.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1969.

Nadkarni, M.V. *Ethics for our Times: Essays in Gandhian Perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Nanda, B.R. *Mahatma Gandhi: 125 Years: Remembering Gandhi, Understanding Gandhi, Relevance of Gandhi.* New Delhi: Indian Council For Cultural Relations and New Age International Publishers Limited, 1995.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. *The Unity of India*. New York: John Day Company, 1948.

----------------- . *Toward Freedom: The Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru.* Boston: Beacon Hill Press, 1963.

----------------- . *Jawaharlal Nehru Speeches, Vol. I September 1946-May 1949.* Calcutta, 1949.

Noss, John B. *Man's Religion's.* New York: Macmillian Company, 1949.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Clash Within: Democracy, Religious Violence, and India's Future.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Pande, G.C. *Dimensions of Ancient Indian Social History.* New Delhi: Books &Books, 1984.

Panikkar, Raimundo. *Worship and Secular Man.* London: Orbits Books, 1973.

----------------- . *The State and the Citizen.* Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1956.

Paranjape, Makarand. *Altered Destinations: Self, Society, and Nation in India.* London: Anthem Press, 2009.

Parekh, Bhikhu C. *Gandhi's Political Philosophy: A Critical Examination*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
----------------- . *Gandhi.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Parel, Anthony. ed. *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule.* New York: Lexington Books: 2000.

----------------- . *Gandhi's Philosophy and Quest for Harmony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

---------------- . *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings.* Trans. and ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Parsons. *Sociological Theory, Values and Sociocultural Change*. ed. Edward A. Tiryakian. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Pecora, Vincent P. *Secularization and Cultural Criticism: Religion, Nation, and Modernity.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Merkl, Peter H. and Smart, Ninian. eds. *Religion and Politics in the Modern World*. New York: New York University Press, 1983.

Patil, V.T. ed. *Studies on Gandhi.* New Delhi: Sterling Publishing Pvt. Ltd., 1983.

Quinn, Philip L. and Kevin Meeker. *The Philosophical Challenge of Religious Diversity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Radhakrishnan, S. *Religion and Society.* New Delhi: Harper Collins, 1995.

---------------- . *Mahatma Gandhi 100 Years.* New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1968.

---------------- . *Indian Philosophy Vol. I.* London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1989.

---------------- . *Indian Philosophy Vol. II.* London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1989.

---------------- . *The Hindu View of Life.* London: Unwin Books, 1927.

---------------- and Moore. eds. *A Source Book in Indian Philosophy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Rao, V.K.R. *The Gandhian Alternative to Western Nationalism.* Bombay: Bharatiaya Vidya Bhavan, 1970.

Richards, H. John. *The New Cambridge History of India: The Mughal Empire.* Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Rob, Peter. *Empire, Identity, and India: Liberalism, Modernity, and Nation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Roberts and Garton Ash. *Civil Resistance & Power Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Rose, D.B. *Dingo Makes Us Human: Life and Land in an Aboriginal Australian Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Rouner, Leroy L. ed. *Celebrating Peace.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990.

Roy, Asim and Hasan, Munshirul. *Living Together Separately: Cultural India in History and Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Roy, Himanshu. eds. *Secularism and Its Colonial Legacy In India*. New Delhi: Manak Publication Ltd., 2009.

Roy, Ramashray. *Self and Society: A Study in Gandhian Thought.* New Delhi: Sage Publications India, 1984.

Rudolph, Lloyd I. and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph. ed. *Postmodern Gandhi and Other Essays: Gandhi in the World and at Home*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Ryne, Terrence J. *Gandhi and Jesus*: *The Saving Power of Nonviolence.* New York: Orbis Books, 2008.

Safran, William. Ed. *The Secular and the Sacred: Nation, Religion and Politics.* London: Franck Cass, 2003.

Scalmer, Sean. *Gandhi in the West: The Mahatma and the Rise of Radical Protest.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011

Scott, C. *Seeing Like a State*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Sen, Amartya. *The Argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian History, Culture and Identity.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Sethia, Tara. *Gandhi: Pioneer of Nonviolent Social Change.* Boston: Pearson Education, Inc., 2012.

Shankar, Dubey Daya. & Tandon, Rajesh. *Constitutional History of India*. Allahabad: Allahabad Law, 1987.

