INTRODUCTION: 'SECULARISATION' AND 'COMMUNALISATION'; THE CONCEPT AND THE PROCESS
Communalism is a very serious problem looming large over India today. Even though it has been an integral part of socio-political life in India for a very long time, the colonial period is widely considered to be responsible for the large-scale communalisation of India. However, its replacement by an independent secular state which was preceded by the partition of the country on communal lines, was expected to lay the foundation for a steady decline of the communalisation of Indian society. But this expectation seems to be progressively belied in recent times. There appears to be now an unparalleled growth of communalism and, consequently, communal tensions in India. It is a fact that communalism has crept into all levels of Indian polity and that there is today a complimentary relationship between politics and communalism. Hence it may be asked if the present problem is a continuation of the same in its colonial mode or is it an altogether discontinuous development.

It is this growth and spread of communalism, in the recent periods, that is proposed to be analysed in this study.
Ironically, most of the analyses of this problem attempts only to trace out the historical roots of this situation, that too, the colonial roots. Results of such an analysis is bound to be ambiguous. In fact, to be concluding that the communal tensions in India, even in the most recent of its political history, are of colonial construction, would amount to casting serious doubt on the nature and the role of our independent secular state during the last fifty years.

In this study, it is argued that the roots of this problem of increasing communalism in the present day India are to be searched in the nature of the modern state itself and in its various policies and programmes of secularisation. In other words, the post-colonial secular state is largely responsible for this development; more specifically, it was the nature of the relationship between the secular and communal politics that actually brought about this rise of communalism. That the most manifest variety of communalism in modern India, i.e. the majority communalism (*Hinduvta* movement) has taken roots in places
where there was a fundamental crisis in the secular Congress \(^1\) (Indian National Congress, INC) party, justifies the above argument. Obviously the rise of Hindu communalism under the auspices of *Jana Sangh* and *Bharatiya Janata Party* has an understandable base in the loss of the established identity of the Congress party as a secular political organ. Consequently any analysis of communalism in India at present should, necessarily include an analysis of the crisis of legitimacy of the philosophy of secularism too.

Paradoxically enough, this has never been the analytical framework of any social scientific studies on communalism in India. On the one hand, the interpretations of the problem of communalism in India almost always appear preoccupied with a colonial interference, and on the other, with the practices or the policies of the emerging ‘Hindutva’ groups. The so-called secular state in independent India has therefore been totally absolved of its role and responsibilities, if not even of its culpability in the rise of communalism.

---

It is, however, not the objective of this study to argue that communalism is altogether a post-independence phenomenon. Nor is it contended that colonialists are not guilty of this development in any manner. However what is proposed here is that the intensification of communalism in India in the recent past is fundamentally a by-product of the failure of the secular parties and the secular state during the last fifty years or so. Slowly but surely, the post-independent Indian state has tended to recede into the dark recesses of communalism and communal violence. What is particularly alarming in this situation is that, in many instances, the state itself has acted in a reprehensively prejudiced manner indulging in non-secular practices. The failure of the state policies has been still more disheartening. The failure to introduce a uniform civil code as stipulated in the Constitution is one of the most telling examples of such a failure. Further, succumbing to the compulsions of electoral politics the state has also followed policies to favour one community or the other at different times.

However, none of these analyses could explain the ambiguities in the practices of the state. This may be attributed

---

2 References can be made to the instances of communal appeasements like the passing of Muslim women’s Bill in 1986, opening the gates of Babri Masjid etc.
as the main factor which must have prevented those analyses from becoming an objective one. In other words the tendency was to look at this phenomenon as a pernicious ideology distilled by an unknown agency and swallowed by the ignorant masses. This has only distracted our understanding. More significantly, the basic contradictions of this phenomenon have always eluded this framework also and as a result it still remains unaddressed and unresolved in India.

It is this recognition which forms the basis of this study. The foundation of the argument is that the emerging problem of communalism has its real base in some of the inherent weaknesses of Indian polity after independence. This analysis intends to look at the political structure, more specifically the varied methods of giving effect to the principle of secularism, as guaranteed by the Constitution. The various schemes and policies initiated by the secular state is examined and analysed.

SECULARISM: THE CONCEPT AND ITS ORIGIN

Secularism is a much used and as a result an amorphous word in India. Along with communalism, it indicates a number of
concerns very often with meanings transformed beyond recognition.

