

# NOTES ON SECULARISM AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

BY

**Dr. W. C. Smith**

*Director*

**Centre for the Study of World Religions, Harvard University U.S. A.**



सत्यमेव जयते

**EDUCATION COMMISSION**  
**UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION BUILDING**  
(Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg)  
**NEW DELHI**  
1965

NOTES ON SECULARISM & RELIGIOUS STUDIES

By

Dr. W.C. Smith  
Director  
Centre for the Study of  
World Religions  
Harvard University

EDUCATION COMMISSION  
Government of India  
New Delhi

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Secularism	1
II. Religious Studies	
(a) Comparative Religion Studies	9
(b) Moral and Spiritual Values in Education	16
III. Education and the Modernisation Process	18

# NOTES ON SECULARISM AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

By

Dr. W.C. Smith

## I. SECULARISM

The secular quality of the state, both in certain other countries and most importantly in India; both as an ideal, legal and philosophic and social, and as an historical process of concrete achievement and struggle; is a matter about which there is much to say. In addition to the secular state, there is much to say also about secularism as an ideology, with implications not only for political but also for social and educational and even moral and religious life; again both as an ideal concept (in many forms) and as an actual historical process, whose movement and force and ramifications and oppositions and setbacks have to be discerned and clarified.

I personally have done a certain amount of reflecting on these matters, at the conceptual level, and a certain amount of investigation of contemporary historical processes involving them, in India and elsewhere, more particularly in the case of the Muslim community but also a little with regard to the Hindu. However, my concern here is not <sup>to</sup> advocate or even to expound my own views or observations (a few of which I have had occasion to publish [1-], many others of which have yet to be formulated systematically). Rather, my submission is simply that these matters should be discussed. I would

urge that they deserve, and would repay, more formal, public, sustained study than they have yet had. I am deeply persuaded that further analysis and explication could prove seriously rewarding, intellectually but also in terms of economic and social welfare.

Two chief reasons underly this conviction.

First, present views on the subject turn out on careful inquiry to be conflicting; often negative; and sometimes vague. Views are found ranging all the way from one extreme that secularism implies the exclusion of all religious relevancies, to the opposite extreme that it signifies rather the inclusion of all religious traditions simultaneously [2]. (Over against Pakistan with its affirmation that the state rests on the basis of a religious system, India may be thought of as affirming that its state rests on no religious basis, or on all equally). Again, there is a range from the negative attitude that secularism is simply the absence of religious and even moral considerations (whether of one system or of several), to the vision of a positive (personal) faith in secularism as a constructive and indeed powerful force, with its own metaphysically based convictions, its own deeply held humane values, its own inspiration. On the crucial question of the drive that is to transform abstractly formulated programmes into active operational achievements, some see secularism as neutral, an abstaining system specifically allowing each citizen to derive that drive from his own personal or group conviction, or not to derive it at all; while others see secularism (and/or nationalism, or secular

nationalism) as specifically providing that drive itself.

The implications of each of these views (and others) for an educational system are significantly diverse.

The second reason for urging more active consideration of these questions has to do with the creative challenge that is involved. In this matter, India is tackling an issue of monumental importance, yet one that it must solve creatively. There are no models for it to follow, no extant solutions for it to adopt or even to adapt. The West internally has faced problems in this realm in no comparable form and on no comparable scale; externally, it is becoming involved in problems of living in a multi-religious community but has not yet solved them - has not even yet much recognized them or their seriousness. What is at stake here is a new humanism yet to be created.

Western humanism, based ultimately on Greek philosophy and related positively or negatively to only one particular religious orientation, the Judaeo-Christian, may at most contribute to, but cannot substitute for, a new humanism truly cosmopolitan in which the Indian and the Islamic traditions will be at least subsumed, not to say more constructively engaged. Only a very few of us in the West are sensitive to this need and aware of the new vision and the major creative effort that it will involve. India is the first country to confront immediately and practically the exhilarating, demanding new task of constructing a way of life in which groups of radically differing historical and conceptual and moral backgrounds not only may live together in harmony but may actively collaborate in a democratic joint effort to construct together a new order

of which all will be able to approve. The classical Hindu philosophic tradition, with its universalist overtones, is clearly relevant here, and the chief ground for aspiration, but the extrapolation to 20th-century conditions has yet to be clarified, and the translation of philosophic precept into sociological institution.

