

CHAPTER - I

Secularism and the process of secularization

The growth of secularism and secular politics has been a new phenomenon in modern history. The history of the societies both in the East and in the West may be treated as the biography of the developing civilisation on the Earth. And this development takes place in degrees with the elapse of time bearing with the birth of new ideas and ways of life. Secularism, likely, is a new outlook of the way of life by reason of it's being an alternative to supramundane ethical system and theology. It would be a narrow question where secularism first sprang from. Secularism as an idea originated exclusively neither from the East nor from the West, rather it was a by-product of the experiment of man in general for a better way of life. The growth of secularism as a phenomenon of human thought emerged out of the evolution of man's search regarding the meaning of life in the changing civilisation. Though change is a universal law of nature, change of thought does not take place on equal pace everywhere in every age. It depends on adaptability. When an inconsistent environment becomes unbearable, it gives birth to an opposite which in turn changes the system already prevailed. Secularism, despite it's being an achievement of the entire human society, came in it's typical form first in Europe.

In Europe, however, the genesis of secularism can be traced historically, philosophically, politically and scientifically.

'Necessity is the mother of invention'. So, historically the birth of secularism was necessitated. The fog of ignorance and privileges that mounted high in the Dark Age brought about its own debacle through the break of the Renaissance (1454-1520) — an outburst of rationality, humanism, logical politicization of State-affairs and sciences. The people, dissatisfied¹ with the tenets and orders of the Church, also with the clerical dogmas, searched for a new outlet to the understanding of an alternative to the Church. This objective search found a relief of solution in the Renaissance and this advancement continued in the later period. New ideas of life were found both out of the Greco-Roman revival and the discovery of further new. The authority of the Church was questioned and challenged. Francesco Petrarca (1304-1374), Giovanni Boccaccio (1313-1375), Sir Thomas More (1478-1535) and Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536)² attacked the Church, opened the path of reformation and humanism. The Lutheran reformation which followed afterwards broke up the Western Christian ecclesiastical unity, rebelled against the authority of the Church, and disavowed of the Catholic dogmas³.

The emergence of natural philosophy contrary to the dictations of religious institutions made suspicious the birth of secularism in the offing. The Renaissance, of course, did not mark great achievement in philosophy⁴, but it was certainly the beginning of modern philosophical outlook. This time onward upto the end of the nineteenth century, the growth of philosophy under

went a rapid change turning it's face to life in nature, and it's relationship with the reality mostly in empirical sense. The idea of the Cosmos and of the Earth⁵, the goal of man and the summum-bonum of life were reflected in philosophy in the new leaves of reason, logic and science. Dogmatism inseparable from religious philosophy of the Middle Ages had to retire to the verge of non-existence. The Europe that marched through the arches built by Rene Descartes (1596-1650), John Locke (1632-1704), Spinoza (1632-1677), Leibniz, David Hume (1711-1776), Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), Hegel (1770-1831), John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Bergson (1859-1941) realized the objectivity of material existence, the reality of man's life, the utility of pragmatism and the irrelevance of the supernatural in determining the temporal goal of life. This philosophical development anticipated the emergence of secularism. In the course of this philosophical advancement, the anti-theistic ideas of Thomas Paine and Richard Carlile, utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and positivism of Auguste Comte (1798-1857) by providing non-religious concepts of human knowledge and ends of human activities, laid the rudimentary foundation of secularism. On the basis of all these ideas in the nineteenth century George Jacob Holyoake⁶ conformed the structure of secular philosophy.

The Renaissance covered the whole field of human experiences. This coverage went on developing to lead man to a stupendous

achievement in science. The mediaeval darkness relatively encouraged negative scientific disquisitions in the period between 400 and 1543 A.D.⁷ Though a great deal of translation works of the Greek and Hindu sciences was done in the Arabian land, it could not generate a scientific tradition. The post Renaissance period ushered a probe into science preceded by the scientific logic of induction and scientific methods devised by Francis Bacon (1561-1626). His process of analysis of material and efficient causes and the valuation of experiment in science developed the philosophy of science⁸. It had an extra bearing too on his interpretation of history by uniting the highest good of man from another life and basing man's aspiration in nature and experiment⁹. Bacon laid the process of advancing in scientific haust, and this ensued a revolution. Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543), the precursor of modern science, of course, was before Bacon, but his posteriors Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), Galileo (1564-1642) and Isaac Newton (1642-1727) actually brought the eye of science as opposed to ecclesiastical overtures and superstitions. Galileo introduced the process of demargesting scientific interpretation and the language of mathematics in the study of nature.¹⁰ Newton combined the usefulness of inductive and deductive procedures under the stress of experimental confirmation both in analysis and synthesis. In edvancing science by leaps and bounds, he applied and systematized the generalization of laws and axiomatic methods¹¹. With the uniformity of all its methods,

discoveries, inventions and experiments, science started a civilisation anew¹². Man's taboos and fear about religion pined away. In the subsequent time, on the structure of scientific knowledge was born the industrial revolution. In succession, came capitalism and to its contradiction followed socialism. Secularism was born in between these ages of transition.

In the age of the Renaissance, keeping equal pace with philosophy, was formulated and cemented political theories. Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) was, perhaps, the first man to concretise political theory as a separate study of state-affairs. His works — 'The Prince', 'The Discourses', 'The Florentine History' and 'The Art of War' — set up a new political morality of the ruler. He repudiated politics based on the Bible or Christianity. What he told was neither religious nor irreligious but what suited for better administration. Thus, he was the child of political Renaissance to establish Realpolitik¹³. Subsequently, the philosophers proved to be great political theoreticians and they changed the skeleton of political thought by separating it from things religious. The eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries made distinct landmarks by giving nationalism a full-shape. The American war of independence, the French Revolution, the Bill of the rights of man, the July and the February revolutions in 1830 and 1848 in France expanded the practical network of revolutionary politics quite separate from matters religious. The exercise of democracy bestowed power on the people.

The ultimate manifestation of this trend was attained in the secularism of George Jacob Holyoake and the socialism of Karl Marx.