The term ‘secular’ is derived from the Latin word ‘saeculum’ which means ‘age’ or ‘the present age’. It indicates a state of being not connected with and separated from religion. This concept had its origin in a particular western milieu, but in terms of its applicability, it has a universal appeal. It was first of all a Christian phenomenon developed in western Europe after the break-up of the medieval republics of Christendom (the Christian Commonwealth) into different national and territorial states. “It was only after the prolonged and devastating territorial wars of religion had exhausted Continental Europe, that the Western Europe accepted this notion of peaceful co-existence of states subscribing to different religious creeds”. However this process has been an all-time gradual one and the conditions and events that contributed to this process differ from country to country.

---

In the European context, it was the emergence of a liberal tradition and the subsequent Protestant reformation that speeded up this process. New notions of rationality and reason were the products of this liberal thought which brought in a multitude of conflicts within Christendom thus resulting in the emergence of a number of Protestant sects. This necessitated the transformation of the medieval conceptions of doctrinal and ecclesiastical unity of the Christendom, setting the stage for the development of a conception of citizenship not dependent on a common religious faith.  

Factors like English Civil War, American Revolution of 1776, French Revolution of 1789, Russian Revolution of 1917 etc., have been the crucial historical events in the emergence of this new tradition of secularisation in the respective countries. The resultant patterns of secularisation were also different in different countries. However, broadly speaking, there existed certain primary unity of meaning too. As Oommen argues "the Western secularism refers to separating man and society from the transcendental and divine, institutionalising rationality through a process of displacing religiosity and relegation of religion to the

---

7 David Martin *op. cit.*, p-4,5.
private realm of human activity”.  

"It is often perceived as the onward march of rationality aided by science and abetted by technology". On the whole, this underlines a liberal, rational and scientific spirit marking the modernist sphere in social development".  

Like most other modern developments, the Western ideology of secularism too was largely adopted in the East. Imperialist colonisation had been the most effective historical event in this direction. Originally this notion of secularism was brought into the Indian society, as a necessary outcome of the British self-interest. According to D.E. Smith, "It was the result of an attempt to combine the three conflicting imperial roles, the legitimisation of the commercial, imperial objectives, their status as an Indian ruler and their official profession of Christianity". However this policy remained throughout as in-conclusive and its paradoxes have always been in the forefront of their rule. Establishment of the Church of England, patronage of Christian
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9 Ibid., p-117.
10 Ibid.
missionary activities and their much criticised policy of ‘divide and rule’ all stand out markedly in this paradoxical tradition.

SECULARISM IN INDIA - AN ADMINISTRATIVE, POLITICAL BASIS

In India, however, the appeal of secularism stood up against all these absurdities as the nationalist leaders of both pre and post-independent India also took up this policy as a relevant tool to suit their political agenda of fighting colonialism and developing a blueprint for a united Indian nation.¹²

Subsequently secularism and the idea of a secular state were seriously proposed as a national policy with two specific purposes: first to combat communalism which has even resulted in the partition of the subcontinent and secondly, to provide a basis for the development of a socio-religious community into a harmonious society.¹³

In this tradition, it was asserted that, every citizen of India should enjoy freedom of conscience, and the right to freely profess and practice any religion subject to public order and morality. That

¹³ Ibid.
all citizens are equal before the law irrespective of religion, creed, caste or sex. That no disability is attached to citizens for these reasons in regard to public employment and in the exercise of any trade or calling. That the state should observe neutrality with regard to all religions.

Obviously as a result of this, the debates on secularism in India have almost always revolved around this political conception of secular state even after independence. Talking at a function at Oxford University, the then Indian Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru said, "In England the constitutional government has got an official religion while the society is largely secular, but in India, it is the government which is secular whereas the society is religious and non-secular". Similarly one of the prominent writers on secularism in India, Imtiaz Ahmed, argues that the acceptance of the concept of secularism in India have a radical break with its past traditions.

A number of other distinguished sociologists and political scientists have also subscribed to similar views on this issue.

---


Their primary claim is that secularism cannot endure in India because it is a cultural ideology imposed in our country and as a result it can have only a political, or to be more specific, a statist base in India. It is a fact that secularism in India was always accompanied by a long list of cultural contradictions and some of their claims have been found to be true.

