Chapter 2

Religious Violence: Sacrifice to Human bomb

In this chapter efforts will be made to understand the nuances of the phenomenon of religious violence through the study of some related phenomena and concepts which are often used in the discourse of religious conflicts resulting into violence and the understanding of which will be helpful in the analysis and understanding of religious violence. Among them, sacrifice and circumcision are considered to be forms of ritual violence which are/have been wide-spread in many religious traditions, the concepts of Holy-War, Crusade, Jihad, and Dharma-yudh are of tradition specific origins, whereas the concept of martyrdom is more or less ubiquitous; traditionalism, fundamentalism, communalism, and terrorism are of comparatively, recent origin and provide the ideological understanding of religious violence being inflicted by various religious groups/traditions. These concepts may contribute in the thematic understanding of the initiation of religious violence, its actual occurrence, escalation, justification(s), or condemnation(s). We divide these concepts broadly in four groups namely ritual, war, ideology and praxis.

I RITUALS

Sacrifice

Sacrifice has been a major ritual in many religious traditions in the past, continuing well into the present, though loosing its original cultic importance and retaining symbolic value only. In the early Vedic religion, performance of Sacrifice (yajna in Sanskrit) was the central ritual,\(^1\) similar was the position in the Roman\(^2\) and


Greek

3 religions. In the first chapter, we referred to the story of Abel and Cain, the sons of the first human couple as per the Old Testament and the “first murder” by Cain whose offering of agricultural produce could not propitiate God who had accepted animal offerings (or sacrifice) from Abel, a shepherd. Realising that God can be placated only by blood offerings; Cain also offers a sacrifice – not of an animal, but by the blood of his own brother. 4 Therefore, it does not remain the first murder but becomes, probably, the first human sacrifice in Judaism as well as Christianity. Next in the Jewish tradition is the much debated offer (or near sacrifice) of his son Isaac as sacrificial victim on the command of God by Abraham. 5 In Islam, the willing offering of his son Ishmael by Ibrahim (Abraham) to God is remembered till today and celebrated by killing animal such as sheep and goats on Id-al-Adha (Feast of Sacrifice). 6 In Christianity, the death of Jesus Christ on cross is presented as the final (perfect) sacrifice for effacement of sin of the whole humanity. 7 These are just a few instances which show the presence of “sacrifice” in some of the major religions, but the first task is to define it.

The Random House Dictionary defines sacrifice as follows: “(as) noun 1. the offering of animal, plant or human life or of some material possession to a deity, as in propitiation or homage. 2. something that is so offered. 3 the surrender or destruction of something prized or desirable for the sake of something considered as having a higher or more pressing claim. 4. the thing so surrendered or devoted. . . . (as) verb ... 7. to make a sacrifice or offering of. 8. to surrender or give up or permit injury or

3 “Rites (Greek).” ibid. 425-26.
5 Genesis 22.
6 “’Id” The Penguin Dictionary of Religions op. cit. 230.
disadvantage to, for the sake of something else. . . .”

Whereas, Oxford Dictionary defines it as: (as noun) “1. the fact of giving up something important or valuable to you in order to get or do something that seems more important; something that you give up in this way. 2 sacrifice (to somebody) the act of offering something to a god, especially an animal that has been killed in a special way; an animal, etc. that is offered in this way. (as verb) 1 sacrifice something (for somebody/ something) to give up something that is important or valuable to you in order to get or do something that seems more important for yourself or for another person. 2 to kill an animal or a person and offer it or them to a god, in order to please the god.”

From the above we find many layers of the meaning of the word sacrifice – the ritual or process of offering something of importance; that what is offered and it may not necessarily be animate as it can be both animate and inanimate; and the slaughtering or giving up in itself etc. It has similar symbolic meanings in the day to day life in the secular world also. But these meanings seem to be bereft of the function or purpose of the act as they are far removed from the real act as Jill Robbins ascribes the enigmatic nature of sacrifice to the fact that “the old sacrifice is no longer practiced.”

The etymology of the term sacrifice shows its origin from the Latin sacrificium from sacer – holy and facere – to make, which gives meaning in the sense of a religious act which makes an object holy by sanctifying or consecrating it.

E. O. James defines sacrifice as “a rite in the course of which something is forfeited or destroyed, its object being to establish relations between a source of spiritual strength and one in need of such strength, for

---

the benefit of the later.”¹² Henry Hubert and Marcel Mauss give the following definition: “Sacrifice is a religious act which, through the consecration of a victim, modifies the conditions of the moral person who accomplishes it or that of certain objects with which he is connected.”¹³ This way sacrifice is defined through its social function. They give the name “sacrifier” to the “subject to whom the benefits of sacrifice thus accrue, or who undergoes its effects.”¹⁴ But as already seen above, the victims was not always necessarily an animal or human being, it could be inanimate things or plants or their produce.¹⁵ The definitions so far make difference between sacred and the profane world more or less on the lines of Durkheim, the need of the profane or the worldly for the sacred which is wholly other, more powerful and can not be approached in a casual manner, therefore a mediator is required. As Hubert and Mauss say that despite being used for differently purposes, sacrifice “consists in establishing a means of communication between the sacred and profane worlds through the mediation of a victim, that is, of a thing that in the course of ceremony is destroyed.”¹⁶ But the role of medium of communication was no less important, for example the first few hymns of Rig Veda are addressed to Agni, the fire god who is addressed as the chosen Priest, God, minister of sacrifice because it is the carrier of sacrifice to the Gods.¹⁷ In the Hebrew Bible burnt offering are called the olah, which literally means “that which goes up,” and is entirely consumed in fire, which the Septuagint translated as holokaustus and King James version has “holocaust,”¹⁸ the

¹⁴ Ibid., 10.
¹⁶ Henry Hubert and Marcel Mauss (1964), op. cit. 97.
term that became a symbol of persecution and genocide of the Jews in the Europe under Hitler’s Nazi Germany. The term *zebah* is used in the Hebrew Bible for slaughtering animals for sacred (sacrificial) as well as ordinary purposes, however, the term *korban* is used exclusively for sacrifice, “expresses the idea of “approach” or “bringing near,”” possibly to the altar”\(^{19}\) and these terms are used in Islam also. Fire being the most common carrier (through its flames and fume which go upward), was not the only one, as in a sacrifice to water gods, the offering was submitted into a water-body and for the gods of nether world it was buried or left on ground.\(^{20}\)

Sacrifice has other layers of its meaning, for example, James J. Preston says that fasting is also a sacrifice,\(^{21}\) as such, misnomer such as Buddhist or Jain sacrifice may arise; but here we find its meaning is in the sense of abandoning or giving up food and/or water dedicating the same to some deity or may be for secular reasons. Nigel Davies defines it as “killing with a spiritual or religious motivation, usually, but not exclusively, accompanied by ritual. Normally it was performed in a sacred place or one that had been made sacred for the occasion.”\(^{22}\) Bataille writes: “to sacrifice is not to kill but abandon and to give.”\(^{23}\) Some scholars see sacrifice as commerce – “I give in order that you may give”, as George Gusdorf writes: “Sacrifice realizes a kind of commerce between man and the gods, but the economic sense of this commerce masks in reality a deeper sense.”\(^{24}\)

While ascertaining the nature, types and purposes of sacrifice, the answers to questions such as who is sacrificing, what, for whom, how, where, when and why may differentiate various types of sacrifices as some of these may be culture specific

---

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 286.

\(^{20}\) Jack David Eller (2010) op. cit. 94.


\(^{22}\) Quoted in Jack David Eller, op. cit. 82.

\(^{23}\) Quoted in Jill Robbins (1998), op. cit. 290.

\(^{24}\) Quoted in ibid., 289.
and others universal with minor variations. Therefore, different scholars define sacrifice differently – while Luc de Heusch criticises its sacred-profane conceptualisation not being “cross-culturally universal”, E.B. Taylor took it as gift to the divinity, Robertson Smith did not consider it more than a community meal, for James Frazer it was “a ritual means of controlling death”, Edward Westermark stressed its “substituting or “scapegoating” nature. \textsuperscript{25} John Bearty related sacrifice with power when he said, “almost always sacrifice is seen [by its perpetrators] as being mostly, about power or powers.”\textsuperscript{26}

We find that Sacrifice was prevalent in almost all cultures of the ancient – whereas, the Hindus (Vedic) had elaborate cult of yajna, Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, Africans and Muslim also had their own modes of sacrifice that continue even till today, though, subsequently, righteousness is said to give way to sacrificial rituals as sacrifice alone was not considered sufficient.\textsuperscript{27} Nevertheless, sacrifice has not only been a bridge between the sacred and the profane worlds, but it gives a sense of community in relation to a deity to the adherents vis-à-vis the “other” who sacrifice to the other deity or do not perform any sacrifice at all. This identity formation by finding community is very important function of sacrifice. There are parallels in the religious violence and sacrifice – for example in sacrifice, sometimes, affairs are so managed that the animal being sacrificed appears to have violated the sacred law as in the Greek ox-sacrifice, the ox not only volunteered by lowering its head to eat the grains put before it but by the very act of eating the sacred grains committed grave

\textsuperscript{25} Jack David Eller (2010) op. cit. 84-85.
\textsuperscript{26} Quoted in Ibid., 85.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid. 89.
violation thus becoming perfect offer,\(^{28}\) similarly in religious violence the other is dehumanised and “labeled as beyond the pale of human compassion and empathy.”\(^{29}\)

Human sacrifice, “the most fascinating and horrifying variety of sacrifice”\(^{30}\) has also been in existence in many culture of yore as the human beings provide “the ultimate or ideal victim.”\(^{31}\) Luc de Heusch says, “the most perfect sacrificial debt is that which a man must pay with his own blood. . . . The animal victim is only a substitute.”\(^{32}\) In the Judeo-Christian tradition killing of Abel was perhaps the first human sacrifice whose body was buried, perhaps in defiance to God and to propitiate fertility gods as Cain was tiller of land. Second instance was that of offering of Isaac (or Ishmael in Islamic tradition) for sacrifice by Abraham but a ram was substituted at the last moment. This incident has been variously interpreted to show the binding power of faith, Abraham had bound his son for sacrifice indicated through Jewish word \textit{akedah} but Isaac is also said to be a fully grown young man in his late twenties or thirties and he could not be bound by his father almost five times of his age – hence he must have offered himself willingly; this led to development of the concept of martyrdom in Judaism,\(^{33}\) and also in Islam, though the victim there is Ishmael. There are other numerous examples of human sacrifice in the Bible – sacrifice of his daughter after victory in a battle by the Israeli king Jephthah (Judges 11:40), burying of sons under foundation of new buildings (1Kings 16:34), Eller says that Moses’ utterance in Exodus 13:15 that his god had killed all the firstborn (both of human beings and beasts) in the land of Egypt indicates the human sacrifice which went upto

\(^{28}\) Ibid, 93.
the ultimate sacrifice of Jesus as clearly mentioned in 1Corinthians 5:7 – “Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us” and Ephesians 5:2 – Christ “hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.”

There are evidences which prove existence of human sacrifice in pre-Christian Europe, Hawaii and Pacific Islands, many parts of Africa and Mesoamerican civilisations. For existence of human sacrifice in Indian tradition, the most common reference is made to the Purusha Hymn in Rig Veda. Though some scholars, such as H.T. Colebrooks, asserted that “human sacrifice was not authorized by the Veda itself,” however, sources such as Vajsaneyi Samhita and Satpatha Brahmana are put forward by others to prove that human sacrifice (Purushamedha) was in existence and even its continuity till present day “especially in Eastern India, in the Sakta Tantric worship of Durga, Kali and related goddesses.” Bakker says, “the Satpatha Brahmana (6.2.1.18) unambiguously declares that ‘a man (Pursa) should be sacrificed first of the sacrificial animal (pasu)’” But we can not accept all these assertions uncritically. The colonial rhetoric to accuse the native cultures of diverse practices is not a secret, moreover, the missionary zeal has always prompted for such accusations and all this justified imperialism as well as the cultural and “moral superiority” of the European colonisers. We can not deny that sacrifice has been there in past, but as far as human sacrifice is concerned, most of the “evidences” are not from the authentic sources. Nirbhai Singh says that in the Indian context words

35 See endnote 7 in Chapter 1.
37 Ibid., 157-58.
38 Ibid., 177.
such as bali, dehtyag, jivantyag, balidana etc. were in vogue whereas bali was an offering presented to the deity.  

We have seen above that Hubert and Mauss emphasised the social function of sacrifice. René Girard also focuses on this function when he says, “The sacrifice serves to protect the entire community from its own violence; it prompts the entire community to choose victims outside itself. The elements of dissension scattered throughout the community are drawn to the person of the sacrificial victim and eliminated, at least temporarily, by its sacrifice.” But sacrifice is not uncontrolled violence; rather it is “structured, channelled and held in check by fixed laws.”

Emphasising the social function of sacrifice, Girard says that in the primitive societies, the victim of violence or his near one has the right to take vengeance as there is no “central authority” to administer justice, but vengeance is “an unending process”, therefore, there is sacrificial process which “prevents the spread of violence by keeping vengeance in check” as it is channelised towards the sacrificial victim (which becomes scapegoat or what Girard calls the “surrogate victim”) instead of the culprit through the purifying violence of the sacrificial rites. Emphasising the importance of sacrifice, Girard says that when sacrificial rites disappear from the community, the result is “sacrificial crisis” as the difference between impure and purifying violence disappear and “impure, contagious, reciprocal violence spreads throughout the community.” But Girard’s model is not helpful in analysing all the communities with sacrifice and more so those without it as he based his analysis on Freudian assumptions about the Greek myths.

---

43 Ibid., 9.
44 Ibid., 17-18.
45 Ibid., 84.
46 Ibid., 51.
Before we conclude, one incident that is part not only of the history of Sikhism, but ever-living part of the Sikh psyche, needs mention here and that is what happened in the Fort of Kesgarh at Anandpur on 30 March 1699. Major Gurmukh Singh referring to Kuir Singh’s Gurubilas Patshahi 10, one of the earlier sources, writes that that day being Baisakhi day, a huge congregation had gathered there. Guru Gobind Singh “made a dramatic appearance, a naked sword in his hand, and asked if any one of the assembly would be willing to offer his head to him. The audience were benumbed to hear this strange demand. Guru Gobind Singh repeated his call twice. At the third call, one Daya Ram, a Khatri from Lahore, offered himself. The Guru took him into an adjoining enclosure. After a while he returned, his sword dripping blood, and asked for another head. This time, Dharam Das, a Jat from Hastinapur, came forward and was led to the enclosure as had been his predecessor. Likewise, three other disciples ... offered themselves.” 47 All the five were led back in new cloths which symbolised that now they had transformed to be worthy for that was happening very soon. Thereafter, they were baptised by administering Khande ka Pahul – “a sweetened elixir sanctified by recitation over it of holy hymns and stirred with a steel khanda, double-edged sword” and taking five vows; but the surprise was not yet over, “[t]he Guru himself stood up before the Panj Piare (the five beloved) and begged with folded hands to be admitted to their rank.” 48 Here the sacrifier himself was offering him to be sacrificed and sacrifice was getting an innovative interpretation; here the voluntary offer for sacrifice, without any fear or trembling, had culminated into the birth of a new egalitarian, brotherhood, ending all the previous bonds including those of caste. The ideological ground for this act had already been laid by Guru Nanak as we will find while discussing the concept of Dharma-yudh. In addition to internal

48 Ibid.
transformation, acceptance and preservation of the body received from the creator makes Sikhism a distinct religion in contrast to some other religions where interference with body is mandatory and one of such act is circumcision which we discuss next.