The meaning of Secularism:

Before we discuss the principles of secularism, we have to see what was wrong with religious belief and bigotry or if there was any need of secularism at all. The religions of man have been many in number. In the midst of religious plurality, a common definition of religion may be suggested that religion is a socio-ethical and behavioural doctrine based on theology with the depth of a belief in the existence of the supernatural power guiding all else out of it's own in the world, punishing and rewarding man for his deeds and misdeeds either in this world or in the next world. Owing to this belief in the next world (peaceful or wrathful), man had to live anxious life for happiness in the next world even at the cost of the value of life in this world. Before the birth of organised and revealed religions the ancient societies had to undergo the order of the priests who supposedly claimed to have known the supernatural, and this established their superiority upon others. After the birth of organised religions the order of the priests did not end, rather it took more rooted shape in the order of the clergies of Christianity, Ulemas of Islam and Brahmins of Hinduism. These privileged classes for their own convenience bestowed temporal power in the king and the divine right of kingship came into being.

Consequently through different courses of development, religion entwined politics. Belief in the after world and the theory of the hands of God as the cause of one's becoming rich and poor sanctioned exploitation in the society. More sordid was the fact that the religious creeds and denominations being many such as Hinduism, Christianity, Mohammedanism, Judaism etc. there was no uniformity and homogeneity of religious ideas. Bigotry of the religionists and their fanatic activities felled mankind to peacelessness and warfare like the Crusades. So the belief in religion grew to be a matter of strife and anxiety in state-affairs. It also helped stretch hands to the exploitation of the ignorant mass by the shrewd and heartless Clergians. But this age of agony ended with the dawn of humanism which in turn contributed to the new philosophy of secularism. Thus it seems that secularism was most needed as an alternative way of life.

Eric S. Waterhouse defines secularism as a movement intentionally ethical and negatively religious¹⁴. Without any disagreement with this definition we may elaborate this that secularism is a positive system of ethics making the way of human life distinctly separate from religion by holding man as an end in himself instead of a means to the realization of the unseen supernatural. Secularism typically signifies a value system of morality making politics free from religion and theology of any form. It is exclusively a worldly value system in relation to the walks of the present life. It is a living of life on the line of natural philosophy in consonance with science.

Secular principles in historical perspective:

The growth of modern science from the beginning of the seventeenth century took place on the discovery of natural laws governing the universe. These laws, as had been found to happen recurrently without the hand of the supernatural, made incredible the delineation of the sudden creation of the world as told in the Bible. The mystery and fear about the vast infinite sky vanished from man's mind. Because, the religious bindings imposed on man were neither spontaneous in man's nature nor in the environment. Now the scientific study of man in response to natural laws sought to systematize an order in man's spontaneous activities without any reliance on the divine. So, the more mystery of the world was discovered the more religious hold declined. Thus it seems that reliance on natural laws became one of the principles of secularism.

Verification of facts, as derived from the type of scientific verification, became another principle of secularism. The most important advancement in the act of disobeying the scriptures was, of course, not only the scientific inventions but the method¹⁵ of science in analysing the environment and nature of which man is a being. Scientific methodologies comprising observations and experiments ruled out the religious authorities whose description of the universe was not scientific but based on the eulogies of God. Science depended on verification, while religion was a tradition and belief. What science emphasised could be reproduced

in the identical situation. But religion could only trace a source from tradition; naturally, it had to yield in the combat of the new methodology. Secularism based on verification of facts, therefore, got a strong hold.

The logic of science discovered the law of causality — the system of cause and effect. This system ruled out suddenness and pointed out that incidents in nature take place as issues of cause and effect. Every action has its respective reaction, every action must have a cause as its background, and every action must produce its effect, if, at least, it is an action. This logic accrued with and developed man's knowledge about the universal rule of Law. The supernatural phenomena and mystic experiences, so far claimed, were put thus into suspicion and groundlessness, as they were not reproducible in the system of causality. The reproducible criterion and causality¹⁶ became now the foundation stone of man's knowledge. Because of these principles being established the supernatural phenomena incapable of being reproduced failed to meet the challenge of sciences. Any law discovered could be verified and anything invented could be tested in science. But the supernatural experiences, right or wrong, were never verified. The mystic theory of predestination of the universe could also not be verified. Therefore, whether human fate, activities, loss or gain on earth were predestined or not were sceptically asked by the natural scientists. Since the predestination

theory curtailed man's freedom, philosophy of science tried to establish freedom by controlling nature is building man's destiny. This development in science threw a challenge to religion and the structure of secularism¹⁷ based on natural philosophy and science came to get the headway. Hence it is clear that the laws of causality and dependence on natural philosophy are proved principles of secularism. Starting from the age of Newton, the theme of natural philosophy became popular as an anti-thesis to the bible and paved the path to secularism.

Dependence on the theory of evolution has become now an acceptable principle of secularism. In the mid-nineteenth century, along with the development of biological science, the image of man as a special creation of God was capsized by Darwin. This was a landmark of knowledge about the origin of man and of other species. The Darwinian theory of evolution¹⁸ with the ideas of struggle for existence, natural selection, adaptation and heredity called on a challenge against the Biblical genesis of the early man. In the later period, Julian Huxley produced the synthesis of all biological evolutionary theories¹⁹. The theory of evolution, however, having been accepted the religious authority turned to be flimsy of resources. The idea of evolution wiped out logically the angelic tales of the paradise and grime of the hell. The Kingdom of Greece was found nowhere. The state got on the way to be free from religious bindings. The path of secularism accounting life valuable on the Earth for human purposes became clear of theological impediments.

Secularism has been a rational victory of the art of philosophy over the dogmatism of theology. It is obvious, naturally, that rationalism is a principle of secularism. The emergence of rational procedures or rationalism basing on the appropriate employment of intelligence in the light of experience in solving the problems of life and society carved out a new criterion. Rationalism became a dependable control system over animality in man. It required no help of religious experiences but the knowledge of man's interaction with nature and the environment. Rationalism does not annul intuition²⁰. But it insists on intuition of intelligence and its cultivation in the inward mind with the perception of the world outside. This way rationalism helped the growth of secularism.