COMMUNALISM - THE CONCEPT AND ITS MEANINGS

Along with secularism, communalism is also part of a wide variety of interpretive constructions. A close look at some of these constructions will bring out the base of some of the above formulations on secularism too. In fact, as noted above, the vocabulary as well as the context of the discussion on secularism are the same as that of communalism. It appears that the line demarcating ‘the secular and the sacred’ in India is too thin and as a result communalism too appears as a loose and ambiguous concept like secularism.

The term ‘community’ and ‘communal’ have been used in India with meanings much different from what is commonly understood. The word community has a positive connotation in
the West and is used to express fellowship of relations or feelings, common character, agreement and sharing, and communalism means an expression of this community feeling\(^{16}\).

In India, the word ‘community’ is used mostly in the sense of religious community, i.e., a group of people who share a religion, even though they may not have anything else in common\(^ {17}\). The word communalism is however used in a derogatory sense, i.e. as a case of exclusive loyalty to one’s religious community entertained even if its pursuit is detrimental to the society as a whole. Thus the word ‘communal’ is one of the most negative terms in Indian political vocabulary. It is used to describe an organisation that seeks to promote the interests of a section of the population, presumably detrimental to the larger society as such.

A classical definition of communalism has come from Bipan Chandra. In his words, “communalism is the belief that, because a group of people follow a particular religion they have, as a result, common social, political and economic

\(^{16}\) Saral Jhingran, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

interest". According to him “communalism in India asserts first that the secular interests of a group are coterminous with its religious identity; and secondly, these secular interests are dissimilar and divergent; and finally that they are mutually antagonistic, exclusive and incompatible”. In fact, Bipan Chandra has also made an analysis of the factors that have led to the growth of communalism in India. Two of the most important factors are colonialism and democracy or mass based politics. Interestingly it is claimed that secularism has also had a similar context of origin.

One of the most wide-spread assumptions regarding communalism is that it is a product of colonial rule. Many historians have adopted this approach and have tried to establish a direct connection between colonial policies and the present-day religious communalism. In a famous study entitled “The Construction of Communalism in Colonial North India”, Gyanendra Pandey puts across this conception in a very
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effective manner. According to him, “communalism is a form of colonialist knowledge. The concept stands for the puerile and primitive,.... all that the colonialism in its own reckoning was not”\(^2\). “It captured for the colonialists what they had conceptualised as a basic feature of Indian society - its religious bigotry and its fundamentally irrational character long before the term actually came to be used in its Indian sense”\(^2\). It also served to designate a pathological condition; it was like the term tribalism which has been widely employed in the writings on African politics and history as a statement on the nature of particular primitive societies\(^2\). Pandey went on to observe that “…paradoxically, the nationalists (writers and leaders) have done more than anybody else to propagate this colonialist understanding of communalism”\(^2\). His main contention is that the terms of reference of this understanding were laid down by the colonialists themselves and it is derived from the same liberal ideology in which rationalism and secularism operate as adjacent elements of thought. Both the colonialist and the nationalist interpreters of

\(^2\) [Ibid., p.6.]
\(^2\) [Ibid., p-10.]
\(^2\) [Ibid.]
\(^2\) [Ibid., p-6.]
communalism have also accepted a givenness of communalism in India primarily on the basis of their understanding of the ‘other’ i.e. ‘secular west’. "This is", according to Gyanendra Pandey, "the root of the constructions on communalism in India", and he cites the cases of the absence of any powerful sense of an ‘All Indian Hindu Community’ and ‘All India Muslim Community’ in the 18th century and the appearance of both these categories towards the 20th century as the most visible basis for this colonial origin of the problem of communalism in India.

What is emerging from these analyses is the fact that it is not religion or any such inherent cultural feature of the Indian society that has caused communalism in India. It is simply a product of the European view of Indian society. As Asghar Ali Engineer puts, it is the ‘secular demands, either socio-economic or political in nature, voiced by a religious community by virtue of its belonging to a particular religion, which constitute the core of communalism’. Religion, according to Engineer, is only a powerful instrument in the hands of a group of elites who use it

26 Ibid., p-16.
for the realisation of their secular aspirations. Engineer here makes a very important point that the communal divide was engineered during the pre-partition days by the secular elite and not by the religious leaders. Thus, strangely enough, secularisation seems to have resulted in a greater polarisation of different (religious) communities in a backward socio-economic structure.