One could wax ineffectively eloquent on all this; the significant operational point is rather that a new venture is required. For it, syllabi, textbooks, patterns, etc. are not available and must be constructed ad hoc (to say nothing of the question of trained personnel). This will not be easy; especially because of the tendency still not dead to suppose that the process of modernising means introducing the latest methods from the West (or Russia) with or without modification, whereas in this case what is required is an indigenous innovation, creative, novel, exploratory, the confronting of a specifically Indian problem by Indian imagination and intellect and will. (It is a world problem in principle, but specifically Indian in practice, so that the lead must probably come from India).

Concretely, then, I propose that the topic "secularism" be introduced into the Indian university system as a subject of inquiry. Specifically, I would suggest a paper on "secularism" beginning probably at the M.A. level, starting probably at one or two universities but gradually spreading to others (since part of the point is precisely the stimulus and creativity that should emerge from diversity of presentation, cross-

criticism, and dialectic). Departments of Political Science, and of Philosophy, and perhaps History (contemporary)(see further below, Section III) and Comparative Religion (below, Section II), would reasonably be involved.

Some thought should perhaps be given to the question of whether it would be more practical to have the establishment of such a paper preceded by an exploratory theoretical study eventuating in a book or project delineation. This step could be combined with the training of personnel by specific fellowships, or other preparatory programme. A U.G.C.-sponsored seminar (forthcoming at the Law Institute?) or series of seminars, or a development at the new Simla Institute of Advanced Study, are other possibilities. (Any help that Harvard or, presumably other Western universities, might provide would gladly be made available). On the other hand, the introduction of a paper would itself stimulate interest and educate lecturers; I personally am somewhat inclined to feel, though careful consideration would have to be given to this point, that a paper should be introduced and these other devices developed simultaneously, in mutual and dynamic interaction -- so that a process is generated within the academic world, rather than waiting until an ideal pattern becomes available to be imposed.



Suggested materials to be covered in "Secularism"  
paper

1. Political and constitutional theory:

- a) Western: (i) The U.S., U.K., France, U.S.S.R. models
  - (ii) Philosophical secularism, with Greek background (esp. 18th Century "Enlightenment")
- b) Turkey, post-war Japan, and other 20th-century experiments
- c) India: (i) The Constitutional position (with court interpretations)
  - (ii) Statements of Jawaharlal Nehru, Abul Kalam Azad parliamentary discussions, &c.

2. The Indian background:

- A. Normative. (a) Classical Hindu orientations:
    - (i) to the state
    - (ii) to other religious groups
  - (b) Classical Islamic orientations:
    - (i) to the state
    - (ii) to other religious groups:
      - (a) shari'ah; Ottoman, Millet system,
      - (b) Sufi &c.
  - (c) Other orientations: Sikh, Jain, Christian  
(the "church" as something that can be separated from the state), &c.
- B. Historical. Selected illustrative moments, of actual problems, solutions, failures: Vijayanagar, Akbar's reign, British non-intervention, recent communalist hostility; &c.

3. The Contemporary Process of Secularisation in India:

- (1) Secularisation as a process through which 'religion' has been moving (from c.1850?) from being a comprehensive cultural pattern to becoming one particular segment of personal and social life alongside others (the 'religious factor' and 'secular factors' in modern life). The emergence of values and considerations (from the West? from science? from new occupations, new economic patterns and possibilities?) unconnected with ('religious') tradition.