On the very side of rationalism the interplay of 'reason' further developed the infrastructure of secularism. The causality of science has its counterpart in 'reason' of philosophy and the art of justice. Without 'reason' logic is devoid of skeleton and without logic philosophy turns to be dogmatic. On the other hand, without philosophical root, secularism becomes aimless. So, all these disciplines of man's ideas and activities are inter-related. Inferences, that once built the cradle of religion, when taken into argumentation in the light of reasoning, were apprehended fallacious and erroneous. So the process of reason contributed to the organic structure of secularism. With the outlay of 'reason' in achieving the realistic truth the contribution of positivism

made the idea of secularism more confirmed. Regardless of mysteries and the superficial explanation of the Church, positivists asserted two things : (1) ascertainment of facts, (2) discovery of natural laws²¹. This process eliminated the subjective outlook and over-emphasis on personal factors as the causes of incidents in history and nature. Objective conditions and background, now, came to be considered as more important than personal factors. Thus, the supernatural receded from the course of events in history. So, reasoning and exercises of natural laws became conducive principles to the growth of secularism.

Another pillar of secularism is humanism. Humanism began growing toward the Italian Renaissance. It brought about a basic change of outlook in contrast to supernaturalism and morals of the above. It established the glory of man at the centre of all interests in civilization. Humanism was an inquiry and study as well as realization of the infinite beauty of worldly life. The Renaissance even professed a new dimension in composing history with more sympathy to the activities and deeds of man instead of God²². Humanism and its search after the beauty of life formed a new aesthetical sense and made a revolution of the theme of art from ecclesiastical to human. Man's suffering and happiness, emotions and notions now came to be mirrored in art. The renaissance artists enlivened thus the aspirations and aims of the awakening age²³. Fervour religious began to be less attractive than the breaths of life. Humanism made man's love Earth-bound. Man was

sought to be treated through love — love with it's end in man himself. In later times, humanistic outlook strived for man's freedom²⁴, justice and equality. Humanism urged separation of the state from religion, and laid the foundation of secularism.

As an idea secularism is not atheism, though historically it has been intermingled with atheism. George Jacob Holyoake who may be called the outstanding protegon of secularism of his age insisted on the distinction of secularism from atheism. Secularism does not grope into anything without realistic and material conditions. It avoids useless controversy; hence, it does not exclusively claim that there is no other good, rather, it clearly maintains "that, the good of the present life is a real good and to seek that is good"²⁵. It's aim is not to fight religion, It's sole objective is to place an alternative for the good of man. Secularism positively asserts, "There is light and guidance in secular truth whose conditions and sanctions exist independently and not for ever"²⁶. Thus it appears that the relation of secularism to religion is not intentionally hostile, rather, purposely exclusive both in ends and means.

Secularism upholds agnosticism. Agnosticism explains that man should have no inquiry about the supernatural because the supernatural phenomenon is unknown and unknowable. This is a kind of sinful avoidance of the vexed and got-up problem of the supernatural. Since God is not seen in reality agnosticism does not fumble about Him. Thus, secularism was founded on the philosophy

of agnosticism. On the basis of this, from the beginning, secularism concentrated on doing good of man in the society without raising all-directive debate about the unseen. The principle of pragmatism is another pillar of secularism. As to secularism Coor²⁷ puts that by pragmatism is meant secular man's concern with the question "will it work?" It is just empirical concerning with the knowledge of practical outlook of the world. Reality-concerning is the procedure of pragmatism and that is the way of secularism. Mystery has no appeal here. Pragmatism judges ideas by the results they show in practice. Ideas are thus justified by their utility in relation to problems of life and the projects of their solution. Pragmatism upholds that, knowledge is derived from experience and which in turn gives the impressions or sensations and also the knowledge of their relationships. In accordance with practicability from time to time, pragmatism becomes dynamic to maintain adaptation and contextuality. It is always against unius status-quo, and maintains no connection with traditionalism. Owing to it's consideration of nature as the whole reality, secularism is always dynamic in exploring the highest good of man in the course of causal eventuality in nature.

Industrialisation and urbanisation²⁸ — these twin aspects of modern developments — have been interlocking parts of secularism. Industrialisation builds the passage to modern urbanisation/urbanization leads to anonymity; and anonymity paves the path to secularism. Industrialisation helped the growth of urban sectors,

urbanism, urban culture and way of life. Anonymity, impersonal relationship and the complex network system of city life do not bring any particular person into light. This impersonal functional characteristics fabricate typically irreligious patterns in the society. Cox holds the view that secularisation and urbanisation are connected in a factual way²⁹. Mobility and dynamism in urban people's search of jobs and services, and their run in pursuits of progress and improvement have brought the least interest in religion. Their aim in movement is a role to play in economy — to shop and to socialise. Industrialisation and urbanisation are offshoots of science, technology and commerce and these also provide the secular mode of life.

Secular principles concentrate to realise the aims of liberty, justice, freedom and equality for the good of man. So the right of man, battle against exploitations of all kinds and socialism have become gradually aim and end of secularism. It permits no privilege to any class or group. Duty and right are simultaneously observed. Secularism primarily agrees with the equal share of all people on the basis of labour, justice and the legitimacy of 'live and let live'.

Secularism secures its identity by its own principles. In the midst of plurality of religions in the society, secularism keeps up a balance by the persuasion of agnostic toleration. No overtone of any religion is allowed; no religiosity is let loose³⁰. Only rational procedures and secular values maintain the type of

7
1955
SOUTH AFRICAN
GOVERNMENT PRINTING
WORKS, JOHANNESBURG

tolerant needed in the pluralistic society. The religion in a secular society is humanism — religion without revelation³¹.

Though, devoid of religious value system, secularism has its own axiology — norms and values. Secular axiology aims at doing good of man by man and for man. Nothing is concerned for the supernatural, but this is not totally an instrumental value system, rather, a humanistic one. The entire emphasis is given on utility and adaptation of the value system in relevance to the needs of the society. Propositions of any kind regarding values are revisable. "The criterion of accepting and rejecting a change is utility"³². Both collective and individual approaches have justification in secularism, if that imparts timely service to man. The gravity of dependence is on rational law. There is flexibility in law and in its entire attitude. Dynamism is the guideline, since service to man can never be carried out to man within a rigid enclosure but through adaptable change and progress. Thus secularism is progressivism against stagnation and status quo.