**Circumcision**

Male circumcision is associated with religious practices and ethnic and cultural identity. The oldest evidences of circumcision are reported from Egypt from mummies some 6000 years old\(^49\) and Egyptian tomb work and wall paintings dating from around 2300 BC also show that circumcision was in practice,\(^50\) however, its prevalence in the earlier periods can not be ruled out because the religious or cultural practices are evolved over a long period of time. Judaism, Islam and certain religions of Africa and some tribal religions in the other parts of the world prescribe mandatory circumcision in males and with some exceptions in females also. On the other hand, male circumcision on medical grounds is also not uncommon as under the United Nations AIDS programme it is being propagated as a preventive measure to reduce spread of AIDS,\(^51\) however, such claims are not beyond doubts. It has a strong bearing on the group-identity which makes the people of other religions reluctant to undergo circumcision. Circumcision is the removal of foreskin of the male penis as is clear from the following dictionary meanings. The word circumcision is a noun which is defined with reference to the verb “circumcise” as the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary defines it as the act of circumcising somebody; the religious ceremony

---


\(^{51}\) Ibid., 15.
when somebody, especially a baby, is circumcised\textsuperscript{52} and the word circumcise is defined as “1 to remove the foreskin of a boy or man for religious or medical reasons. 2 to cut off part of the sex organs of a girl or woman.”\textsuperscript{53} But its religious character links it with spiritual purification also as the Random House Dictionary gives a third meaning of the word “circumcise” as “to purify spiritually” and circumcision in turn is “spiritual purification.”\textsuperscript{54}

Anatomically, in males, it is drawing forward and cutting of the male prepuce which is a loose fold of skin covering the \textit{glans-penis}, at the base of which it is attached to the penis where some sebaceous secretion is emitted; and in females it is incision of clitoris, the female counterpart of penis – a small organ of erectile tissues, with a rudimentary \textit{glans} and prepuce, and the \textit{labia minora} which extends from “the clitoris toward the \textit{orificium vaginae}, and merge on the one side wall of the vagina.”\textsuperscript{55}

The anatomy of these organs brings perfection of body to fore as by removing foreskin which is treated as vestigial vagina to make a man complete and similarly in women, it is argued, the “excision of a penis-like part will “perfect” the female.”\textsuperscript{56} On the other hand effeminacy through castration is also found in certain religious traditions including Christianity where authority of Matthew 19:12 which says: “For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother’s womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and the eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake.” Even circumcision is termed by some as symbolic castration,\textsuperscript{57} however, LaFleur terms them as the polar

\begin{footnotes}
\item[52] “Circumcision” Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English, 265.
\item[53] “Circumcise” Ibid.
\item[54] “Circumcise” and “Circumcision” The Random House Dictionary of the English Language. 268.
\end{footnotes}
opposites – whereas castration “removes gender difference”, circumcision accentuates it. 58

There is no indication to show that this ritual was ever in vogue in the traditions of Indian origin, though rigorous ascetic practices to mortify the flesh have been part of Jainism and some strands of Hinduism also. But even in the traditions where circumcision has been prevalent, there have been wide variations with regard to – who is to be circumcised, whether the whole populace or selected few and exceptions; disposal of the prepuce once it is incised which may be buried, thrown in water, swallowed or kept as trophy or relic; the instrument employed may range from human nails and coarse stone cutter to the modern operation theatre instruments; who will circumcise is also different in different cultures it may be man or woman, father or near relative or priest or a specialist such as mohel in Judaism and barber in Islam; place and the persons present may also vary, the place may be public or private, a religious place such as synagogue, there may be certain conditions and taboos as to who will be present at the time of circumcision; the age at the time of circumcision may vary from seven days in Islam and eight days in Judaism to 16-17 years in Wakikuyu tribe of East Africa and even in any single tradition there may be variation, for example as per Genesis 17:23 Abraham was 99 years old when he was circumcised, however, it is before marriage in most of the cases; circumcision may have different effects on the social and legal status of the person being circumcised as in Judaism permanent name is given at this ceremony as is evident from circumcision and naming of John the Baptist and Jesus as mentioned in Luke 1:59 and 2:21 respectively, the legal and social rights emanate from here as the uncircumcised are looked upon with contempt in certain cultures and circumcision is mandatory for

holding certain offices; the different stages of age at which this ritual is performed, connect it with certain other initiation rites.\textsuperscript{59}

The origin of circumcision is shrouded in obscurity as the most common reason given by the groups practising it is: “it was done by our fathers”\textsuperscript{60}, though they may have some legends connected to it. However, some probable factors were suggested by the early social scientists and it was conjectured that it may have “(1) marked captives, thereby signifying subjection, (2) attracted the opposite sex, (3) been a tribal or ethnic mark, (4) been hygienic, (5) increased sexual pleasure, (6) removed men from maternal bonds, (7) tested bravery, (8) sacrificed part of the self to ensure future rebirth, (9) been a form of symbolic castration to support the domination of youths by their elders, or (10) even simulated menstruation.”\textsuperscript{61} But none of these reasons appears to be the original cause when we put the same to test vis-à-vis the wide range of factors discussed in the previous paragraph. Among the earliest written sources, the first authentic account of the origin of circumcision appears in chapter 17 of Genesis, the first book of the Old Testament and circumcision is to be followed as a token of covenant between God and 99 years old Abraham that he shall father many nations through a son to be born to his wife Sara, already 90 years old for which God commands: “And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generation, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not thy seed,”\textsuperscript{62} and the natural corollary of this was that the uncircumcised had to become outcast, circumcision becoming the criterion to decide the “in” and “out” group. But we have nothing more than God’s command but interestingly there is no female circumcision in Judaism. The Jewish law made

\textsuperscript{59} L. H. Gray “Circumcision (Introductory)” op. cit.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 664.
\textsuperscript{62} Genesis 17:12
circumcision mandatory to be a Jew, both for the new born and the converts and each circumcision ceremony is thought to be attended by Prophet Elijah.\textsuperscript{63} The matter of essentiality or otherwise of circumcision became a problematic area for the early Christians as Christianity emerged among the Jews and some people even thought it just as a new sect of Judaism where circumcision was an essential condition to become a Jew. However, when it spread to new areas, the question whether an uncircumcised person (gentile) could be saved by bringing him to the fold of Christ even if he refused to be circumcised was settled in the Jerusalem Conference and the verdict went in the favour of the “gentiles.”\textsuperscript{64} The Coptic Christians of Egypt have retained it, may be due to their surrounding culture or as their own cultural baggage. When we look at Islam we find that as in Java, circumcision is the ceremony for entry of men into Islam; there is no mention of either male circumcision (khitan in Arabic) or female circumcision (khifad/khifd in Arabic) in the Qur’an, however, it finds mention and support in the tradition based on hadith some of which says that Muhammad was born circumcised and he was declared king of the circumcised,\textsuperscript{65} and it is pertinent to mention here that circumcision was already prevalent among Arabs.

Whatever, the explanations are put forward by the people themselves or the social scientists or anthropologists to explain the origin and occurrence of circumcision with all sorts of misconceptions, some facts come out very clearly – the origin of circumcision is, most probably, long back in prehistory when nudity was still part of human society, it gives a distinct identity to a person to identify him with a particular community, it is also used as an instrument of dominance, superiority and even proselytisation. Here an irreversible change or mutilation is done to the limb

\textsuperscript{63} “Circumcision (in Judaism)” The Penguin Dictionary of Religions. 113.
\textsuperscript{64} Acts 15.
long connected with the gender (mostly maleness) and fecundity. Circumcision once done can not be undone, so is the identity linked with it. In Judaism, circumcision has been taken “as "completing" the male and as essential for male entrance into the covenant (brit), the community, and “the world to come” through the brit milah (covenant of circumcision) and this naturally puts women and uncircumcised outsiders at a subordinate position. The records of the initial European encounters with the Muslims in India and elsewhere show that uncircumcised people were looked at with contempt and not worthy of any dealing and sometimes forced circumcision was also performed as a sign of dominance by the perpetrators. Discrimination was the other way round also; in the ancient Greek male nudity was not prohibited at least not during games where the foreskin was to be tied tight with a clasp or fibula, therefore, looking at circumcision as attack on Greek culture, the Seleucid Emperor Antiochus IV declared it illegal in 168 BCE and even the mothers who had their infants circumcised had to undergo severe punishments such as flogging, crucifixion or stoning; the Roman Empire, went a step further and in 70 CE, a circumcision tax – Fiscus Judaicus was imposed and all males were ordered to be inspected.

Even today, circumcision is no less controversial; in June 2012, a German court in Cologne, in a case where circumcision had caused serious body impairment to a four year old Muslim boy, banned circumcision saying that the boys “fundamental right to bodily integrity” was more important than the parents’ rights and he could decide to undergo circumcision when grown-up, however, this invited much resentment from both Jews and Muslims as intrusion into and a threat to

68 Ibid.
religious freedom and identity. However, there were people who called it as “religiously motivated violence against children” which no more could be tolerated. This dichotomy is present in both, the sacrifice and the circumcision but what makes them relevant to the subject of the present research is what Paul Recoeur calls their symbolism of blood, for blood is equated with life for its expiatory power and creation of faith communities around these rituals. In many cultures the blood from sacrifice is applied on forehead of the sacrifier and similar is the case in circumcision in many tribes in Africa. The zeal to kill and being killed as martyr for one’s religion appear to have its roots in the above rituals or the symbolism of blood; as through these rituals the differences between in-group and out-groups are not only sharpened with clear-cut specificity but are also heightened. But these are not the necessary pre-conditions to become a martyr as there are no less number of martyrs in cultures where both of these rituals are absent. In today’s globalised world with live coverage on media, such rituals may also accentuate the creation of the image of innate barbarity and savageness in the “other”, hence defending the use of violence as a justified means to deal with such people.

II WARS

Now we turn to religious wars which are not only common to some of the major religions but are also accepted ethically. Most of the religions have concept of a benevolent and judicious God. The concept of God and religious war are interconnected as various religious communities often give birth to some people who are not only extraordinarily kind but are courageous enough to commit themselves to

justice, in the true image of the compassionate and judicious God. This compassion for others and commitment to justice makes it obligatory to right the wrongs even by use of force. Therefore, wars waged by the followers of various religious traditions, be it Holy-War in Judaism, Crusade in Christianity, Jihad in Islam or Dharma-yudh in Indian tradition, have always been claimed to be just and divinely ordained. Conrad Lorenz finds the origin of “religious war” somewhere else when he writes, “….we had better dispense with the personification of evil, because it leads, all too easily, to the most dangerous kind of war: religious war”\(^73\) In this section we will try to examine the origin, ideological basis and actual practice of religious wars for which the various traditions have their own language and culture specific nomenclature. This may also save us from many misconceptions which would otherwise arise due to the singular use of any of these terms as substitute for the others as we sometimes find in literature.

**Defining War/Yudh**

The word “war” originated from late Old English (c.1050) word “wyrre” or “were” which goes back to French “guerre” and then to German “verwirren” meaning “to confuse, perplex”, however, the verb meaning "to make war on" is recorded from 1154CE.\(^74\) But the word “yudh” used in same sense in the Indian traditions has older origin as it was used in the Rig Veda and then in the Mahabharata in the sense to fight, wage war, oppose or (rarely) overcome in battle.\(^75\) Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy says, “war should be understood as an *actual, intentional* and *widespread* armed conflict between political communities.” \(^76\) The World University Encyclopaedia defines war “as an armed contest between nations or states, or between different parties in the same state…. [p]lunder, tribute, territory, extension of trade,


propagation of religion, acquisition of colonies, avenging of insult, redressing of wrongs, and vindication of honour have been objectives of war in all times.”

So war is a widespread (both in time and space) armed contest between states or groups/blocks of states, communities, parties etc. having to serve varied motives; local skirmishes on petty issues can not be called wars.

**The Concept of Just War**

In the west concept of “just-war” is considered closely associated with Christian thinking involving questions relating to resort to and conduct of war, but all the world’s major religions have addressed the issues associated with warfare and have contributed to the development of notions of restraint and discrimination. We shall discuss the Christian concept of just war along with the concept of crusade in due course, but before that let us discuss what is meant by the concept of Just War in general and try to find out the most commonly agreed upon conditions that a war must satisfy to be a just war. John Rawls said that wars can be waged in self defence, or to protect the human rights of other people only and not to maintain military, economic or territorial superiority, and during war the human rights of enemy non-combatants are to be respected. The aforementioned suggestions by Rawls divide the conditions for just war in two groups (using the Latin nomenclature), the *jus ad bellum* conditions concerning the resort to war and the *jus in bello* conditions concerning the means to fight and conduct during the war. The *jus ad bellum* conditions stipulate that war is just when it is resorted to for a just cause, is declared by a legitimate authority, is fought with right intention, has a reasonable hope for success, is resorted

---

to as a last resort and its destructiveness is not out of proportion to the intended good to be achieved. The *in bello* conditions include making discrimination between combatants (soldiers) and non-combatants (civilians) so that deadly force is targeted to combatants only; killing soldiers and especially civilians is forbidden if it serves no military purpose, and finally the collateral killing of civilians is forbidden if the resulting civilian deaths are out of proportion to the relevant good one’s act will do, that is, use of excessive force is wrong. The condition that war should be waged as the last resort need some further elucidation as there is always something more which can be done and even war can not go on for ever, other means have to be introduced once again. Therefore, it has been suggested that war is permitted only if its net outcome is better than those of all alternatives. Some scholars say that there is a third stage also which is *jus post bellum* referring to the justice during the termination of war. The conditions at this stage stipulate that the peace settlement should be measured and reasonable and it should not be made to serve an instrument to take revenge, the settlement should secure those basic rights whose violation triggered the justified war, there should be discrimination among leaders, combatants and civilians during war trials (which should be fair) and meting out punishment, as the civilians should be immune from the punitive post-war measures, and finally the financial restitution may be mandated but it should be subject to both proportionality and discrimination. The above said conditions must be fulfilled before a war is called “just”.

A holy or religious war is not the same operation as just war, but it has to have all the attributes of such war as the holy war has to be just war, but one religiously
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and theologically oriented. Now attempt will be made to delineate the subtleties of
in Judaism, Christianity, Islam (Semitic traditions), Hinduism and Sikhism (Indian
tradition) to find out the ideological foundations and justifications for resorting to war
in the respective traditions vis-à-vis the actual practices of the same as manifested
through instances gleaned from those very traditions.

**The Jewish concept of Holy War**

Judaism is one of the oldest religions in the world and it is a monotheistic
religion originating in the areas consisting of modern day Palestine and Israel,
between the nineteenth and sixteenth centuries BCE. Abraham who is believed to
have lived around 16th century BCE is considered as the father of the Jewish nation,
Israel. The Hebrew Bible (Old Testament) is its holy book. It is said that Yahweh
(name of God in Hebrew) gave total 613 commandments (*mitzvah*) [consisting of both
positive (*mitzvah aseh*) and negative (*mitzvah lo taaseh*) commandments] covering all
aspects of the Jewish life. Out of the basic Ten Commandments one was prohibition
to kill/murder. The Jews had a peculiar belief from the very beginning that they were
“the chosen people” of Yahweh, the basis for this belief was the covenant (agreement)
made between Yahweh and Abraham wherein land from the river of Egypt up to the
great river, Euphrates (called holy land later) was promised to be given to the Jews
and circumcision (of males) was made a token of this covenant. The Jewish concept
of holy war originated from this covenant as the Promised Land being inhabited by
other nations, had to be got vacated by war.
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Jewish Holy War: Definition and Ideology: Encyclopaedia Britannica defines “holy war” as “any war fought by divine command or for a religious purpose. The concept of holy war is found in the Bible (e.g., the Book of Joshua) and has played a role in many religions.” As per the Dictionary of Beliefs and Religions “[t]he concept of a holy war, declared, fought and won by Yahweh, god of Israel, originates in tradition of the god as a divine warrior which are found in the Hebrew Bible.”

The Jews were commanded to do what was good in the eyes of the Lord. In the Promised Land there were seven nations namely, the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, all of whom were greater and mightier than the Jews. The reason for promising that land to the Jews by Yahweh was not their righteousness but it was the wickedness of those nations. They were wicked because of practice of idolatry, their beliefs, rituals and ceremonies including human sacrifice, sorcery, witchcraft and necromancy etc. abhorred by the Lord. Therefore, to get the land vacated from the mightier occupants Yahweh Himself was to fight for the Jews as He had done in Egypt (when they had been released from slavery by Moses with the active guidance of Yahweh).