- (ii) Secularisation as a process of substituting new and different values for traditional religious ones. Under this heading, factors and movements may be considered that give evidence that new considerations, rather than supplementing religious traditions, as under (i), actively replace those traditions, negating them in whole or in part. The emergence of new loyalties, new ideologies. Nationalism (in part), marxism, anti-religious movements, science vs. 'superstition'.
- (iii) Secularisation as a process of the disintegration of moral and spiritual values. Tendencies and movements in contemporary society and thought (in the West, in India) tending to the collapse of old loyalties and convictions and discipline, without anything taking their place. The weakening of morale.
- (iv) Secularisation as the process of 'respect for all religions'. Tendencies and movements in recent and contemporary society and thought towards universalism, "unity in diversity", inter-religious understanding and collaboration.
- (v) Obstacles to a process of secularization:
- (a) Theory. Critics of secularism (Jan Sangh; Jama'at-i-Islami; &c)
  - (b) Practice. Caste and communal factors in "democratic" politics. Economic and sociological communalism; &c.

(vi) Secularism in the School system:

(a) Explicit. The deliberate promotion of a secular ideal (which form?) -- theory, and practice. Successes and failures.

(b) By insinuation. The influence of the total curriculum (and total school programme) on religious considerations.

(vii) The "Integration Programme" of the Government of India. Theory, and practice.

(viii) Desirable (and feasible) next stages in the secularisation process.

## II. Religious Studies

It would be presumptuous of an outsider to comment on the substance of so delicate and subtle a matter as religious instruction or 'moral and spiritual values' in any educational system. I am sensitive enough to the honour that is done to me in allowing me to participate in these discussions at all. What perhaps without being brash I might profer are one or two suggestions on the form, rather than the substance, of possible moves to deal with these matters. I do so under two headings: comparative religion studies, and the institutionalising of inquiry into moral and spiritual values in education.

### A. Comparative Religion Studies

It is one of the redeeming features of our otherwise distressingly belligerent age that significant attempts at inter-religious understanding are seriously developing. Academically at the university level this is relatively incipient, but promising. Because of its tradition one naturally looks to India for an outstanding contribution in this realm. In this country also, however, it is only recently that the universities as such have taken up this question.

My experience in this area of study as an academic discipline and administration would lead me to make two specific proposals, concerning the form of a potential department (or 'Centre'). The first has to do with the point that comparative study of religion is in danger

of being vapid or sentimental unless it follows after and is based squarely upon a study of religious particulars. "Only he should compare who knows what it is that he is comparing." One cannot profitably study (or teach) comparative religion as such, except after one has studied at least two religious traditions with some rigour. One of my first moves on arriving at Harvard in its new 'Center for the Study of World Religions' was to propose the abolishing of the M.A. in Comparative Religion, as the wrong stepping-stone to the doctorate in this subject, and on the grounds that at the master's level a student cannot yet have the requisite expertise to 'compare'. (Indeed, I have some qualms about even a doctorate in this subject, wondering whether all comparison should not rather be at the post-doctoral level, though in an imperfect world this is probably utopian. We are developing a post-doctoral level, however.) Anyway, for admission to doctoral candidacy the appropriate prerequisite is competence at the M.A. level in at least two particular religious traditions, one's own and one other. I append herewith a statement on our Harvard programme. For India, I would propose that admission to doctoral candidacy in Comparative Religion should be open only to those who hold two M.A.'s, one in Sanskrit and one in Islamic Studies; or a B.D. in Christian theology and an M.A. in Indian philosophy; or the life.

A practical implication of this orientation is that rather than multiplying posts in Comparative Religion as such, a strong department or Centre of these studies

would be headed perhaps by one professor or Reader in this subject but manned by say four complementary posts, in Hindu studies, Islamic studies, Buddhist studies, Christian studies. A regular meeting or joint seminar of these particular specialists (along with the comparativist director of the programme) either on comparative theory or on some common problem, could then prove highly stimulating and fruitful, both to them and to such advanced students as might be admitted. Yet the prime responsibility of each would be his own speciality. This would give realism to the comparativist study, as well as context and universalism and perspective to the individual's study of the particular tradition on which he was concentrating. Gradually in this way a generation of true comparativists will be formed; but at the moment they do not yet much exist (at least, not in the West, and there is reason to believe that here also personnel are sparse).