The process of secularisation:

The meaning and principles of secularism are explained above. Now the processes of secularisation are studied below in sequence. Secularism is a philosophical idea of socio-political system regardless of religion and theology, but secularisation is an art of applying this idea into practice. So this is a very articulated complex phenomenon or state-of-affair. Experiments, observations and experiences — all are equally needed in the

steps of secularization. Although it is an employment of an idea for the good of all in a state; none the less, the process is not always smooth and even everywhere. Furthermore, it has to be noted that since the structure of any idea is not monolithic, owing to exigencies, change in the process becomes often inevitable. No doubt the objectives of secularisation remain uniform and all the same in the course of probable change if any. In the pluralistic society, where many religions exist, the materialisation of secularism becomes as difficult as necessary. Secular motive-force is pre-requisite. Even a scientist may, in practical life, remain unsecular. A secular man himself, though seldom, may have a traditional bias. So, there is a gap between secular theory and its practice. That is why, only sincere and cautious attempts can do away with all these impediments. It also depends on the literacy of the common people and their consciousness about nature and the origin of their social life. A secular man should suffer from no contradiction of the notion that he is born in nature, his growth and knowledge depend on his interaction with nature, whatever he gets comes from nature and the environment, and his destiny lies on his control over the unbearable in nature. So it is the outplay of will, knowledge and motive force that paves the path of living a secular life. The secular intentions start from disengagement. The task of secularisation is both constructive and destructive. It is constructive in terms of fabricating the secular ingredients in the society conducive to the purpose of building a solid

political system. It is destructive in wiping out the contents those are against secularism and the common outlook of peace in the society. The constructive task of secularization is unification, and the destructive side is differentiation and desecralization.

Religions are of many forms, totem and taboo, cult or tradition and heritage from the unknown past, and organized religions. In the still existing tribal societies, totems and cults of various types are practised. In the civilized sectors the organized religions such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity and Mohammedanism are deep rooted. Where many religions are prevalent in a singular society, difference of customs, usage, rituals and bigotry cause social unhappiness by interreligious strife and bloodshed. Moreover, the right of state-religion acts as a fang of politics. In that case politics of the religious state becomes conducive to exaggerating a particular religion. Education, government policies, public transaction of the state are made subservient to that religion and believers of other religions are mercilessly suppressed. When the government deprives other denominations economically and politically, it violates human right. It, then, pushes the deprived ones to revolt. The freedom struggles of the third world countries were hastened by the religio-economic policies of the colonial powers. Even the long-drawn struggle of Ireland against Great Britain was fueled by the religious measures of protestant domination over Catholic Ireland. Secularization, therefore, is the remedy for the harm

done by religious penetration in political affairs. It is a process of dissociating the public affairs and the state-affairs from these religious. Differentiation alone does not suffice. So the concomitant process to be taken in unionisation or homogenisation of the contents of secularism in practice.

Differentiation and Unionisation:

The concept of the society and culture is not unitary but divided into several inter-related structures. Whenever any change is needed, the model of culture and the society can not be changed as a whole suddenly. The change takes place gradually in different structures — macro-structures and micro-structures. Religious activities and beliefs are fixed in the unsecular society; so change towards secularisation first is heralded in the structures of practice, usage, behaviour, ideas and belief. Talcott Parsons identifies the process of secularisation with differentiation, and through this, according to him, religion loses its strength. He writes "... it seems to me that the losses are mainly the consequence of processes of structural differentiation in the society, which correspond to changes in the character of religious orientation but do not necessarily constitute a loss of strength of the religious values themselves"³³. But Parsons means by secularisation not the elimination of organised religion, but a redefinition of religion itself. By structural differentiation, he indicates, some functional change inside the organs of religion and culture that could check and prohibit the unnecessary parts of

religion, and the rest good could be used for the society. The Parsonian school, however, includes the process of unification in the name of generalisation within the fold of differentiation. Two aspects of differentiation have been thought of -- (1) the development of pluralistic organisation (2) the development of higher levels of generality or generalisation on the line of societal evolution³⁴. Parsons points out to differentiate between the social community and the religious community within religion itself, and between faith and real ethics. In this he envisages a secular order in religious legitimisation.

We may not fully conform with Parsons on the utility of the legitimisation of religion for secularism; it has to be said that differentiation is to be led to putting cult, religious custom, rituals and formalism separate from the social elements in religion. It is a fact that there are some social and ethical values intermingled with religious values. 'One should speak the truth', 'should not steal', 'should help the helpless' -- all these are social values as well as religious values. But, as it is stated in the Koran whether the large worshippers should or should not be tolerated is exclusively a religious question of creedal values. So differentiation in this case means differentiating the social values and rational elements from those religious. Differentiation of the secular values from the religious must be followed by unification of the secular values. The social values and elements ought to be welded together for the construction of a pure secular system.

Some scholars try to show spiritualism as reliable for secularism guided by non-religious morality; and secularism based on materialistic behaviour guided by non-religious principles³⁵. But there must occur anomalies and contradiction if the ideas of these schools accepted. First of all, the process of secularization is not supposed to depend on spiritualism, since it can not be so easily separated from religious predilectes. In case of the second view, it is obvious that pure materialistic behaviour can never be with religion. And on the other, religion can not be guided by non-religious morality. The actual thing is that secularization is not a diabolical war against religion; it's relation with religion is exclusive. Secularization is the adoption of a new view of life, because secular philosophy stands by itself without any dependable reference to religion.

Regularization of Politics:

Regularization differentiates politics of the state from religion and unifies politics with the contexts of time and the progressive thought of political sciences. It is a mobility from religious control to public administration by the rules of law in all aspects of life. Religious institutions have nothing to do with politics and administration. Religious values are denied in political and administrative values. Legislation and the judicial parts of the government in the state are likely set free from religious and spiritual sanctions. Religious tutelage is not consulted³⁶. In a state having state-religion, the administration,

legislation and justice are under religious tutelage and dictation. But in the secularisation process, religious tutelage is kept apart. Secular political theories and law on the basis of human right are the guidelines in all affairs.