Sharma, Jagdish Saran. *Mahatma Gandhi: A Descriptive Biography.* Delhi: S. Chand &Co., 1968.

----------------- . *Religious Studies and Comparative Methodology: The Case for Reciprocal Illumination.* New York: State University Press, 2005.

----------------- . *One Religion Too Many: The Religiously Comparative Reflections of a Comparatively Religious Hindu.* New York: Suny Press, 2011.

Sharma, Anand. ed. *Gandhian Way: Peace, Non-violence and Empowerment: Celebrating Hundred Years of 'Satyagraha' (1906-2006).* New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 2007.

Sharma, Arvind. *Classical Hindu Thought: An Introduction.* Oxford: University Press, 2000.

Sharma, Sri. Ram. *The Religious Policy of the Mughal Emperors.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940.
Sharp, Gene. *Gandhi as a Political Strategist: Essays on Ethics and Politics.* Boston: Poster Sargent Publishers, Inc., 1979.

Smart, Ninian and Shivesh, Thakur. eds. *Ethical and Political Dilemmas of Modern India.* London: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Smith, Donald Eugene. *India as a Secular State.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Smith, Nicolas H. *Strong Hermeneutics: Contingency and Moral Identity*. London & New York: Routledge, 1997.

----------------- . *Charles Taylor: Meaning, Morals and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity, 2002.

Smith, Vincent A. *Oxford History of India*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1958.

Solomon, Robert C. and Higgins, Kathleen M. *A Short History of Philosophy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Stern, Robert. *Hegel, Kant and the Structure of the Object*. London: Rutledge Chapman Hall, 1990.

Tejani, Shabnum. *Indian Secularism: A Social and Intellectual History 1890-1950.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2008.

Thakkar, Usha and Mehta, Jayshree. *Understanding Gandhi: Gandhians In Conversation with Fred J. Blum.* London: Sage Publications, 2011.

Thapar, Romila. *A History of India, Volume 1.* New Delhi and London: Penguin Books, 1990.

----------------- . ed. *Philosophy in an Age of Pluralism: The Philosophy of Charles Taylor in Question*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Tidrick, Kathryn. *Gandhi: Political and Spiritual Life.* London: I.B. Tauris and Co. Ltd., 2006.

Vanaik, Achin. *The Furies of Indian Communalism: Religion, Modernity and Secularization.* London: Verso, 1997.

van der Veer, Peter. *Imperial Encounters: Religion and Modernity in India and Britain.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Venkateswar, Sita and Hughes, Emma. eds. *The Politics of Indigeneity: Dialogues and Reflections on the Indigenous activism.* London: Zed Books, 2011.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Studies and Colonial Rule in India.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.

Warner, Michael, Van Antwerpen, Jonathan, and Calhoun, Craig. eds. *Varities of Secularism in A Secular Age.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

White and White. eds. *Religion in the Contemporary South: Diversity, Community, and Identity.* Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1966.

Wolpert, Stanley. *Gandhi's Passion: The Life and Legacy of Mahatma Gandhi.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Selected Articles

Abbey, Ruth. "Charles Taylor's Politics of Recognition: A Reply to Jonathan Seglow." *Political Studies* 47 (1999): 710-714.

---------------- . "Communitarianism, Taylor Made - An Interview with Charles Taylor." *Australian Quarterly* 68 (1996): 1-10.

---------------- . "More Perspectives on Communitarianism: A Reply to Chandran Kukathas." *Australian Quarterly* 69 (1997): 73-82.

---------------- . "Humanism and Enchantment: An Essay on Charles Taylor and the Gifford Lectures," *Literary Review of Canada*, 8-2 (2000): 9-12.

---------------- . "The Primary Enemy? Monotheism and Pluralism" in *How Should We Talk About Religion?* ed. James Boyd White, 211-229. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.

Abel, Betty. "The Grand Design," *Review of Hegel in Contemporary Review* 227 (1975): 330-1.

Adeney, Frances S. "Review of Sources of the Self." *Theology Today* 48 (1991): 204-10.

Admirand, Peter. "Embodying an 'Age of Doubt, Solitude, and Revolt'." *Heythrop Journal* 51.6 (2010): 905-920.