Where a given university already had a department of Sanskrit or of Arabic or of Pali (or, as Delhi, Buddhist Studies), then these could perhaps (not necessarily) be drawn on for the Comparative Religion programme, or a joint arrangement, perhaps involving joint appointments, might be worked out that would strengthen both these and the new Comparative Religion programme itself. Anyway, the heart of the whole venture should be an insistence that comparative study should be firmly based on an authentic understanding of a religious tradition other than one's own. Of course, the director of the programme (head of the department)

would have to have a genuine universality of interest and perspective, along with some specialised competence.

(No doubt, some consideration would have to be given to the administrative anomalies involved in a departments' offering a doctorate in Comparative Religion, but M.A.'s in Hindu studies, Islamic studies, etc.; and in the fact that in this case the doctorate would require, beyond the master's, not merely a research thesis but also attendance at an advanced seminar in comparative study as such and possibly the passing of additional papers. At this stage I am not submitting a worked-out blue-print for a concrete programme, since if the suggestions seemed promising in general, a particular syllabus and structure would presumably have to be worked out specifically for a given university in terms of existing other departments and offerings in that university, and of potential and then actual relationships with them.)

The second submission that I would urge in this whole matter is that the particular studies of the Hindu, Islamic, Buddhist, and Christian traditions should include in each case instruction (papers) not only on the classical, normative materials but also on modern and indeed contemporary developments. True dialogue, a true understanding of modern man's religious diversity and condition, an authentic awareness of the problem of human brotherhood and/or fragmentation (and, of course, of the problem of modern Indian development), require not only a knowledge of what each community has been (and is ideally), but also a discerning of what each is actually, and what

it is in process of becoming, with its present-day aspirations and frustrations. Thus a study not only of Veda and Gita and Sankara, of Qur'an and shari'ah and Rumi, but of 19th- and 20th-century movements and perplexities and innovations, the historical reactions of each community to British imperialism, to modern science, to labour movements, to democratic politics, to urbanization, to each other, etc.

Much of the material for the teaching of courses in this area is not carefully known and would have to be collected, "researched", analysed. This is a difficulty, but also is one of the more cogent arguments in favour of this proposal. There is major value in assigning to our universities a task of finding out where we are in process of going; not only because we need to know in order to act with wisdom, but also because the universities need such tasks in order to operate with vitality.

The construction of a course of studies in each tradition (modern Hindu, modern Islamic, etc.) would itself be a major challenge. I have not thought it my task here to make concrete suggestions, as in the Secularism case above; though I should be happy to participate in further discussions if this were desired. Apart from curriculum, a substantial problem in this whole area is the training of personnel. This is a world problem; my assignment at Harvard is to tackle it there. I do not at all know whether the new Simla Institute is a potential counterpart here. In any case, a truly effective programme will await competent, imaginative, and concerned trained personnel - though also vice-versa.



Two subsidiary points may be mentioned in connection with Comparative Religion departments.

Such departments lend themselves with peculiar aptitude to international interchange, of both student and teacher. At McGill University, I made it a condition for the doctorate in Islamic Studies that the candidate spend at least a year in the Muslim world, and a Harvard though not yet required candidate in Comparative Religion is "expected" to study in the country where the tradition other than his own in which he is specializing prevails; and so far as teachers are concerned, it is now widely recognized that they must regularly visit the area of their concern. We should greatly welcome an opportunity for our students and teachers to work for a time in corresponding departments here. It is true that India, unlike most other countries, is in a quite special situation in having the religious diversity that is being studied, exemplified richly on its own doorstep, so that in one sense the urgency of this exchange of personnel is, from its side, less. Nonetheless, it is one of my dreams that eventually a network of Departments of Comparative Religion in various universities across the world should constitute a kind of living institutionalisation of the pursuit of that international and inter-religious understanding of which we all stand in need. And in this, India must be thought of as playing a leading role.