Man is more a social being, than religious. He seeks his good of life in the society. This good is socio-economic, political and educational. He has to live with others in view of the knowledge of 'live and let live'. In this broad sphere of man's social and political life, religion may not guide him to love all indiscriminately, obeying duty and right, without any bias to any particular creed. So reliance ought to be on pure political theories (of political science) as it is a separate organ of man's political knowledge.

The concern of politics as a social science is to deal with human beings in relation to organized state and principles of government in administering the citizens and state-institutions for public good. Here public good can never be attained, if the state be not unbiased and scientific in its approach to administration, legislation and justice. Freedom of man has to be recognised so that one's freedom may not retard others' freedom. Any religious emotion and illusion, not entangled with state-affairs should not let the citizens of the country suffer, which they equally do not share at all. Non-interference of religion and complete freedom of politics are, therefore, the two pillars of secularization. Niermann points out that humanism and humanistic

values are in the help of secularisation of politics³⁷. Because humanism is an alternative to religion in the field of politics.

In the process of political secularisation, the role of political ideology is of vital significance. Right-wing and left-wing politics have respective ideologies and so maintain respective relationship with religion. David Martin has explained the view that Catholic monopoly so far has been connected with Right-wing politics³⁸. There is no denial, however, that religious authority pleads for Right-wing politics. It is more a fact than allegation. George Jacob Holyoake³⁹, according to Eric S. Waterhouse, realised the necessity of secularism emergent while he found the bishops fighting the supporters of the reform Bill in the British Parliament in 1832, notwithstanding the Bill was progressive and liberal. Liberalism historically is associated with anti-clericalism and the Church, for it's typical existence has made resort to Right-wingism. Furthermore, David Martin suggests that right-wing regimes relates to the place of regional sub-cultures, and in Europe Catholicism has been the guardian of sub-cultures⁴⁰. Thus, it seems that in political practice and cultural outlook Catholicism and Right-wing politics are occasionally interwoven. But there are reasons, of course, which Martin has not explained, for religious institutions being allied with Right-wing politics. Firstly, the discovery of science and scientific methodology putting religion and creed into suspicion have made the religionists conservative and more attracted to tradition.

They too became so for their own sake. Secondly, the religious institutions have been reared always by the rich whose cause is upheld by Right-wingers whom in turn the clericalists support for their own position. Thirdly, the religionists favour elite-elements in culture which on the other are the reflections of bourgeois aspirations in culture. Lastly, the rise of socialism, communism and proletarian revolutions have unnerved the clericalists and religionists all the world over. The religious institutions and their supporters more or less survive on the labour of the have-nots. But the proletarian dictatorship does not like the upbringing of the useless religionists who bear no contribution in the field of virtual labour economy and production. So all these objective and subjective conditions have made the religionists to be allied with Right-wing politics. But the Marxists⁴¹ do not blame only religion itself for exploitation, they blame the class which employs it as an instrument of exploitation. They blame the bourgeoisie who use religion as a reactionary instrument against progressivism. Whatever interpretation there may be, the fact remains that, in the process of secularization, emphasis on Left-wing politics can never historically be denied. Socialism, hence, appears to be an organ of secularization. No doubt, democracy also reflects public opinion in degrees against anything unnatural to modern civilization and common good. Yet, religious sentiment, of course, may play its part there.

The Right-wingers unionise religion with politics and use religion as a means to a political end in their favour. On the contrary the Left-wingers differentiate religion from politics

and replace religion by politics alone to an end of ideological objectives for the good of the common people. It is a fact indeed that the teachings of religious scriptures are not for exploitation by persuasion. Religious gospels, in many cases, are to initiate the way of love. But historically, the religionists could not be true to the teachings. Consequently, religion came to be stigmatised in practice and was used for exploitation. As a result of which the socialists and communists hold religion as non-permissible in politics.

To the communists, "All religion ... is not in, but the fantastic reflection in man's mind of those external forces which control their daily life, a reflection in which the terrestrial forces assume the form of supernatural forces"⁴². It becomes clearer by the remarkable statement of Marx that religion is the opium of the people⁴³. To Lenin religion is one of the forms of spiritual oppression which everywhere weighs down heavily upon the masses of the people overburdened by their perpetual work for others, by want of isolation⁴⁴. To communist ideology religion is a superstructure on the basic-structure of capitalist economy, and it is also an instrument of exploitation in the capacity of the bourgeoisie. Lenin asked the proletariat to take the side of socialism to dispel the fog of religion. He declared religion to be a private affair, but for the communist party he did not even allow it to be a private affair anyway. He allowed no subsidies⁴⁵ to the religious institutions.

In Russia, after the revolution of 1917, politics was made to entertain complete independence from religion. In education and administration, nowhere, religion had to make any footing. The communist ideological weapon, said Lenin, was ready to combat out the capitalist weapon of religion⁴⁶.

Marxist materialism is hostile to religion both in theory and practice. To rule out religious morality, Marxism places its own morality embracing ordinary standards of human behaviour which the communists formulate in their struggle against exploitation and vice.⁴⁷ In the struggle against exploitation they developed moral qualities as mutual assistance, fraternal solidarity, and intolerance of slackers and parasites.⁴⁸ According to Lenin communist morality is subordinated to the interests of the proletarian class struggle, whose content and aim is to build and consolidate communism. It is the love to the socialist motherland which places for mankind the trial into the communist morrow the love for all the socialist countries. There is no doubt, the attitude of the communists is adventurous for secularization from the very grass-root level of the society to the top of administration. Religion has no excuse in the communist and proletarian society. Religion is sheer clear of religion in communism. But to man like David Martin, the secularization process undertaken by the communists is a 'secular monopoly of the left'⁴⁹. He says that, the logic of such systems is a logic of power seeking maximization, the church is at the mercy of secularist elites⁵⁰. The communist

process of secularization, however, may carry to excess, as Martin alludes to. But this process can not be denied as a powerful and lasting one to meet the challenge of religious bigotry. Communism, however, belongs to the opposite pole of religious bigotry and is as rigorous as religious fanaticism.