Agassi, Joseph. "Review of Philosophical Papers, 1 and 2." *Canadian Philosophical Reviews* 6 (1986): 35-8.

Alexander, Gregory S. and Peñalver, Eduardo M. "Properties of Community." *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*: vol. 10: No. 1, Article 6 (2009): 127-160.

Amber, Rex. "Gandhi's Concept of Truth." *Gandhi's Significance for Today* eds. Hick and Hempel, 90-109. London: Macmillan, 1989.

Anderson, David E. "Is That All There Is?" A Review of A Secular Age. *Religion and Ethics Newsweekly* 24 (2009).

 Bauberot, Jean. "Two Thresholds of Laicization.*" Secularism and Its Critics.* ed. By Rajeev Bhargava, 94-137. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Bell, J.S. "Narrative Inquiry: More Than Just Telling Stories." *TESOL Quarterly* 36(2) (2002): 207–213.

Berlin, Isaiah "The Originality of Machiavelli." *Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1979.

Bhagwati, Jagdish. "Secularism in India: Why is it Imperiled." in *The Future of Secularism* ed. T. N. Srinivasan, 8-15. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Bhargava, Rajeev. "The "Secular Ideal" before Secularism: Preliminary Sketch." *Comparative Secularisms in a Global Age* .eds. Linell E. Cady and Elizabeth Shakman Hurd, 159-181. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Bilgrami, Akeel. "Gandhi, Newton, and the Enlightenment: Akeel Bilgrami Conjures a World Re-enchanted." *Columbia News* November 8 (2006).

Bilgrami, Akeel. "Gandhi's Religion and Its Relation to Politics." In *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi*. eds. Judith M. Brown and Anthony Parel, 93-117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Bilgrami, Akeel. "Secularism, Nationalism, and Modernity" in *Secularism and Its Critics.* ed. Rajeev Bhargava, 380-418. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Brown, Judith. "Gandhi and Human Rights: In Search of Truth Humanity." in *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule* ed. Anthony Parel, 87-103. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2000.

Brownm, Judith M. "Gandhi as a Nationalist Leader, 1915-1948" in *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi* eds Judith M. Brown and Anthony Parel, 51-71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

C Heredia, Rudolf., "Interpreting Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj"* in *Economic and Political Weekly, Vol.* 34, No. 24 June 12 (1999): 1497f.

Chatterjee, Margaret. "The Concept of Dharma" in *Facts and Values* 19 (1986): 177-187.

Chatterjee, Margaret. "Gandhi-ji's Conception of Collective Action." in *Gandhi: Theory and Practice Vol. II: Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance* Gen. Ed. Niharranjan Ray, 79f. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1969.

Chatterjee, Partha. 'The Nation in Heterogeneous Time.' *IESHR, 38, 4*(2001): 399-418.

Chatterjee, Partha. "Secularism and Tolerance," *Secularism and Its Critics* ed. Rajeev Bhargava, 345-380. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Conle, C. "Narrative inquiry: Research tool and medium for professional development." *European Journal of Teacher Education* 23(1) (2000): 49-62.

Cooke, Maeve. "Authenticity and Autonomy: Taylor, Habermas, and the Politics of Recognition." in *Political Theory*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (1997): 260-290.

Copley, Anthony. "Is there a Gandhian Definition of Liberty?." in *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule* ed. Anthony Parel, 25-47. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2000.

Cravinho, João. "True Dialogue – Acceptance of the Universal and Local Values." in *Gandhian Way: Peace, Non-violence and Empowerment: Celebrating Hundred Years of 'Satyagraha' (1906-2006)*. ed. Anand Sharma, 227-231. New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 2007.

Dallmayr, Fred. "Rethinking Secularism with Raimundo Panikkar." *Review of Politics* 61 (1999): 715-735.

Dallmayr, Fred. "What is *Swaraj?* Lessons from Gandhi." in *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule* ed. Anthony Parel, 103-119. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2000.

Dalton, Denis. "Gandhi's Originality." in *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule.* ed. Anthony Parel, 63-87. Oxford: Lexington Books , 2000.

Desai, Maraji. "Gandhiji and the Destiny of Man", in *Mahatma Gandhi 100 Years* ed. S. Radhakrishnan, 62-69. New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1968.

Diwakar, R. R. *Saga of Satyagraha*. New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1969.

