

State Society Religion And Secularism: A Study Of The Evolutionary Path Of Secularism As A Spirit And As A Terminology

Mausumi Bose

Abstract:

The study aims to assume the applicability of Secularism to state and religion, state and individual, individual and Sect or religion, and vice versa. As this could not be done adequately without examining various factors that govern a state or a religion on different lands without knowing their kind, the study has also reviewed the study relating to religion, its essential ingredients and its variants, and statehood. The study also attempts to define various levels of Secularism, or the degrees to which it may be considered adequate for the general welfare of Man. It also examines why Secularism cannot be a utopian concept. It presents a detailed argument to plan that the idea of Secularism, as understood in this study, is a practical concept that can be easily implemented.

Thus, this brings out an understanding of the current situation in our country. As we point out, Secularism, in its absolute form, serves as an instrument of welfare in multi-religious societies. However, it also serves as a Utopia, a goal, and a value. Our main contention is that Secularism has difficulties in either form. For instance, the total elimination of religion and other social institutions in the process of welfare is impossible, and as in Utopia, Secularism is something beyond realization. The solution is to understand the term not in its absolute form but in terms of degrees and its difficult sorts. The study suggests three levels of Secularism. These are Secularism, welfarism, utopia, and views that admit degrees and kinds. The paper has taken a historical study of the evolutionary process of Secularism as a Philosophy. The term has three defining levels: (a) as it has evolved, (b) the various contexts have defined the term difficulty, and (3) How the state irrespectively of what it claims operates.

As a tradition of thought, Secularism is a philosophy, an intellectualism, a rational thought process, an ethical standard, the highest kind of religiosity, a unique kind of socialism leading to fraternity, the best model of administration and statehood, and, at times, an anti-religious conspiracy.

In this paper, we have thus attempted to resolve the semantic crisis raised by this multiple usage of the term by analyzing different usages and contexts in which it grew and arriving at a universal dimension, a broader concept applicable in the present global context.

Keywords: Secularism, welfarism, Anticlaricalism, Anti Transcendentalism

Date of Submission: 07-03-2025

Date of Acceptance: 17-03-2025

I. Introduction

As a Practical concept, the term secularism has been taken to imply two extremes.

(i) In its most ideal form, which is mainly unattainable, Secularism is welfarism. In this form, Secularism represents a body of polity, a government, a make of Man, a mindset where nothing discriminates him from the other so far; his welfare is in question. In this form, the make of Man is crucial as this mindset of Man continues to disseminate one Man from another even though society or the state tries its level best to ensure Secularism is made into a utopian notion. Thus, the mindset or make of Man acts as a hindrance. Thus, in these forms, Secularism is an ideal that can be dreamt of but cannot be realized.

(ii) The second aspect of the term is that in its purest forms, it is a utopian notion. This core expression describes at least the theoretical half of the existing society and state. Moreover, if this is written off, then that half will not have any term to define it. This aspect of the term also acts as a ladder to rise above the theocracy and dogmatic thought processes.

Thus, Secularism has originated and developed in two veins and two ways. It originated and developed as a spirit, a mindset, as an angle to look and conciliate between two conflicting entities. As a linguistic term, it represents a definite body of thought that has evolved with time. It accommodated the needs of the changing society. In both types of origin, it is essentially intellectual and rational. However, in one case, it is an evolution, a tradition that did not grow out of a single mind or at one point but out of the routine intellectual deliberations and practices of life through centuries. On the other, it grew out of a definite chronology and out of the mind of

ascertainable individual's historical overview to place the degrees of Secularism in the context of the relationship between the state -individual- religion, which is at the root of the concept of welfare.

In its long period of growth, Secularism has been constantly changing, adapting itself to the changing contexts and the peculiar needs of the lands where its seeds sprouted. Consequently, it was not and is not the same in the context of the East as it was and is in the context of the West.

In the following two sections, we will study the origination and growth of the term in both Indian and Western traditions, comparing and contrasting the hypothesis.