As an alternative to the communist secularisation process of atheism, there is another secularization process. This is a process based on religious neutrality⁵¹, non-committal value system and the rule of law. Neutrality here means neutralisation of religions in state-affairs. No external or internal domination of religion is permissible, no subsidies to religious institutions, on the other, no combat against religion. The state-administration, according to neutrality, is maintained by the rule of law; and regarding the value system of religion, there is no organised ideology as communism but follows the line of non-committalism⁵². Disengagement is the main criterion in the neutrality process. Civil right, in this process, is the highest form of right. Kemal Ataturk's Turkey and Japan are the models of this kind of secularization. In Turkey, secular advancement has been made in economic, political and social life, notwithstanding, the traditional concepts of religion are still to die out. In Japan, though shintoism continued to be a matter of concern in the state, yet it was more an emblem of patriotism than religion⁵³. The new constitution of 1946 disestablished shinto, and began deriving sovereignty from the people⁵⁴.

Secularization, Nationality and Nationalism

Though nationalism⁵⁵ is a state of mind in which the supreme loyalty of the individual is felt to be owed to the nation-state, yet religion has occasionally played it's role in the formation of nationality and nationalism. Here, the study is not to operate whether or not the nation-state is an instrument of exploitation of the have-nots by the bourgeoisie as the Marxists take it to be⁵⁶. It is only a study how far religion is one of the factors of the awareness of nationality and nationalism. Religious nationalism was staged in history in the course of offensive and defensive unity of the nationalities in their respective sphere. Invasions of India by the Mohammedan rulers from the Middle-East were stimulated by the ideas of economic gain and glorification of Islam. It has been mentioned already that the Crusades took place owing to religion being considered as the focal point of interests by the Muslims and the Christians. The remnants of this idea infusing religious actions are still in the brains of some politicians in different countries. Religion is still an incentive to nationalism. Sometimes, movements for national self-determination became concomitantly intermingled with religious self-assertion like the Pan-Islamic movement. Religious cultures and regional cultures in some situations appear indistinguishable. Identification of ethnicity⁵⁷ with religion being understood by some ethnic groups such as the Jews and the

Armenians pushed them to be religious nationalities. Regarding religion as a factor in the formative stage of nationalism and nationality, says Carlton Hayes, that religion in any form is ingrained in man and, naturally, nationalism can not be thought of devoid of some religious affinity⁵⁸. But Hayes seems to have overestimated the role of religion while he says that the nationalist movements of the Asiatic and African countries were outstanding features of Muslim, Buddhist, Confucian and Hindu civilisations. Especially he points out the rise of nationalism in Egypt, the Muslim communal nationalism in India (Pakistan), Indonesia, Sudan, Morocco, Libya and Algeria as offshoots of Islamic identity movement⁵⁹. Whatever fact the observation of Hayes may contain, it is not a special point to be detected in case of Asia and Africa only. The kindred phenomenon is also visible in European history. Nationalism in Serbia, Bulgaria, Roumania and Greece was sealed by identity with Christianity in contrast to Islam of Turkey. Moreover, the expression of nationalism occurs on the inculcation of heritage, past patriotism and bravery mentioned in the myths. Sometimes the national myths resemble the religious myths. In that case nationalism and religion become parallel and inter-sectional.

The above delineation makes it a category study that religion, willynilly, has been considered as one of the many factors of nationalist identity. This is an obstacle to the spread and practice of secularism. The process of secularization proceeds

on differentiation and unification methods. Differentiation, here, is held to separate the religious heritage from the national heritage. Religious myths and culture are not dealt with national outlook; the secular side in culture is then taken atop the surface and strengthened. In multi-national societies, past unity among the nationalities are given more importance than to any religious patriotism. Bravery is looked upon as a matter of spirit in man, not of religion. Thus, religious patriotism depicted in myths is ascribed to man-hood-spirit regardless of religion. Ethnicity in religion is envisaged as something sacred and mysterious. Secularism explains it as a result of geographical and climatic variations, atmospheric temperature and zonal difference. So the differentiation process puts apart religion from the idea of nationality; and nationalism; and the unification process explores the derivation of nationalism out of different secular cause and effect relationships. Secularization process thus clears out sectarianism, apartheid, and communalism from the idea of nationalism.

Secularization of culture:

Historically in every country culture grew more or less under religious guardianship. The Church⁶⁰ in the Christendom of Europe, Islam in the Mohammedan territories and Hinduism in India were guardians of culture. Equally the sub-cultures of the regional people were also grown on religious tread. The Church and Islam monopolized culture in their respective sphere of influence.

The advancement of science could not eliminate the religious organs in cultural set up altogether. Even language, literature, music, folk-lore and tradition always have religious heritage. Religious hierarchy seems, thus, deep-rooted in the cultures of peoples. The sub-cultures of regional areas or particularly ^{the} segregated ethnic groups, in ^{the} course of time, became monopolized by the organised religious cultures of the majorities (i.e. macro-culture). As for instance in India, the Aryan culture overran many prevailed cultures of small ethnic groups. In Europe and in the Middle-East the Christian and the Islamic cultures overweighed the regional cultures. Often particular languages historically were inter-related ^{with} particular religions — supposedly, Latin with Christianity, Arabic with Islam, Sanskrit with Hinduism, Pali with Buddhism and Chinese with Confucianism etc. Religious fanaticism made religions and languages identified despite the translation of the scriptures into local languages. It is only because, in the heydays of every religion, a particular language was used as vehicle for preaching. So the union of culture and religion has been a fact, and owing to this fact religion sometimes brings cultural differences between men and men. Religious cultural identity has divided the world into useless segments, and so it caused the matters of strifes. In many cases, customs, usage and manners are guided by religious dictums.

In view of all these problems, secularisation process proceeds along the methods of differentiating the secular traits

of culture from the religious traits. The sub-cultures are not suppressed, rather, they are sublimated to the level of secularity and the religious trends are carefully differentiated and put into nullity. Along with this negative side, the positive and constructive side is also advanced. First of all, the religious cultures are replaced by cosmopolitan culture, adopting and adapting with the best secular propensities of all cultural trends in the world. Culture is then inculcated for man, and not for God and other-worldliness. It is taken to reflect the nature of life, the dignity and glory of man on the Earth. Unity and fraternity of man are given preference in secular culture. It is to wipe out religious differences between man and man. Secular culture banishes religion from national education schemes. No religious school is run under government auspices. No religion is considered in governmental policies. All religions, if not banned, are looked upon and met with respectful avoidance — leaving it aside as a matter of private life only. Secularisation establishes secular and rational values and synthesised secular characteristics to be dealt in public life.