He had commanded the Jews to destroy those nations utterly without any mercy; nothing that breathed was to be saved alive; no relation was to be kept with them; matrimonial relations were strictly prohibited lest they turn the Jews away from Yahweh; and their properties including their altars and graven images of their gods
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were to be destroyed by burning.\(^9\) Therefore, war against the opponents was to be fought till their complete annihilation and Yahweh being the commander it was holy war as such there was no violation of the commandment prohibiting murder. The war against the above said seven nations was enjoined by Yahweh, therefore, it was called obligatory war (\textit{Milchemet Mitzvah}) and all other wars not specifically required by a commandment were voluntary wars (\textit{Milchemet Reshut}).\(^{10}\)

For wars against the seven nations Yahweh’s command was sufficient, however, for war against any other nation/city (being voluntary/optional for the expansion of the boundaries of Israel), a set of ethics was prescribed and every such city was to be given offer of peace before attack and if the people became tributaries and served the Jews, no war was to be made, however, in case the peace proposal was declined, then the city was to be besieged and every male thereof was to be killed with the edge of sword taking into possession women, children, the cattle and all that was in the city (the spoils) rightfully.\(^{11}\) The law of war also included exemption from joining war to the person(s) who had built new house but had not shifted in it or had planted a vineyard but had not eaten its fruit or who had betrothed a wife but had not consumed marriage or who was fearful or weak hearted.\(^{12}\)

**Jews in the Battlefield:** During their struggle to possess the Promised Land, Yahweh was always there to guide and facilitate the Jews in their venture. Moses had already died and the Jews crossed river Jordan under the leadership of Joshua. Their first target was the city of Jericho, which was besieged, however, its walls came down with the providential help and then no native of the captured city was spared from death except a whore named Rahab, her parents and brothers as she had provided
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shelter and protection to the two spies sent in advance by Joshua, and she was allowed to live in Israel.\textsuperscript{103} (This was done despite whoring being strictly prohibited in Israel.\textsuperscript{104}) Even woman, young and old, oxen, sheep and asses could not escape from the Jews’ swords.\textsuperscript{105} The whole city was burnt and only silver, gold and utensils of brass and iron were put into the treasure of the house of God.\textsuperscript{106} The divine curse was invoked for whosoever attempted to rebuild that city.\textsuperscript{107} Thus had the divine punishment humbled the first city of the Promised Land.

It was not that the Jews were always committed to the divine commandments and when they went astray the Godly anger was kindled. In the very first battle, a Jew named Achan from the tribe of Judah had taken away some part of the spoils by stealth for his personal use, thus had violated the Yahweh’s commandment and the consequence was disastrous for the Jews; the very next attack on the city of Ai was repulsed by the enemy by utter destruction, they had to flee and a sense of powerlessness and cowardice started dominating them.\textsuperscript{108} Joshua sensed the trouble and prostrated before Yahweh and put dust upon his head to express total submission and dependence on Him.\textsuperscript{109} After much pleading, Yahweh chided him for transgression of His commandments and the only condition for forgiveness was to get rid of the wicked among them.\textsuperscript{110} Achan was caught and taken to a valley along with his family and all their belongings and they were stoned before being burnt.\textsuperscript{111} Then Ai was conquered and thereafter, there was no transgression; while meting out punishment to the conquered cities/places Yahweh’s commandments were followed
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in letter and spirit. Some of them were totally annihilated and burnt while spoils were plundered from the others.\textsuperscript{112}

There is only one instance during this period that shows that the Jews were not war mongers. When the natives of Gibeon who were called Hivites (they were among the seven nations) heard about the fate of Jericho and Ai, they approached them and offered subjugation, though without disclosing their true identity, and they were taken into subjugation as “hewers of wood” and “drawers of water”.\textsuperscript{113} No other city made peace offer and all other cities were taken in battle.\textsuperscript{114} When the Promised Land was conquered, it was divided among the twelve tribes of the Jews and there was a long period of peace.\textsuperscript{115} Despite all their endeavours, the Jews could not annihilate the seven nations completely; therefore, Joshua cautioned them to remain aloof from remnants of nations like Canaanites lest they learnt their habits so that Yahweh’s anger was aroused,\textsuperscript{116} though they were allowed to serve under tribute.\textsuperscript{117} But by making such people their tributaries, the Israelites had disobeyed the commandments, and as a result they degenerated into evil and became powerless before their opponents as we are told subsequently.\textsuperscript{118}

From the foregoing discussion we find that for the Jews “righteousness” was not an obligation towards any fellow people or nations but it was defined as the observance to do all those commandments before the God as He had commanded.\textsuperscript{119} No doubt the seven nations were termed as wicked due to some inhuman practices, however, the reason of war was temporal (annexation of land in this case) with
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communal basis and there was generalisation as the whole population of the promised land was commanded to be punished and killed indiscriminately. Moreover, war was resorted not as the last resort but as the very first without exhausting other avenues. We also find that though they were commanded to be destroyed, the Canaanites were spared and were brought under subjugation even at the cost of Yahweh’s anger. It may be ascribed to the impracticability of annihilating any nation completely with the means the Jews had at their disposal, perhaps some positive human values also might have played their role. In the sparing of the lives of Rahab, a whore and her family, selfishness was the guiding factor instead of any moral ground. From all these facts we can say that though, due to Yahweh’s direct involvement, the war could be called holy but it was in no way fully just. The state of Israel came into existence in 1948, and the concepts of the Promised Land and holy war have been used by the Zionist state to expand by annihilating or expelling the native Arab populace.

The Christian concepts of Just War and Crusades

Christianity was born about two thousand years ago in the Jewish milieu and it got its name from belief in Jesus of Nazareth (4BCE-29CE) as the “Christ” or “Messiah”, both terms meaning the “Anointed One” of God.\(^1\) It is a monotheistic religion but the God consists of the Trinity - the Father, the Son (Jesus) and the Holy Ghost. Bible is its holy book which has two parts the Old Testament (Hebrew Bible) and the New Testament. Christianity started in pacifism, but subsequently turned to defending the righteousness through a just war which ultimately developed into aggressive crusades. The essential qualities of a believer as propounded by Christ were humility, repentance for past sins, meekness, spiritual desire for righteousness, mercy, purity of heart, peace making and glorifying God by doing good deeds among

others and he said that if some body slapped you on the right cheek turn to him the other also.\textsuperscript{121} He also said that instead of taking revenge from the persecutor pray for him.\textsuperscript{122} However, various parables told by Jesus to his disciples indicated that sometimes, instead of being forgiven, the wicked deserved to be separated and punished. One such parable was of wheat and weed, where weed (being undesirable and harmful) was weaned out and bound together to be burnt.\textsuperscript{123} The other parable was of wicked husbandmen who instead of paying his due to the owner of the vineyard, beat his servants and killed his son. Jesus said that the owner was right if he destroyed such wicked husbandmen.\textsuperscript{124} In the book of Revelation in one vision Christ is shown riding white horse as faithful, true and is said to judge in righteousness and wage war, with sharp sword in his mouth to destroy the nations.\textsuperscript{125}

**Ideology of Just War in Christianity:** During the first three centuries after its birth Christianity remained a severely persecuted religion and the believers were killed and burnt ruthlessly.\textsuperscript{126} It got respite when Emperor Constantine (r.306-337) declared Edict of Milan giving religious freedom to Christians in 311CE and subsequently Christianity became the sate religion.\textsuperscript{127} The original pacifism could not sustain in the changed scenario and St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430) propounded the concept of Just War in Christianity in his book “City of God.”\textsuperscript{128} He justified war waged in obedience to the divine command, or in conformity with God’s laws and said that persons doing so represented public justice or the wisdom of government in their person and killing of the wicked in such capacity by them did not tantamount to
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the violation of the commandment “Thou shall not kill.”

He defined “Just” by quoting from scriptures “The just lives by faith” for man was not capable of seeing his good himself therefore for living rightly God’s grace and help was required. Regarding just war he wrote that wrong doings of the opposing party compelled the wise men to wage just war. Regarding the aim of just war he wrote that there was no man who did not wish to be joyful and have peace and therefore it was with desire to have peace that (just) wars were waged. In his last days (in 430CE), the city of Hippo was under siege by an East German tribe of Vandals who were apostates (heretic Christians) being followers of Arianism which denied divinity of Christ. Here he is said to have encouraged his fellow citizens to resist the attack and retaliate by waging a just war. He argued against the traditional Christian pacifism by justifying the killing of an aggressor when there was no other alternative to defend legitimate rights. This philosophy became the basis for preaching of crusades in the late eleventh century.

**Crusade: Definition and Ideology:** The word “Crusade” has been in vogue only since early eighteenth century. It was respelling of *croisade* (1577), from M.(Middle) French *croisade*, Spanish *cruzada*, both from M. Latin *cruciata*, past participle of *cruciare* “to mark with a cross,” from Latin *crux* “cross.” This term was not in vogue when the first crusade was preached; the terms initially used were: pilgrimage, expedition of cross (*expedition cruces*) etc. Even in the Arabic historical writings
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the literal word for crusade *al-salibiyyum* is found not earlier than the twentieth century.\(^{138}\) Crusades have been defined as the medieval Christian version of the idea of the holy war in the form of “military expeditions, beginning in the late 11th century, that were organized by Western Christians in response to centuries of Muslim wars of expansion. Their objectives were to check the spread of Islam, to retake control of the Holy Land, to conquer pagan areas, and to recapture formerly Christian territories; they were seen by many of their participants as a means of redemption and expiation for sins.”\(^{139}\) These are also defined as the “expeditions undertaken in fulfilment of a solemn vow to deliver the Holy places from the Mohammedan’s Tyranny. The origin of the word may be traced to the cross made of cloth and worn as a badge on the outer garment of those who took part in these enterprises.”\(^{140}\) From the above definitions we can say that the crusades were battles against the Muslims and other infidels as all “campaigns against the enemies of faith whether Muslims, heretics or schismatic, were seen as legitimate crusades by popes and canonists”\(^{141}\) and these were spread in a period from late eleventh century to the eighteenth century.

With the expansion of Islam after mid seventh century, a substantial area in Middle East including Christian places of pilgrimage like Jerusalem having the Holy Tomb (Sepulchre) of Christ and Bethlehem (his birth place) connected with the life of Christ had come under its sway. Although, the Eastern (Greek) church of the Byzantium Empire and the Western- Roman Catholic (Latin) church had separated on 16 July 1054\(^{142}\) yet, the increasing influence of the Islam and harassment of the pilgrims by the Muslims compelled the Byzantine Emperor Alexios I Komnenos
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Pope Urban II (r. 1088-99) called a council at Clermont (France) and while addressing the gathering, Pope appraised of the urgent need for help to the Christians living in the East. He portrayed the Muslims in emotive and violent language, their religion as false, their prophet as the antichrist and gave details of the killings of Christians, desecration of churches and devastation of the church’s empire by the Muslims. He echoed St. Augustine when he called for righting the evil deeds of the infidels. Moreover, Christ had said, “If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.” At that moment the crowd shouted “Deus le vult” – God wills it. It is pertinent to mention here that the Muslims were no strangers in Europe as they had captured Spain in the early eighth century. Pope promised immediate remission of sins (indulgence) to all those who died in this pursuit. Death on crusade was equated to martyrdom and guaranteed direct entry into paradise. The three essential elements of crusades were papal authorisation, the crusader’s vow and granting of indulgence and other elements included some temporal privileges such as protection of family and property by Church, immunity from law-suits and interest on debts.

**Christians in the Battlefield:** Though papal authorisation was must, yet the ensuing mass euphoria resulted into many unorganised expeditions to the East. The very first casualty were the Jews as the rivalry with the Jews had never died since
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crucifixion of Jesus and this hatred when supported by the new enthusiasm resulted into one of the greatest atrocities in history: the blood-curdling massacre and annihilation of the Jewish community in the Rhineland (Germany) as the people wanted to kill the infidels at home first. The Jews at some other places such as Cologne, Mainz and Worms etc. were destroyed along with their holy books and at Mainz alone 700 to 1300 Jews perished. The Jews were given choice of either death or conversion by the unruly masses, though there was no such command from the pope but there was no papal condemnation either.

The first crusade was undertaken mainly by the French and Italian crusaders and after difficult long journey and hardships due to stark climatic changes; Jerusalem was captured on 15th July, 1099. Although, extending help/protection to the eastern Christians was one of the motives of the crusaders yet, they made no discrimination between Muslims, Jews or native Christians and all the inhabitants were put to sword, and the most gruesome was the massacre of the Muslims who had already surrendered and were sheltered in the al- Asqua mosque. Instead of giving conquered territories under the Rule of the Byzantine Emperor, a Latin king was installed in Jerusalem and three other small Latin Christian states namely the Counties of Edessa and Tripoli, and the principality of Antioch were also founded. But the new alien rulers were not liked by the natives and their trouble started when the Muslims power recovered. Gradually, the Muslims started capturing their lost territories and in 1144 Edessa was lost to Muslims. Therefore, in 1148 the second crusade, which
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was the most numerous and most ambitious crusade ever started,\textsuperscript{160} reached the holy land and every one expected the European knighthood and the crusader armies to attack and recapture Edessa, the capital and the country. But they instead, attacked Damascus, capital of Syria and after four days’ battle had to retreat shamefully, ending the crusade prematurely.\textsuperscript{161} The little success in this crusade compelled retrospection at home and some people started to ask whether the crusades were divinely inspired.\textsuperscript{162} In 1187 Saladin, one of the greatest Muslim rulers marched to Jerusalem and on October 2\textsuperscript{nd}, after eighty eight years of Christian domination, Jerusalem opened its gates to Saladin.\textsuperscript{163} Though bad behaviour seemed to know no religious bounds and the rulers and warriors of Islam were no less vicious or ruthless than their crusading counterparts however, Saladin took a more conciliatory line and not much blood was spilled.\textsuperscript{164} Christian world retaliated and the third crusade under the joint leadership of many countries including England reached the holy land in 1191 and city of Acre was captured from Saladin; when negotiations with Saladin for ransom and exchange of prisoners failed, all the 3000 Muslim soldiers who had already surrendered were massacred ruthlessly.\textsuperscript{165} After this first victory a great part of the crusader army started for home, and on 14\textsuperscript{th} September 1192 peace accord was reached with Saladin keeping the status quo and Jerusalem, the goal of the crusaders, remained Muslim thereafter.\textsuperscript{166}

The fourth crusade was called in 1198 by pope Innocent III(r.1198-1216) who was the first pope since Urban-II to be both eager and able to make the crusade major.
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papal concern. There was turmoil in the Byzantine Empire due to internal strife. The pope had prohibited the crusaders to involve them in the affairs of the empire. But instead of going towards Jerusalem, they reached Constantinople (the capital) and after installing a new king initially, they sacked the city after wards. On April 12, 1204 history saw one of its most disgraceful days. Despite being under vows and threats of excommunication, the crusaders ruthlessly and systematically violated the city’s holy sanctuaries destroying, defiling, and stealing all they could lay hands on for the full three days. Many of them broke their vows to respect the women and assaulted them; and such behaviour of “pilgrims” of the fourth crusade filled the pope with shame and he strongly rebuked them. The subsequent four crusades to the East remained utter failures, only the crusades in Europe achieved lasting results by conversion of pagan tribes to Christianity.

In this way we find that the initial lofty motives of setting the holy land free from the Islamic control could not be fulfilled as it was found that the interests of Christendom and those of papacy did not always coincided and many a time the popes used the men and money for their own vested temporal interests. We find that most of the times, the crusaders behaved more like the unruly masses than the disciplined soldiers of the church. Instances of killings of the Jews at Rhineland and other places; indiscriminate mass massacre of the inhabitants of Jerusalem and especially that in the al-Asqua mosque during first crusade; ruthless massacre of 3000 Muslim soldiers, who had already surrendered, during the third crusade at Acre; the plunder of Constantinople, defilement of holy places and molestation of women during the fourth

167 Peter Lock (2006), op. cit. 158.
168 Ibid., 161.
171 Peter Lock (2006), op. cit. 175.
crusades- all this in utter disobedience to the papal commands; lust of the crusaders for worldly kingdoms instead “of the kingdom of God” of Jesus and least regard for any discipline by most of them, all these facts taken together, give an impression that the crusades were lacking much to make these wars in the East (and the West itself) both holy as well as just. The crusades were product of their own times and cultures but the concept and the word are so deeply imprinted on the minds of the people in the Christian as well as the Muslim cultures that we get projection of the same even in the twenty-first century. The display of such projection was most conspicuous immediately after 11 September, 2001 in the use of this word by the American President in his speech which unwittingly confirmed Osama bin Laden’s allegation of “Crusade” of the Christian-West against Islam. He projected Jihad as an answer to such attempt.