II. The Evolution Of Secular Philosophy In The West

This section studies the core of Secularism, i.e., its background in the European controversy between the Church and the growing concerns of human welfare. We have focused on the tension between the hegemony of the Church vis-à-vis the Renaissance conception of Man, the autonomous individual, on the one hand, and the process of the complete cessation from the Church. The inputs from the philosophers towards the establishment of Secularism are usually broadly characterized as anti-transcendental and anti-metaphysical, and they restrict the realm of ethics to what Man does here in this worldly life. Religion was very dogmatic in the West, so the division between religion and Secularism was sharp and radical. This Secularism developed as a sharp contrast between religious concern and temporal concern.

In the Western world, the term 'secular' underwent several metamorphoses, and it did not become a positive philosophy until the eighteenth century.

In the same century, some bold, humanistic thinkers cut the Gordian knot that linked social, political, and moral values to religion.

However, before the birth of this positive concept over four centuries, the term secular struggled with what was then known as regular or religious edicts. Around the period when King Henry the Second reigned, controversy surfaced, as we gathered from the argument that Henry the Second had with Thomas Becket over the criminal jurisdiction of the king. In the Tudor age, we notice the origination of the state's sovereign authority. Once Henry the Eighth found a way of supplementing the common law while leaving it unimpaired as the law of England, 'secular' contrasted with that known as regular or religious.

In 1597, secular was first defined as belonging to the present and visible world or being temporal or worldly. From 1597 to 1629, it took some decades to concretize and develop a cohesive idea of this worldly philosophical value as distinct from the transcendency of religious values.

It is not essential to discuss this chronology in detail, except for the relevant fact that the tussle between two classes of power mongers, namely the Church on the one hand and the king on the other hand, had surfaced not purely for the reason that each one of them had all of the sudden become conscious of their juridical control. On the contrary, the tussle between them arose because of the rise of reason's role and scientific intellectualism's revival. This revolution is one of the crucial reasons that swayed the trend from transmittal ends to worldly ends, resulting in the supremacy of Man. During the same period, we also notice that due to colonial settlement in many continental countries, wealth rose, and communication channels improved. All these had an incumbent effect on the social, cultural, and political factors that inevitably moved away from the Church organization. Religious sanctions also weakened politics, where the rise of the nation-states challenged the medieval conception of the relationship between ecclesiastical and civil authority.

The sixteenth century provided the pivotal base for the liberalization of religion. It also established a willingness to destroy the political and social institutions that conserved the idea of the Church. This changed outlook resulted in a more fair and naturalistic society than the one that existed prior to the sixteenth century.

Towards a more positive definition of Secularism

Anticlericalism and socialism were handed to Europe almost together in the seventeenth century. While Anabaptists could be said to be the forerunners of socialism, so could Winstanthey, the great leveler in whom we hear the first outcry against Christian theology, which sanctioned ill-treatment towards the poor. There was also rising support in favor of materialism among middle-class Europeans. As a reaction against Christianity, Thomas Hobbes, the great royalist supporter of the same century, provided the theoretical justification for establishing a strong monarchy. In a nutshell, all these paved the way for the liberal philosophy of the eighteenth.

This concept of secular value, which now guided the philosophical prescripts, gave prominence to theories like universalism and altruism. Even the most simplistic analysis of society provided by utilitarians like Bentham spoke of "the greatest happiness of greatest number." One also notices that, in the same period, there was support for democratic values, which could later lead to the need for distribution to all and equality before the eyes of the law. It was a social security bond guaranteeing no arbitrary infringement on life and property. Rousseau's claim that "my liberty should not be abused" supplies the philosophical basis for mood prevention. This sense of liberty and equality soon earned the prestigious status of a 'natural right.'

Administrative laws were directed towards the welfare of a man in general. The inside kernel of this philosophy contained the new value system composed of secular ideas. Another factor that impeded this was that the new entrepreneurs keen on material welfare preferred a civilian ruler to ecclesiastical governance. At the cost of oversimplification, it can be said that economic and social change is geared toward the alternative value structure. The Secularism of the eighteenth century, which emerged as a positive philosophy, had but all these ensuing reasons preceding it.

