Chapter-VIII
State and Religion

Relationship of Guru Nanak's Vision

Relationship between State and Religion has always been a matter of much controversy since the inception of the institution of State. Even at present there are some people who vehemently argue that the realms of activity of State and Religion are entirely different and the both have nothing to do with each other's functions. At the same time, there are those who consider State and Religion to be closely related to each other and argue that both are inseparable.

The word 'Religion' is derived from the Latin word religare which means to tie back. According to W.L. Rease, religion refers to an institution with a recognised body of communicants who gather regularly for worship and accept a set of doctrines offering some means of relating the individual to what is taken to be ultimate nature of reality.

Here, a brief study of the various perspectives on the relationship between State and Religion will be helpful in understanding the changes that took place in this relationship from time to time.

2. W.L. Rease, Dictionary of Philosophy and Religion P.48
In the Western Political Thought, the relationship between State and Religion varies with the different political thinkers.

In the scheme of the state of Plato's vision, "Religion, like education, is subjected to the rules and regulations of the state. Plato forbids private religious exercise. Religious rites will be performed only in public temples and that too by authorised priests. He also suggests that a creed of religion must be created by the state. This makes the Platonic state a theoratic state, which is contrary to the principles of secularism. He proposes penalty for the disbelieffulness of religion and even imprisonment and death to the atheist."¹

Aristotle regards it as an essential function of the state to take proper care of religion. For the proper maintenance of the life of state,"....fifthly, or rather first, there must be a care of religion, which is commonly called worship."²

It is noteworthy that before the advent of Christianity, no distinction was made between the religious duties and the duties to the state. "In the classical polities of Greece and Rome duties to God were not distinguished from duties to the state, for the

gods were the gods of the state. Similarly for the Jews of the Old Testament, Jehovah was the God of Israel, and it was impossible to distinguish the service of Jehovah from the service of Israel."

"Christianity introduced into medieval politics a new concept of spiritual power independent of, and even superior to, political authority. But when Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire in the 4th century, and the only permitted faith in the 5th, it led to the rapid development of the theory determining the relations between the Church and the state."

According to Prof. Dunning, "The starting point in all medieval theorizing on politics was the dogma of the two powers." This dogma of the two powers, popularly known as Gelasion theory of Parallelism or the theory of 'Two Swords' goes back to the command of Christ in the Gospels: 'Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' It informs the teaching of St. Paul

1. Michael B. Foster, Masters of Political Thought, Volume I, Plato to Machiavelli, P.232

* Pater says to Christ in the Gospel: "Lo, here are two swords" (Luke XXII,38), and the two swords were regarded in the Middle Ages as the symbol of the two powers." Quoted in Michael B. Foster,op.,cit.,P.235
and St. Peter in their epistles. "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God."¹ "Fear God, Honour the King."² Thus, the "New Testament holds that government was a divine institution obedience to which was at once a political necessity and a religious obligation."³ "It is the principle of Augustine's doctrine that the Christian on his pilgrimage in the world makes use of the peace of the "earthly city".⁴ "It was, indeed, the modus vivendi of the early church in the Roman world that its members hold themselves bound to pay absolute obedience to the civil magistrate, save only when he sought to control their worship and religious belief."⁵

"They (i.e. the civil authorities) shrink from interference with religious matters, and recognize that these do not fall within the measure of their authority, which has been allotted to them for the judgment of human things, nor also for the controlling of divine things ... But, after the coming of Christ (who was Himself both the true king and the true priest), no emperor thereafter has assumed the title of priest, and no priest has seized

1. Rom, XIII, 1, quoted in Michael B. Foster, op.cit., p.231
2. I Peter II, 17., quoted in Michael B. Foster, op.cit., p.231
3. R. Pandey, Political Thought: Plato to Machiavelli, p.305
5. Ibid.
a regal throne .... For Christ, being mindful of human frailty, provided by a grand dispensation for the salvation of his people. He separated the kingly duties and powers from the priestly, according to the different functions and dignity proper to each, wishing that his people should be preserved by a saving humility, and not again ensnared by human pride", observed Pope Gelasius.