The Islamic concept of Jihad

Islam was born in the seventh century in Mecca, a prominent trading centre in the Arabian Peninsula where the majority of inhabitants believed in polytheism, worshipping hundreds of deities often in the form of stones placed in the Arabia’s central shrine of Kabbah and some had even converted to Judaism or Christianity. In such surrounding, Muhammad ibn Abdullah (son of Abdullah) (c.570-632CE) founded Islam which has the “Qur’an” (Arabic meaning recitation, proclamation) as its holy book. The word “Islam” originated from Arabic word “aslama” (root of which is Arabic “salam” meaning peace); therefore “aslama” means (peace as reward for) submission to the will of God Almighty. The Muslims were considered as one ‘ummah (community) and the status of the people of the Book (Jews and
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Christians) was that of the *dhimmi* who were subject to certain restrictions and taxes (jizyah). The unbelievers (i.e., people other than the 'ummah and dhimmi) were called *kafirs* and this classification of the people resulted in the division of the world into two parts- *daru'l-Islam* that is area under Islamic control and *daru'l-harb* (the land of warfare) that is non-Muslim areas of the world opposed to Islam; some scholars like Muhammad ash-Shafii bin Idris (767-820CE) defined a third area called *dar al-'ahd* (also called *dar-as sulh*) that is the area in which non-Muslims lived in peaceful agreement with Muslim state. This separation of the Islamic and anti-Islamic worlds gave birth to the concept of Jihad, a duty enjoined on Muslims to wage war against the *kafirs*. For Sunnis Jihad is a *fard 'ala'l-kifaya*, a duty in general on all male, free, adult Muslims, sane in mind and body and having means enough to reach the Muslim army, yet not a duty mandatory on every individual whereas the Shias believe that Jihad is one of the seven pillars. Fighting (Jihad) is enjoined even if one does not like it because only Allah knows what is good and what is bad and Jihad is prescribed by Him. Professor Hiti writes that being theocratic, in Islam there can be no secular war but so is the case with any of the other religions and even Muslims have participated in wars other that religious.

**Jihad: Definition and Ideology:** The concept of Jihad took shape during the life time of the Prophet Muhammad. As we have seen above it is an incumbent religious duty established in the Qur’an and in the traditions as a divine institution for the
furtherance of Islam and repelling evil from Muslims.\textsuperscript{184} Jihad is an Arabic word with root \textit{Juhd} which means striving one’s utmost, but with the striving some reward or worship is associated.\textsuperscript{185} Jihad has been defined in the Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World as an endeavour towards praiseworthy aim and it may be through tongue, pen or sword and the underlying doctrine is the belief in the existence of one single Islamic state ruling the entire \textit{ummah}.\textsuperscript{186} The duty to expand this state is enjoined on the \textit{ummah} so that maximum people are brought under the sway of Islam and the kafirs are extirpated.\textsuperscript{187} According to Sufis there are two types of Jihad – \textit{al-Jihadu 'l-Akbar} or the greater warfare which is against one’s own lust and \textit{al-Jihadu 'l-Asghar}, the lesser warfare which was against the infidels.\textsuperscript{188}

When a non-Muslim approaches Islam for the first time, he is confused because of the juxtaposition of Surahs relating to peaceful coexistence and commands for aggressive warfare against the “infidels” in the Qur’an. This confusion arises as the all the 114 Surahs of Qur’an (which were revealed in a period of 23 years) are not in the chronological order.\textsuperscript{189} Some scholars of Islam, like Sir William Muir have attempted to arrange the Surahs in chronological order and such attempts have helped in understanding the development of Islam starting from moral teachings to that of a prophetic and warring religion.\textsuperscript{190} It is found that the concept of Jihad as religious war was laid down only after Hijrah to Medina in 622CE. At Mecca majority of Surahs (ninety as per Sir William Muir’s listing)\textsuperscript{191} clearly accept coexistence with the unbelievers as in Surah 109 it is said “Say, O ye that reject faith! I worship not that
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which ye worship…. To you be your way, and to me mine.” It was enjoined to preach Islam with gracious arguments as it was said, “Invite (all) to the way of thy Lord with wisdom and beautiful preaching; and argue with them in ways that are best and most gracious: … but if you show patience, that is indeed the best (course) for those who are patient.”

The next stage was that of retaliation if first attacked, as it was said, “Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress limits; for Allah loveth not transgressors… And fight them on until there is no more tumult or oppression, and there prevail justice and faith in Allah; but if they cease, let there be no hostility except to those who practise oppression.”

It is prohibited to fight in the mosque or during the holy month of Ramdan but if attacked first, it is enjoined to kill the attacker. Rewards were promised for the fighters in the way of Allah, as they were not dead but “they live, finding their sustenance in the Presence of their Lord. They rejoice in the Bounty provided by Allah.”

Forced conversion was prohibited as “Let there be no compulsion in religion: Truth stands out clear from error…” But at the same time it was enjoined “to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies of Allah and your enemies, and others besides, whom ye may not know….. But if the enemy inclines towards peace, do thou (also) incline towards peace, and trust in Allah: for He is the One that heareth and knoweth (all things).” Jihad is said to be a test for the “faithful” as Allah is almighty and He could exact retribution from the enemies Himself but he lets the believers fight in order to test them. As it is a duty, therefore,
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the deserters and traitors were to be seized and killed except those who took asylum with a tribe with whom there was a treaty of peace and amity and those who on their own heart desire never to take up arms against Islam, though they may not wish to join the forces of Islam.

We find call for aggressive Jihad against all unbelievers after 630 CE, when the Maccans surrendered and converted to Islam, Prophet Muhammad and his followers took over the city and cleaned the Ka’aba of some 360 idols. It was enjoined to dissolve all treaties with those who had not kept the same by giving four months’ notice, to continue with others till the expiry of periods of treaties and not to make new treaties with the unbelievers in future. The converts to Islam were brother Muslims but the breakers of agreements were to be fought with and punished and no help or protection was to be sought from non-Muslims. Even the relations with the people of Book had undergone some change as they were to be accepted only if they paid jizyah (compensation) with willing submission, and felt themselves subdued. Jihad is enjoined to be continued even if the means are small lest Allah inflict serious punishment, but for those who give all they have to Allah and slay and/or are slain in Jihad the gardens of Paradise are promised with houris (beautiful women)/ “Companions, with beautiful big and lustrous eyes.” The Muslims are commanded to fight the unbelievers surrounding them and inflict torture and death on those who oppose the true faith. The Muslims gave three options to the
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conquered “infidels”: conversion to Islam or payment of a poll tax (Jizyah) or death by sword.\textsuperscript{210}

The contradictions in the Qur’anic Surahs, as we see above, are resolved in the Qur’an itself on the basis of the principle of abrogation (Arabic \textit{naskh}) by which it is said that Allah replaces some previous revelations.\textsuperscript{211} After death of the Prophet, treatise on law about Jihad were written by scholars like Abd al-Rahman al-Awzai (d. 774CE) and Muhammad al-Shaybani (d.804) and it was enjoined that the idea of Jihad should remain alive; even though the caliph could make a truce with the enemy in the interest of \textit{ummah} but he may wage Jihad whenever he wishes.\textsuperscript{212}

\textbf{Muslims in the Battle field:} In Arabia, looting the caravans of merchants (\textit{ghazu}) was an accepted way of making ends meet when times were hard.\textsuperscript{213} Therefore, the Muslims after migration to Madinah resorted to it without any moral dilemma and the first battle with Quraysh of Mecca was fought at Badr due to their attempt to make \textit{ghazu} on a Meccan caravan.\textsuperscript{214} In this battle the opponents, though being superior in numbers, were defeated.\textsuperscript{215} The number of Muslim warriors varies as per different sources from 152 to 364 but the same (generally 313) is considered as the minimum number of Muslims who can together exhort the Imam to “rise and change the socio-political conditions.”\textsuperscript{216} When the Muslims started killing the prisoners of war as per established Arabic fashion, a revelation came to Muhammad to stop it and to release them on ransom; the fight on the division of booty was avoided by dividing it up equally.\textsuperscript{217} The subsequent revelations provided that in case no ransom was coming,
the prisoner himself could earn it for his release.\textsuperscript{218} In the very next battle of Uhud in 625CE, the Muslims were badly defeated, the cause of the same as per new revelation was that the Muslims had been quarrelsome, rebellious and undisciplined throughout the campaign.\textsuperscript{219} To accommodate the widows of the war a revelation came and the Muslims were allowed to keep four wives.\textsuperscript{220} To the Prophet Allah had allowed keeping wives even more than four and this increasing number and the rifts among them gave birth to various parties in the \textit{ummah}.\textsuperscript{221} In January 627 Muhammad led an expedition against a tribe of Jews and looted their provisions including 200 of their women, and the daughter of their chief was to become the new wife of the Prophet\textsuperscript{222} as the Prophet was given special right to keep the women captured in war as his wives.\textsuperscript{223}

The increase in the power of \textit{ummah} led to bitterness among the Jews of Madinah.\textsuperscript{224} Some Jews were held to be treacherous as they had sided with the Quraysh of Mecca in the battle of khandak (Trench) in 627CE and when they surrendered, all of their 700 men were decreed to be killed, their wives and children sold into slavery and their properties divided among the Muslims.\textsuperscript{225} Karen Armstrong defends this massacre by ascribing it to the lack of universal natural law among the Arabs at that stage.\textsuperscript{226} But such explanations may not hold water, the Prophet himself being involved in decision making, therefore, some more extensive study is required in this regard.
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Islam spread throughout the whole of the Arabian Peninsula soon after the
death of Muhammad as the increasing power of the Muslims compelled many cities
including Damascus and Jerusalem into subjugation and not much blood was
spilled.\textsuperscript{227} The guiding ideal for Jihad was to create one \textit{ummah} throughout the whole
world by converting it into \textit{dar al-Islam} as the people of other religions were
generalised as the enemies of Allah; however, when the boundaries of Islam further
extended, the ideology of aggressive Jihad gave way to peaceful coexistence not only
with the people of the Book but also those of other religions. However, it appears that
by offering three options of conversion to Islam, Subjugation (by paying Jaziah) and
death, the onus of war was passed to the \textit{Kafirs} (the Other). In this way we see that in
Islam a complementary theology of war and peace had evolved,\textsuperscript{228} where people like
Saladin behaved with restraint (as mentioned above) though instances of persecutions
in the name of Jihad for narrow temporal gains by the Muslim rulers are not
uncommon in history. Today, perhaps Jihad is one of the most extensively used words
both by Muslims as well as non-Muslims. The Muslims use it as an attempt to repel
the efforts to gag and suppress Islam (mostly) by the Christian West and most of the
non-Muslims (and mainly the American and European scholars and politicians) use it
as a rhetoric to blame Islam for most of the violence in the world (and in fact
retarding of their own expansionist self-interest mainly in oil rich areas).

\textbf{The Concept of Dharma-yudh in Indian Tradition before Sikhism}

Indian tradition has credit of giving birth to the two of the non-violent
religions i.e., Jainism and Buddhism however, as we have already seen, the concept of
war is very old in the Indian tradition. The rules of fair warfare were also developed
and these included that only Kshatriyas were to engage in battle, that non-combatant
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were to be spared, that no one was to attack another from behind, at night or in a position he could not defend himself and the wars where these conventions were followed were called dharma-yudh and where these were not followed or which were waged with greed or lust were called *kutayudh* or *asuryudh.* When we look at the actual practice we find that even the most ideal king Ram who was incarnation of Vishnu (one god of the Hindu triune) and the hero of the epic Ramayana killed Bali by stealth. The vertical division of society on the basis of *varna* (caste) was so deeply ingrained in the society that the same Lord Ram killed a learned person named Shambuk (for the sake of “dharma”—righteousness) whose only crime was that he had dared to learn Vedas in spite of being a Shudra.

The Bhagavad Gita, containing the teachings of Lord Krishna to Arjuna during the battle of Mahabharata at Kurukshetra, is one of the most reverend sacred books. Arjuna refused to fight seeing his close relatives on the other side. But Krishna, who was another, subsequent incarnation of Vishnu, persuaded him for war and said:

“Further, looking at thine own Dharma, thou shouldst not tremble; for there is no greater good for the Kshatriya than righteous battle. (31)

“Happy are the Kshatriyas, O Partha, when such a battle comes to them of itself like the open gate of heaven. (32)

“But if thou dost not fight this battle for the right, then hast thou abandoned thy Swadharma and thy glory, and sin shall be thy portion. (33) …
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“Slain thou shalt attain heaven, victorious thou shalt enjoy the earth; therefore, arise, O son of Kunti, resolved upon battle. (37)”

As we have seen above in Hinduism, righteousness was not based on some universal ethics but it emanated from the varna-vayavastha (cast-system) where instead of treating a person on the basis of his virtues, he was treated either as a kshatriya or Brahmin or Vaishya or Shudra as is evident from the instances of killing of Shambuk and Arjuna being provoked to fight in the name of his Kshatriya Dharma. The gains were also personal, in case of victory Arjuna would reign on earth and in case of death he would get moksha or heaven. From the above instances we can say that the concept of dharma-yudha, though having some theoretical foundations was lacking on many fronts in actual practice and many a times there was kutayudh in stead of the claimed Dharma-yudh.

**The Concept of Dharma yudh in Sikhism**

Sikhism, a strictly monotheistic and the youngest among the world religions, was born in 1499 CE, when its founder Guru Nanak (1469-1539) had a direct encounter with the Supreme Reality which he called Nirankar, the Formless One.

The very first declaration made by Guru Nanak: “There is no Hindu, there is no Mussalman” was a revolutionary one at a time when both the contemporary dominant religions of India, Hinduism and Islam were suffering from moral degenerations as Hinduism had divided the human beings on the basis of varna system making the shudras untouchables being the lowest ones in the varna-hierarchy and the ruling Muslims were inflicting all kinds of tyrannies and usurping every freedom of the masses. This spiritual journey of Guru Nanak culminated in the birth
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of a distinct and independent new faith though it bore close affinities in its
terminology and in some of its philosophical assumptions with other India-born
religions and Islam.\textsuperscript{236} The Sikh religion, which originated in Guru Nanak’s revelation,
had nine subsequent Gurus and after the tenth Guru, this status of Guru was conferred
on the Guru Granth Sahib, the Sacred Book, which was so apotheosized by none other
than the tenth Guru, Guru Gobind Singh himself.\textsuperscript{237}

**Dharmayudh: Definition and Ideology:** The concept of Dharmayudh in
Sikhism, though has been taken from the earlier Indian tradition; however, it has been
interpreted in somewhat different vein by various scholars. The Sikh Encyclopedia
does not contain any entry of this term, however, referring to the joint agitation of the
Akali Dal and Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale started in August, 1982, the concept
of Dharmayudh is equated with “religious war,”\textsuperscript{238} Raghbir Singh Bains in his
Encyclopaedia of Sikhism defines it as “Holy war, war for righteousness, truthful
struggle,”\textsuperscript{239} Bhai Kahn Singh Nabha defined it as a war fought on the basis of
religious tenets or a war in which deceit and untruth are not used, he also defines it as
war fought for protection of the religious prescriptions,\textsuperscript{240} and Punjabi University
Punjabi-English Dictionary gives its meaning as “religious war, crusade.”\textsuperscript{241} Prof.
Nirbhai Singh uses dharma-yudh in the sense of moral and spiritual struggle,\textsuperscript{242}
whereas Khushwant Singh calls it the “battle for the sake of righteousness” in his “A
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History of the Sikhs”243 and “just war” at an other place.244 Most of these terms being taken from the western cultural milieu may depict some of the salient features of dharma-yudh in the Sikhism but not its totality; therefore, “dharma-yudh” is the appropriate term. The concept of “Dharma-yudh” as such finds no mention in the Guru Granth Sahib, however, the philosophy of Sikhism as propounded by Guru Nanak and his successors manifests that a Sikh has to fight a perpetual battle for the righteousness. Guru Nanak wanted every human being to reflect the qualities of the Ultimate Reality such as being fearless (nirbhao) and having enmity towards none (nirvair) as enshrined in the mul-mantra because in Sikhism a fine synthesis between spiritual and social values is found.245 The explicit use of the concept was made by Guru Gobind Singh who while describing his mission as “Dharma-yudh”, said that he had no other wish except eagerness for dharma-yudh.246 But the Guru was in no way a war monger as it was amply clear when he further elaborated his mission as the fight for victory of morality and truth over evil and injustice by promoting the righteousness and extermination of the wicked.247 The Dharma-yudh has been defined as “a moral war of truth against untruth, war of the good against the evil….to annihilate the wicked and to safeguard righteousness.”248 Therefore dharma-yudh is a fight for righteousness, justice and truth and not a battle for any temporal gains or conversion of people to Sikhism.

