CHAPTER-III
NEHRU'S ROLE AND PRACTICE OF SECULARISM

Nehru emerged on the Indian political scene at the most critical juncture when the Britishers were applying their nefarious policy of "divide and rule". In order to put this policy in practice, they managed to provide representation in assemblies of various provinces of British India on communal bases. Initially, in 1909 they made the provision of separate representation for Hindus and Muslims.

In it the Hindu and Muslim electorates were compelled to vote for the candidates of their own religion only. The constituencies were earmarked for Hindu and Muslim candidates. This provision alienated Hindus and Muslims from each other and the harmonious and good-neighbourly relations of both communities were damaged considerably and the Britishers were quite successful in achieving their evil designs. In order to create more chasms in Hindu Community, they initiated the policy for providing separate representation for the untouchables and backward communities of Hindu society. J. Nehru and M. Gandhi provided leadership to Congress Party in opposing the provision
and the fast unto death of M. Gandhi in 1931 brought an amicable solution of this provision and Britishers were forced to track back on this issue.

Nehru visualised the serious consequences of such provisions as they were likely to became a major stumbling block in making India united. His vast knowledge and experience made him a firm believer in making future India as a secular state where all citizens of India, irrespective of caste, creed, colour, community and social status, are equal citizens and enjoy equal rights and opportunities in all walks of life, because any deviation from this stand was bound to create divisions and dissatisfaction among the citizens and create different categories of citizens. Nehru adhered to his principles of secularism till his last. However, time and again he was criticized by his critics for deviating and adopting lukewarm and evasive attitude towards his own perceptions about secularism. To this effect, certain instances of Nehru’s life time are given as following:

Nehru was the most vocal and staunch supporter of secularism, still the term secular was not included in the constitution during his life time. This term was incorporated in the constitution in 1976 under amendment No. 42.
His contribution regarding the upliftment of the backward classes in the spheres of social reforms and social legislation has not only failed in raising their status in society but underline their backwardness. Merely the provision of reservation of few seats and some legislative enactments are not sufficient to root out the evil of casteism if the enactments are not properly implemented will not serve any useful purpose.

The other contribution was in the field of social legislation, he got a uniform civil code for the whole of India to strengthen national unity. This code was enacted only for Hindus where Sikhs, Buddhists and Jains are termed as Hindus and not for the followers of alien religions Muslims, Parsis and Christians. So he himself was partisan and viewed Indians on the bases of their religions and not as Indians in the real sense where he lacked courage of conviction and sincerity in practice. He applied different yardsticks on the bases of religion, caste and creed in making such vital decisions which were very important for India’s future unity. He left the dilemma unresolved.

Though he propagated for secular education to all, but here too he made provision for providing financial assistance to the educational institutions run on the bases of religion and caste like Aligarh Muslim University and Banaras Hindu
University. His adherence to continuation of English language in official correspondence and All India Services provided missionary run English medium schools and institutions an edge over the students educated in Hindi and other regional languages.

He stressed on separating religion from politics. Here it is quite paradoxical when we observe that he not only violated his own dictum but eulogized this aspect to the maximum and to appease minorities, especially Muslims. He did not dare to touch them for polygamous marriages prevailing among them in India inspite of the fact that majority of Muslim countries in the world including Pakistan have banned this practice long back. His party men of today are throwing iftar parties and paying allowances for Maulvis from the state exchequer. He adopted the policy of pick and choose the Chief Minister and other senior executives and democratic norms were thrown to the winds. For example, he always preferred to keep a Chief Minister who was a Brahmin. In 1975 and earlier if we go through the list of Chief Ministers of Indian states, then it becomes conspicuously clear that Nehru surrendered to caste. In this connection Msyed Mir Quasim – Chief Minister of J&K once observed, "When I walk through the corridor of parliament house then I see so many resembling Kashmiri faces, but to my utter surprise, none of them is a Muslim but they are all Kashmiri Pandits only."
He never hesitated to waive off essential requirements for a particular job and accommodated undeserving and not fully qualified officers for senior appointments e.g. Lt. General BM Kaul was given the charge of 33 corps of Indian Army during 1962 war whereas he was initially from an army service corps office and did not possess the infantry warfare know-how.

He always claimed himself a true secular and did not believe in the rituals and traditions of Hindu religion, but it is interesting to note that he wrote to his sister Krishana Utheesing to get a proper horoscope for Rajiv, his grand son after his birth.¹

He expressed his wishes thus, "I was happy to get the news. In my letter to Indira I suggested to her to ask you to get a proper horoscope made by a competent person."

