

# **‘Religious’ Nationalism – A Threatening Blend**

**Vincent Alva**

Research Scholar  
Department of English  
Mangalore University  
Mangalagangothri  
India - 574199  
[alvavincy@gmail.com](mailto:alvavincy@gmail.com)

## **Abstract**

*Defining nationalism has never been an easy task. Several thinkers like Benedict Anderson, G. Aloysius, Partha Chatterjee and others have tried to define nationalism in different ways depending upon the situation. Thus there has been a clear cut demarcation between Western nationalism and the Eastern nationalism. Though everyone is of the opinion that nationalism is an outcome of emotional feelings, the cultural, ethnic, linguistic, social, political and religious components which influence the construct of nationalism a lot cannot be bypassed. Further, nationalism can also be taken as ‘experience’. If for the West it was always the experience of dominance, for the east it was a feeling of subjugation and nationalism for the latter was the imitation of the masters.*

*India having a long history of colonialism, the nationalism for her was that of imitation as well as aggression which paved way to freedom struggle. The luminaries like Gandhi and others throughout spoke of the diversity of Indian nationalism there always hung a cloud of separatism which tried to ‘colour’ Indian nationalism. The postcolonial political developments in India clearly indicate that Nationalism in India is the religious game of a dominant group for political gain. This has posed and continues to pose a major threat to the diversity of India which has shaped the largest and strongest constitution in the world. “Can ‘Hindutva’ or any other religious ideologies in India claim to be Indian Nationalism?” is a question requiring immediate attention.*

*This question has disturbed many writers and they have tried to answer this question in different ways. Rohinton Mistry and Shashi Tharoor have largely discussed this question allowed in their writings. Mistry in his fiction has made an effort to speak the fear of Parsi community, which he belongs to and very clearly states that Indian Nationalism cannot be branded by a single ideology. In his Trilogies he blames “Shiv Sena” for their sectarian kind nationalism. He was very much pained when Mumbai University dropped his novel *Such a Long Journey* from the syllabus as a response to the Shiv Sena agitation. Shashi Tharoor, who is yet another prolific writer, too has come down heavily upon the advocates of branding Indian Nationalism as Hindu nationalism. His fictional as well as non-fictional works discuss the question of Indian nationalism quite seriously.*

*The two novelists are referred here in the abstract just to show that in literature too the writers voiced their fear over religious nationalism. Though their novels have not been analyzed in this present paper the readers have a large scope to go into their works to understand the impact of such kind of nationalism.*

**Key words:** Nationalism, Experience, West and East, Dominance and Subjugation, Master and the slave, Colonial freedom, Diversity, Hindutva.

Even to this day intellectuals have not been able to give a precise definition to the term nationalism. If some, while defining nationalism, stress the political aspect of nationalism some give more attention to the cultural aspect. Each one has and will have his/her share in contributing to the community feeling of nationalism. A. R Desai (1998) calls nationalism a movement of various classes and groups comprising of a nation, attempting to remove all economic, political, social and cultural obstacles which impede the realization of their aspirations. The definition by Rosa Luxemburg which is quoted by Desai clearly justifies what has been said already. “National States and Nationalism are empty vessels in which each epoch and the class relations in each particular country pour their particular content” (Desai, 1998). So it is the feeling of oneness that creates nationalism and secure feeling solidifies the need for nationalism.

According to Partha Chatterjee (1986), “nationalism as an ideology is irrational, narrow, hateful and destructive. It is not an authentic product of any of the non-European civilization which, in each particular case, it claims as its classical heritage. It is wholly a European export to the rest of the world. It is also one of Europe’s most pernicious exports, for it is not a child of reason or liberty, but of their opposite: of fervent romanticism, of political messianism whose inevitable consequence is the annihilation of freedom” (p. 7). But this statement by Chatterjee should not put us off from further discussing nationalism. ‘Nationalism’ has been one of the highly discussed and contested terms. Even to this day it continues to be a complex mixture of an ideology of a class of people, policy-orientation of a state, ‘noble’ sentiment of pride and commitment to one’s state, and a socio-political movement for nation-building, along with many more interpretations. This being the reality it is but natural that the questions of nationalism are highly value-laden. It is because they are nothing but expressions of interests and power positions of individuals, groups and even nation-states from time to time.