Though the word “dharma-yudh” was used by the tenth Guru only, but the concept had the ideological roots in the bani of the first Guru as the aim of life is to
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be truthful (sachiara) and the way is to follow the God’s will and loving His creation. But the way of truth is not easy and without confrontations as Guru Nanak said: “Shouldst thou cherish the desire to participate in the play of true love, place thy head on the palm of thy hand: then alone mayst thou enter this quarter: Shouldst thou put thy foot forward on this path, hesitate not to give up thy head.”

This theory came into practice when the fifth Master, Guru Arjan Dev (1563-1606) was martyred in 1606CE at Lahore on behest of the fanatic Mughal emperor Jahangir (r.1605-1627). This event gave a martial turn to the community’s orientation, and his son and successor, Guru Hargobind (1595-1644) instead of donning the rosary and other saintly emblems, wore a warrior’s equipment for ceremonies of succession and encouraged his followers to be trained as soldiers. He set the principle of miri and piri, combination of worldly strength with spiritual faith. He built Akal Takht (the throne of the Timeless God) where “ballads extolling the feats of heroism were sung to instil sense of heroism in the Sikhs.”

But it was just turn of orientation, as such spirit was the underlying philosophy contained in the Guru Granth Sahib as Kabir (1398-1448), one of the great saint-contributors to the Granth, taking the life as a battlefield said:

The sky-resounding kettle-drum (of spiritual inspiration) is struck, and the heart is pierced with the true passion (for righteousness): The hero is engaged in the battle; now is the time to fight up to the last: He alone is the hero who
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fights to defend the humble and the helpless; Who even though hacked from limb to limb, will not flee the field.\(^{254}\)

This spirit was not diminished afterwards and Guru Tegh Bahadur (1621-1675), the ninth Guru, again had to lay down his life to defend the people’s right to their religious beliefs and his successor and son, Guru Gobind Singh created the martial order of the Khalsa in 1699 at Anandpur Sahib, it was a “classless commonwealth of self-abnegating Sikhs, now surnamed Singh, devout and peaceful worshippers of the One God but irreconcilable opponents of injustice and tyranny”\(^{255}\). Creation of Khalsa by Guru Gobind Singh was an act of great foresight to establish a moral society based on the concepts of truth, justice and equality, and wage a war against evil and tyranny.\(^{256}\) The Guru had no temporal ambitions to fulfil rather he strived for the establishment of a society where human dignity was the most cherished goal. Though a number of battles were fought and won by the Guru, he neither bothered to acquire even a square inch of territory nor allowed any of his followers to resort to plunder.\(^{257}\) The sword in the hand of Khalsa was “not to establish any political power but to defend the weak and downtrodden and to destroy the armies of the wicked and the tyrant.”\(^{258}\) By creating the Khalsa the Guru raised an army of marjivare, the persons who were free from fear of death and volunteered “to pick up the gauntlet and jump into the battlefield of moral struggle (dharma-yudh) to achieve the ideal of self-realization.”\(^{259}\)
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Guru Gobind Singh wrote the heroic pursuits of the characters from the Indian mythic-religious traditions in the Dasam Granth but throughout this exercise the basic tenet that only One God is to be worshipped was nowhere compromised. While praying to God, the Guru did not request for any temporal gifts:

Grant me this boon, O God, from Thy Greatness,

May I never refrain from righteous acts;

May I fight without fear all foes in life’s battle;

With confident courage, claiming the victory;

May my highest ambition be singing Thy praises;

And may Thy Glory be grained in my mind;

When this mortal frame reaches its limits;

May I die fighting with limitless courage.

Fauja Singh writes that “the theory of Dharam-yudh thus evolved was elaborated further by incorporation into it certain new and original elements such as the concept of God as the Mightiest warrior and investiture of weapons with divinity.” By invoking God’s intervention in support of good against evil, the impossibility of defeat of the warriors of good operating under His benevolent care and protection is ensured and by conferring attributes of divinity on the weapons, they are made entitled to veneration and respect. The chief of weapons is the sword which is given epithets like *sukh santa karnam* (protector of saints), *khal dal khandan* (scatterer of armies of the wicked), *durmat darnam* (scourge of the evil) *jag karnam* (creator), *sarist ubharan* (saviour) and *pratparan* (sustainer) etc. But the use of

---
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force was not for the sake of force but must be (i) for a cause legitimate and noble; (ii) a remedy of the last resort and last and not the least one must be capable of using force when required.  

In his famous Zafarnamah-Epistle of Victory addressed to the Mughal Emperor, Aurangzeb Guru Gobind Singh wrote:

When no other way was left to me, I took
the path of war and put my arrow on my
bow. When all other means have failed, it
is righteous to draw the sword.

The Tenth Guru had given not only a definite outer appearance to the Sikhs when he initiated them into Khalsa through Khande ka Pahul and made five essential Ks (kes, kangha, kachh, kara and kirpan) but he made the Khalsa (initiated Sikh) symbol of his ideology as each K was interpreted to stand for some moral ideal: kes for spirituality; kangha for physical cleanliness, kachh for sexual morality and self control; kara for moral professional integrity and kirpan for heroism and defence of the righteousness. So by initiating Khalsa the Guru prepared persons of highest moral convictions who were always ready to fight against the tyranny and injustice without restraints of any parochial interests. While emphasising that Dharma-yudh is fought on principles and it is dharma of Khalsa to fight against evil and tyranny in the society, Professor Nirbhai Singh says that a war in which fraud, deceit, and falsehood are used is not a dharma-yudh, as were the wars during the misl period when the jathedars indulged in looting and plundering.

Dharma-yudh in Sikhism is not to be waged for narrow communal interests. Guru Nanak had made it very clear that no creed could claim to be the only path to
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God, the path was common but one had to accept will of God and lose ego, for example, he defined a true Muslim: “He should accept the will of God, the Creator (as protector), and lose his ego. Nanak says only then he can be called a Musalman, if he is merciful to all beings.”

Taking this philosophy further, Guru Gobind Singh said that the whole humankind should be recognised as one and said: “Some call themselves Hindu, some Turk (Muslim), some Hafzi and others Imamsafi. But the entire human kind should be recognised as one.”

He made it more explicit when he said that the manifest differences were due to the external factors as

The temple and the mosque are the same. Worship [in the temple] and namaz [in the mosque] are also the same. All human beings are [essentially] one though they tend to look many. Addressing humans differently with nomenclature such as god, demon, yaksha, gandharva, Muslim, Hindu etc. is result of influence of different places and vestures. Everyone of them has same eyes, the same ears, the same body and same power to speak and all of them are made of the earth, air, fire and water. Allah, given to no specific vestures as said in Quran, and Brahma described in the Puranas are the same: they are the same form, the same.

The dharma-yudh was to be resorted without hatred or desire for revenge. This dictum is best manifested in the life of Guru Gobind Singh as his father, four sons, mother and various followers fell in battle or were martyred by the tyrant Mughal rulers but neither did he talk of avenging these murders nor uttered any word of hatred against Islam.

“On the contrary many Pathans fought on his side as his comrades-
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in-arm; and more than once his life was saved by his Muslim admirers who, in so
doing, imperilled their own.”

**The Sikhs in the Battlefield:** Sikhism was to face not only the tyranny of the
Mughal rulers but also fight against certain forces affiliated to Hindu religion which
was afflicted by caste based division of society, superfluous rites, rituals and
idolatry. Prominent among such forces were the Hindu Hill Rajas who instead of
making league with the Guru started conspiring against him by making secret pact
with the Mughals. However, when the Mughal officer, Alif Khan came to collect
suzerainty from the Hill Rajas, finding the amount too huge they requested Guru
Gobind Singh for help and the Guru, fully knowing their treacherous nature, assured
them full help. In the ensuing battle the Guru and Sikhs discharged fatal arrows and
caused havoc in the enemy’s army. Surprisingly, the same Rajas subsequently
demanded cost of the land occupied by Khalsa at Anandpur, whereas the same had
already been paid by Guru Teg Bahadur at the time of establishment of this city.
The Khalsa under the Guru fought a number of battles against the confederation of the
Hill Rajas and the Mughal Army at various places but the basis for the battles was not
communal as at various stages even Muslims fought along side the Khalsa. Pir
Budhu Shah of Sadhaura (a Muslim) along with his sons and followers assisted Guru
Gobind Singh in the battle of Bhangini and for this act, he was later put to death by
the viceroy of Sirhind.
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To save the helpless and fight the tyrant Sikhs never cared for their lives. Baba Jujhar Singh, the eldest son of the tenth Guru rescued a Brahmin women from a Muslim tyrant and in the similar spirit Jassa Singh Ahluwalia rescued a Hindu women from the aggressive Nawab of Kasur when a supplication was laid before the Khalsa at the Akal Takht.279

In the fifth battle of Anandpur, a Sikh named Bhai Ghaniya used to serve water to the wounded soldiers but in doing so he did not discriminate and served water even to the enemy soldiers. The matter was raised before the Guru, but instead of rebuking him, he expressed his pleasure as the said Sikh had imbibed the true philosophy of the dharma.280 In the famous battle of Chamkaur, a haveli (katchi garhi) was given to the Guru and his soldiers by Roop Chand, a Hindu.281 It was in that garhi only that the Guru, honouring the democratic ethos of the Khalsa panth bowed before the resolution of the five Sikhs and following their dictate left the garhi along with two Sikhs, and thus the Khalsa was equated to the Guru.282

The most striking aspect of dharma-yudh in Sikhism is that the saint-soldiers engage into battle of righteousness without counting the odds and without ever doubting that he will win and without any concern for the consequences. This was evident when the Sikhs fought the battle of Chamkaur on 7 December 1705. The battle lines were clear; the Sikhs had to face a very heavy and well armed contingent of the enemy. They were very few in number and their weapons were no match to those of the enemy. But Instead of surrendering they went in small batches to fight the
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strong contingent of the enemy and died fighting. The Guru sent even two of his sons Ajit Singh and Jujhar Singh who also achieved martyrdom in the battlefield.\textsuperscript{283}

From the above discussion we can conclude that Dharma-yudh in Sikhism is not a concept confined to the battlefield only but is part of the all spheres of day to day life. It is quest for justice and truth not only for the Sikhs but any person who is being tortured by a tyrant. Caste, creed, race etc. are not the basis of such spontaneous resorting to dharma-yudh but the underlying motto is that the whole humanity is one. From above discussion, dharma-yudh in Sikhism evolves as a war for the sake for righteousness, protection of the weak and extermination of the wicked, where before resorting to war all other options should be explored and it should be resorted as the last option only, that the motive of Dharma-yudh is not to take revenge, that the fighter must have very high level of moral standards and be disciplined to the core of his heart; there is no place for mercenaries in it, that dharma-yudh is not a communal affair nor it is a sort of missionary endeavour; it is undertaken to right the wrong done by the evil, protect the weak and check the tyranny and in all this the religious affinities of the victim as well as those of the tyrant play no role, that the aim of dharma-yudh is not to annex any territory or to loot any property, that the non-combatants, women and children are not to be targeted. The aim is nowhere to terrorise as the ninth Guru said that only that person is called spiritually wise who does not frighten anyone, and who is not afraid of anyone,\textsuperscript{284} above all the, dharma-yudh is initiated even where there are bleak chances for victory. This feature makes the dharma-yudh one step ahead of the modern just war theory in which “a reasonable hope for success” is also a precondition, and in certain situations, a true Sikh can not wait a legitimate (human) authority to declare war, the Gurus made the ideological
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grinding so sharp that he plunges into the battlefield spontaneously and the Guru 
Granth Sahib is his/her constant guide and legitimate authority in this regard. As we 
have seen above, in the last quarter of the last century, the concept of dharma-yudh 
was employed during 1982 Morcha under the dictatorship of Sant Longowal, however, 
its philosophy was invoked time and again by various militant outfits for justification 
of initiation and continuation of use of violence by them.

III IDEOLOGY

Before the last quarter of twentieth century started, it was widely assumed that 
with the societies becoming more developed and modernised with eradication of 
disease due to improved health facilities, spread of mass literacy, political and 
economic development programs, application of new technologies due to progress in 
science, the “primordial loyalties” such as kinship, caste, and ethnicity were fast 
waning even in the third-world countries. It was also assumed that religion (being 
one of the elements in ethnic identities), being central to human life had influence 
almost all of its aspect so far, was waning fast and the individuals were restricting 
their religious beliefs to their private thoughts and activities. The development was 
conceptualized as modernity which was defined as a post-traditional historical period 
marked by industrialisation, capitalism, the nation-state and increasingly sophisticated 
forms of social surveillance. Modernity is said to be started in the eighteenth 
century Europe with enlightenment, an intellectual movement which made critique of 
tradition and authority, and had emerged from the writings of thinkers who valued 
the power of reason – especially science – to demystify the world over and against

superstition, myth and religion. The pre-enlightenment societies were taken as
superstitious where religion and mythology interpreted and provided meaning to the
human affairs and the cosmos.

Modern, modernism, modernity and modernisation are the words which lead
to the condemnation of tradition, traditional and traditionalism. The word “Modern”
came into English from French “moderne” from Late Latin “modernus”, which itself
derives from the adverb “modo” – a term that was equivalent to nunc, meaning “now”
since fifth century – was meaning “just now”, therefore, everything which was
current was modern; however, since nineteenth century and “very markedly” in
twentieth century, “modern” became equivalent to improved or satisfactory or
efficient. Fredric Jameson lists 14 different uses of this term from classical period
until 1960s; however, using the Marxist discourse, Jameson says, “if modernization
is something that happens to the base, and modernism the form the superstructure
takes in reaction to that ambivalent development, then perhaps modernity
characterizes the attempt to make something coherent out of their relationship.
Modernity would in that case describe the way “modern” people feel about
themselves; the word would seem to have something to do not with the products
(either cultural or industrial) but with the producers and consumers, and how they feel
either producing the products or living among them.” In this way modernity comes
out to be the outlook of the modern man towards the process of modernisation.

In ideal situations, modernisation should have been manifested in various
spheres of human activity – in economy in shift from feudal agrarian to capitalistic
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industry economy; in polity in shift from monarchical to nation states where the powers of nobility and church were replaced by those of the public at large through liberalism and secularism; in society in emergence of individualism with social mobility replacing the age-old institutions of family and community and ever more important roles of science and technology the changed social milieu; in philosophy in dominance of enlightenment, rationalism and empiricism; in arts, in prominence of naturalism and expressivism in place of iconic; and in theology, in the prominence of historical method and religious experience. In religious matters, modernity has brought not only the process of secularisation through which the institutional spheres of economy, politics, education, science and family got their own rationale and rejected the “overarching claim of religion” but also made secularism imperative. The modern communication technologies have enabled religious groups to better coordinate and communicate their ideas with wider audience. But the vice versa is also not incorrect as the political actors also use religious imagery and propaganda for their vested interests as we will find in the ensuing discussion.

Daniele Hervieu-Leger says that the advances in science and technology while solving large number mysteries could not reduce “the human need for security... the structural incertitude of human condition.” For example in health, a large number of disease spreading epidemics have been eradicated, but new and more deadly disease like HIV AIDS, Hepatitis B, C etc. have emerged. The means of transportation are fast but so is the enormity of accident. Individualism though, may
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be helpful in fast upward social mobility, but the lack of old family ties and social fabric is pushing people to depression. What one actually sees around, especially in the third world countries, gives such a grim picture that “development” often seems to be just statistical manipulation only. On the political front also, the making of the nation states is not without its grave side effects as in the European experience, most of the times, the options before the Jewish “other” (except in case of Spain which included the Muslim “other” also) were either to convert to Christianity, or deport or be persecuted to the extent of extermination.²⁹⁸ As such a new concept of postmodernism was coined which Jeff Haynes says, “is an enigmatic concept, whose very ambiguity reflects the confusion and uncertainty inherent in contemporary life. ... it decisively reflects the end of belief in the Enlightenment project, the assumption of universal progress based on reason, and in the modern Promethean myth of humanity’s mastery of its destiny and capacity for resolution of all its problems”²⁹⁹ In this background, now we discuss various phenomena and the related concepts.

**Traditionalism**

Every religion makes certain truths claims and has principles which are claimed to be of divine origin, revealed or unveiled to mankind by messengers, prophets, *avatars, Gurus* etc. These first principles help in envisaging what is called world view and cosmology, which in turn lead to the formation of ethics, law, social structures, symbolism, art and other aspects of the cultural life; this totality is transmitted in a continuous flow from generation to generation and is called tradition. No religious community is an island in itself thus can not remain unaffected by the developments in its surroundings as well as those in other aspects of its cultural life; therefore, the concept of tradition is applied also to the secular aspects of cultures.