If the U.G.C. should see fit to include Comparative Religion among the subjects for which international scholarships could be made available, or the Government of

India could request ~~this~~ of Commonwealth countries (in both directions: e.g., the current discussions with Canada), etc., these would be significant and welcome steps. In the other direction, apart from students coming to India for Hindu studies, if the suggestion above were adopted of including papers in various particular traditions in these departments, then an important and rewarding opportunity would be available for Western scholars of comparative religion to work at intervals in this context, where they could teach some or all of the work in Christian studies, as well as participating constructively in comparativist studies. 3

Finally, one may record the entrancing suggestion that a lecturer or a paper on "Secularism", as proposed in Section I above, might perhaps be incorporated within this very department. A Comparative Religion programme might very justly be the home for such a subject, perhaps as a compulsory paper (though it should be available also - perhaps compulsorily? - to students in Political Science and Philosophy and History). For not only may modern society, in the world at large and in India in particular, be recognised as indeed constituted ideologically of Hindu Islamic, Buddhist, Christian, and also secularist strands, in a complex interrelationship well worth investigating. Further, the lecturer on Secularism, by participating in the joint comparativist seminar, adumbrated above, with his religiously oriented colleagues, might well both contribute to it, and profit from it, most fruitfully.

B. Moral & Spiritual Values in Education

The questions of whether virtue can be taught, and if so, how, are as old as Plato in the West and the Upanishads in India. Therefore, it is hardly illegitimate to suggest that in the Radhakrishnan and Sri Prakasa reports, for all their wisdom, the last word has probably not been said in what will doubtless remain a perennial issue. Rather than attempting here to add any new and obviously minor comments to this continuing discussion, my proposal would simply be to recognize the continuing quality of this problem by incorporating it also within the structure of academic concern. The Sri Prakasa report makes vividly clear the importance of this question not only for education but for national life. Accordingly, it deserves continuing and sustained confrontation. This accords with a concept of the university as a question-asking and solution-seeking institution. Here is a major social problem: therefore, let it be tackled by the university, whose business it is to address itself intellectually, experimentally, analytically, responsibly, to the challenges that face the society in, by, and for which the university stands.

I would propose, accordingly, first a paper on "Moral and Spiritual Values in the educational process: theory, and practice" in all Institutes of Education. As well, a long series of doctoral theses making investigations on particular parts of this matter could contribute to enlightenment on the actual situation, without ever exhausting the problem.

Secondly, I would urge that in Arts faculties also papers be introduced -- with the same intent of clarifying contemporary processes and concrete problems -- on the relation of values and morale to economic development [4], on current cultural trends in relation to national progress (or process in the particular state where the university stands), and the like. Whether these should be in departments of Economics, or Sociology, or (modern) History, or the like, is a matter for consideration. (We shall return to this over-all issue in Section III below.) One might also raise a question whether there might not be value (both intellectual and social) in establishing a department of "Religion & Society" or something of the sort. Given the inescapable and massive significance of this relationship for modern India and its contemporary development, such a proposal is hardly quixotic.

Section III

"Education and the Modernisation Process"

(Education and the Renovation Process)

Note: Since the word "modern" has acquired a connotation of contrast with something that is not modern, whereas I prefer to think rather of the new India that is to emerge in terms not of contrast with, so much as of development (however radical) from, what has been and is, therefore I personally prefer a nation such as "renovation". This also avoids the danger of thinking of the "modern" as something imported from abroad, rather retaining neutrality on the complex issue of the degree to which elements of Western origin and elements derived from Indian traditions will play a role in the renovation process -- as well as leaving room for (what I imagine may in fact prove crucial) creativity, for specifically new factors to be generated ad hoc, neither Western nor traditional-Indian but authentic innovation.