According to John of Salisbury, "The prince is a minister of the priestly power, and one who exercises that side of the sacred offices which seems unworthy of the hands of the priesthood. As the original and true owner of the temporal sword, the Church has the right to depose the prince if he violates the law of God and disregards the precepts of the Church, for he who can lawfully bestow can lawfully take away."²

"St. Augustine had already described the Church as the visible sign of the City of God, whose business was the regulation of heavenly life. The saving of souls was regarded more important than the regulation of mere physical life which was a concern of the state. St. Ambrose of Milan had said that "the glory of princes was to the glory of bishops as the brightness of lead to the brightness of gold".³

1. Tractus, IV,II; quoted in Michael B. Foster, op.cit., PP. 231-32
3. Ibid., p. 284
St. Thomas Aquinas regards governing as steering of a ship. While expounding the relation between the state and Church, he compares the function of the temporal ruler with that of the ship's carpenter, whose task is to keep the ship in repair while on voyage. The task of the Church is like that of the pilot, who has to steer the ship to the goal of its voyage. According to him, the state is not independent of the Church, and is subordinate to it in so far as their spheres of authority overlap.

Marsilio of Padua, a staunch secularist, holds that the Church is definitely and clearly subordinate to the authority of the state. He treats the clergy like an ordinary citizen. As ordinary citizen he cannot claim exemption from secular laws. According to Marsilio, the task of civil government was the maintenance of peace. The Chief disturber of the peace of Christendom was the bishop of Rome 'called Pope'. But his power rests on no divine sanction, it has been created by man, and by man it may be and should be destroyed, and until it is destroyed, there can be no true peace. The clergy has no coercive authority of any kind, divine or human, temporal or spiritual.

1. Michael B. Foster, op.cit., P. 259
2. Sukhbir Singh, op.cit., PP 342-43
Machiavelli, the Western contemporary of Guru Nanak, does not recognise the distinction between the Human Law and the Divine Law. He denies any claim by the Church not merely to superiority but to independence of the state.

But this does not mean that Machiavelli despises religion. He writes, in the title of a chapter in his Discourses, the "importance of giving religion a prominent influence in a state, and how Italy was ruined because she failed in this respect through the conduct of the Church of Rome".  

Similarly, he writes at the opening of the same chapter, "Princes and Republics who wish to maintain themselves free from corruption must above all things preserve the purity of all religious observances and treat them with proper reverence; for there is no greater indication of the ruin of a country than to see religion contemned."

"Machiavelli's theory is not hostile to religion. Religion, he thinks, is necessary for the health and prosperity of a state....This is to attribute to religion an important place within the state; but a place within the state, not above it or beside it.

1. Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livius, Book I, Chapter XII, quoted in Michael B. Foster, op. cit., P. 269.

2. Ibid.,
Machiavelli praises religion as instrumental to the ends of the state, and the Church as an organ of the state. That is to say, he values religion in its pagan form, but rejects the Christian principle.\footnote{Sukhbir Singh, op.cit., p. 387}

However, Machiavelli makes a systematic attempt to dissociate politics from ethics. According to him, "the keeping of faith is praiseworthy, but for the sake of maintaining political power, deceit and hypocrisy are indispensable."\footnote{The Prince, C.18, quoted in Sukhbir Singh, op.cit., p. 376}

Luther preached the divine origin of authority and the doctrine of passive obedience which strengthened the hands of national monarchies in many parts of the world.\footnote{Michael B. Foster, Op.cit. pp. 269-70}

According to Calvin, the State is based on two fundamental ideas, viz., the sovereignty of God and the Fall of Man. To him men are evil, nine out of ten being damned. Secular Government is, therefore, necessary to preserve order.\footnote{Michael B. Foster, Op.cit. pp. 269-70} Both the Christian Church and the Christian State, in his view, are created by God.\footnote{Michael B. Foster, Op.cit. pp. 269-70} Since the authority of the
Church is spiritual, it should include no element of secular concern. And the authority of the State is temporal, its jurisdiction, therefore, should be confined to the physical and external existence of man. But the two are equally sancrosanct.\(^1\)

But Calvin was willing to obey the secular authority as long as it obeyed the theocracy, but where the government was hostile, Calvinism developed an authority.\(^2\) The Geneva system which grew up under Calvin's influence was Church-state because it was "Theocratic in principle and aristocratic in operation."\(^3\)

The secular authority, however, benefitted such theories. So much so that James I, holds that the wickedness of a King can never make subjects that are ordained to be judged by him, to become his judges.\(^4\)

The above discussion shows that in the Western World, religion was ultimately subjected to the authority of the state.