Dreyfus, Hurbert L. "Taylor's (Anti-) Epistemology." in *Charles Taylor* ed. By Ruth Abbey, 52-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Dube, S.C. "Harmonizing Dimension in Hindu Civilizational Processes.*" in *Secularization in Multi-Religious Societies: Indo-Soviet Perspectives*. eds. S.C. Dube and V.N. Basilov, 1-11. New Delhi: Naurang Rai Concept Publishing Company, 1983.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. Review of Multiculturalism and 'The Politics of Recognition' in *American Political Science Review*, 87 (1993): 482-3.

----------------- . "The Risks and Responsibilities of Affirming Ordinary Life." in *Philosophy in an Age of Pluralism: The Philosophy of Charles Taylor in Question*, ed. James Tully, 670-80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

----------------- . "Augustine and Diversity," in *A Catholic Modernity? Charles Taylor's Marianist Award Lecture*, *with responses by William M. Shea, Rosemary Luling Haughton, George Marsden, and Jean Bethke Elshtain*. ed. James L. Heft, 95-103. Oxford University Press, 1999.

Essop Pahad, "Dialogue between Cultures: Understanding the Contributions of Indian and South Africa" in *Gandhian Way: Peace, Non-violence and Empowerment: Celebrating Hundred Years of 'Satyagraha' (1906-2006)*. ed. Anand Sharma, 199-203. New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 2007.

Galanther, Marc. "Secularism: East and West" in *Comparative Studies in History and Society* 7. 2 (1965) :133-159.

Ganesh, Prashad. "Whiggism in India," in *Political Science Quarterly* 81.3 (1966): 412-431.

Gier, Nicholas. "Nonviolence as a Civic Virtue: Gandhi and Reformed Liberalism. " in *Synthese* 109 (2) (2003): 121-141.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Individuation through Socialization," in *Postmetaphysical Thinking: Philosophical Essays*. trans. William Mark Hohengarten, 149-205. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Themes in Post metaphysical Thinking," in *Postmetaphysical Thinking: Philosophical Essays*. trans. William Mark Hohengarten, 28-57. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Secularism's Crisis of Faith: Notes on Post-Secular Society." in *New perspectives quarterly* 25 (2008): 17-29.

Hume, David. "Of the Immortality of Soul." in *Essays: Moral, Political and Liberty.* ed. by Eugene Miller, 319-324. Indiana: Liberty Classics Fun Inc., 1987.

Jahagirdar, Justice R. A. "Secularism in India: Inconclusive Debate." Accessed May 15, 2011. http://irhayouthforum.org/articles/02.htm.

Juergensmeyer, Mark. "Shoring Up the Saint: Some Suggestions for Improving Satyagraha," in *Gandhi's Significance for Today* eds. John Hick and Lamont C. Hempel, 36-51. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.

Kamala, Srimati. "Gandhi's Holistic Vision" in *Mahatma Gandhi 125 Years* ed. B.R. Nanda, 159-166. New Delhi: Indian Council For Cultural Relations, 1995.

Kapur, Sudarshan. "Gandhi and *Hindutva:* Two conflicting Visions of *Swaraj.*" in *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule* ed. Anthony Parel, 119-139. New York: Lexington Books, 2000.

Kashyap, C. Subhash. "The Case for a Divorce between Religion and Politics*."* in *Hinduism and Secularism.* ed. by Arvind Sharma, 78-95. New York: Palgrave Publication Ltd., 2001.

Kearney, Richard. Review of Sources of the Self, in *Hermathena* 149 (1990): 121.

Kearney, Richard. ''Narrative Imagination: Between Ethics and Poetics.'' In *Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action.* ed. Richard Kearney, 173-190. London and New York: Sage, 1996.

Kerr, Fergus. "The Self and the Good: Taylor's Moral Ontology." in *Charles Taylor* ed. Ruth Abbey, 84-105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Khilmani, Sunil. "Nehru's Faith" in *The Crisis of Secularism in India.* ed. Anuradha Dingwaney Needham and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan, 89-103. London: Duke University Press, 2007.