In order to justify his will for immersing his ashes in the holy river the Ganges he does not attach any holy aspects to river, Ganges, but simply pleads that he had spent his younger days on the banks of river, Ganges. If he was so sentimental about

his attachment to river, Ganges, then why he did not wish to immerse his ashes in Thames river of England also, where he had spent most of his younger days.

He gave due weightage and importance to the caste and communal consideration when he nominated his party candidates in a constituency on the bases of dominating caste or religious group. For example, he nominated Muslim candidates from Muslim constituencies.

He abhorred all the religions and claimed himself a true secular, but he involved Govt. of India in the celebration of 2500th Anniversary of Lord Buddha in 1956 and recognised Buddha as a great Indian, whereas he directed Dr. Rajender Parshad, President of India not to attend the ceremony of rebuilding of Somnath temple; this attitude of Nehru gives an indication that his opposition to Hindu customs, rituals and traditions and appeasing other religions will prove him to be a true secular.

He issued directives and instructions and got acts passed in the parliament to take stringent action against the civil officials who failed to maintain law and order and tranquil communal atmosphere in their respective areas. However, not even a single civil officers was taken to task for not discharging his duties properly from 1950 to 1960, though communal riots took
place at regular intervals during this period. He not only took any action against the proven guilty by the Enquiry Commissions but rewarded them to serve his political interests. Here it would not be out of context to mention the case of Sardar Partap Singh Kairon, Ex. Chief Minister of the Punjab who was squarely blamed for misusing his political status by Dass Commission. He was not only exonerated but was rewarded to continue as a Chief Minister of Punjab, so that the Akalis could be kept away from coming into power. So here, his political interests over-ruled his head.

Nehru lived in his own fanciful world. He hardly gave any importance to any counsel from his colleagues. He yearned to project himself a world-class leader. He lacked farsightedness and ground facts of an issue and nourished an idea of idealism. Due to his this lackadaisical attitude India faced the ignominy of shameful defeat at the hands of China. When China was preparing to attack India, then he was hosting Chou-en-Lai, Prime Minister of China in India and shouting slogans of Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai. Instead of taking interest in strengthening country he was becoming the Messiah of peace and was globe-trotting with A.G. Nasser, President of Egypt, and Marshall Tito, President of Yugoslavia to draft Panchsheel without realising that weaker nations cannot dictate the terms at the international stage. All it shows that he was big dreamer rather than a practical leader.
His desire to become Prime Minister of India made him accept the partition of India without expressing any opposition. He did not hesitate to brand Mahatama Gandhi as an old and spent-force when he opposed the partition of India. Here also, his personal ambitions compromised the unity of India. His quixotic and irrational behaviour left M. Gandhi as a broken and sad person. He did not hesitate to condemn his political mentor (M. Gandhi) after achieving his long cherished ambition of becoming India’s prime minister.

Nehru believed in the equality of all citizens, irrespective of their caste and the religion etc. But he never studied the diverse social practices, rituals, superstitions and inequalities prevailing in various parts of the country. He expected all sorts of concessions and sacrifices from Hindus only, the term ‘Hindu’ includes Buddhist, Jains and Sikhs. He could not visualise the basic difficulties coming in the way of implementation of secularism. Though, the Jains are against any type of violence including insect-killing where he did not throw any light. Similarly, a Sikh is allowed to carry kirpan in his possession, but not others. Perhaps, he took all the Hindus for granted to abide by his irrelevant, whimsical as well as arbitrary dictates.
In a democracy, the prime minister is considered to be first among equals. But in practice Nehru did not consider any of his cabinet colleague of his own competence and stature. He lacked even the basic courtesy of attending the last rites of Sardar Patel who died in Bombay (Mumbai). He even went to the extent to ask President Dr. Rajender Parshad not to attend his funeral. It also shows that he had the traits of discourtesy, dictatorship, and the most knowledgeable and perfect person. In the case of minority communities he tried to be tactful and shrewd. His policies created a feeling in the majority communities that in India a minority group person is more than equal. He believed in providing more concessions and privileges to the minorities, especially to Muslims. In India all citizens are governed by uniform criminal code but he created different civil codes for Muslims and considered certain provisions like marriage and divorce as sacrosanct. So there are many instances which indicate about his thoughts and actions on his concept of secularism. It will not be out of context to mention that his government initiated the scheme of proceeding financial assistance to the Muslims proceeding on Haj pilgrimage from the state exchequer, but did nothing for Hindu pilgrims proceeding on various pilgrim sites in India and neighbouring countries.
Although, India is claimed to be a secular state but the states enacted laws in which certain measures were taken which pertained to the Hindus only. These provisions, may be well intentioned, were not upto the non-interference by the State in the sphere of religion.