---

1. Sukhbir Singh, \textit{op.,cit.}, P.393
2. Ibid., P. 393
3. Ibid., P.383
The concept of religion in the sense in which it is available in the Western world did not exist in ancient India. "The Sanskrit word dharma is usually rendered into English as 'religion'. But the two words are not exactly the same in meaning. The essence of religion is creed, of dharma, religion." Thus dharma is wider in its signification than religion as it includes the ideas of virtue, piety, duty and law.

The ancient Indian conception of dharma "centred on a code of life adapted to the caste and station of each man by which the whole gamut of his duties - moral, social, and religious - was determined. Each caste had its own dharma but dharma was also the moral order and truth, and satya, transcending the gods and preserved by them." 

In ancient India, the term dharma connoted the varnasrama dharma which was regarded as the divinely ordained social order. It was based on the Sacred Law which prescribed the ethics which varied with each varna.

1. P.N. Banerjee, Public Administration in Ancient India, PP. 193-200 quoted in N.Q Pankaj, State And Religion In Ancient India,P.187
2. N.Q. Pankaj, op.,cit.,P.187
3. Ibid., P.70
Dharma was regarded as the essence of ideal kingship. Ancient authors advocated righteous administration by the king. Only a righteous king could ensure a righteous and prosperous people while an evil king meant the reverse. The political righteousness was stressed in the ancient Indian polity. But the Brahmana canonists conceive that the king's righteousness is relative in the sense that he is primarily governed by the distinctive laws of his order which are sufficiently elastic in their composition to permit incorporation of rules and principles from the Arthasastra.¹

In ancient India, the promotion of dharma was regarded as one of the foremost aims of the state. The king was expected to encourage piety and virtue and to grant aid to religious institutions of various sects. According to the Vedic Literature, the "king or the head of the state was to be like god Varuna, the upholder of the law and order (dhrityvrata); he was to punish the wicked and help the virtuous. Religion was to be promoted, morality was to be patronised."²

---

1. N.Q. Pankaj, op. cit., PP. 71-186
2. Chandogya Upanishad, V II.5, quoted in A.S. Altekar, State And Government In Ancient India pp. 47-48
In the early Vedic times, no sharp demarcation of distinction was made between the religious and political activities of the people. "The king had purohita who was not merely the priest of the royal household but a public functionary who shared with the king the responsibility for the safety of the state."1 "It was his duty to pray or sacrifice in the assembly house for the victory of the king."2

"The connection of state with dharma in the Brahmanic period was of a peculiar kind. The religious rites and ceremonies and the ethical rules of conduct were settled and declared by the Brahmanas, matters with which the state did not interfere. But it was the duty of the king and his officials to enforce on the people the observance of their respective duties."3 The king was thus the protector of the religion. Moreover, the king had to act according to the instruction of Purohita, the royal priest, who had now become an institution by himself, and through him the injunctions of religion.4

2. R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalkar (Eds.), The Vedic Age, p. 451, quoted in N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., p.188
3. Apastamba, II,X,27,18; Vasistha XIX,8, quoted in N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., p.189
4. N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., p.189
Now the question arises to what extent the ancient Indian state was theocratic. "A theocracy may arise when a King usurps the functions of the Church, as was the case with the Khalifas, or when the head of the Church becomes the King as is the case with the Dalai Lama of Tibet and the Pope of the Vatican Kingdom. Or, the king may be a mere agent or instrument of the church, as was the case for some time in Europe during the 8th and 9th centuries A.D. The Pope and the bishops at this time claimed the right to punish the King, if he was not ruling according to the will of God".

"Gautama-Dharmasutra (C.500 B.C.) claims that the royal authority does not touch the priest and reminds the king that he can prosper only if supported by the latter. If he does not employ a qualified Brahmana priest, says the Aitareya Brahmana, gods will not at all accept his oblations. At the time of the coronation, the King three times bows before the Brahmana; he thereby accepts his subordinate position, and as long as he does so, he will prosper. Priests

1. A.S. Altekar, op.,cit.,P.51
2. Gautama Dharmasutra, I.II. quoted in A.S. Altekar, op.,cit., P.51-52
4. Ibid., III,9, quoted in A.S. Altekar, op.,cit.,P.52
like Vasishtha exercised profound influence on the royal court. Rituals were also devised to ensure the subordination of the Kshatriyas and the Vaisyas to the Brahmanas. In the Rigveda there is a clear passage to show that a King, who honoured his chaplain properly, could secure an easy mastery over his subjects and a smashing defeat over his enemies. These evidences show that down to the end of the Brahmana period (C. 1000 B.C.) the priests tried to extend their sway over the monarch and through him over the state though they could never succeed in having full control over the monarch. Dr. U.N. Ghoshal refers to the "striking fact that this class (the Brahmanas) throughout our history failed to assert (except in theory and in legend) its claim to control kings and emperors."