Moreover, with the advancement of science industrialisation has come to be a character of the modern civilisation. Industrialisation is followed by urbanisation and the rapid spread of education. All these bring about a total change of the mode of life and the way of living. Modern culture is anonymous and impersonal. And this anonymity has further differentiated culture itself from the kernel of religion. So anonymity is also a part

of the cultural differentiation process of secularization.

Secularization of the mind, individual and social life:

From the very unknown past religion has been a tradition in man's mind and nature. Religious tradition often occasions man's behaviour faith and hope to be religious while he pulls through the inopportune moments. It occurs unconsciously and spontaneously because of his got up impressions from parental or environmental influence. Since, the religious activities are deep-rooted in man's behaviour, secularization of the mind is presupposed in secularizing the society and the state. It is a task of purporting the substantiality of love of man toward man without any motivated interest in the imaginary after world. Here, the mind ought to be made rudimentally free from taboos so that it may subsist on science and logic.

Alongside the secularization of the mind, there crops up a question — what is the meaning of secular life? This question is very much instrumental regarding the problems of secularization. J. Wisdom is of opinion that life on earth ought to be treated as an end in itself without reference to any further reality beyond⁶¹. Because, if we ask what is the reality of life, what is the reality of God, what is the reality of reality? it raises questions ad-infinitum, and we come to nowhere. It only begins an infinite and unending regress. Rodney⁶² points out that, the world we see and live in is not a paradox to our knowledge; it can not be absurd. There is no way of being disillusioned of

the world's existence. Following wisdom and Thody we may here elaborate the idea with some addition that, considering the supernatural as a 'x', as we take it in working out a case one should not proceed in a wild-goose chase. Because this proceeding is only imagination after imagination. It has no connection with and reference to the waking life. Our senses through which we know the world do not bring illusions of existence. We perceive that happiness and pleasure are agreeable to our senses, mind and existence, on the contrary suffering and pain are disagreeable. Hence we may love the world by eliminating suffering and providing happiness to man, and that is conducive to the reality of life. It is referenceless to the supernatural, but a principle of serving the world. It is supposedly a secular principle and morality. Here lies the meaning of secular life and secularisation. Secularisation is a set of human activities of man for man with a belief in life on earth. Relevant to this idea, we may quote Vernon Prett's view : "It is perfectly proper ... to speak of activities as worthwhile 'in themselves', and it would certainly seem that the possibility of man's life being meaningful or worthwhile in this sense is quite unaffected by whether he believes in a 'transcendent reality'".⁶³

The meaning of the social and national life is to attain common good. In the pluralistic society, in the midst of plural denominations, religious principle of no particular religion can serve the need of all. It, rather, brings about division among men and dichotomy between this world and the next world. In the

jargon of this anomaly the purpose of the national life and common good turn to be attenuated and diverted. So it is secularisation that amply takes care of life in itself on earth to serve the common purpose of all essentially. Thus it appears that secularization crystallizes the meaning of the individual, social and national life.

Conclusion:

The above brief study clarifies it that secularism is a way of life giving rise to a new ideology of the state to render administration and justice for man and by man on the basis of rationality, humanity and non-religious culture, education, value system and the rule of law. Secularism depends on logic and science to build morality of man on earth in the frame of humane life. It seeks man's goal in nature. Referenceless to the supernatural, secularism, however, is not anti-religious, but non-religious, because it justifies freedom of man. It is an independent view of life irrespective of theism or atheism; it is clearly agnostic. Secularisation is not even motivated and coercive materialisation of the state-system with the end to suppress religion. If the circumstances is not so favourable and the people, not mentally upgraded secularism fosters the spirit of tolerance. In the course of development, when the people are readily free from traditional clutches and ignorance, secularization follows the guidance of pure science and humane logic. So it advances at the pace of evolution of the society. Nothing is forcibly done.

Secularization is not destruction but attainment of liberty from the unknown pursuit of the supernatural world. Secularism is the love of life for the cultivation of humanity based on reason, norms and universal fraternity.

Secularization is collateral to socialism too, though, perhaps not only Marxism. It stands for equality in the socio-economic life of the people. Because secularism never supports exploitation. It does not find reasons of inequality and asserts the right of man to live and livelihood. A secular state neither patronises any religion or religious institution, nor allows the entry of religious tutelage in the public institutions; it leaves religion to the individual as his private concern. Thus religion and state are put separate from each other. A secular system never discriminates the citizens of the state on the ground of religion. No difference is maintained between men and women on the basis of religious traditions. It keeps no mystery covert in the relationship of the two sexes. May there be sacred mystery according to any scripture or religious personal law, secularism does not admit it. Secularism is, of course, not anti-religious, but it does bear with no religious excess which may endanger the secular institutions of the citizens. Thus secularization is not a passive course, but an active process. It is an educative paradigm through unionisation and differentiation to let people deliberate and work together on a better plane of life which has emerged out of the evolution of the ages. It is to live upto the philosophy of

life in it's contextual andiate patterns of norms based on human experiences and observations in the perceptible existence. Secularism insists on the objective study of history in the series of cause and effects and it comprises the utilisation of the knowledge of history for the progress of mankind.

Notes and references

1. Hale, J.R., Renaissance Europe (1480-1520), London, 1971, pp. 242-244.
2. Sir Thomas More and Erasmus were close friends and exemplars of the Northern Renaissance. They were not philosophers in strict sense, however, they illustrated the temper of the pre-revolutionary age. Vide — Russel, Bertrand, History of Western Philosophy, Ninth Impression, London, 1965, p. 499.
3. Spite, Lewis W. ed., Problems in European Civilization, the Reformation, Boston, 1966, pp. 58-59.
4. Russel, Bertrand, op. cit., p. 487.
5. Nussbaum L. Frederick, The Triumph of Science and Reason, New York, 1962, pp. 1-24.
6. George Jacob Holyoake was born in 1817 in England. Though his upbringing was religious, later on, having envisaged and realized the reactionary activities of the Bishops at the time of passing the Reform Bill in England in 1832 and other anti-humanist and anti-liberal activities of the clergies, he became irreligious. Later, in life, following Robert Owen, he grew to be an Owenite socialist and the outstanding secular political personality in Gladstonian Parliament.
— vide Hastings, James ed., Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. XI, Edinburgh, 1958, p. 348.
7. Singer, Charles, From Magic to Science, London, 1928, pp. 65-67, 84.