²⁹⁹ Malise Ruthven (2007) op. cit. 122.
Tradition is defined as the formal transmission of information (both verbal and non-verbal) in religions and in religions with oral tradition the process of such transmission becomes all the more vital since there is no independent repository of information in written form, whether designated as scripture or not; since everything can not be put in written shape, myth and ritual have foundational importance in all religions.  

But tradition also includes the body of socially transmitted practice and belief from the past. Therefore, tradition is defined as the handing down of statements, beliefs, legends, customs, etc. from generation to generation, especially by word of mouth or by practice; or that which is handed down. 

The etymology of this word shows that it came into English around 14th century from its immediate forerunner word “tradicion” originating from Old French “traditionem” from ultimate traceable Latin word “tradere” – to hand over or deliver; the Latin noun had the sense of (i) delivery, (i) handing down, (iii) passing on a doctrine, (iv) surrender or betrayal. Raymond Williams says that this word “survives in English as a description of a general process of handing down, but there is a very strong and often predominant sense of this entailing respect and duty.”

Williams points out that though the word tradition tends to move towards age-old and towards ceremony, duty and respect; however, “tradition” and especially “traditional” are now often used dismissively within forms of “modernization theory.” Until seventeenth century, tradition was largely considered as an unquestioned source of insight; however, the advent of enlightenment in Europe brought a world-view for which tradition was an anathema being opposed to rational.
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hence could not be acceptable as a source of knowledge.\footnote{306} But tradition could not be dismissed outrightly, as Karl Popper says, “[q]uantitatively and qualitatively by far the most important source of our knowledge – apart from inborn knowledge – is tradition.... The fact that most of the sources of our knowledge are traditional condemns anti-traditionalism as futile.... without tradition knowledge would be impossible.”\footnote{307} But we can either accept tradition uncritically, often without even being aware of it or we may critically examine it to accept, reject or perhaps compromise with it.\footnote{308} Foucault gives a functional regressive definition of tradition and says that it is “intended to give a special temporal status to a group of phenomena that are both successive and identical (or at least similar); it makes it possible to rethink the dispersion of history in the form of the same; it allows a reduction of the difference proper to every beginning, in order to pursue without discontinuity the endless search for the origin; tradition enables us to isolate the new against the background of permanence, and to transfer its merit to originality, to genius, to the decisions proper, to individuals.”\footnote{309}

The development of tradition can be visualised as a dialectic process. Every society is in a flux and at no point can be said to be static. Therefore, tradition continuously interacts with this ever-changing social milieu and assimilates some new aspects and some old parts are discarded. This process goes on, some times unnoticed and it is presumed that the tradition in its original form is still continuing. Williams says that the traditions are present in values and standards but only some of them or parts of some of them are selected for respect or duty and it is “sometimes observed

\footnote{308} Ibid.,164.  
that it only takes two generations to make anything traditional: naturally enough, since that is the sense of tradition as active process.”³¹⁰ Hobsbawm adds a new facet that the “traditions” which appear or are claimed to be old are often quite recent in origin and some times invented; he says, “‘Invented tradition’ is taken to mean a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a historic past.”³¹¹ Perhaps, Feuerbach was expressing somewhat similar views when he said, “What yesterday was still religion is no longer such to-day; and what to-day is atheism, tomorrow will be religion.”³¹²

René Guénon had linked the usage of the term “tradition” with what he called “perennial philosophy,” to which S.H. Nasr says that “it implies both the sacred as revealed to humanity through revelation and the unfolding and development of that sacred message in the history of the particular human community for which it was destined; it implies both horizontal continuity with the origin and a vertical connection that relates each moment in the development of the life of any single tradition to the metahistorical Transcendental reality.”³¹³ Nasr emphasises on the need to define tradition universally on two accounts, first because of the onslaught of modernism on religious values and secondly, what he calls “the appearance upon the scene of that caricature of tradition called “fundamentalism’,” and says “[t]radition implies sacred, the immutable Truth; the perennial wisdom as well as the continuous
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application of its immutable principals to various conditions of space and time.”

But our concern is not with a mere philosophical movement whose purpose is to find commonality between various traditions of the past and putting them against modernity, nor we wish to return to the ideal past, or like Sedgwick to identify the Orient with tradition and the Occident with modernity, tradition with survival and modernity with destruction and thus revival of tradition “to avert extinction of the West” which is nothing more than an exaggerated and wishful thinking. A certain period in history of Occident starting with renaissance has been defined as the point from where modern originates, but so far it could not do away with the traditional and modern still remains what is contemporary in the original sense of the word.

In spite of rationality, the modern man enters into the act of believing because of realisation of lack of security and certitude in modernity and by the very act of believing the said lack is resolved (or, at least, concealed). Daniele Hervieu-Leger defines religious believing “– as a particular modality of the organization and function of the act of believing.” Then he says that there may be “no religion without explicit, semi-explicit, or entirely implicit invocation of the authority of a tradition, an invocation that serves as support for the act of believing.” In all religions, this authority of tradition transmitted from generation to generation is more than a simple assertion of continuity, as “it functions simultaneously as a principle of social identification, ad intra (through integration into believing community) and ad extra (by differentiation from those who are not of the same heritage). The religious experience is manifested in myriad ways but efforts are made to contain it in doctrines.
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and express its effects through ritual and cults which gain fixed shapes and are then taken as “impressed unassailable and binding” forms.\footnote{Gustav Mensching. Structures & Patterns of Religion. Trans. Hans F. Klimkeit and V. Srinivasa Sarma. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1976. 276-277.}

The religion being a human affair carried forward through rituals and cults its possessions in the shape of tradition can not remain pure in its original form for generations, but is it possible to break the tradition or assimilate new elements into it other than the continuous forward flow of human civilisation in the tunnel of time? Max Weber offers an answer when he says, “[t]he bearers of charisma, the oracles of prophets, or the edicts of charismatic war lords alone could integrate ‘new’ laws into the circle of what was upheld by tradition. Just as revelation and the sword were the two extraordinary powers, so were they two typical innovators.”\footnote{Max Weber. The Social Psychology of the World Religions. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Trans. & Ed. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. London: Routledge, 2009. 297, 267-301.} However, some other personalities or movements may also appear again and again in the history of religions that raise their voices against such corruption of tradition and want to establish the original tradition as interpreted by them.\footnote{Gustav Mensching (1976) op. cit. 277.} The power of tradition is emphasised most when the prophet while contesting the dominant religious order, justifies his mission and points out that he is to do what the religious institution has “neglected or forgotten.”\footnote{Daniele Hervieu-Leger (2008), op. cit. 256-57.} But as soon their work is done such innovations “succumb to routinization” which results into traditionalisation.\footnote{Max Weber (2009) op. cit.} Collective memory thus undergoes a mobilisation whose continuity transcends even history.

In Judaism tradition is an unwritten body of laws and doctrines, or any one of them, held to have been received from Moses and handed down orally generation to generation, in Christianity it is a body of teachings or any one of them, held to have
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been delivered by Christ or his apostles but not committed to writing.\textsuperscript{325} In Islam, the ancient Arab concept of Sunna (pl. \textit{sunan}) had the meaning similar to tradition as “in pre-Islamic Arabia, as in many tribally structured societies, any person renowned for his rectitude, charisma and distinguished stature was, within his family or clan, deemed to provide a \textit{sunna}, a normative practice to be emulated.”\textsuperscript{326} The earlier prophets, as well as Mohammad represented a prime source of \textit{sunan}. After the death of Mohammad, his \textit{sira} (the manner of his proceeding or course of action in particular matters/ events) became established as \textit{sunna}.\textsuperscript{327} In Sikhism, tradition is the source of some very important aspects such as \textit{Sangat} (the congregation), \textit{Langar} (the community kitchen), Pangat (sitting in rows without any stratification), \textit{Miri-piri} (saint-soldier) and \textit{rahit-maryada} (code of conduct) etc.

Traditionalism is not merely the acceptance of tradition as authority, rather it is insistence on that very authority only and in the context of modernisation this word is used dismissively. Traditionalism is defined as “emphasis upon historical authority of, and the continuity with or recovery of, norms and institutions basic to a cumulative tradition.”\textsuperscript{328} Traditionalism is also defined as adherence to tradition as authority, especially in matters of religion; it is also termed as “a system of philosophy according to which all knowledge of religious truth is derived from divine revelation and received by traditional instructions.”\textsuperscript{329} Joroslav Pelikan said, “Tradition is the living faith of the dead, traditionalism is the dead faith of the living. And, I suppose I

\textsuperscript{325}“Tradition.” The Random House Dictionary of English Language. 1502.
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should add, it is traditionalism that has given tradition such a bad name.\textsuperscript{330} From Pelikan we may infer that tradition is what continues from generation to generation but as already noted, all that is followed or adhered to by one generation to the other does not continue and some part of it dies in the process and some new part is added and traditionalism is insistence to continue with that dead part.

Traditionalism is some times confused with conservatism which is an approach to human affairs and it mistrusts both a priori reasoning and revolution, preferring to put its trust in experience and in gradual improvement of tried and tested arrangements.\textsuperscript{331} It is the disposition to preserve what is established and to promote gradual development rather than abrupt change.\textsuperscript{332} Conservatism is considered as a “valuable and necessary component” of all religions as it not only “cherishes the traditional symbols, rituals and spirituality” that constitute the rich religious heritage, but also resists “fads and too quick adoptions”.\textsuperscript{333} Traditionalism is a more “radicalized orientation” as it seeks to freeze doctrines, disciplines, expressions of religious identity “while seeking to monopolise the entire religious economy.”\textsuperscript{334} This, some times, gives rise to conflicts regarding what the actual tradition has been and also insistence on continuity of what is redundant, which may some times result into a conflict ending in to intra-religious violence. The traditionalists complain about the “blurring of their identity and loss of ... hegemony in the social, cultural, and political sphere.”\textsuperscript{335} Williams says that traditionalism seems to become specialized usage for
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description of habits or beliefs inconvenient to virtually any innovation,\textsuperscript{336} hence is taken as an aberration.

**Fundamentalism**

Fundamentalisms are said to be “recently developed forms of traditionalism”\textsuperscript{337} in which the traditionalists struggle with their own co-religionists, who, they think are going astray by following the dictates from the secular world\textsuperscript{338} but they are also said to be different “from traditionalism or orthodoxy or even mere revivalist movement. \textit{It differs in that it is a movement in conscious, organized opposition to the disruption of those traditions and orthodoxies.”}\textsuperscript{339} Then what is fundamentalism? This word is derived from “fundamental” which is defined as “a serious and very important, central or basic; affecting the most central and important part of something.”\textsuperscript{340} Fundamentalism itself is defined as “1 the practice of following very strictly the basic rules and teachings of any religion 2 (in Christianity) the belief that everything that is written in the Bible is complete and true.”\textsuperscript{341} This term is generally applied to movements which are considered inherently opposed to modern, scientific and secular values.\textsuperscript{342} But it represents much more than that. If its literal meaning is pursued, we find that every person or group is fundamentalist at one time or the other because “[a]ny person or group which holds deep convictions, which possesses any sense of conscience or which retains any sense of human dignity and
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honour holds fundamental beliefs. Fundamentals are touched when one’s most cherished and hallowed traditions or values are at stake, and when verities by which one has defined one’s personal or group identities are pushed, isolated and threatened.”

Fundamentalism as a term was coined from a series of ninety articles by leading conservative Protestant theologians in the U.S.A. which started being published and distributed free of charge among Protestant in 1910 under the title “The Fundamentals: A Testimony of Truth”. The project was sponsored by two successful businessmen brothers, Milton and Lyman Stewart with a lofty purpose of stopping the erosion of what were considered to be “the Fundamental Beliefs of Protestant Christianity: the inerrancy of the Bible; the direct creation of world, and humanity, \textit{ex nihilo} by God (in contrast to Darwinian evolution); the authenticity of miracles; the virgin birth of Jesus, his crucifixion and bodily resurrection; the substitutionary atonement (the doctrine that Christ died to redeem the sins of humanity); and his imminent return to judge and rule over the world.”

Curtis Lee Laws, a conservative Baptist editor added the –ist when he declared that the fundamentalists were those who were ready to do battle royal for The Fundamentals.

Ammerman gives the following four central features of fundamentalism in North America at that time: (1) Evangelism i.e., organized efforts to convert by convincing the unconvinced as the motto was: “eternity in heaven is better than the eternal damnation in hell that surely awaits the unsaved,” (2) inerrancy i.e., whatever is written in the Bible is correct and a true Christian must believe the whole Bible, the parts they like along with the
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parts they dislike;\textsuperscript{347} (3) premillennialism i.e., before Jesus comes back to rule for a millennium (one thousand years), the Antichrist will rise and there will be a final battle (Armageddon) between the forces of good and evil; then Jesus will establish reign of peace and righteousness and due to the belief that Christ will have to return before the millennium, the fundamentalists were called premillennialists.\textsuperscript{348} (But Ruthven interprets Premillennialism in the argument of the fundamentalists that “the world must be put to rights by people before Jesus’ return”);\textsuperscript{349} (4) separatism i.e., the fundamentalists say that there has to be “uniformity of belief within ranks and separation from others whose beliefs and lives are suspect.”\textsuperscript{350} Almost a half century later this laudatory term used in the context of American Protestant Christianity of twenties became suggestive of “narrowness”, “bigotry” “obscurantism”, and “sectarianism”\textsuperscript{351} and started being applied to such aspects in all the religious traditions. It was creationism i.e., the strict belief in creation of the world by God based on inerrancy of the Bible, which forbade many American states from teaching evolutionary theory of Darwin for a long period in the last century. Bruce Lawrence defines fundamentalism as “the affirmation of religious authority as holistic authority and absolute, admitting of neither criticism nor reduction; it is expressed through the collective demand that that specific creedal and ethical dictates derived from the scriptures be publicly recognised and legally enforced.”\textsuperscript{352} But fundamentalism is something more which has do something with identity and boundaries as Hobsbawm writes: “The ‘fundamentals’ that fundamentalism stresses always come from some earlier, presumably primal and pure ... stage in one’s own sacred history. They are
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used for setting boundaries, for attracting one’s kind and alienating other kinds, for
demarcating.”

In the third quarter of the twentieth century, development in various areas of
human activity and scientific discoveries, secularisation dominated the political
sphere and it appeared that rationality and scientific temperament will replace religion.
But all was not well; whatever was termed as “great” leap of development had some
side effects causing more serious damages and alienation as the old communal
support systems were not replaced by some substitutes but had been simply removed
without any alternative. The result was that in the next (last) quarter there were
religious groups all over the world who believed that their religions had an important
role to play in the present turmoil and rose against the establishments with militant
means; as such the term fundamentalism started being used for all of them. It has been
found that the fundamentalists claim to be (1) “upholding both orthodoxy (right belief)
and orthopraxis (right behaviour)” claiming that their authority comes directly from
God and thus their programme for reform and transformation is, in principle, beyond
criticism; (2) defending and conserving religious traditions and traditional ways
from erosion; hence make a cultural critique to prove that all is not well with social
or community life thereby establish a meaningful relationship between past and
present by appealing to the tradition, redefining it or even inventing a new one; (3)
devising new methods and articulating new ideologies (which may be in violation of
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actual historical belief, interpretive practices, and moral behaviour of earlier
generations or that of the contemporary conservative or orthodox believers) and
adopting latest “processes and organizational structure”;\footnote{358} (4) fighting back the
forces of attrition (as “merely” claiming to be conservative or traditionalist is not
enough)\footnote{359} to capture political power so that by remodelling the state, cherished goals
are achieved;\footnote{360} (5) [in doing so] relying on authority of the sacred past, whether
represented in a text or tradition, or in the teachings of a charismatic or official leader
to show the continuity of their teachings and programs to the tradition or religious
heritage;\footnote{361} (6) holding ground against the secular contamination, they may take
advantages of weaknesses/side effects of modernisation viz. crime, moral decay,
breakdown of family and the community, ecological disasters etc.\footnote{362} (7) It is also
found that regional and cultural variations accentuated by traditions and histories
create an impressive variety of fundamentalisms which have dualistic or Manichean
world view with uncompromising divide between light and darkness, absolutism and
inerrancy of the holy texts, faith in the miraculous triumph, fully committed selected
membership, sharp boundaries, authoritative organisation, and strict ethical
behaviour.\footnote{363} (8) The fundamentalist leaders persuade ordinary believers to suspend
existing teachings that condemn violence and promote peacemaking and as the
ordinary believers are not always sufficiently grounded in the teachings and practices
of their traditions to counter fundamentalists’ selective reading of sacred texts the
young and untutored become target of such propaganda.\footnote{364} (9) It is also found that
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fundamentalists are not opposed to change, but are committed to change a world that they find as godless, and think that whatever was around could not be called “progress,” therefore, “they inhabit the modern material and technical world while attempting to cast off its pernicious, dehumanizing, materialistic philosophy.”