Romilla Thapar, another eminent historian, has also expressed similar opinion on the spread of communalism in India. In her words, it was the periodisation of Indian history in the colonial period which encouraged the two-nation theory in which the Hindus and the Muslims were presented as communities generally antagonistic to each other. Thapar argues that the idea of a ‘Hindu Community’ is only a recent construction; it is not found in any of the sources of early history and hence, through a distortion of history, a communal history is constructed, and this acts to legitimise this antagonism between Hindu- Muslim Communities.
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28 Ibid., p.17,39,190, etc.,
30 Ibid.
The colonial history of British India had periodised the Indian history in terms of the Hindu civilisation, Muslim civilisation and the British period. Emphasising the separateness of each period under the dominance of a single religion and thus identifying the historicity of a religious political structure in India all through. This has resulted in an attempt to project the centrality of religion in the political and cultural life of India.

Unfortunately, for India, even the nationalist socio-political discourses, or the post-independent secular formulations, could never move beyond these discursive dominance of Western interpretations. The democratic political consciousness, more or less, remained as a prisoner to this communalist vocabulary all through the modern Indian history. The concept of Indian nation projected under the principle of secularism could never really bring about a transformation in this identity structure. A number of nationalist leaders and scholars came forward demanding an important place for religion in modern Indian national life. Quite naturally, as Saral Jhingran puts it, the concept of giving equal
regard for religions, in the long run came to represent giving equal regard for, or accommodation of all kinds of communal demands.\textsuperscript{31}

Obviously it is here that we can locate a number of ambiguities that have come to co-exist within the concept of secularism in India. In a way, these are nothing but some very serious cultural contradictions.

**CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND THE CULTURAL CONTRADICTIONS OF SECULARISM IN INDIA**

Nehru's conception was that even though the Indian society is basically religious in character, with the introduction of a state sponsored scheme of education and industrialisation, this would easily get transformed into a modernist social structure. Hence it was quite natural for Nehru to conceive the secularisation as a constitutional agenda and it was with this conception that he initiated the large scale modernisation schemes in India. However contrary to all these expectations, those processes developed within themselves a number of ambiguities, more often on the lines of cultural contradictions. The most significant of this

\textsuperscript{31} Saral Jhingram, *op. cit.*, P-171.
contradiction is that Indian state, though not allied with any one religion, in practice, does not dissociate itself from religion as such. In other words, it only embellishes itself with an aura of neutrality by publicly recognising all religions and their social practices. In the process, even customs and practices deriving sanction from religious obscurantism are held sacrosanct and are maintained. The issue of state-endorsed denial of maintenance payments to divorced Muslim women is but one example.

Hence while secularism as an ideology was developed in the West as a result of various factors fundamentally related to an ideological or scientific movement, none of these dimensions ever had any significant progress in the Indian context. As a result, in India, the secularisation as a process had a double edged task of moving both backward and forward as it had to construct a context as well as to emancipate it from another context.

The constructive dimension emerges from the fact that the so-called secular values are, in origin, a European category which is almost non-existent in India. Similarly the emancipatory requirements comes out of the situation that there is an apparent anti-religious bias in the Western concept of secularism which can
have no relevance to India with its spiritualistic, pluralistic and traditionalist nature. Further, secularism as an ideology took its roots in India at a different juncture of history, for reasons different from that of the West.

A number of such differences can be cited here. First of all the European distinction between the spiritual and temporal world has no parallel in any of the Asiatic religions and this make the anti-religious concept of secularism practically irrelevant to India. The traditional pattern of relationship between the religious and the political authority among the countries of this area was one of interdependence. The fact that in Hindu tradition, the Brahmins enjoyed a superior position over the King, who belonged to the varna of Kshatriya and the importance given to both Dharma as the premier code of rules even for kings, indicate this specific historic cultural nature of Indian tradition. Obviously none of these aspects can claim complementarity to the Western notion of secularism. However, the spirit of nationalism and the Freedom Movement simply overlooked these differences and the aforementioned cultural distinctions of India suddenly got re-
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32 D.E. Smith, op. cit., p. 27.
interpreted to suit the modernist values of Western society. To counter the colonial claims of cultural superiority the nationalist Indians began to argue that India also has got numerous secular elements in its tradition. Hence 'secularism' began to be conceived as a cultural category, having its roots in the tolerant Hindu tradition, in the caste-based functional division between religious and political life and in the pluralist multi-religious social composition of India. Quite naturally, these conceptions could not subsume the inherent contradictions, as Imtiaz Ahmed puts it, "this so-called glory of India's past is only a myth and on the other hand the social system of justice in ancient India was founded on the principle of inequality sanctioned and conditioned by religious tradition."