The constitution contains clauses which enshrine specific interference, in Article 290 A, made it mandatory on the part of Government of Kerala and Madras (Tamil Nadu) to pay Rs. 46.5 lakhs and Rs. 13.5 lakhs respectively, to Dewaswom funds for the maintenance of Hindu temples.

The legislation of entry of Harijans in temples in 1955 under Untouchability (Offences) Act, clearly views the State’s interference in the affairs of the religion, whereas others protested that untouchability was abolished to pre-empt mass conversion of Harijans to Christianity or Islam and therefore saw a pro-Hindu bias in this reform.

Madras Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act of 1951 brought to administer religious institutions where a public servant was bestowed with vast financial and administrative powers. Subsequently, in 1959 vide an amendment temple employees were classified as government servants. The Hindus criticized
the draft bill for tightening the government noose on temples and nationalising them. Inspite of criticism and objections, the bill was passed with certain amendments.

It clearly shows that the fathers of Indian constitution desired that the state performs religious functions and not to make walls of separation between state and religion. So State's intervention in religion was permitted unwittingly.

So, here it is reiterated that they did not use the expression 'Secular'. It is all known that Nehru had his heart set on establishing a polity based on secularism.

The secular State of Nehru's conception was neither a 'theocratic' nor an 'irreligious' state. It did not discriminate against any particular religion. Nor did it recognise special rights of the followers of any religion. His attitude was not only of 'tolerance' but of respect towards all religions.

He incorporated in the resolution on Fundamental rights at the Karachi Congress in 1931 clauses asserting that every citizen of India should enjoy freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess and practise any religion, subject to public order and morality. That all citizens were equal before the law, irrespective of religion, creed, caste or and that no disability
will attach to citizens for these reasons in regard to public employment and in the exercise of any trade or ceiling. These formed the bases of the articles in the Constitution.

The "objectives Resolution" which was the foundation of the constitution of India, was formulated by Nehru. Among the eight points, which Nehru stressed in the objective Resolution, points 5 and 6 stressed the secular nature of the constitution. The relevant portions of the objective Resolution, namely paragraph, 1, 5, and 6 are as follows:

(1) This Constituent Assembly declares its firm and solemn resolve to proclaim India as an Independent Sovereign Republic and to draw up for her future governance a Constitution...

(5) Wherein shall be guaranteed and secured to all the people of India justice, social, economic and political, equality of status of opportunity, and before the law, freedom of thought, expression, Belief, Faith, Worship, Vocation, Association and Action, subject to law and public morality; and

(6) Wherein adequate safeguards shall be provided for minorities, backward and tribal areas, and depressed and other classes...
These points in the Objectives Resolution were not only embodied in various Articles in the Constitution of India but were also retained in the Preamble of the Constitution. In order to understand as to what extent the concept of secular state has been embodied in the Constitution, it is necessary to know the specific provisions of the Constitution also.

**Article 25:**

(1) Subject to public morality and health and to the other provisions for this part, all are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion.

(2) Nothing in this article shall affect the operation of any existing law or prevent the State from making any law;

(A) Regulating or restricting any economic, financial, political or other secular activity which may be associated with religious practice;

(B) Providing for social welfare and reform or the throwing open of Hindu religious institutions of a public character to all classes and sections of Hindus.
II. Freedom to Manage Religious Affairs:

Article 26

Subject to public order, morality and health, every religious denomination or any section thereof shall have the right

(a) to establish and maintain institutions for religious and charitable purposes;

(b) to manage its own affairs in matters of religion;

(c) to own and acquire movable and immovable property; and

(d) to administer such property in accordance with law.

III Freedom as to Payment of Taxes for the Promotion of any Particular Religion:

Article 27:

No person shall be compelled to pay any taxes, the proceeds of which are specially appropriated in payment of expenses for the promotion or maintenance of any particular religion or religious denomination.
IV. Freedom as to Attendance at Religious Instruction or Religious Worship in certain Educational Institutions:

Article 28

(1) No religious instruction shall be provided in any educational institution wholly maintained out of state funds.