Madan, T. N. "Secularism In Its Place," in *Secularism and Its Critics* ed. Rajeev Bhargava, 297-320. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Oommen, T. K. "New Nationalism and Collective rights: the case of South Asia," in *Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Minority Rights.* eds. Stephen May, Tariq Modood and Judith Squires, 121-143. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Parekh, Bikkhu. "Gandhi and Interreligious Dialogue." in *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi for the Twenty-first Century.* ed. Douglas Allen, 1-19. NY: Lexington Books, 2008.

Parel, Anthony J. "The Doctrine of Swaraj in Gandhi's Philosophy," in *Crisis and Change in Contemporary India* eds. Upendra Baxi and Bhikhu Parekh, 57-81. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1995.

----------------- . "Gandhi and the State" in *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi*. eds. Judith M. Brown and Anthony Parel, 154-173. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Prabhu, Joseph. "Gandhi's Religious Ethics." in *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi for the Twenty-first Century*. ed. Douglas Allen, 163-178. NY: Lexington Books, 2008.

Rawls, John. "The Idea of an Overlapping Consensus," in *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies,* 7 (1) (1987): 1-25

Rorty, Richard. "A Reply to Dreyfus and Taylor," *Review of Metaphysics*, 34 (1980): 39-46.

----------------- . "Absolutely Non-Absolute*," Review of Philosophical Papers, 1 and 2* 6 (1985): 1379-80.

----------------- . "Inquiry as Recontextualization: An Anti-Dualist Account of Interpretation." in *The Interpretive Turn: Philosophy, Science, Culture*. ed. David R. Hiley, 59-80. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

----------------- . "Taylor on Self-Celebration and Gratitude." In *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 54 (1994): 197-201.

----------------- . "Review of The Ethics of Authenticity." in *London Review of Books* 3 (1994): 7-8.

----------------- . "Taylor on Truth," in *Philosophy in an Age of Pluralism: The Philosophy of Charles Taylor in Question*, ed. by James Tully, 20-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Ruparelia, Sanjay. "How the Politics of Recognition Enables India's Democratic Exceptionalism." *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* 21 (1-4) (2008): 39-56.

Sangari, Kumkum. "A Narrative of Restoration: Gandhi's Last Years and Nehruvian Secularism." in *Social Scientist,* Vol. 30, No. 3/4 (2002): 3-33.

Sen*,* Amartya. *"*Indian Pluralism." in *India International Centre Quarterly* (1993): 39.

Sen, Amartya. "Secularism and Its Discontents." in *Secularism and Its Critics* ed. Rajeev Bhargava, 454-485. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Smith, Miriam. "Review of Rapprocher les Solitudes." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 28 (1995): 145-8.

Smith, Nichaolas. "Contingency and Self-Identity: Taylor's Hermeneutics vs Rorty's Postmodernism." *Theory, Culture and Society* 13 (1996): 105-20.

Smith, Nicholas. "Reason After Meaning." Review Essay of Philosophical Arguments in *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 23(1) (1997): 131-40.

Smith, Nicolas H. "Charles Taylor, Strong Hermeneutics and the Politics of Difference." *Radical Philosophy* 68 (1994): 19-27.

Steelef, Meili. "Ricoeur Versus Taylor on Language and Narrative." *Metaphilosophy* Vol. 34, No. 4 (2003): 425-446.

Suhrud, Tridip. "Gandhi's Key Writings," in *Cambridge Companion to Gandhi*. eds. Judith M. Brown and Anthony Parel, 71-93. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press, 2011.

Tajani, Shabnum. "Reflections on the Category of Secularism in India." in *The Crisis of Secularism in India.* ed. Anuradha Dingwaney Needham and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan, 45-65. London: Duke University Press, 2007.

Tambiah, Stanley J. "The Crisis of Secularism in India." in *Secularism and Its Critics.* ed. Rajeev Bhargava, 418-453. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Thapar, Romila. "Is Secularism Alien to Indian Civilization?." In *Future of Secularism* ed. T.N. Srinivasan, 83–108. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Tilak, Srinivas. "Hindutva – the Indian Secularists' Metaphor for Illness and Perversion." in *Hinduism and Secularism After* Ayodhya. ed. Arvind Sharma, 123-134.Great Britain: Palgrave Publications, 2001.