In short, what comes out is the fact that this principle of secularism has more of a political origin in India and that too in the colonial politics. Quite naturally like most other colonial constructions on Indian society this principle is also caught within a specific frame of reference, that the colonialists themselves have brought into being in India. In other words, the principle of
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33 Imtiaz Ahmed, op. cit., p.1169.
‘secularism’ was adopted in India under the framework of an inherent cultural difference between the Western and the Indian cultures and more specifically under a framework of cultural superiority of the West. As a result, the post-independent nationalists accepted the principle of ‘secularism’ as a remedy to counter the emerging communal threats. Yet, while trying to give a locally relevant definition to this principle, the so-called nationalists failed to offer a purely nationalist one. At the same time the attempts for secularisation always revolved around the same socio-political images brought into being in India by the colonialists. Hence, even when secularism was conceived as an inherent cultural feature of India it was attached with a number of exceptions, as only the Western societies could be considered naturally secular.

The secularisation agenda of the nationalist state of free India, therefore, almost completely revolved around the same socio-political framework of community, to be more specific, a communal calculation very much in tune with the Western constructions on India. Whether such a framework is positive or negative, or was unavoidable or not, is not the concern here. The
significant fact is that the nationalistic aspirations of secularisation schemes in India were not really a new framework but were a mere continuation of the colonial procedures. As a result, the very same problem for which the new solution was proposed began to co-exist with the solution itself in a dialectical manner. Hence as Sumantra Bose puts it "...the relationship between secularism and communalism in post-colonial India has been more complex and dialectical rather than simply being adversarial". In fact the net result was a kind of complexification of the whole problem as both the problem as well as the solution got fully abstracted from the reality.

The political and economic spheres have also witnessed similar fall outs. The economic and political competitiveness, unleashed by the process of modernisation, gradually began to sow the seeds of communal discord and within a short span of about half a century the communal violence and tensions seized Indian Society.

In fact, the decision to become a secular state was not an ideologically simple and constitutionally uncomplicated task. As is
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34 Sumantra Bose, *op.cit.*, p.106.
well known, the term ‘secular’ was not included in the original Constitution of India. It was introduced into it only through an amendment of the Constitution subsequently.35

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SECULARISM AS A NATIONAL IDEOLOGY

The most important factor that has determined the profession and understanding of secularism in India is the pluralistic constitution of the Indian society and its complex heritage which necessitates mutual toleration for a peaceful and harmonious social existence.36 Even though the ancient Indian heritage is often considered to have influenced our understanding of secularism in India, its conceptual and ideological formulations have been the products of a specific historical situation in the early 20th century. This situation seems to have emerged from the contributions of British colonialism and the processes of modernisation initiated by them. Under colonialism, despite their much publicised secularist image, the imperialists seem to have perceived the Indian society

35 The word ‘secular’ was introduced in the constitution through the 42nd Amendment Act of 1976, by incorporating the word ‘secular’ into the preamble itself.

36 Saral Jhingran, op.cit., p.120.
through a framework of religious identities and acted accordingly.

Such a policy began to draw a dividing line between the different communities, particularly between the dominant Hindu community and the most numerous minority community, the Muslims. The fact that the end of the colonial rule was marked by a division of the Indian sub-continent on a religious basis itself is a proof of the past situation. Strangely enough, the process of communalisation of Indian society, therefore, inherited this secularist or modernist basis of the colonial rule. In a way this is also the most serious paradox of the problem of communalism in contemporary India and it is this paradox that has been the root of ambiguities in the process of establishing a secular society in India.