The social philosophers and the seekers of justice had two aims to fulfill in the period that preceded the Industrial Revolution. One was a struggle for a more rationalized structure of administration, which they thought would be possible when a government was geared to the needs of the commoner. This was termed as civil liberty. The other attempted to restructure society's moral codes, which they felt must be shorn of divine justification.

Thus, the secular philosophy that originated in the eighteenth century reveals a few interesting hallmarks. These are:

- (i) Administrative laws were directed towards the welfare of Man in general.
- (ii) The government had only executive powers. It administered justice in keeping the welfare of the commoner in mind. In case of the unfulfillment of duties by the sovereign authorities, the commoner has the right to dissolve the government.
- (iii) Egalitarian and humanistic values based on the principle of natural rights were adopted.

From the earlier section, the concept of Secularism, a philosophy of this life and its well-being, evolved in the West in the thoughts and writings of different thinkers. These thinkers had a deep and sincere concern for the welfare of Man and his moral enhancement, and they were against such religions that instrumented Man's exploitation or hindered his overall development.

The secular thought process, which evolved by Western thinkers, developed both as positive and negative. It is a positive concept as it leads to the operation of scientific temper and rationality displacement of religious power and influence within various structures and processes of the state and at different levels in a civil society. It is a negative concept as much as a struggle against communalism or communalization of any or everything. Viewed thus, secularization operates vis-à-vis the state and the entire social formation. In the West, Secularism is more a radicalism, an instrument of change of breaking away from the established order, from the clericalism of religious hierarchy. However, at times, and in the thoughts of some of the thinkers, Secularism also meant tolerance and coexistence. They sought Secularism as a means of coexistence and patching up the vast differences by orthodoxy or conflicting ritual practices of two religions and what often prevailed amongst different segments of the same religion.

Secularism in the Indian context

The term secular or Secularism is a relatively recent innovation. However, in spirit, Secularism, as this concept has evolved through the ages, has been the core of Indian thought and even theology since ancient days. In India, Secularism may be said to have sprouted as an effort of her mind to reconcile the diverse conflicting elements of Man and nature, intellect and emotion, Man and state, state and religion, material and spiritual, and various sects besides the intrinsic conflict of such conflicting elements. The coexistence of these conflicting elements at different stages of the evolution of Indian civilization suggests a synthesizing mind that has always had the leaning we can safely name Secular.

The secular philosophy, as it is so far conceptualized, originated in ancient Indian philosophical thoughts and practices. However, unlike the Western world, secular laws and ethics in ancient India had a somewhat smoother beginning. With the emergence of city-states graduating from tribal societies, there arose a need for political and social laws that would now suit the present need for the welfare of the citizens. Unlike in the West, civil and administrative laws arose unimpeded by the religious forces in India because the various urbanization processes had content-wise outgrown the tribal religio-centric society.

Secularism developed due to an ideological development of Hindu, Jain, and Buddhist thought. From the inception of statehood, the state was conceived as an institution that functioned beyond sectarian consideration. The idea of a secular state was the guiding force, though Buddhism and Jainism saw it regarding Man's material and moral well-being.

The idea of Secularism, as understood in ancient India, manifested itself in diverse ways. In the pre-Nauryan era, the equivalence between the state and the Sect constituted the essential trust of 'secular thought'. They lay the root of the 'secular' in the thought that the state as an institution should work beyond sectarian consideration. Society as an independent institution began in the Nauryan era but was a more decisive factor in the Gupta era. Secularism was now an idea that discovered the balance between three factors in the Sect, the state, and society. After the Islamic invasion of India, there was a revival of the Indians' religious and moral values. As a result of this revival, the Bhakti movement came into being. In this new context, the individual was

as significant as the state sect and society, and thus, Secularism as a thought developed to search for an equivalence between four instead of the earlier three.