Tully, James. "Wittgenstein and Political Philosophy: Understanding Practices of Critical Reflection," Political Theory 17 (1989): 172-204.

van der Veer, Peter. "Smash Temples, Burn Book: Comparing Secularist Projects in India and China," in *Rethinking Secularism*, eds. Craig Calhoun, Mark Juergensmeryer, and Jonathan Van Antwerpen, 270-281. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Varshney, Ashotosh. "Contested Meanings, Indian Nationalism Unity, Hindu Nationalism, and the Politics of Anxiety." in *Daedalus* 122 (1993): 227–261.

Vora, Rajiv. "Gandhi's Dialogue on Civilization." in *Gandhian Way: Peace, Non-violence and Empowerment: Celebrating Hundred Years of 'Satyagraha' (1906-2006)*. ed. Anand Sharma, 215-216. New Delhi: Academic Foundation, 2007.

Web Sources

Askdefine. "Wholism." Accessed April 16, 2012.
http://www.webstatsdomain.com/domains/wholism.askdefine.com/.

Britannica. "Satyagraha." Accessed April 5, 2012.
http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/525247/satyagraha.

Dailymail. "Nicolas-Sarkozy and Multiculturalism." Accessed March 27, 2012.
http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1355961/Nicolas-Sarkozy-joins-David-Cameron-Angela-Merkel-view-multiculturalism-failed.html.

Diggins, John Patrick. "The Godless Delusion." Review of A Secular Age by Charles Taylor. New York Times. December 16, 2007. Book Review. http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/16/books/review/Diggins-t.html?pagewanted=all.Oxford Dictionary, Wikipedia source, and so on.

Flanagan, Owen. "Consciousness Reconsidered." Accessed June 9, 2012.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Narrative.

Harvard Review. "Richard Rorty." Accessed May 21, 2012.
http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/~hrp/issues/1995/Rorty.pdf .

HereNow4u. "Secularization and Culture." Accessed November 30, 2011. http://www.here-now4u.de/Eng./secularization_and_cultural_di.htm.

Hindubooks. "Hindu Roots: Secularism." Accessed November 13, 2011.
http://www.hindubooks.org/sudheer_birodkar/hindu_history/secularroots.html.

Indcast. "History of Ashram." Accessed April 10, 2012.
http://www.indcast.com/ms/ASHRAM%20HISTORY.htm.

Indian Government. "Indian Constitutuion." Accessed November 28, 2009. www.Inidan constitution.com
Preamble of the Constitution of India.

M.K Gandhi. "Ethical/Ideal." Accessed May 21, 2012. http://www.mkgandhi.org/ethical/ideal_morality.htm.

M.K.Gandhi. "Non-Violence." Accessed November, 28, 2011. http://www.gandhiinstitute.org/.

Pseudosecularism-blogspot. Accessed January 29, 2011. http://pseudosecularism.blogspot.com/2008/07/origin-and-meaning-of-secularism.html.

Rogers, Ben. "Charles Taylor Interview." In Prospect Magazine, Issue 143, February 2008. Accessed May 21, 2012. http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/charles-taylor-philosopher-interview/.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. "Multiculturalism." Accessed March 16, 2012.
Stanford.edu/entries/multiculturalism/.

The Free Dictionary. "Harmony." Accessed April 16, 2012. http://www.thefreedictionary.com/harmony.

USA. "US Constitution." Accessed November 12, 2009. http://www.usconstitution.net/const.html.

Wikipedia. "Akbar." Accessed January 25, 2011. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akbar.

Wikipedia. "Bhagavat Gita." Accessed November 5, 2011. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhagavad_Gita.

Wikipedia. "Dharma." Accessed March 9, 2012. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dharma.

Wikipedia. "Holism." Accessed April, 16, 2012. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holism.

Wikipedia. "Khalsa." Accessed June 10, 2011. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khalsa.

Wikipedia. "Lion Capital of Ashoka." Accessed October 6, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lion_Capital_of_Asoka.

Wikipedia. "Mahavakyas." Accessed April 17, 2012.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mah%C4%81v%C4%81kyas.

Wikipedia. "Muhammad Ali Jinnah." Accessed April 26, 2012.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muhammad_Ali_Jinnah.

Wikipedia. "Narrative." Accessed May 9, 2012. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Narrative.

Wikipedia. "Shah Bano Case." Accessed November 7, 2011. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shah_Bano_case.

Wikipedia. "Vaishnavism." Accessed March 3, 2012. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vaishnavism.