1. Pāñchavimśa Brāhmaṇa, XI, II.1., quoted in A.S. Altekar, op.cit.,P.52
2. Rigveda, IV., 50-7-9, quoted in A.S. Altekar, Op.,cit., P.52
3. Dr. U.N. Ghoshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, P.7
The mixture of politics and religion was not a deliberate and exclusive feature of ancient Indian polity. The mingling of religious ideas with political thoughts in the ancient Indian polity helped the governments to be stable in every sense in the conditions of the time. No sharp distinction seems to have been made between religion and state or government as everything was viewed through religious glasses. The religious orientation was very pronounced in the ancient Indian polity. The conception of dharma in relation to the state indicated that the latter was ultimately tied up with the final goal of existence.¹

In the Mauryan period, religion came to be used for securing the stability of the state. "The most important development in the administrative methods of the Mauryan state was the skilful use of religion for serving political ends. A master of the science and craft of politics, Kautilya gave a place of honour to the orthodox religious system. Basically he supported the Brahmanical social order and opposed heretical sects."²

1. N.O. Pankaj, op.cit., pp.186-87
2. Ibid., P.191
"The patronage and regulations of temples was simply another area of state administration. However, the Arthasastra did undermine the theoretical basis of the promotion of religion by the state. The religious measures of the Mauryan state were intended to strengthen royal power, though the tradition of Vedas is accepted and the king is charged with the preservation of custom and religion".  

"Strikingly enough, Kautilya makes deliberate use of religion in deceiving masses and securing their loyalty to the state. He recommends the exploitation of religion for political ends. He always thinks in terms of the state and values asceticism primarily for its usefulness in espionage and intelligence activities". 

The non-Brahmanical literature points to some significant changes in the relationship between state and religion. The Buddha was primarily occupied with social and religious problems of his times. Whenever

1. Arthasastra, quoted in N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., p.191
2. N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., pp.,191-92
necessary, he made a positive approach to give to religious institutions some moral temper. A close study of the Buddhist literature makes it clear that the heterodox ideology was not only fighting against the Brahmanical religious practices but was also contesting the neo-political ideals and unrestrained military life of the monarchs which was destructive of the traditional social system. The Buddha attempted to strike out a rapprochement between religious ideals and political power, which ultimately proved to be a bold and positive contribution to Indian polity.¹

Dharma, in the conception of the Buddhist canonists, signifies especially the principle of righteousness. The Buddhist dharma in its relation to the king involves the application of the universal ethics of Buddhism to the State administration, this principle being even extended, to the concept of the World-ruler.²

2. U.N. Ghoshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, P. 73.
"The Buddhist conception of dharma did not accept its theological and metaphysical aspects as absolute truths and the highest reality. It concentrated on its operation in the laws of nature and the mutual relations and conduct of men. The Buddhist ideas aimed at laws applicable to the whole mankind and thus paved the way for an unlimited imperialism", 1 "In the eyes of the Buddhist canonists the standard of ethics is absolute in the sense that the same moral law governs the conduct of the laxity, whether king or commoner." 2

Asoka who was a ruler of rare imagination, sought to merge dharma and politics together to all possible extent, bringing dharma within state control. He departed from the orthodox tradition of recognising the Vedic polity and orthodox social and religious laws. He introduced his own dharma in the state and the empire, which incorporates the essence of Buddhism. His dharma based on ethics, non-violence, and antivedic policy of abolishing sacrifices and class privileges on account of his adherence to Buddhism was

1. The Book of Gradual Sayings, I. pp. 94-95, quoted in N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., p.70
2. Jātaka, (Fausboll's ed.), I. 260, quoted in N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., P.71
diametrically opposed to the spirit of Kautilya who upholds positivism in politics, but duly recognizes the varna system, the sacrificial cult, and the claims of the upper classes.¹