"Education & the Renovation Process", then, might almost be said to be the very question with which the Education Commission is fundamentally and as a whole concerned. Clearly it would be silly for me to attempt to comment substantially. Even apart from that, I have had occasion recently to express certain general views in this realm that it would be redundant to repeat [5].

Once again, then, what I can perhaps reasonably suggest is that this issue is in principle and will continue to be a challenge to the society, and therefore could and ought to be academically institutionalised, incorporated as one of the on-going tasks of the university. (Specifically, the question as explicitly formulated could be entrenched in an Institute of Education research programme or curriculum; but more generally the matter involves the university as a whole.)

Whatever wisdom may be available from the past or from other sources, and whatever wisdom this Commission itself may formulate, will if implemented serve to change Indian society in such a way that new wisdom will then be needed. And so the process goes on. The modern university is inter alia a problem-solving body. By intellectual abstraction it can so clarify a situation for us that we understand its structure and its processes, and then can guide them or be guided by them, into a new situation. And this is true not only of sectional isolates, but increasingly of complex social wholes, which are found to be not only in movement but in intelligible movement. Thus the modern university, in addition to conceptualising the past out of which its society and mankind at large have come, and the natural universe in which they exist, serves also by conceptualising the processes through which the society is going. And it can offer at the theoretical level alternative patterns of possible subsequent stages in the process, among which those in positions of influence may choose. (The validity of the theoretical academic formulations are then tested by the practicability in actual operation of the various solutions proffered.) Thus the university becomes that organ of a society by which the society becomes self-conscious of its own development, and able to act intelligently in its further evolution. Of course, this ideal can be realised only in part. Yet one of the processes of present-day society -- and one of the indexes of 'modernity', certainly one of the major agencies of renovation -- is precisely the process of

the universities' increasingly assuming (being assigned) this role.

In India, universities when established in the 19th century by the British were, essentially, assigned the function that to-day is rather that of the college: namely, the transmission of extant knowledge and (only partially, because of the Western and un-Indian orientation) of culture, and the training of men to carry out various functions within the framework (thought of as given) of the society. To-day, however, the universities are not true universities and are not truly Indian until they add to this the new role of not only transmitting old knowledge but of generating new, and of training men not only to execute extant functions in society but to see and choose which new functions society shall fulfil, what new framework it may have.

In the natural sciences, the universities of India have entered the new phase with enthusiasm; in the social sciences and the humanities, an outside observer gains the impression that there is will some way to go. In certain departments admirable work is being done; perhaps especially economics, presumably because the work of the Planning Commission makes it clear to all concerned that in the intellectual work here is involved the destiny of the country. This should be equally true, but is currently much less clear, in virtually all departments.

The difficulty is due in part to the continually foreign quality of the Indian university: the modern Western university is oriented to modern Western problems,

and to some degree the modern Indian university has continued to model itself on Western patterns, so that the processes of current Indian evolution, and the challenges pressing on current Indian life, sometimes get less academic confrontation and analysis than they deserve, or than will enable them to be solved with full understanding and adequate intellectual analysis and clarification.

Even the departmental structures of a Faculty of Arts in India reflects to an extent that seems to me disquieting, the departmental pattern of a Western Faculty of Arts, whereas this latter pattern is in my view inadequate (not to say misleading) even in the West itself now that the West has taken on some kind of world role, so limited is the traditional pattern to specifically Western culture. Departments of politics, economics, philosophy, law, etc., and the conceptualisations that they presuppose and perpetuate, represent a particular analysis of a particular society: one way of slicing up the seamless whole of human experience, a way that was worked out to handle the data of Western civilisation, - but is inadequate or inept when applied uncritically to other civilisations, or indeed to the new world civilisation that is to-day emerging.

∟ Not only is the slicing up done in a locally Western fashion. Also, the relation among the various parts, which differs from culture to culture, is ignored. All this is one major reason why a normal Western mind cannot understand another civilisation.