(2) No person attending any educational institution recognised 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 imparted in such institution or in any premises attached thereto unless such person or, if such person is a minor, his guardian has given his consent thereto.

V. No discrimination in Educational Institutions:

Article 29(2)

No citizen shall be denied admission into any educational institution maintained by the State or receiving aid out of State funds on grounds only of religion, race, caste language or any of them.
Article 30

(1) All minorities, whether based on religion or language, shall have the right to establish and administer educational institution of their choice.

VI. Citizenship:

Article 15

(1) The State shall not discriminate against any citizen on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them.

VII. Equality of opportunity in matters of Public Employment:

Article 16

(1) No citizen shall, on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth, residence, or any of them, be ineligible for, or discriminated against in respect, of, any employment or office under the State.

VIII. No Communal Electorates:

Article 325

There shall be one general electoral roll for every territorial constituency for election to either House of
Parliament or to either House of the Legislature of a State and no person shall be ineligible for inclusion in any such roll or claim to be included in any special electoral roll for any such constituency on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, or any of them.

It is obvious from the above that various aspects of the "Objective Resolution" are enshrined in different Articles of the Indian Constitution. According to Articles 25(1) and 26 individual and collective freedom of religion has been guaranteed.

Article 25(2) empowers the State to interfere; to provide social welfare and reform regardless of the provision of non-interfering with religious freedom of the individual or society.

Article 30(1) guarantees the right of minorities. The constitution guarantees and emphasizes common citizenship. No person is discriminated on the basis of religion.

Article 27 means that there is separation of state and religion as no person shall be compelled to pay taxes for following any religion. Further Article 29(1) and (2) and (3) can also mean the separation of religion and state as there is provision for secular education.
On Nehru's urging, the Constituent Assembly adopted Article 44 under the Directive Principle of State Policy which states:

'The state shall endeavour to secure for the citizens a Uniform Civil Code throughout the territory of India.'

The Hindu Code Bill sought to modify Hindu Law in regard to marriage, adoption, guardianship and women's property rights. Many orthodox Hindus considered it a direct invasion on traditional Hinduism. This was a great challenge to Nehru and he in his Presidential Address to the Congress emphasized the progressive outlook inherent in the Bill.

"Thus the Hindu Code Bill which has given rise to so much argument, because it is a symbol of this conflict between progress and reaction in the social domain, I do not refer to any particular clause of Bill... but rather to the spirit underlying that Bill. This was a spirit of liberation and freeing our people and more especially, our women-folk from outworn customs and shackles that burden them."

He was of the opinion that Uniform Civil Code is important for the unity of India as well as for Secularism.

"Yet we cannot accept it. Because Muslim community is a minority and we do not wish the Hindu majority to do it. These are personal laws and so they will remain for the Muslims, unless they want to change."³

He was very particular that scientific temper should be the main component of Education. He wrote:

I have a partiality for the literary aspects of education and I admire the classics, but I am quite sure that some elementary scientific training in physics and chemistry and especially biology, as also in the application of science, is essential for all boys and girls. Only thus can they understand and fit into the modern world and develop, to some extent at least, the scientific temper.⁴

COMMUNALISM

Nehru defined communalism as "the intrusion of religion or so-called religion into political matters", in other words, when one religious group is incited to hate another religious group, it is "religion mis-applied to politics."⁵

For Nehru, Communalism was the badge of a backward nation. It was an inheritance from the medieval world. It signified social reaction. It created parochial sub-nationalism.

Nehru condemned Muslim communalists as well as Hindu Communalists. He wrote:

"Muslim communal leaders said the most amazing things and seemed to care not at all for Indian nationalism or Indian freedom, Hindu communal leaders, though always speaking arrogantly in the name of nationalism, had little to do with it in practice and, incapable of any real action, sought to humble themselves before the Government, and did that too in vain."

Nehru emphasized that the British government as the third party always intervened to bring about discord between the Hindus and the Muslims. Thus he said:

"British governments in the past and the present have based their policy on creating division in our ranks. Divide and rule has always been the way of empires, and the measure, of their success in this policy has been also the measure of their superiority over those whom they thus exploit. We cannot complain of this or, at any rate, we ought not to be surprised at it. To ignore it and not provide against it is in itself a mistake in one's thought."

Nehru's remedy for communal accord was the creation of a common rational or social outlook.