In his book *Nations and Nationalism*, Ernest Gellner (1983) defines nationalism in the simplest possible terms. According to him, “nationalism is primarily a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent”. (p. 1). He terms nationalism as a sentiment or a movement. Sentiments or movements are always attached to the self. “Nationalist sentiment is the feeling of anger aroused by the violation of the principle, or the feeling of satisfaction aroused by fulfilment. A nationalist movement is one actuated by a sentiment of this

kind”. (Gellner, 1983, p. 1). When the spirit of modernization sweeps across and the people try to identify themselves belonging to a particular community, sharing common cultural heritage, focusing on secure structure on which the political and national unit can be safe guarded, the feelings of nationalism become focused. Any injustice caused to the members belonging to your community would call for the up rise of nationalism. The person or the thing which becomes responsible for the concerned situation becomes the ‘other’. To confront that ‘other’ a nationalism is born.

The birth of nationalism will give rise to the birth of nation state. The principles of nationalism will bring the people together ethnically which disallows them to cut across other ethnic boundaries. Sometimes political interventions within or without the ethnic groups might cause unrest among the members belonging to different ethnic groups. In order to control this uprising the central political authority delegates the responsibility to apply violence. This body is called a state. Gellner says,

...the state is that agency within the society which possesses the monopoly of legitimate violence. In most orderly societies any form of violence is illegitimate. But there may arise conflicts, thus disturbing the peace in the society. In such case, in order to suppress the erupted conflicts the central political authority delegates the responsibility to some to apply violence. This body by applying force ensures peace in the society. This body or agency or group of agencies is state. (Gellner, 1983, p.1)

Gellner gives two definitions to nationalism. Firstly he says, “Two men are of the same nation if and only if they share the same culture, where culture in turn means a system of ideas and signs and associations and ways of behaving and communicating.” Secondly he says, “Two men are of the same nation if and only if they *recognize* each other as belonging to the same nation. In other words, *nations maketh man*; nations are the artefacts of men’s convictions and loyalties and solidarities. A mere category of persons (say, occupants of a given territory, or speakers of a given language, for example) becomes a nation if and when the members of the category firmly recognize certain mutual rights and duties to each other in virtue of their shared membership of it. It is their recognition of each other as fellows of this kind which turns them into a nation, and not the other shared attributes, whatever they might be, which separate that category from non-members” (Gellner, 1983, p.1). He extends the view stating that nationalism is the ‘congruence between culture and power’. Then, the obvious question that one might ask is if culture was apolitical in the pre-nation phase of history. As an answer to this question we need to acknowledge that certain amount of blend of culture and power could be identified even in pre-modern period. However, with the idea of nation the congruence between culture and power is thought to be a definite necessity.

Chatterjee (1986) quoting John Plamenatz, observes that there are ‘Two types’ of nationalism (p. 1). They are ‘Western’ and ‘Eastern’. ‘Western’ nationalism emerged primarily in Western Europe and the ‘Eastern’ nationalism emerged in Eastern Europe, in Asia and also in Latin

America. In both types of nationalism, as Plamenatz observes, there is 'primarily a cultural phenomenon' though it always takes a 'political form'. It was strongly believed that the Western Nationalism was culturally equipped to remove the deficiencies. Britain and France were the already advanced nations and Germans and Italians already had the linguistic, educational and professional skills that were deemed necessary for a 'consciously progressive civilization'.

Eastern Nationalism has appeared among 'peoples recently drawn into a civilization hitherto alien to them, and whose ancestral cultures are not adapted to success and excellence by these cosmopolitan and increasingly dominant standards' (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 1). The people of such nations are aware of their backwardness in terms of certain universal standards set by the advanced nations of Western Europe. They easily inherited the alien culture because their nations' culture did not provide the necessary 'adaptive leverage' to facilitate them to reach those standards of progress. Eastern type of nationalism was bent upon 're-equipping the nation culturally and thus transform it'. But the Eastern Nationalism, as Chatterjee puts it, could not transform the nation so easily by imitating the alien culture. It feared the loss of 'its distinctive identity'. "The search therefore was for a regeneration of the national culture, adapted to the requirements of progress, but retaining at the same time its distinctiveness" (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 1).