Paradoxically, instead of having any cultural references, this was more significantly catering to the political necessities of that time which in turn provided scope for several contradictory developments. Invariably, a multitude of images and counter images of Indian society emerged out of this political tradition alone and as Asghar Ali Engineer puts it “Secularism, therefore,
became a bone of contention\(^3\). The problem here is that the debates centring around these concepts never really attempted to resolve these contradictions. As Engineer again puts it, “these formulations, therefore, turned out to be mere philosophical expressions rooted in the self-interests of the respective groups and what is of concern is not this or that concept of secularism”\(^4\).

What is coming out from the foregoing introduction is that the principles of secularism as they are conceived in India are in the midst of a number of ambiguities. Each different formulation of this concept simultaneously reconstruct its opposite with equal relevance.

The widespread claims of a cultural basis for secularism in India based on the belief that Indian society was traditionally tolerant is, however, silent about the intolerant and conservative basis of our culture. Hence, while projecting the secular traditions, the fact that the first ever religious protest movements, dating back to the sixth century BC, giving birth to Jainism and Buddhism, have taken place in India is often forgotten. It is also ignored


\(^{4}\) \textit{Ibid.}
that both Buddhism and Jainism are largely expatriate religions now and that they constitute only one percent of India's population at present 39.

Similarly the nationalistic claims for the need of secularism also contain a few contradictions. First of all, as we noted above the views about the colonial basis of the problem of communalism in India are not fully correct. This in any way is irrelevant to the problem of communalism in modern India. Secondly the so-called secularist projects of the nationalists are not characterised by any substantial difference of approach from that of the colonialists and, as a matter of fact, they were also pursuing the conceptual framework and policy of the latter.

It is widely perceived that the colonialists projected a secular image not based on their socio-political policies but on the claims of a difference from the alleged communal character of the Indian society in order to, suit their agenda of colonial rule with a difference 40.

The same can be said about the nationalist secularists also, as they too have retained this 'secular image' only by invoking an

39 T. K. Oommen, op. cit., p.121.
40 Gyanandra Pandey, op. cit., p-5.
opposite image upon their political opponents. These nationalists never initiated a shift in the basic policy of the state; in other words, they functioned within the same colonial political framework with an 'abstract difference'. Just as the colonial rule in reality contributed to an intensification of communal tensions in India, the policies of the so-called secular nationalists are pushing India towards the same consequences, may be with even more intensity.

The case of the Muslim League in India is a good example of the above mentioned manipulation of the concept. The Muslims are often held to be the original communalisers in the subcontinent, notwithstanding the fact that the Muslim League, as a political party, came into being in India as a result of the numerous compromises of the so-called secularists and nationalists with other communal elements in India. Even so, as Ayesha Jalal puts it, “the original sin of being communalists for the most part has been reserved for the subcontinent’s Muslims”.\(^{41}\) In other words, while the majority communalism very easily passed off as rudimentary nationalism, the majority Communalism
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\(^{41}\) Ayesha Jalal and Sugata Bose, *op.cit.*, p. 78.
by its very nature, stands off and shrieks, so to say, and expresses itself as 'different', 'divisive', 'separatist' and 'anti-national'.

More significantly these discourses brought into existence a largely arbitrary and exclusionary meaning of communalism also. Hence the secular nationalists' own communal intentions and policies always went unaddressed in the analytical process, even though it was their contributions which really resulted in an institutionalisation of this problem. The seemingly inadvertent contributions of the political incumbents in power is an aspect all too often overlooked because of the above mentioned one-sided focus on the characteristics and activities of the apparently overt functionaries in the opposition.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

However there had been widespread reluctance among scholars of contemporary India, to situate this crisis within a broader, substantive critique of the above mentioned type of arbitrary discourses. What is often attempted is an exaggerated projection of the religious-communal dimension of this crisis,
completely putting aside the political base of the problem. Of course, this is not to deny the fact that besides the political factors, there are also other communalising elements in Indian society. Communalism in India is a very complex problem with deep roots in the history of Indian society. However, our chief argument here is that the contemporary Indian situation is a much different one and the communal history has only a minor influence on the present day crisis of India which has more to do with the post-independence politics of the country than with its pre-independence history.

The present study is therefore an attempt to bring to light these inherent contradictions, more specifically, the manipulative political discourses on secularism and communalism in independent India. What is argued here is that, since 'secularism' was adopted as a political option in India and more particularly as an agenda of national development by the ruling state apparatus and the political party, it is the failure of these organs that have actually contributed to an increase in communal tensions in India in recent times.