In the writings of 20th-century philosophers and social reformers, it is noticeable that the primary thrust had been the orientation towards the welfare of the general public. Hence, Secularism was also seen as a phenomenon in Man's practical life instead of a mere thought or a theoretical concept. The entire political movement and the rise of commoners against foreign rule had the overall involvement of the masses. Hence, all kinds of thinking naturally were geared towards the welfare of people. The secular thought process was thus seen as the most effective instrument, as it banned discrimination. Thus, whether it was a philosophical thought interpretation of past or past values, a political movement, or a literary work. Secularism was the core of it. This is reflected in Vivekananda, Aurobindo, Tagore's philosophical writing, and politicians like Gandhi and Nehru.

Thus, comparing the two trends, the king's religion in the Western world was the people's. In the East, it was different. Kings did not ordain but only followed religion. In India, religion was, from its very inception, linked with some renunciation. It had broadly two consequences. The kind occupied only a secondary role to the one who renounced the world. Thus, the theocracy and the state did not merge, and the sword did not command people to this or that faith. Secondly, religion was for those who had renounced the world as a full-time occupation, giving them ample opportunity to develop the metaphysical as well as the ritual or the practical side of the religion. Obviously, as ritual practices and faith, religion evolved as an emotional thing, while metaphysical deliberation is a purely intellectual endeavor. Thus, in India, two entities, one the state and the other religion, evolved, and there were two levels: one of pure intellectualism and the other of faith or rituals.

Conflicting factors characterized the mystery of human existence. Metaphysical intellectualism, hence, had this duality of conflicting factors as its prime theme. To explain the mystery of existence in the face of this conflicting duality, metaphysical intellectualism had to direct its energies to reconcile the conflict and discover cosmic unity. This intellectualism is institutionalized under different seers and seekers of truth. This gave birth to different schools of thought. Thus, the area of intellectualism widened further. It was also required to reconcile these various schools of thought. Metaphysical intellectualism, amongst other things, was thus directed to discover thoughts that reconciled conflicting duality – the state and religion, plurality of metaphysical thought, and duality of the cosmos. Toleration and existence, the cherished ideals of medieval and modern Secularism, were ancient India's answers to the problems of reconciling the conflict.

As opposed to this, West had faith but little metaphysical intellectualism dealing with cosmic questions and Man's intrinsic being or reconciling conflict of whatever kind. Authoritative methods accompanied the religion. The fear of God's vengeance, the king's rod, and the clergy's whip were the most powerful to regulate religion. Code, a body of prohibitions and prescriptions, was foremost in the system. Kind representing God on the earth and with clergy as his servant combined all three in him. Hence, the state proclaimed the code and had the force of land and religion. In the ancient West, the execution of opponents was the sole technique or method for reconciling the conflict. Hence, when there was an uprising on both sides of the state and the Church to separate one from the other, it resulted in a conflict between the two, for the Church wrestled to full itself from the clutches of the state and the state put its entire weight to retain Church under its supremacy. The earliest talk about Secularism in the West resulted from this state-church controversy. Later in the system of the Church itself grew hierarchies, and one that served the Church but preferred to keep to worldly ways was called secular, an interior kind of clergy. The 18th century brought a different concept of Secularism, which was concerned with Man's material welfare and was largely anti-church. In the thought of later thinkers, the Church was wholly denounced as obstructing Man's welfare. Welfarism was the ultimate goal of governance and society, and these philosophers put it before humanity. However, critics also defined it as a Utopia, for according to them, it was the goal of which one could dream but not realize.

Indian mindset was set with tolerance and coexistence, as its cardinal did not find it challenging to absorb whatever new came. The massive Islamic and later Christian inflow was absorbed almost amicably as a natural process. It was during the freedom movement that Indian thinkers and politicians felt that the nation's attitude towards religious plurality was made explicit. Secularism was the term by which they discovered the solution. However, different from the West, religion in India was her lifeblood, and Man could be without anything but not without religion. Hence, the term secularism got a new definition in *sarva dharma samabhava*.