In order to be identified with the ideologies of the Western Nationalism, the Eastern Nationalism had no other choice but imitating the alien culture. Imitation was not that easy since the 'attempt was deeply contradictory'. The Eastern Nationalism was both receptive and hostile to the models it imitated. It was very easy for it to 'imitate the value of standards set by the alien culture'. But the hostility was even greater. It had to imitate the 'the intruder and dominator' and at the same time reject the ancestral ways which were seen as 'obstacles to progress and yet also cherished as marks of identity'.

It is imitative in that it accepts the value of the standards set by the alien culture. But it also involves a rejection: 'in fact two rejections, both of them ambivalent: rejection of the alien intruder and dominator who is nevertheless to be imitated and surpassed by his own standards, and rejection of ancestral ways which are seen as obstacles to progress and yet also cherished as marks of identity'. (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 2)

The dilemma the Indians faced here was purely an emotional one. Accepting to imbibe the spirit of nationalism means imitating 'them' who are intruders and once again is an act of subjection. The act of rejection means, rejecting both the intruder and ancestral traditions deterring the progress. The balancing the two though difficult was manoeuvred by the Indians.

It was not enough for the Eastern nationalism just to imitate the West. As it has been stated earlier the Western nations had been already equipped with resources to merge in the spirit of nationalism without much difficulty. But it posed a great challenge to the Eastern nations. They had to focus more at achieving growth and progress.

Indeed, the very fact that nationalists of the 'eastern' type accept and value the ideal of progress – and strive to transform their inherited cultures in order to make them better suited

for the conditions of the modern world – means that archaic forms of authority are destroyed, conditions are created for the growth of a certain degree of individual initiative and choice, and for the introduction of science and modern education.’ (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 3)

It is interesting to observe the debate by Chatterjee, Elie Kedourie (1970) and Anthony D. Smith (1971). Chatterjee agrees with Kedourie when he says nationalism cannot help the poor people to achieve autonomy and liberty. He calls nationalism as the most pernicious export from the Europe. But Chatterjee neatly draws a line between Anthony Smith and Kedourie. He says that Anthony blames Kedourie’s interpretation of nationalism as ‘one sided misinterpretation’. For him nationalism is an ideology which has a great humanizing and civilizing influence. Anthony is optimistic when he says nationalism can help the developing countries in legitimizing ‘new regimes desirous of maintaining political stability and keeping a fissiparous population under single and viable harness’ (Smith, 1971, pp. 12-14).

Kedourie is very pessimistic about eastern nations and about their spirit of nationalism. He predicts as though seated on the judgment seat that non-European peoples are culturally incapable of acquiring the values of the Enlightenment. But Chatterjee is of the opinion that the liberals assert that even the non-European countries are involved in the historical process of modernization. When the elements hindering the growth of progress are removed even the eastern countries can press forward to become like what the European countries are today (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 12).

Nationalism is not just the issue between the West and the East. It is now a global phenomenon. Slowly the knowledge starts playing a major role in shaping the ideology of nationalism. Many liberals like Horace B. Davis assert that nationalism is not an abstract thing. It is a continuous process which is achieved by the string of scientific knowledge and rationality. It is also a cross-cultural phenomenon. In our case, India offered itself to be laboratory for different cross-cultural experimentation. The colonial onslaught one after the other not only gave way to cross cultural nationalism but also to rationality built upon knowledge and scientific education. Whole world now came to know that the knowledge is something through which one can conquer any force. So to the non-European countries application of scientific truth to assess the already existing traditional beliefs and norms became all the more important. This process Davis calls the period of enlightenment. The two types of nationalisms which we referred to in the beginning, Davis calls them the nationalism of enlightenment which ‘was by and large rational than emotional’ and the other ‘based on culture and tradition’. This type of nationalism asserts that the nation was a natural community and therefore ‘something sacred, eternal, organic, carrying a deeper justification than the works of men’ (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 18).

In the process of understanding nationalism and the thoughts of nationalists Gandhian thoughts would throw a broader light on Indian nationalism. If almost all the nationalists blame the cultural degeneration for the Indian subjection, Gandhi blames it on moral degradation. The spirit of nationalism was not so blatant in Indians because they were morally resigned to the colonial rule. He puts it very tersely in his *Hind Swaraj* which is recorded by Chatterjee. “The English have

not taken India; we have given them. ... they had not the slightest intention at the time of establishing a kingdom. ... it is truer to say that we gave India to the English than that India was lost” (Chatterjee, 1986, pp. 85-86).