"How are we to provide against it? Not surely by bargaining and bagging and generally adopting the tactics of the market-place, for whatever offer we make, however high our bid might be, there is always a third party which can bid higher and, what is more, give substance to its words. If there is no common national or social outlook, there will not be common action against the common adversary. If we think in terms of the existing political and economic structure and merely wish to tamper with it here and there, to reform it, to 'Indianise' it, then all real inducement for joining action is lacking. The object then becomes one of sharing in the spoils, and the third and controlling party inevitably plays the dominant role and hands out its gifts to the prize boys of its choice."

Talking historically, he wrote:

"It is interesting to trace British policy since the Rising of 1857 in its relation to the communal question. Fundamentally and inevitably it has been one of preventing the Hindus and Muslims from acting together, and of playing off one community against another. After 1857 the heavy hand of the British fell more on the Muslims than on the Hindus. They considered the Muslims more aggressive and militant, ..., and, therefore more
dangerous. The Muslims had also kept away from the new education and had few jobs under the Government. All this made them suspect."

He continues,

"The new nationalism then grew up from above the upper class English speaking intelligentsia and this was naturally confined to the Hindus, for the Muslims were educationally very backward... The British Government sought shelter in communal difficulties and made the agreement of certain reactionary communal groups and minorities a pre-requisite for any further consideration of the political problem." 10

Communalism was for Nehru also on economic problem. Thus he wrote:

"It was also an economic problem. In some places, like Bengal, the peasantry was largely Mohammedan and the landlords were Hindus. There, it was a tenant-landlord problem. In the United Province, it was slightly the other way round, the peasants were largely Hindus and the landlords, Muslims. But in order to hide the main conflict, the colour of communalism and religion was given to an essentially economic problem." 11

10. *Ibid*.
Nehru wanted to evolve suitable policies to safeguard the culture, language and certain special privileges of the minority communities.

"The real struggle today in India is not between Hindu culture and Muslim culture, but between these two and the conquering scientific culture of modern civilization. Those who are desirous of preserving 'Muslim culture'... need not worry about Hindu Culture, but should withstand the giant from the west. I have no doubt, personally, that all efforts of Hindus or Muslims, oppose modern scientific and industrial civilization are doomed to failure, and I shall watch this failure, and I shall watch this failure without regret."12

Nehru was the architect of India's concept of Secularism. It was he who was responsible for its incorporation into the Constitution of India. He sought to separate Law from religion. He sought to separate social reforms from religion. With the help of the State he sought to bring about religious reforms. He separated Education from religion and insisted on secular and scientific Education.13 He succeeded a great deal in bringing about an atmosphere of Secularism in Indian Society and polity. However, he had also his failures. As pointed out by S.Gopal.

"Nehru accepted the creation of Pakistan as a political necessity and not as recognition of the validity of the two-nation theory on the basis of religion. Rather, with large religious minorities remaining in India, secularism became all the more important, for it is the only possible basis of a uniform and durable national identity in a multi-religious society... Only secularism can be corner-stone of an egalitarian, forward-looking India, with religious pluralism, full civil liberties and equal opportunities." 14

For Nehru, the idea of a Muslim Nation in India was a medieval concept. He condemned it by saying:

"Stress has been laid on the 'Muslim nation' in India, on 'Muslim culture', on the utter incompatibility of Hindu and Muslim 'culture.' The inevitable deduction from this is... that the British must remain in India for ever and ever to hold the scales and mediate between the two 'cultures.' A few Hindu communal leaders think exactly on the same lines... Politically, the idea is absurd, economically it is fantastic; it is hardly worth considering, and yet it helps us a little to understand the mentality behind it. Some such separate and unmixable nations existed together in the middle Ages and afterwards." 15

He believed that the idea of having a nation on religious bond was against the spirit of modern civilisation. Thus he wrote,

14. Ibid., pp.13-14
"To talk of a 'Muslim nation', therefore, means that there is no nation at all but a religious bond; it means that no nation in the modern sense must be allowed to grow; it means that modern civilisation should be discarded and we should go back to the medieval ways; it means either autocratic government or a foreign government; it means finally, just nothing at all except an emotional state of mind and a conscious or unconscious desire not to face realities, especially economic realities.\(^{16}\)

He did not even accept the idea of a Muslim culture or that of a Hindu culture. In this matter he was making the popular Marxist mistake of ignoring all signs of ethnicity and religion.