8. Bacon, Francis, The Advancement of Learning, Kitchin, G.W. ed. Last reprint, London, pp. 93-96, 161, 124-129.
9. Ibid, pp. 69-80.
10. Losee, John, A Historical Introduction to the Philosophy of Science, Oxford University Press, 1972, p. 52.
11. Ibid, pp. 81-86.
12. Bernal, J.D., Science in History, Vol. 2, London, 1969, pp. 554-568.
13. Hightman, W.P.D., Science in a Society, London, 1972, pp. 78-79.
14. Hastings, James ed., op. cit., Vol. XI, p. 347.
15. Willey, B. The Touch of Cold Philosophy, in Jones, A.F. ed, The Seventeenth Century, London, 1951, pp. 373-374.
16. David, Bohm, Causality and Chance in modern physics, London, 1957, pp. 7-8.
17. Mac Intyre, A. 'Is understanding religion compatible with believing?' in Hick, J. ed. Faith and Philosophers, London, 1964, pp. 128-129.
18. Darwin, Charles, The origin of species, Burrow, J.W. ed. Penguin Books, Reprint, 1977, pp. 101-173, 425-462.
19. Huxley, Julian, Evolution, the modern synthesis, London, 1955, Sixth impression, pp. 13-22, 47-61, 356-372.
20. Sinha, Jadunath, Introduction of Philosophy, Part I, Calcutta, 1977, pp. 30-32.
21. Collingwood, R.G. The Idea of History, Oxford University Press, Reprint, 1983, pp. 126-133.

22. This view of Leonardo Bruni-Aretino^{is} quoted in Burke, Peter, The Renaissance, London, 1964, pp. 66-67.
23. Gilmore P. Byron, The World of Humanism (1453-1517), New York, 1952, pp. 229, 239-242.
24. Chakraborty, Basudha, Maubatsad (Humanism), Bengali version, Calcutta, 1961, pp. 68-77, 149-160.
25. The Encyclopedia Americana, Vol. 24, International edition, New York, 1969, p. 521.
26. Ibid, p. 521.
27. Cox, H., The Secular City, London, 1965, pp. 60-61.
28. Anderson, Nels ed., Urbanism and Urbanization, Leiden (Netherland), 1964, pp. 1-6.
29. Cox, H., op. cit., pp. 4-5.
30. Wilson, Bryan, Religion in Secular Society, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1969, p. 112.
31. Meland, Bernard Eugine, The Secularization of Modern Culture, Oxford University Press, 1966, pp. 143-144.
32. Sharma, G.S. ed. Secularism : it's implications for laws and life in India, Bombay, 1966, p. 86.
33. Parson, Talcott, Structure and Process in Modern Societies, Chicago, 1960, p. 320.
34. Ibid, pp. 22, 301.

35. Dr. Umakanta Saxena classifies the ideas of secularism into three schools: (a) purely materialistic with its adherence to religion, (b) materialistic with religion guided by non-religious morality and (c) purely spiritual guided by non-religious morality.
Vide-Saxena, Dr. Umakanta, A secular state and its institutional pattern, Bhopal, India, 1971, pp. 3-5.
36. Glasner, Peter E. The Sociology of Secularisation, New Delhi, 1977, p. 32.
37. Rahner, K., ed. Sacramentum Mundi: An Encyclopedia of Theology, Vol. VI, New York, 1970, Laicism, Pt. II of 'Secularism' by Niermann, E. p. 70.
38. Martin, David, A general theory of secularisation, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1978, pp. 45-46.
39. Hastings, James ed., op. cit., p. 348.
40. Martin, David, op. cit., p. 47.
41. Afanasyev, V.G., Marxist Philosophy, Moscow, fourth edition, 1960, p. 383.
42. Engels, Frederick, Anti-Duhring, Moscow, 1978, eighth printing, p. 382.
43. Marx, Karl, Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, Introduction, (Marx and Engels on Religion), Moscow, 1957, p. 42.
44. Lenin, On Religion, Moscow, 1981, pp. 7-8.
45. Ibid, p. 8.

46. Ibid, p. 9.
47. Afanasyev, V.G., op. cit., pp. 376-377.
48. Ibid, pp. 376-377.
49. Martin, David, op. cit., pp. 47-48.
50. Ibid.
51. Yinger, J.M., The scientific study of Religion, MacAllan, New York, 1971, pp. 436-456.
52. Sharma, G.S. ed. secularism it's implications for laws and life in India, Bombay, 1966, p. 93.
53. Kato, Genchi, What is Shinto? Board of Tourist industry, Japanese Government Railways, 1935, pp. 64-72.
54. Bellah, R.M., 'Religious aspects of modernization in Turkey and Japan' in American journal of sociology, Vol. 64, 1958, p. 5.
cf. Glasner, Peter E., op. cit., p. 36.
55. Kohn, Hans, Nationalism : It's meaning and History, rev. ed. Princeton, 1965, p. 9.
56. Lenin, Selected Works, Moscow, 1977, pp. 160-161.
57. Martin, David, op. cit., pp. 77-78.
58. Hayes, Carlton, J.M., Nationalism : A religion, New York, 1960, pp. 11-12.
59. Ibid, p. 1.
60. Martin, David, op. cit., pp. 55, 78.

61. Wisdom, J. 'Paradox and Discovery'; Blackwell-Oxford, 1965, pp. 40-41.
62. Shody, P., Albert Camus, paperback ed. London, 1964, p. 31.
63. Pratt Vernon, Religion and Secularisation, Macmillan, London, 1970, p. 76.