Chatterjee elaborates what Gandhiji continues to say. According to him if India is conquered it is not because of its cultural weaknesses or lack of sense in embracing modernity. He feels that freedom cannot be achieved by modernizing Indian society. It is precisely because the Indians were seduced by the glitters of modernization that they remained a subject people.

Indeed, as long as Indians continue to harbor illusion about the ‘progressive’ qualities of modern civilization, they will remain a subject nation. Even if they succeed physically in driving out the English, they would still have ‘English rule without Englishman’, because it is not the physical presence of the English which makes India a subject nation: it is civilization which subjects (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 86).

Under the colonial rule dreaming of an independent nation state was a positive political dream. To realize this dream the colonized had to wage a struggle, which was not so easy. The colonial government always saw to it that the colonized received only those facilities which helped them to rule their subjects. So it was colonial state which was an obstacle to all the attempts of transformation. The formation of nation state was an easy alternative in order to bring about transformation. ‘To achieve this peasant of the vast country had to be mobilized into freedom struggle. They were there but with irrational emotions, always prone into violence. The major task of national leadership was to organize, coordinate and keep under control the uncontrollable mass’ (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 153). Here where Gandhiji becomes all the more important. Though the views of the nationalists differed from one another, the object was same – formation of a free nation state. It was possible only for Gandhiji because he could at the same time speak to the intellectuals who could understand his highly intellectual political discourse and to the poor, ordinary peasants who would only know to react and would only understand the language only which is close to their heart (Chatterjee, 1986, p. 153).

In the post-colonial India power politics began to play a major role in shaping Indian nationalism. The Western notion of nationalism - one culture, one language, one religion - was never to be seen in Indian nationalistic ideology even when India was engaged with the colonial struggle. The colonial struggle, in the leadership of Gandhiji, chanted the mantra of ‘unity in diversity’, which was a natural aspiration, to achieve the freedom. But, it is evident in the colonial history that, even before the colonial freedom, the dye was cast to set a platform to fight for separatism based on caste and community. When the Muslims strongly adhered to the demand of a separate nation, which should come to being with the evacuation of the colonial imperialism, the people living in the other part of the country, majority of them being Hindus, felt a strong urge to feel oneness under the umbrella of religious identity, ‘Hinduism’. This paved the way for the new facet in the Indian nationalism, which the political opportunists called ‘Hindu Nationalism’ (Bose, 1997) which was strongly based on Hindu philosophy. This was again renamed by the Hindu



fundamentalists, when the greed for power became so imminent in them, as ‘Hindutva’ - ‘the early twentieth- century expression for Hindu Nationalism or political Hinduism’ (Nandy, 1995, p. 6). This ‘Hindutva’, as Sumantra Bose argues, later on became a cause for the demolition of Babri Mosque on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992 (Bose, 1997, p. 104). This view has been very strongly upheld by Neeladri Bhattacharya. “The Battle for Ramjanambhoomi is part of a wider political struggle for a constitution of ‘Hindu’ consciousness and identity ... and for the assertion of ‘Hindu’ power over all other communities in India.” (Battacharya, 1991, p. 125)

There is no record in the Indian history, prior to the British rule, that any of the Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim kings sought to divide the people politically on the grounds of religion alone. Even the most intolerant Muslim rulers, who destroyed temples and exacted *jiziya* tax, employed Hindu generals and ministers to serve them. “But the idea of dividing Indians by the manner in which they held out their hands to God was born in the wake of the unsuccessful, but multireligious, “mutiny” of 1857, when Hindus and Muslims rose together in revolt against the foreigner” (Tharoor, 2006, p. 14). The British were more shocked by the unity of the soldiers belonging to different faiths and regions than the actual mutiny which was quelled by the force of the superior arms. To achieve their goal the colonial administration came up with the old Roman Maxim *divide et impera* – “divide and rule”. Thus it was the British who sowed the seeds of sectarianism in India which was embalmed with religious separatism, which finally caused the emergence of two “nationalisms” prior to the formation of two nations. And this desire for nationalism was dubbed purely on religious separatism than any other feelings.