The difference between the Eastern and Western approaches and attitudes to religion becomes evident when we compare the life of Jesus and his teaching as recorded in the Gospels with the Nicene creed. It is the difference between a type, a personality, a set of dogmas, a way of life, and a scheme of metaphysics. The characteristics of intuitive realization, non-dogmatic toleration, insistence on nonaggressive virtues, and Universalist ethics mark Jesus as a typical Eastern seer. On the other hand, the striking features of Western Christianity are the emphasis on definite creeds and absolutist dogmatism with its consequences of intolerance, exclusiveness, and confusion of piety with Patriotism.

The distinction between Western and Western religions lies in the individual seeking salvation and services to others. It is not enough to retire into solitude to seek closer contact with the divine. Religion is not

only life-transcending but also life-transforming. True worship is in the service of suffering humanity, which alone is true religion. Religions qua affirm the startling doctrine of the immeasurable value of every human soul—the ecstasy of a conscious equality of all souls. The ecstasy of a conscious equality of all souls melts the barriers between Man and Man. True religion, with its intuition of the unity of the human race, works for a spiritual community. This lone man requires appreciation of other people's beliefs, a feature in which the Eastern faith is superior to the Western faith.

Thus, the evolution of the term secular and the relation it had with religion as developed by Western and Eastern thinkers shows that in the Western world, it developed in an overall form that has been evolving since the collapse of the medieval Christian culture and civilization, and signaled by the renaissance and the reformation and culminating in the dreams and hopes of the enlightenment of the 19th century, the historical location of the modernist ideology, visions, and illusion. The watchwords of this new way of ordering Man's life in all its aspects were humanism, rationalism, and materialistic naturalism, articulated by every shade of the ideological spectrum and from the reactionary romanticism of the conservation to the ultra-radical, including socialism. Thus, religious traditions in the West and the East have been very different. Christianity has been dominated more by religions than by ethnic-religious issues. Moreover, this situation facilitated a secular framework.

When we look at the Indian situation, we find fundamental quantitative differences from the West. This secularistic project of the Western world is alien to an Indian society in which religion permits several key points and a wide range of options for both individuals and communities. In the West, religion has not been institutionalized regarding a church or a textually enshrined avoidance. Here, the institutions of the temple or the cast are too open-ended to generate the kind of historical conflict that has characterized European history – the crusaders, the burning of heretics, and church and state conflict. The secular sacred distinctions, so contextual to the Western cultural evolution, cannot arise in India, which has been assigning such dualism for centuries. Thus, the way Western thinkers have understood Secularism is not applicable in the Indian context.

III. However, we find another interesting connotation of Secularism: Secularism is rooted in a pragmatic need. In a multi-religious and multi-caste society, Secularism is a dire necessity for the survival of a plurality of groups to function as a minimally interrelated society. Functioning based on minimal trust, does the political system have to generate a frame of reasonable parity between the groups?

In a society where religion is an everyday mode, not a sociological dramatization, Secularism cannot mean a structural separation between the religious and the secular but an arrangement wherein all group identities and contingent religions enjoy a fair deal. This is Gandhian Secularism, which is based not on the exclusion of the 'religion' but a relocation of the religions as secular. The wisdom of Gandhiji can be seen when we realize that this is what Indian Secularism has turned out to be in practice, not an absolution of the religious category in politics but a religious parity within the political framework.

Although the forty-second amendment in 1976 added the word "socialist and secular" to the preamble of the Indian constitution to make India a sovereign socialist, secular democratic republic, the concept of Secularism was imbibed in the constitution from the beginning.

To Mahatma Gandhi, Secularism meant "sarva dharma sambhava. Jawaharlal Nehru, despite being an agnostic, adopted it. Aware of the adverse consequences of an association between the state and religion, he defined the term vaguely. A secular state "does not mean a state where religion is discouraged. It means Freedom of religion and conscience, including Freedom for those who have no religion, subject only to their not interfering with each other with the fundamental conception of our state. The free India's constitution thus incorporates the right to Freedom of religion as a fundamental right to guarantee "Freedom of conscience and the right to profess, practice and propagate religion freely.