Depending upon their assessment of the outside world and perception of their role in the divine plan, the fundamentalists adopt any one or more of the ways to abolish enemies: (a) “the world conqueror is to grab control of the structures of society which have given life to the enemy,” they include such groups namely, Revolutionary Shi’ism in Iran- 1960s-1970s, Sunni Radical Movement in Egypt under Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas in Palestine in mid 1980s, the U.S.A. Protestant Christians Late -1970s, Sikh Militants in Punjab – 1980s, Gush Emunim in Israel – 1970s, and Sri Lankan Buddhist extremists, 1956; (b) the world transformer “is to reinterpret and influence the structures, institutions, laws and practices of a society” to facilitate victory and to retard any move of opposition, they include U.S. Protestant Fundamentalists – 1875-1925, Cominione e Liberazione in Italy in 1960s, Hindu Nationalists – RSS, VHP etc. upto early 1990s; (c) the world creator “is to create alternative and encompassing societal structures and institutions” they include Habad (Lubavitcher Hasidim) in early nineteenth century Byelorussia, Christians in South India etc.; and (d) in a relatively rare mode, “the world

renouncer relates to the outside world in a complex pattern of dependence and rejection.\textsuperscript{372} They may include the French Catholic Lefebvrisis and Haredi Jews.\textsuperscript{373}

Fundamentalism is a term mainly coined for scholarly analytical purpose. The group which a scholar may label as fundamentalist may claim to be progressive. Moreover, religion and culture specific factors should be taken into consideration and this term should not be used as a generic term without qualifying the same. We find that different religious movements have been termed as fundamentalist, however, it may be wrong to conclude that all believers are fundamentalists, that all fundamentalists are terrorists, thus every form of orthodox religion should be banished from public expression.

**Communalism**

Communalism is a phenomenon which deals with relations between religious communities and is located mainly in the Indian Sub-continent and interestingly, the meaning it is ascribed in the Indian sub-continent is not the same as those it has elsewhere. In most of the English dictionaries, its meanings are given as: 1. a theory or system of government according to which each commune is virtually an independent state and nation is merely a federation of such states. 2. the principles or practices of communal ownership. 3. strong allegiance to one’s own ethnic group rather than to society as a whole,\textsuperscript{374} here the third meaning, though indicative still is not clearly defining. Only Oxford Advance Learners’ Dictionary has a meaning for this word that too from Indian English as “a strong sense of belonging to a particular, especially religious, community, which can lead to extreme behaviour or violence


\textsuperscript{374} “Communalism” The Random House Dictionary of English Language.
towards others.” Community is a group of people bound together by a sense of moral, religious or social factors and Hansen uses *samaj, jati* and *qaum* as binders.\(^{375}\)

Mushirul Hasan says that there is no standard definition of communalism, however, he defines it as “an ideology and a movement that employs narrow religious loyalty as a basis of collective action, and, in the process, accentuates artificially contrived distinctions and heightened community oriented consciousness.”\(^{376}\) Most of the scholars use the definition given by W.C. Smith who defined communalism as an ideology “that has emphasized as the social, political, and economic unit the group of adherents of each religion, and has emphasized the distinction even the antagonism, between such groups; the word “adherents” and “religion” being taken in the most nominal sense.”\(^{377}\) Bipan Chandra says that communalism is basically an ideology, ideology he defines as “a belief system or inter-related assumptions through which polity or society are viewed,” hence communalism is “a way of looking at politics and society and politics organized around that ideology.”\(^{378}\)

Religious diversity has been a major feature of Indian civilisation from the very beginning as in addition of four major religions Hinduism (with its various sects), Jainism, Buddhism and Sikhism, and various other smaller cults which originated at various stages of its history, the presence of Christianity and religions from Iran and Babylon at the beginning of the common era is evidenced by historical sources.\(^{379}\) The Arabs were no strangers to India as the trade with Europe in spices and other merchandise was made through them, therefore, there is no surprise that Islam also
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reached India very soon after it was founded. The Zoroastrians (Parsees) emigrated here in the 10th century CE from Persia (present day Iran) due to persecution by Muslim rulers and are living here ever since. Therefore, unlike many countries elsewhere, India has been a pluralist society from the very beginning. But the problem of communalisation of the religious communities is said to be originated in the colonial period only as the English played their trump card of “divide and rule” to perpetuate their hegemonic rule.\textsuperscript{380}

Communalism is based on the assumption that society is divided on religious lines into monolithic religio-political communities having not only different but antagonistic religious interests and whose political, economic, social and cultural interests also can be served with reference to their religious identities only and that too at the cost of those of the other.\textsuperscript{381} Numerous religious communities including various sects of Hinduism and Islam with their numerous sects lived in harmony and instead of “forming exclusive and antagonist groups” had rather been “cooperating in cultural life and social affairs.”\textsuperscript{382} Irfan Habib says that up to 1857 despite having affinities to their respective traditions, Hindus and Muslims could unite for common cause i.e., the native country (watan), and gives instances from the Revolt of 1857 when Shi’ite scholar Muhammad Baqir who edited the weekly Dehli Urdu Akhbar, appealed to both Muslims and Hindus “to refer to their sacred books and beliefs, put their trust in God and unite to fight the English.”\textsuperscript{383} On 19th July, 1857, an appeal was made to “all ‘fellow country men’ to consider each other to be organs of the same body,”\textsuperscript{384} these joint appeals show that the relations were not acrimonious till then.
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But the colonial interests of the English made their official historians to find
differences and where absent, to invent the same, and despite multitude of differences
among various Muslim groups, the English considered Muslim as a monolith which
presented them as a separate nation.\(^{385}\) The independent India has witnessed a large
number of incidents of violence arising out of communalism against minorities be it
Muslims, Christians or Sikhs. Bipan Chandra says that communalism and communal
violence are different as the former is primary and the cause of the latter which is the
consequence.\(^{386}\) The sudden eruption of violence resulting into rioting, looting, killing,
arson, rape or other brutal means of violence is result of the prior, continuous
indoctrination of the people over a period of time so that communalisation is instilled
into their brains. Bipan Chandra says in bold letters, “IT IS IMPORTANT TO KEEP IN VIEW THAT COMMUNAL IDEOLOGY CAN PREVAIL WITHOUT COMMUNAL VIOLENCE BUT COMMUNAL VIOLENCE CAN SELDOM TAKE PLACE WITHOUT PRIOR SPREAD OF COMMUNAL IDEOLOGY.”\(^{387}\)

Though communalism has engulfed various communities in the independent
India, however, the main contention continues to be that between Hindus and
Muslims in various parts of the country. The thesis of colonial machinations is some
times refuted and scholars like Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi claim that the Muslims
constituted a separate nation and their rivalry with Hindus had started much before the
arrival of the British.\(^{388}\) But most of the scholars ascribe the presentation of this
phenomenon to the partisan historiography and selective discrimination by the
English during colonial period.\(^{389}\) Communal violence is seen as a form of “social
control” or “a key defining factor in the history of struggle for dominance of one
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Community over another." But why control or dominance is needed? Moreover when the “other” is also a legitimate member of the same nation state – a citizen by birth having every right to live, are the religious contentions so acute that matter can not be left as such. It may be portrayed that the “other” is “too greedy, demanding and gasping” or has been getting more than deserved. Why do the religious factors come to fore all of sudden? Dipanker Gupta cites an instance of anti Sikh riots in 1984 in Bokaro Steel City where the Sikhs did not have any significant population but the post-Indira Gandhi assassination massacre there was “no less horrible than what happened in Delhi.” Gupta makes a very penetrating observation that most rioters though, may be ready to kill for a cause but not to die for one, and are also not fully devout to their religions, that means, someone has usurped the religious tradition to propagate, to preach communal hatred and riots. A sort of meta-narrative is extended to show the injustice having been committed in the past by the “other” which needs to be retaliated, the inborn flaws of the “other” are emphasised and for this ideals of one’s own religion are contrasted with practices of that of the other.

Communalism is not confined to India; Pakistan, a country with majority population as Muslims, though, there are some Hindus, Christians and Parsis also, has its own history of post independence communal riots. There is violence between Sunni and Shia sects, Ian Talbot says that during 1990-97 “in all, bomb blasts, assassinations and machine gun attacks on rival sectarian places of worship resulted in 581 deaths and over 1600 injuries.” Here, the role of politicians and the state come

---

392 Ibid., 81.
393 Ibid.
394 Gustav Mensching (1976) op. cit. 2.
to fore, as the pre-partition tension filled days of the Muharram festival spilled over to the whole year. Islamisation of the body politic through the Sunni dominance during Zia-ul Haq regime caused most damage and even the Shias were subjected to zakat at one stage, though, the same was abolished after much opposition, however, denial of Shias as true Muslims persisted.\textsuperscript{396} The collapse of state education system and the same being dominated by the madrasas has helped in instilling ideological bigotry from the tender years in the minds and has played a very crucial role.\textsuperscript{397}

When we examine the process of indoctrination of the ideology, it is found that the work of communalisation is started well in primary schools by various Organisations, where the people from the other community are portrayed in very bad light. For Indian Muslim majority such function is fulfilled by madrasas and various seminaries and for the Hindus the function has been taken over by the schools such as Vidya Bharti. For example, an extract from Itihas Ga Rahaa Hai (1991) being taught in Vidya Bharti Schools to class V is as follows:

\ldots After that the invaders came with a sword in one hand and the Quran in the other. Innumerable Hindus were forcibly made Musalmans on the point of sword. The struggle for freedom became a religious war. Innumerable sacrifices were made for religion. We went on and on winning one battle after another. We never allowed foreign rulers to settle down but we could not reconvert our separated brethren to Hinduism.(p.3)\textsuperscript{398}

Here, not only history is being manipulated, but the fraternity is simultaneously being claimed (in the distant past before conversion to Islam) and
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buried under the present religious affiliation of the other. Apart from such education being inculcated to the children in the schools run by Hindu organisations, during the BJP government a project to Indianise (communalise) the history by making changes in the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) books was initiated but was opposed by the eminent historians tooth and nail.\textsuperscript{399} Even other-wise a divisive history of India has acquired a hegemonic place in national mythology of the country as the first millennium of the Common Era is presented as having been glorified by the Hindu rule whereas the second tells tales of “Muslim conquest, destruction and consequent decay of Hindu civilization.”\textsuperscript{400} Thapar says that the colonial historiography was “almost as if the constructed ‘memory’ takes over from an attempted history.”\textsuperscript{401} The motive of such historiography is not difficult to fathom and it works as the source of ideology that is communalism.

Bipan Chandra says that the majority communalism can acquire power far beyond any minority communalism by passing itself as nationalism and this way can impose fascism, whereas the minority communalism is no less negative as it inflicts damage to not only to the minority but to the country as whole, it plays into the hands of the communal leaders which impedes its long term goals, and finally, far from defending minority interests it serves majority communalism.\textsuperscript{402} Every time there is communal violence, the result is usually in spatial purity, the goal of the majority community\textsuperscript{403}, the examples can be found in displacement of a large number of Sikhs to Punjab after the 1984 violence and that of a large
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number of Muslims after Gujrat riots of 2002 which leads to ghettoisation. The number of death toll in riots is always more on the side of the minority community, be it the above two incidents of beastly behaviour or the other communal riots in the post independence period, be it in India, Pakistan or Bangladesh.

**Terrorism**

It is said that terrorism is not a recent phenomenon; rather it has existed since before the dawn of recorded history of humankind but we can say this thing about terror with more certainty as in the Old Testament, YHWH tells the Jews: “I will send my terror before you, and will throw into confusion all the people.” Jonathan Barker says that the conservative British Politician, Edmund Burke, was among the first to use the terms “terrorism” and “terrorist” to point out what the “reign of terror” by Robespierre’s Jacobin government in revolutionary France meant wherein at least 17000 people had been guillotined. Robespierre had said, “terror is nothing but prompt, severe, inflexible justice” and “[t]o punish the oppressor of humanity: that is clemency; to forgive them, that is barbarity.” But terror was not new to France Voltaire had prescribed it for robbers to sensitise others.

On 1 March 1881, Tsar Alexander II was assassinated by a Polish Revolutionary, Ignatei Grinevitsky who was proud to be a “terrorist” and had died on the spot as the bomb was thrown from a very short distance. However, after the initial period of pride, terrorism started being used as a pejorative and term of abuse to
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describe one’s enemies.\textsuperscript{413} There has been hardly any change in the human nature, however, the change in the nature and degree of threat from terrorism has been brought by “three interlocking trends” i.e., the globalisation of commerce, travel and information transfer.\textsuperscript{414}

Jessica Stern, grappling with the problem of defining terrorism, says that though, definitions of terrorism are generally based on any of the three criteria – the perpetrators, his or her purpose/aim, and techniques used, however, two characteristics make terrorism different from other forms of violence – first, it is aimed at non-combatants, and second is that terrorists use violence for dramatic purpose of instilling fear in the target audience which is often more important than the physical assault, and then she defines terrorism “as an act or threat of violence against non-combatants with objective of exacting revenge, intimidating, or otherwise influencing the audience.”\textsuperscript{415} The two immediate questions about the definition of the non-combatants and whether state can become a terrorist as per this definition are raised by Stern herself. The first question has a situational answer, moreover, in recent past attacks on some military establishments have been termed as terrorist attacks; whereas, the act of raising the second question itself, the answer to which is in affirmative, makes her purpose obvious – to include Iraq and such other states in the list of terrorist states. Surprisingly, she does not discus the implications of the past activities of the U.S.A. in other countries which we will discuss while referring to Noam Chomsky subsequently. The important question whether merely a threat is an act of terrorism even if the potential for its execution is not known is neither posed nor answered.
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The first question Stern raised about her definition may find some answer in the following statement of Osama bin Laden in his *fatwa* titled: “Declaration of Jihad Against the Americans Occupying the land of the Two Sacred Places” in 1996: “Terrorising you while you are carrying arms in our land is a legitimate duty we are morally obliged to fulfil . . . in order to re-establish the greatness of the umma and to liberate the occupied sacred places . . . Our youths are different from your soldiers. Your problem will be how to convince your troops to fight, while our problem will be how to restrain our youth.” So even armed soldiers can be threatened and terrorised.

American agency FBI gives the following definition of terrorism: “the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.” This definition does not tell as to “who” should be a perpetrator to qualify an act to be labelled as an act of terrorism. Barker has the answer – the immediate perpetrator may be an individual but there has to be a group or organisation behind it – be it some anti colonial nationalist or right wing or left wing or anarchist or nationalist or religious group or internal state or external state or colonialist engaged directly or “via proxy organisations” without ever acknowledging that they are engaged in terrorism.

Some people say that defining terrorism is pointless as the dictum goes, “one person’s terrorist is another person’s freedom fighter”, therefore, calling someone terrorist means one is opposed to his or her motivating cause, because everybody calls his or her cause just. Barker says that “only actions are unambiguously terrorist or
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non-terrorist. People and organizations and strategies make more or less use of terrorism often in conjunction with other kinds of political actions. ... Organizations that are designed to carry out terrorist operations can properly be called terrorist organizations and the people who plan and implement the actions are terrorists.”

Alex P. Schmid (and Albert J. Jongman) gave a much elaborated definition of terrorism which is as under:

Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action. Employed by (semi) clandestine individual, group, or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby – in contrast to assassination – the direct target of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat – and violence – based communication process between terrorist (organization), (imperilled) victims, and main targets are used to manipulate the main target (audience(s)), turning it into target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is primarily sought.