What the British euphemistically dubbed “communal feeling” was actively stoked; it became a tenet of colonial policy to encourage particularist consciousness among Indians, both religious (so that they would be Muslims or Sikhs first and Indian second, if at all) and regional (so that they would be Bengalis or Dogras rather than Indians). If the structures of British rule tended toward the creation of a united India for the convenience of the rulers, its animating spirit was aimed at fostering division to achieve the same ends. This seeming paradox (but in fact entirely logical construct) of imperial policy culminated in the tragic Partition of India upon independence – so that August 15, 1947, was a birth that was also an abortion. (Tharoor, 2006, p. 15)

With the birth of two nations at midnight stroke the ideas behind “nationalism” also started changing in the minds of the people as a prerequisite for religious identity. A magician’s wand drew a geographical line and christened two separate countries as India and Pakistan in the world map. Nationalism took the colour of separatist and religious nationalism. During the partition gallons of blood freely flowed in the Hindu-Muslim riot for which the newly born countries became silent spectators. So far considered as our own, suddenly the Muslims were considered as the enemies to Indian nationalism. Politically too nationalism became a bone of contention. Postcolonial India, with its vast experience to be one nation, started growing up branches of different sectarian and separatist nationalism. For the administrative purpose vast independent India was divided into separate states on linguistic lines. Later this division itself became a threat

to Indian nationalism. National and regional political parties, for the purpose of vote bank, started to draw a line among the people on the bases of geography, language, ethnicity, caste, sub-castes and most importantly on the bases of religion.

In the recent past this demarcation has caused a greater threat to Indian nationalism. After the independence, till the departure of Nehru there wasn't much political unrest. The political unrest began with the entry of Indira Gandhi who was considered as an autocrat in democratic India, who also became responsible for the break in the Congress Party, which paved a way for the emergence of Janata Front. Many national parties emerged and plenty of regional parties mushroomed. Every party had its own separatist agenda to attract the voters. One of the National Parties, i. e. Bharatiya Janata Party started gaining prominence through Hindutva identity as its national agenda, and in the recent election it could win majority Lokh Sabha seats to politically steer head the country. Hindu Chauvinists have started to claim Hindutva as Indian nationalism which Shashi Tharoor calls parochial and definitional. But he was proved wrong when the party won the majority seats in the election.

The rise of Hindu nationalism as a political phenomenon in recent years has articulated an alternative view of Indian identity, one that is explicitly narrow and definitional. Its pro-Hindu and pro Hindi, sectarian and antisecular view of Indianness has so far not found sympathy with three-fourths of the electorate. (Tharoor, 2006, p. xiv)

Needless to say that there have been many communal riots already in India which caused the death of thousands of innocent people of all caste and creed. The Babri Masjid – Ram Janambhoomi issue started the riot in a renewed spirit in 1992 in Bombay, on the basis of “Hindutva” nationalism, which is purely a political agenda. Exactly after ten years in 2002, it was Gujarath that exploded and it is known as Godra carnage. Godra horror carnage in Gujarath in 2002 is the extension of the Masjid and Temple issue and the communal riot in Muzafar Nagar in Uttar Pradesh recently is once again the never dying embers of communal ill feeling.

Tharoor throughout tries to speak aloud that violence and separatism cannot form a basis for Indian nationalism identity. This attitude itself has caused much feared unrest in India. After the partition the Muslim minorities who remained in Indian Territory were more worried about their personal as well as community identity. Babri masjid is a historical monument no doubt, but for the Muslims it was a mark of identity rather than a monument. The grouse of Hindus is that it was built on the same place after the demolition of the temple. A lot of discussion for and against this issue has taken place and still continues. Tharoor feels that the destruction of the mosque seemed an appalling betrayal of the compact that had sustained the Muslim community as a vital part of India's pluralist democracy. He is of the opinion that Hinduism doesn't permit this kind of extremism because it is a practiced religion with ideals rather than being governed by fundamentals. He is very critical about this incident. He says;

The Hindu fanatics who attacked the mosque had little faith in the institutions of Indian democracy. They saw the state as soft, pandering to minorities out of a misplaced and



westernized secularism. To them, an independent India, freed after nearly a thousand years of alien rule (first Muslim, then British), and rid of a sizable portion of its Muslim population by the Partition, had an obligation to assert its own identity, one that would be triumphantly and indigenously Hindu. They are not fundamentalists in any meaningful sense of the term, since Hinduism is uniquely a religion without fundamentals; there is no Hindu pope, no Hindu Sunday, no single Hindu holy book, and indeed no such thing as a Hindu heresy. They are, instead, chauvinists, who root their Hinduism not in any of its soaring philosophical or spiritual underpinnings – nor, unlike their Islamic counterparts, in the theology of their faith – but rather in its role as a source of identity. They seek revenge in the name of Hinduism-as-badge, rather than in Hinduism-as-doctrine. (Tharoor, 2006, p. xviii)