"After the Mauryas the state, for a short while, developed a partisan character in contemporary religious matters. Some of the rulers showed partisan spirit either as followers of Brahmanism or Buddhism in the foundation and execution of state policies and strove to promote the ideals of their own religions. The tradition of royal patronage had its origin with Asoka extended in later ages also. It was mainly the age of Brahmanic revival".² In the post-Mauryan period, religion began to be used to strengthen the power and the position of the king and it became an ally of the state. In turn it pleaded for its own protection.³

"With the rise of the Guptas the alliance between religion and state was firmly established. But by proclaiming a policy of religious tolerance to all, the period manifested its progressive and

1. N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., p.195
2. Ibid., p. 196
3. Ibid., pp.196-7
secular nature. The secular tone of the state was not a negative policy, rather it was a policy that the state adopted to secure that social good which it had realized under the Mauryans, the realization of which was incompatible with religious partisanship and persecution. The adoption of this policy involved royal control over religion in a negative manner. 1

The fore-going discussion shows that in India also, the supremacy of the state was established and religion was relegated to the secondary position.

The rule of the Muslims in India is often designated as Muslim Theocracy. A Theocratic state is based on the assumption that unity of religion is, more or less, necessary in order to maintain order and harmony in society and unity among the citizens of the State. In a theocratic state, every subject is forced to embrace the faith followed by his ruler. Thus, conformity by all to one faith is stressed with all staunchness. It is presumed that the theocracy is the rule of God according to His commandments revealed through His messengers, and that the ruler is the agent of God on the earth and he is answerable to God alone for the performance of his duties. Moreover, "a theocratic state is based

1. N.Q. Pankaj, op.cit., p.197
on the presumption that the rulers are answerable, not for the welfare of the bodies of their subjects, but for the salvation of their souls, and that the end of all political endeavour is not in this world but the next.1

The Muslim rulers were informed and guided by the doctrines of the political Islam as expounded by the Mujaddid.2 They, impelled by their fanatic fancies and whims regarded their own faith viz. Islam as the best on the earth and looked at the other faiths with contempt. Their rule was not the rule of God but that of fanaticism. They employed their coercive authority to spread their own faith by forcible conversion of the people of other faiths into their own faith. The people in India who conformed to their own faiths had to lead terrible life under the reign of the Muslim rulers. They were relegated to the position of slaves and tax was levied on their gods and temples. So much so that the whole paraphernalia of worship was put under the Muslim garb and the Supreme being was given

2. Ibid., P. XV.
the name 'Allah'. Guru Nanak comments on his contemporary conditions under the Muslim Theocracy in the following words: -

In Kali-Yuga appeared Atharva-Veda, when God was given the name Allah, In this age people wear blue and is established the rule of Turks and Pathans.

Further: -

Now that the turn of the Sheikhs has come, the Primal Lord is called Allah: And the (Hindu) gods and temples have been taxed: such is the current way: The ablution pot, the prayer, the prayer - mat, the call to prayer, have all assumed the Muslim garb; even God is now robed in blue (like the Muslim did): And men have changed their tongue and the Muslim way of greetings prevails.

It is evident from the above-quoted verses that the people especially those who believed in the faiths other than that of the ruler or the ruling class, enjoyed no religious and cultural freedom in the Muslim State.

1. Guru Nanak, Adi Granth, p. 470
2. Ibid., p. 1191
Guru Nanak while commenting on the political situation of his times, observes that there is no religion, in the real sense of the word, seen anywhere in the state; the rulers who are supposed to ensure the security of the subjects have themselves become butchers and strike terror among the people. To quote him:

The Kaliage is a knife, kings are butchers;
Religion (Righteousness and Justice) has taken wings and fled.¹

Guru Nanak's Perspective:

In order to understand Guru Nanak's perspective on the relationship between State and Religion aright it is necessary to know what Guru Nanak means by Religion. Religion, to Guru Nanak, is no 'ism' or institution; it is Ethics. To put it in terse terms, Ethics is Religion, in Guru Nanak's view. The Ethics, as advocated by Guru Nanak is such a code of conduct as exalts man to a trans-personal plane and makes him a man of righteousness, contentment, service, mercy and truth. He is, no more, an ego-centric, he no more cherishes the selfish interests; rather he dedicates his life to the service of humankind. He rises above all parochial considerations and thinks and works for the welfare and uplift of humankind as a whole seeing only God in each and every being.

¹ Guru Nanak, Adi Granth, P. 145
Religion (Dharma), according to Guru Nanak, is the off-spring of Mercy (Daya) which is the sublime ethical virtue. To quote him:

The Bull of Dharma is son of Mercy
Contentment holds the creation together.