Secularism, thus defined, is counter to its Western connotation, which excludes all considerations drawn from belief in God. The essential feature of Indian Secularism is, as has been discussed earlier, that there will be no discrimination between citizens based on their religion or form of worship and that everybody will be equal before the law. It should treat religion as an individual enterprise and individual action lying outside the genuine and legitimate province of the government. Secular institutions should confine themselves to secular objectives.

As the minimum for a country to be secular, thinkers have set the goal that such a country should have in practice and allow the development of a personal and social ethical code that is consistent with rationality and which aims at attaining a humane society in which every individual has the opportunity to develop to their highest potential. Under this minimum parameter, India also lacks a little. India's emphasis has been mainly on a body of religion that relates to Man's transcendental reality, which is not questioned, but one may also not say anything definite about it. Rational scrutiny is not capable of proving or disproving it. It is, at the most, a matter of faith or experience, which again is non-communicable. Thus, as far as believers are concerned, they should have the Freedom to believe so long as such belief does not express itself in an action that adversely affects others or conflicts with the norms of rationality. At this juncture, the role of social and ethical code begins.

Rationality would be its guiding principle. Hence, if the individual who sees that the rule that society has devised at any given time is not rational and conducive to the promotion of the development of human potential or contradicts it, he should have the right to point out the contradiction and seek to get it modified. In India, such ethical and social codes are subservient to religion, and the welfare in this world is subservient to the welfare in the other world.

Let us also examine the 'sarva dharma samabhava' principle regarding secular ethics. Sarva dharma samabhava is being translated as equal regard for all religions. As regards secular ethics, that is, rational ethical principles for all alike, it may not be said to be unconditionally consistent with the principle of 'sarva dharma samabhava.' Most religions not only set before their member's transcendental goals but also their own rules of conduct through which alone these goals can be attained. The rules prescribed by religions are often ritualistic, dogmatic, and content in conflict with the rational social and ethical code. Thus, equal regard for all religions is also equal regard for their ritualistic and dogmatic code, which is quite impracticable as these codes often conflict and are mutually exclusive. It is not denied that most major religions have helped in evolving a set of values that seem to have universal appeal. Likewise, it is not claimed that all codes of conduct supported by different religions are necessarily irrational. The only thing is that their validation has not been sought at the level of reason and is often given in terms of transcendental goals and the authority of the past. Such notions of right and wrong, sin and virtue, are often rigid, restrained to change, and incapable of examination and validation.

Broadly equal regard for all religions means three things: (i) Equal regard for all the different forms of transcendental beliefs and characteristics of these religions, (ii) Regard for their different notions of life after death, (iii) Their different metaphysical explanation of human sorrow. This is possible for a person who is equally indifferent to all or subscribes to one of these and accepts the others as good enough for their membership. Some scholars consider Hinduism an appropriate example as Hinduism consists of and has equal regard for diversities, a hierarchy of higher and lower forms of metaphysical thought and worship. Its caste system or simultaneous existence of the great tradition and several minor traditions in the broader frame of Hinduism depict its regard for all alike. However, the question is how much of this is an expression of genuine regard for all variations of belief, how much of it is condescending tolerance by the elite of other belief systems, and how much of it is plain indifference to what other people think, or do so long as an acceptable arrangement is worked out for day to day interaction at the social level is challenging to say.

Shared areas of social affairs are where all nationals, irrespective of the religions to which they belong, have equal status and rights, which is another parameter to fudge as to what extent a nation is secular. The goals and norms that direct and govern this shared area are not driven and do not draw their sanction from any particular religious tradition. In this sense, they are secular or 'rational'. It is also significant how the community of goals and norms and a shared area of social affairs will be achieved. The problem is not that these shared values and norms are not derived from any particular religion but that they often run counter.

Every society has to create, consolidate, and continually extend this world of shared values, which is secular and rational. Moreover, linking prescribed norms to desired goals helps keep norms under review. This is the other aspect of rationality imputed to the secular view of life.