It sees the various parts, but does not perceive how they are related to each other. Further, much of the advice of foreign "experts" on Indian development is positively misleading because it is, both in practice and even in principle, unintegrated: so that one aspect of life -- for instance, economics -- may be thought of as an independent entity rather than being seen as an abstraction adjectival to the total process of contemporary India. This is in large part because (negatively) such experts are usually trained in Western universities that are incapable (and even insouciant) of integrating the abstraction called economics into a comprehensive Indian dynamic [6]. The West must learn to rethink its university pattern; but cannot do so without Indian help. ]

All this, however, is a large matter, too elaborate and perhaps as yet too speculative and untested to be developed here in any detail [7]. Suffice it at this point, returning to our immediate assignment, to draw together some of the specific proposals proffered under the preceding Sections, adumbrating a paper on secularisation in modern Indian society, papers on current tendencies in Hindu, Muslim, etc., development, studies on the mutual involvement in present-day India of moral-and-other-values and economic change, an emphasis in History departments on contemporary historical evolution, etc. The over-all suggestion is that the present-day scene, in its quality of a situation in process (a highly complex situation in exceedingly

delicate yet rapid process) should become an explicit, deliberate, major concern of the Indian university. An Institute, Centre, programme, department, or other project to study the modernisation or renovation process itself, could be both intellectually rich (certainly challenging!) and pragmatically useful (certainly relevant).

It would have to address itself to the modern scene not only in its several parts, but with an active concern for the inter-relations among the parts. That is, it would have to be "inter-disciplinary" (this particular term is simply an oblique admission of the inadequacy, which I have argued on other grounds, of the traditional discipline or department pattern). Nonetheless one aspect of the whole would be an insistence that History departments should develop a serious and full-scale study of contemporary Indian history. The Hindu, Muslim, and British periods of Indian history must of course not be neglected; but the period since 1947 is of at least equal, and in many respects is of more crucial, significance. It should get at least equal, if not greater, attention, personnel, and concern.

Of course, 1947 cannot be a neat and firm dividing line. The Contemporary Period should begin as far back as seems, in the judgement of the persons formulating or teaching it, necessary to explain the present.

More generally, I am simply urging a continual and formal and responsible inquiry into the dynamics of life in present-day India: the furthering of a nation's self-critical self-consciousness, as the basis for self-renewal. Difficult, but exciting; problematic, but powerful; intellectually perhaps the greatest challenge that the country faces -- to understand itself.

In other words, when asked to make some sort of comment on the question of education and the whole modernising, renovating process in India, I simply turn the matter back, I hope constructively, by suggesting that this question should be built into the educational system itself, operationally.

N\_O\_T\_E\_S

- 1) Modernisation of a Traditional Society, Asia Publishing House for Indian Council of World Affairs, Delhi, Bombay, &c., 1965;  
  
"Secularism: The Problem Posed", in Seminar, New Delhi, March, 1965;  
  
Islam in Modern History, Princeton, 1957, New York, 1959, esp. chapters on India and Turkey; etc.
  
- 2) In the Independence Day Parade in New Delhi, January 26, 1964, the Delhi float symbolised secularism by a representation of the phūl-wālon kī sayr procession embracing both Hindu and Muslim, and Sikh, sacred sites.
  
- 3) As illustrative of this, I am submitting separately an aide-memoire propounding a particular possibility of this type.
  
- 4) Cf. the Sapru House Lectures, the first item in (1) above.
  
- 5) Id.
  
- 6) I am not insensitive to the paradox that one Western observer, myself, am criticising other Westerners for their deficiencies or non-perceptivities in this realm. In defence it might be argued that the deficiencies of my own suggestions here will be of other sorts; more basically, however, this is fallacious, for such deficiencies or ineptness as my proffered notions may evince will almost certainly, like the others', be due less to inherent weaknesses in the ideas themselves than to a failure of appreciation of the actual situation in India and the processes of its contemporary evolution.
  
- 7) A first step towards enunciating this argument is currently in press under the title, "Non-Western Studies -- the religious approach", by the present writer in a forthcoming symposium; but a full statement must wait.