Truthful living is the essence of his religion. The importance Guru Nanak's thought attaches to truthful living is evident from the following words:

Truth is higher than everything else;
but higher still is truthful living.

The religiosity of a person is determined in terms of the truthfulness of his actions i.e. the observance of ethical principles of religion by him in all the spheres of life—social, political and economic. The truthful living viz. the righteous living of all the individuals ensures order and harmony in the society.

As far as the relationship between State and Religion is concerned, Guru Nanak is not in favour of claim of any formalised faith by the State as its own religious faith. The State of his vision is not the so-called Theocratic State. He regards the assumptions of the theocratic state

1. Guru Nanak, _Adi Granth_, P. 3
2. Ibid., P. 62
as unwarranted. He does not feel the necessity of conformity to the faith of the ruler by all the citizens of the state for establishment of order and harmony in the state. On the contrary, he believes that there is a fundamental unity in the ethics of all true religions of the world though they appear to be diverse. It is this fundamental unity of ethics of the apparently diverse religions that the order and harmony of the state will be a corollary.

The general tenor of Guru Nanak's thought shows that he does not uphold the Divine Rights of Kings according to which the rulers are directly answerable to God alone and the laws made by the kings are considered to be the laws of God Himself and the king is regarded as an incarnation of divinity. In the political system of Guru Nanak's vision, the ruler will have no divine rights; rather the right to govern the State will be bestowed upon him by the Sangat viz. the people who, however, are the representatives of God on the earth. The laws in the State of his vision will not be made by the ruler himself but by the Sangat. Only such laws as framed by the Sangat will be considered to be the laws given by God. The ruler will not be regarded as the incarnation of divinity; rather he will also be one
among the Sangat. No doubt, God pervades in all the individuals and the ruler, being an individual, will not deserve any special honour because of his status as a ruler.

But it does not mean that the State of Guru Nanak's vision is a Secular State or a non-religious State. To him State and Religion are inseparable. In his state, politics and ethics must go side by side. In it, political power will not be used for upholding, protecting, promoting and spreading any particular faith. However, the spirit of religion will be promoted. In the political system envisaged by Guru Nanak, the ethical principles of religion will reign supreme. This system is such in which every individual may be the Ruler, a Panch or only a citizen of the State, cannot do without observance of religion viz. ethical principles. In this system, the Ruler can retain his office only if he is responsive to the aspirations of the people and has an awful respect for the advice of the Panches - the Five Accepted Ones, the representatives of the Sangat. To quote Guru Nanak:

The ruler retains his office due to his good qualities, And till he discharges his duties with the advice and in the fear of the Panches.

1. Guru Nanak, Adi Granth, P.992
For the ruler of the State of Guru Nanak's vision, Religion is not only essential but it is indispensable. Guru Nanak prescribes the way in which the ruler can practise his religion. According to Guru Nanak, he can do so by governing the State with justice. In other words, administration of justice is the very religion of the ruler. To quote him:

A ruler can purify his mind
by administering justice.\(^1\)

The Religious principles viz. the ethical principles are, in fact, the guiding principles which will guide the Ruler, the Panches and the Sangat of the State of Guru Nanak's vision to discharge their respective duties in the best possible way and lead their lives worthily and honourably. Moreover, in the State of Guru Nanak's vision, worship of God will be essential, but to 'worship', here, does not mean worship in the formal sense practised by the people of different faiths or sects in different ways. It simply means 'remembrance of God' by one and all i.e. never to forget God who is the sole Giver to all the beings. It is well expressed by Guru Nanak in the following words:

\(^{1}\) Guru Nanak, Adi Granth, P. 1240.
God is the sole Giver to all,
lest I should forget Him ever.¹

Thus Guru Nanak frees the State from the yoke of formalised faiths or institutionalised religions; but at the same time, he considers it essential that Religion must prevail in the State. Guru Nanak's State, in stead of being a Theocratic or Secular State is, in fact, a Sangatocratic Service State in which no institutionalised religion or sect will be the religion or sect of the state. The sole religion of the State will be the service to its people. Moreover, its people will not only have full freedom of following any faith and practising the religious activities according to their own choice, but they must always remember the Sole God. Thus Guru Nanak regards State and Religion inseparable and he envisages a pragmatic relationship between the two.

¹. Guru Nanak, Adi Granth, P.2