Various other scholars have also come out with their own definitions and after September, 11, 2001 attack in the United States of America, which was the first attack on the national territory of that country after the War of 1812, there is, what we may call glut of definitions of terrorism. One important aspect has been added after
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Some scholars take terrorism as a law and order problem and use terms such as “Jihadi terrorism” forgetting that Jihad is a concept in Islam which may be interpreted differently by Muslims. Therefore, instead of giving more definitions, we try to analyse the phenomenon of terrorism on the basis of various factors such as types of attack, targets, weapons, goals, groups, infrastructure etc. Terrorist attacks may be in the forms of suicide bombing, kidnapping, hostage taking, drive by shooting, target assassination, air piracy; the targets may be public gatherings, oil tankers, journalists, food supplies, abortion clinics, tourists, embassies, places of historical or cultural pride; weapons may include, automatic guns, sarin gas, car/motorcycle/cycle bombs, shoulder-fired missiles, dirty bombs, anthrax or other deadly chemicals, airplane as missile, or ammunition laden trucks or other vehicles, some of which lead to the sure death of the perpetrator(s) also; goals of the terrorists may include, political independence, revenge, to free prisoners, to boost followers’ morale, to weaken government, to publicise demands; the groups may be nationalists, neo-nazis, official state agencies, proxy for state, secret state agency, religious militants, left wing militants; and last but not the least, the infrastructure of terrorists may include, training camps, safe houses, money laundering, counter intelligence, and funding sources. But if we leave aside the above said tangible factors concerning terrorism, we can conclude that it is tool whose biggest attack is psychological, for which the only target is human brain, weapon is creation of fear psychosis, for even feigning to have a deadly weapon may be even more effective than a real weapon.
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goal is to create panic and such trust in the target which ensures that any threat could be translated into reality and the danger is perpetual and real.

Terrorism and counter terrorism are twine children as we can not pass judgements very easily, as is evident from what Noam Chomsky says, “Nothing can justify crimes such as those of September11, but we can think of the United States as an “innocent victim” only if we adopt the convenient path of ignoring the record of its actions and those of its allies, which are, after all, hardly a secret.”426 The U.S.A. has a history of having helped in installation of very corrupt and anti-people governments in various countries of the world for vested interests resulting into innumerable death toll the civilians and exploitation of natural resources of those countries.427 Terrorism, what else it may be, is not the oft claimed, “the weapon of the weak,”428 it may be weapon of the strong even. If we go by the America’s subsequently refined rhetoric of “war against terrorism” which was initially proclaimed as a “crusade” with “stark choice” to the nations of the world to either join the U.S.A. in her war or “face the certain prospect of death and destruction” as, they were either with her or (definitely) with the terrorists.429 Was not it a threat, a terror? Moreover, use of the word “crusade” tragically, brought into open what Laden was alleging to be the hidden agenda of the U.S.A.

Terrorists are not born, they are made. But who makes them – circumstances or volition? Why they become terrorists – to avenge the injustice or due to some predilection for violence? How they justify their acts and themselves – with regard to destruction of human lives and their own destinies? How is it that most of the terrorist acts today generally have not only justifications but also condemnations in religion?
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Can the end justify the means? If we say no then can we justify any war? These and many more questions need to be answered but their answers can not be definite ones. However, one thing is very definite and that is – all terrorism is primarily rooted in local contexts. Even the movements with global reach like al-Qaeda and Hizbullah began in their own distinct regions.\(^{430}\) Brynjar Lia says that relative perception of deprivation and inequality especially among culturally defined groups, poverty and weak state structures may cause collective civil violence which lead to insurgencies and terrorism.\(^{431}\) Most of the times it is a vicious circle, where state plays a prominent role. Joyce Pettigrew, while writing about the conditions in Punjab in 1980s, gives graphic details of the army attack on Golden Temple Amritsar, in June 1984, where along with the targeted persons like Bhindranwale and his accomplices, a large number of civilians, who had gathered due to the martyrdom day of the fifth Guru, were also killed, the impact on the psyche of the Sikhs not only of this attack, but also the simultaneous operation Woodrose in rural Punjab in which youth in the 15-25 age group were rounded up and kept in the army-custody for long periods, and the anti Sikh riots all over the northern India in November that year was so deep that anti state sentiments resulted into insurgency and terrorism, during which many youngsters were killed in encounters with armed forces, some had to cross border to Pakistan and those who remained were convinced that “identity could only be defined in relation to religion, morality, and culture, as they had no sovereignty over any territorial space.”\(^{432}\) Juergensmeyer says that the “perception of erosion of power led them to violence since violence is empowering and the power that comes from the barrel of
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gun is direct, but the indirect psychological dimension of this power may be even more effective.”

But the views of Tambiah in this regard are more realistic and mature when he says, “This signifies organised violence as the order of the day and as a principal mode of enacting politics, through which power is produced, acquired, and employed in a theatricalized and repetitive manner.” This implies that it is not the gun that creates power, it the resulting political mode that does so. Militancy in Punjab could be abated only in the first half of the 1990s, though, with its own after effects which we will discuss in the next part. Further, the following four categories of approaches to terrorism analysis have been suggested by a European study group: 1) the multi-causal approach which includes combination of psychological considerations, economic, political, religious and sociological factors; 2) the political or structural approach which is based on the assumption that terrorism is the product of surrounding environmental factors such as poverty, inequality and suppression; 3) rational or organizational approach considers terrorism as a rational strategy to achieve certain political goals and the same instead of being individual is a group process, however it may be the case only in respect of such groups which have clear chain of command; and 4) the psychological approach considers the motivational factors which make individuals to take such extreme decisions as “suicide terrorism” but the case studies even with a large number of samples do not take us to any conclusion because terrorism “as a means of expression of specific ideas and needs, is part of the human disposition” which may be anything but predictable. One thing
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can be very clearly elucidated – it is not that some people are born with special predilection for terrorism, rather it the most ordinary people who can perform most gruesome acts of terrorism due to combination of any number of factors like individual inspiration, organisational aims and strategies and “cultural catalysts” with no less important roles of suppression and depravity. Similarly, no religion can be said to more prone to terrorism. Loving one’s group and being afraid of or aversive to outsiders are intrinsic parts of human nature and our cultural baggage helps in demarcation and even demonising the other which are the pre-requisites for antagonism of any kind.

Martyrdom

Most of the monotheistic religions have their respective concepts of martyrdom – Kiddush ha-shem in Judaism, martyrdom in Christianity, Shahadat in Islam and Sikhism. Hebrew Kiddush ha-shem literally means “sanctification of the divine name” or glorification of YHWH especially be remaining steadfast in faith. There were three ways to do so – prayer, excellent conduct and martyrdom and it is martyrdom which has always been seen as the ultimate expression of Kiddush ha-shem and which is obligatory and thus preferable to violation of a commandment. Failure to do this leads a man to hillul ha-shem which is profanation of the divine name. The Christian concept is represented through the word “martyrdom” which is derived from “martyr” which originated from the Greek word martus meaning “witness” and the term was originally applied to those apostles who were eye-witness to the life and death of Christ; however, subsequently due to prosecution by the Roman authorities it was applied to those who underwent torture and death to witness
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their faith. In Islam, a special sense of grandure and sanctity is attached to the term Shahid, so much so that “when a meritorious person or deed is to be exalted, it is said that a particular person has the status of shahid, or that a particular act merits reward of shahadat. Ali Shariati says, “The word shahid has the heaviest load of meaning. ... In the lexicon, “shahid” signifies one who is present, an overlooker, an observer, a witness and one who bears witness. It also means the truthful and honest informant, and it also means conscience. It is what is sensed and seen, the one towards whom all eyes are directed, and last but not least, it means pattern, exemplar, model.” He concluded his lecture with these words, “In all ages and centuries, when the followers of a faith and an idea have power, they guarantee their honor and lives with jihad. But when they are weakened and have no means whereby to struggle, they guarantee their lives, movement, faith, respect, honor, future and history with shahdat. Shahdat is an invitation to all generations, in all ages, if you can not kill your oppressor, then die.” In Sikhism, the concept of martyrdom (shahadat/ Shahidi) is very important as Guru Nanak had synthesized spiritual aspects of human life with worldly aspect. Nirbhai Singh says that the Sikh Martyrdom has “spiritual, ethical, and political significance in praxis. Sikhism derives this kind of knowledge from the scripture in which victory over death has been emphasized.” Among the attributes of God given in the beginning of the Sikh Scripture, the attribute “nirbhau” (fearless) is one and Guru Nanak says, “People will not revile if they know how to die heroic death. (2) Consecrated death of the martyr is the truth (haqq) if their dying is divinely
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approached. Only those are called martyrs at the divine court. Therefore a martyr is not a person who is killed, rather a person who chooses to die and die a heroic death. There is a long list of Sikh martyrs starting from Guru Arjan Dev, who is revered as the king of martyrs because he laid his life for humanity and truth, he was followed by Guru Tegh Bahadur, the ninth Guru, who laid down his life to protect the individual and communal right to profess religion, the four sons of the tenth Guru and a large number of other Sikhs. The place of martyrs in Sikhism is very high and they are always remembered in the Ardas (supplication), the relevant part of which is as follows:

Those who dwelled on God’s name, shared their earnings with others, wielded the sword in battle, distributed food, offered their heads at the alter of Dharma, were cut up limb by limb, skinned alive, boiled and sawed in half, but did not utter a sigh nor faltered in their faith, kept the sanctity of their hair until their last breath and sacrificed their lives for the sanctity of the Gurdwaras; remember their glorious deeds O Khalsa and utter Waheguru!

Discussing the Judeo-Christian tradition, Weiner and Weiner say, “It is not at all clear who or what actually makes a martyr. It is a matter of personal intention, dramatic circumstances, agonizing experiences or merely clever propaganda? Does martyr primarily make himself or herself? Is martyr created by the persecutor and the oppressor? In other words, are martyrs created through particular external circumstances, or through the unique force of their internal convictions?” Their dilemma is justified as Girard explains that there is difference in the outlook, of the

Christians and the Muslims as whereas, “in Christianity the martyr does not die in order to be copied. The Christian can be moved to pity over him, but he does not desire to die like him. He is suspicious of it, even. The martyr is for Christian a model to accompany them but not a model for throwing oneself into the fire with him. In Islam it’s different. You die as a martyr to be copied . . . Yes, Islam is a religion of sacrifice in which we find also the theory of mimetic rivalry and the model. The candidates for the act of suicide are not lacking when terrorism seems to fail.” He is echoing Ali Sheriati that “if cannot kill, die.” Weiner and Weiner put forth three basic elements of martyrdom as:

1. The martyrological confrontation i.e., a structured confrontation in which the martyr confronts his or her persecutor;
2. The martyr’s motive i.e., a disposition on the part of the martyr to self sacrifice for conviction; and
3. The martyrological narrative i.e., a literary tradition that immortalizes the martyr’s story.

Then they define martyr as “a member of a suppressed group who, when given the opportunity to renounce aspects of his or her group’s code, willingly submits to suffering and death rather than forsake a conviction.” Kirwan says that no culture, group or grand idea can do without a martyr to make it plausible. Buddhism and Jainism, two religions originating from India preached non-violence. But there are recorded instances of involvement of Buddhist monks in warfare in various countries
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of Asia, since 402BCE (China) till the present times.\textsuperscript{452} There is no such concept like martyr in Buddhism, as the earlier text like Samyutta Nikaya XLII.3 see violence in the battlefield negatively as every person killed there, dies with hatred and pain and can be born in hell only,\textsuperscript{453} however, the later tradition condones killing and violence inflicted with intention to save religion, race or country and in such cases birth in heaven is guaranteed.\textsuperscript{454} The concept of martyrdom in Hindu religion has been manifested through the acts of the Tigers of Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam in Sri Lanka and has basis in old Saivism and the last section of the Bhagavadgita,\textsuperscript{455} the concept was further reinforced by declaring the kar sewaks killed in police firing while attempting to have forced entry into precincts of the disputed Babri mosque complex in October-November, 1990.\textsuperscript{456} Martyrs expose themselves to universal struggle between two formidable forces: the basic drive for biological survival and man’s deep need for a life of conviction. There is a trend to declare as martyr who so ever is killed in a terrorist attack, however, in religious or even secular terms only that person is a martyr who embraces death willingly and consciously knowing the consequences fully and this is why it is very difficult to make judgements as one person’s terrorist is other person’s martyr.

\textbf{Human Bombs}

In the recent times, almost every day media brings out news of suicide attacks resulting into massive destruction of mostly innocent persons and property. When the phenomena of terrorism and martyrdom come together, then we find human bombs
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who seems to have improvised over Ali Sheriati’s dictum to rewrite it as “if you can not kill easily with other means die to kill.” They are also called the suicide terrorists, suicide bombers because they choose their death, but suicide is not approved by any religion, therefore, they are called the human bombers or human bombs. They choose death consciously thereby earning the titles of martyrs in their traditions or at least in their groups. There are instances where persons in medieval period were engaged in assassination missions with every chance of sure death for themselves and were known as assassins or hashishis in Islam, Zealots in Judaism and Kamikazes in Japan. The invention of nitroglycerine in 1866 by Alfred Nobel which was patented as dynamite brought a new weapon of mass destruction in the form of a malleable paste that was easy to carry. Up to mid 1960s, terrorism was still regarded as localized and conflict specific phenomenon confined to the third world, however, the Six day war in 1967 in which Israel had badly defeated Arab powers changed the scenario and the matter of lacs of displaced Palestinians became a pan Arab problem. This antagonism which initially took shape of Islam verses Judaism, later involved Christianity mainly due to America’s tactical support to Israel.

In November, 1982, Ahmad Qasir, an adolescent Hezbollah (an organisation – meaning the party of God, originating in Lebanon during Israeli attack in 1982 itself) drove a white Mercedes loaded with explosives into the Israeli military headquarters in Tyre. Total 141 persons including Israeli militia, Palestinian and Lebanese prisoners were killed. This heralded a new era of suicide bombing on international level in which thousands of people have been killed so far. In the Indian state of
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Punjab when normalcy had returned after much turbulence and bloodshed in the mid of the last decade of the last century, Beant Singh, the then Chief Minister of the state, who had allegedly got thousands of Sikh youngsters killed to curtail militancy in early 1990s, was blown into pieces by Sikh human bomb, Dilawar Singh while he was coming out of his office on August 31, 1995, sixteen other persons were also killed. The remaining perpetrators were subsequently arrested, the alternate human bomb, Balwant Singh Rajoana confessed his deed without ever displaying any remorse and was condemned to death, to which he filed no appeal, though appeals of his co-accused resulted in softening of their sentences.463

The first question is why such mode is chosen and the answer is not simple, for what ever the reasons may be, choice of voluntary death is not without very high motivation M. Hafez finds the “suicidal violence” not as an outcome of “political environment or rational calculation of costs and benefits, but rather as an act of redemption and religious obligation in the context of persecution and injustice. . . . culture of martyrdom is the principal means through which it generates high rates of volunteerism for suicide missions.”464 Pape describes it as “strategy” as a national resistance to a foreign occupation when the religions of the occupier and occupied are different as religion serves to reduce room for compromise, helps in demonising the other and legitimises martyrdom.465 The suicide bomber has clear views about the “other” also as Mohammed Atta, the leader of the 11 September, 2001 attackers, described the people to be killed as the “animals being ritually sacrificed.”466 The other aspect is that deeds speak more loudly than words as is evident from what Rajoana said – “my execution will do what the Shiromani Gurudwara Parbandhak

464 Quoted in James W. Jones (2008), op. cit. 17.
465 Referred to in James W. Jones (2008), op. cit. 16-19.
466 James W. Jones (2008), op. cit. p. 52.
Committee could not do even after spending crores of rupees.” Among with the definite collateral damage, it is a very effective propaganda device. Next question is – whether the suicide bombers psychologically abnormal? The psychological profile of suicide bombers show them to be like any other human being as is deducted from an extensive study done by Robert A. Pape. What prompts them to take such route or what they gain personally and how are they justified? There is no sanction or refute for suicide bombing, suicide itself is taken as cowardice in almost all the religions as life is considered as gift of God. But the theology of martyrdom, of course, provides the ideological justification for suicide terrorism as in the Beant Singh murder case, the Akal Takht, recognising the contribution of Dilawar Singh and Balwant Singh Rajoana, the human bomb and the alternate human bomb respectively, conferred the titles of Shahid and Jinda Sahid on them in addition to plans to make concerted efforts to save Rajoana from death sentence (though against his will). Theology of martyrdom develops in other traditions also with the changing circumstances in some what similar way.

468 Abdel Bari Atwan. (2007), op. cit. 99; Matthew Car (2006), op. cit. 266.