III. Conclusion:

Secularism, as it has evolved during centuries of man's intellectual endeavor in diverse contexts, answering as many needs as possible, far from being a mere term or concept, is a philosophy in its own right and with broader perspectives and implications. Secularism attempts to discover a common path to common welfare rationally beyond such diversities in multiple diversities of thought practices, lifeways, religions, and faiths. Secularism is not anti-religion but rather anti-discrimination on whatever ground Secularism has; hence, in the present-day world and context, significance is greater than that of any other school of Philosophy, for Secularism is primarily the endeavor to protect them all from colliding with each other. Though theocratic authority sees Secularism as its worst enemy, Secularism, as has been explained in this paper, is not in conflict with them. Despite the anti-religious thrust of the Western kind of Secularism, Secularism is not, by and large, against religion. Secularism only identifies areas that may be isolated from religion, and that too without damaging or infringing its authority. It asks to let them be deployed entirely to Man's welfare in this world and to his ethical elevation. Religion deals with transcendental matters, and Secularism does its ethical part.

Secularism is thus a rational principle and practical philosophy, a thing least for ideals and thought and most for practice and practical life. Hence, those who set its most idealistic welfaristic goals, largely impracticable and unattainable, despite their deep commitment to its values and sincere desires to attain it, only render the case of Secularism more complicated. They take Secularism to the same extreme where its critics stand, who, by using these very idealistic parameters, convert Secularism into a Utopia. Of all the sublime things, Secularism is the high goal, which in its fullness may never be attained, but it is worthwhile in whatever degree it is attained.

The "Vasudeva Kutumbakam" ideal of ancient India varied and was primarily reflected in the thoughts of the 20th century, especially the Indian thinkers. United Nations, with its numerous resolutions, dreamt of the global village. Human Rights activists have often agitated for achieving humanity's protection against all wrongs, including religions and other kinds of discrimination, and rights to all things that make life worth living, not only for humanity alone but for all living beings.

Instead of squeezing Secularism into a small ball that rolls between religions, keeping them in their respective orbits, or as something that describes the interrelationships between the followers of different religions and between states and different religious groups, an attempt should be made to expand Secularism to the size of the globe and put it to the delivery of more excellent goods. It may be said that Secularism, in its broader global role, will eventually guarantee the equality of all human beings in all matters and will become the instrument of eliminating every kind of discrimination on an international level and pave the path for the proper kind of international welfare of humanity as a whole.

Thus, we may conclude that Secularism is not Utopian and, if used correctly, may become the subtlest instrument of human welfare. The seeming confrontation between secular and non-secular thought and working cases can easily be overcome by applying the basic tenets of Secularism, which will accomplish larger and broader welfare goals for all.

References

- [1] R. P. Dhokalia, 'Secularism And The Emerging Challenge Of Communalism: Religious Freedom And Beleagured Pluralism,', Secularism And Indian Polity Edited By Bidyut Chakravorty, Segment Books Distributors 1990
- [2] S.Radhakrishnan, Eastern Religion And Western Thought. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1939
- [3] S. Radhakrishnan. Mysticism And Ethics In Hindu Thought. Allen And Unwin Ltd. London 1954
- [4] Jagdish Swarup, Constitution Of India. Vol I, Allahabad 1984, V.N. Shukla, D.K. Singh, Constitution Of India, Lucknow, 1981
- [5] Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, England 1972 Penguin Books.
- [6] Guy Mettallx, Religion, And The Promise Of The Twentieth Century. A Mentor Book Published By New American Library , New York 1965
- [7] James E . Crimmins, Religion , Secularization, And Political Thought . Thomas Hobbs To J.S.Mill, Routledge London And New York
- [8] B.K.Ghosh ' Vedic Literature—General View ' Is In History And Culture Of Indian People, Edited By R.C. Majumdar, Vol. I Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan 1988
- [9] D.D. Kosambi. Culture And Civilisation Of Ancient India In Historical Background Delhi, Villa Publication, 1970