But let us allow him to speak for himself:

"I have tried hard to understand what this 'Muslim culture' is, but I confess that I have not succeeded. I find a tiny handful of middle-class Muslims as well as Hindus in north India influenced by the Persian language and traditions. And looking to the masses the most obvious symbols of 'Muslim culture' seem to be: a particular type of pyjamas, not too long and not too short, a particular way to shaving or clipping the moustache but allowing the beard to grow, and a lota with a special kind of snout, just as the corresponding Hindu customs are the wearing of a dhoti, the possession of a topknot, and a lota of a different kind. As a matter of fact, even these distinctions are largely urban and they tend to

\(^{16}\) Ibid.
disappear. The Muslim peasantry and industrial workers are hardly distinguishable from the Hindu."

In the matter of social reforms, like the moderates, Nehru was always alive, during the freedom-struggle and after Independence to the problem of social reforms. During the period of the freedom struggle, the freedom struggle was itself a bottle-neck in progress towards social reforms.

After independence, Nehru's social reforms were the victims of opposition from Hindu orthodoxy.

For Nehru, Secularism goes with Democracy. There can be no secularism, if there is no liberty and there is no equality. That is why he said that a Caste-ridden society cannot be secular. He condemned Caste. He condemned Racialism. And he condemned Class-structures. He was conscious of the fact that these were powerful forces in society. Thus he wrote about the caste system.

It is curious and significant that throughout the long span of Indian history there have been repeated warnings given by great men against priest craft and the rigidity of the caste system, and powerful movements have risen against them; yet slowly, imperceptibly, almost, it seems, as if it were the inevitable course of destiny, caste

---

17. Ibid.
has grown and spread and seized every aspects of Indian life in its strangling grip. Rebels against caste have drawn many followers, and yet in course of time their group has itself become a caste.18

The main problem with caste is that it is based on birth and not on Individual merit. This is what Nehru recognised when he wrote:

"Caste is the symbol and embodiment of this exclusiveness among the Hindus... It is sometimes said that it should not depend on birth but on merit. This approach is irrelevant and merely confuses the issue. If merit is the only criterion and opportunity is thrown open to everybody, then caste loses all its present-day distinguishing features and, in fact, ends."19

Talking of the evil consequences of Caste, Nehru said,

Caste has in the past not only led to the suppression of certain groups, but to a separation of theoretical and scholastic learning from craftsmanship, and a divorce of philosophy from actual life and its problems. It was an aristocratic approach based on traditionalism.20

What is wrong with Caste is that it denies equality. Nehru, on the other hand, stood for equality. In his words,

18. Jawaharlal Nehru, Discovery of India, p.121.
19. Jawaharlal Nehru, Discovery of India, p.520.
The spirit of the age is in favour of equality, though practice denies it almost everywhere. Yet the spirit of the age will triumph. In India, at any rate, we must aim at equality. It does mean equal opportunities for all and no political, economic, or social barrier in the way of any individual or group. It means a faith in humanity and a belief that there is no race or group that cannot advance and make good in its own way, given the chance to do so. It means a realization of the fact that the backwardness or degradation of any group is not due to inherent failings in it, but principally to lack of opportunities and long suppression by other group.21

Similar is the case with Racialism. Thus he said:

But while we struggle with caste in India (which, in its origin, was based on colour), new and over bearing castes have arisen in the west with doctrines of racial exclusiveness, sometimes clothed in political and economic terms, and even speaking in the language of democracy. He also condemned class-structures because they had their source in capitalism and capitalism was not consistent with democracy. And without democracy, for Nehru, there can be no secularism.22

After analysing the views of Nehru on Secularism and the role played by him in the secular process. He was of the firm opinion that when communal religion is gone and Nehru was impatient for its departure from the World and particularly from

21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
the Indian scene - there remained for him the religion of personal experience and emotion. Communal or dogmatic religion (which is the something) must go not only because it stands in the way of social and intellectual progress, but also because it stands in the way of the evolution of religion itself to its highest form - personal religion.

Nehru did not have any clear concept of religion. He has cited his father, regarding his thoughts on religion, "Of religion I had very hazy notions. It seemed to be a woman's affair. Father and my older cousins treated the question humorously and refused to take it seriously.... I accompanied my mother or aunt to the Ganges for a dip, sometimes we visited temples in Allahabad itself, or in Benares or elsewhere, or went to see a Sanyasi reputed to be very holy. But all this left little impression on my mind."