Tharoor strongly believes that Hinduism, which asserts all ways of worship equally valid, is a religion which is intensely personal, related to the individual's self-realization in relation to God. Such a faith understands that belief is a matter of hearts and minds, not of bricks and stone. In this line of thinking, Tharoor always asserted that a clear cut line cannot be drawn in India to brand a particular type of nationalism. In European countries, since the language of the colonizer and the colonized was the same, it was easy for the colonizers to rule the colony and after the colonial freedom the country called itself a nation with a single spirit of nationalism. This single spirit of nationalism was further strengthened by the same language the people spoke, the same ethnicity they shared, the same religion, culture and tradition they practiced.

Indian nationalism is considered as one of the strangest since no single identity would bind the Indians together. Language cannot bind the people together since India's constitution recognizes eighteen official languages and thirty five other languages as spoken by more than a million people. Ethnicity cannot be a factor to bring Indian under one umbrella since the "Indian" accommodates a diversity of racial types in which many Indians have more in common with foreigners than with his own countryman. "Panjabis and Bengalis, for instance, have more in common with Pakistanis, and Bangladeshis, respectively, than with other Indians" (Tharoor, 2006, p. xiii). The most deep rooted religion cannot be the unifying factor in India since India is a secular pluralistic state which is a home for almost every religion known to mankind. Nor can the geography hold Indians together "since the natural geography of the sub-continent – framed by the mountains and the sea – was hacked by the Partition of 1947" (Tharoor, 2006, p. xiii). So according to Tharoor Indian nationalism, as Gellner and Chatterjee have argued, has always been the nationalism of an idea. "It is, ..., the idea of an "ever-ever land" – emerging from an ancient civilization, united by a shared history, sustained by pluralist democracy" (Tharoor, 2006, p. xiii).

This idea of pluralistic nationalism, Tharoor always argued, has given us more scope to unite under one nation. Indian nationalism, unlike European nationalisms, has been accommodative to diverse cultural practices, customs and traditions. Politically it was much more accommodative by giving equal opportunity for national as well as regional political parties to play their role in nation building. With multiple religions and thousands of religious practices, with multiple castes and sub castes, with numerous tongues, Indian nationalism never claimed

superiority depending upon majoritarian capacity. The pluralistic democratic ideologies decided the political claims in the vast nation which was dissimilar in every step. This itself is the core of Indian nationalism according to Tharoor. To prove this point he writes about a very interesting political incident which took place in the recent politics of Indian democracy.

When India celebrated the forty-ninth anniversary of its independence from British rule in 1996, its then – prime minister, H. D. Deve Gowda, stood at the ramparts of Delhi's sixteenth-century Red Fort and delivered the traditional Independence Day address to the nation in Hindi, India's "national language". Eight other prime ministers had done exactly the same thing forty-eight times before him, but what was unusual this time was that Deve Gowda, a southerner from the state of Karnataka, spoke to the country in a language of which he did not know a word. Tradition and politics required a speech in Hindi, so he gave one – the words having been written out for him in his native Kannada script, in which, of course, they made no sense. (Tharoor, 2006)

Reflecting upon this historical incident Tharoor feels that such an incident is almost unthinkable elsewhere. This is, according to him, what makes India India. Only India could be ruled by a man who does not understand its national language. Only in India there is a "national language" which is not understood by half of its population. Since diversity is the feature of Indian nationalism, only diversity can give meaning to Indian nationalism. Tharoor says;

There has never been an archetypal Indian to stand alongside the archetypal Englishman or Frenchman. If America is a melting pot, then to me India is a *thali*, a selection of sumptuous dishes in different bowls. Each tastes different, and does not necessarily mix with the next, but they belong together of the same plate, and complement each other in making the meal a satisfying repast. (Tharoor, 2006, p. xiv)

To conclude, one can always feel comfortable in India which is founded on its multifarious diversities only if one considers *Nationalism as Religion* and definitely not if one considers *Religion as Nationalism*.

### Works Cited

- Bhattacharya, Neeladri. (1991). Myth, History and Politics of Ramjanambhoomi. In S. Gopal (Ed.), *Anatomy of a Confrontation : The Babri Masjid-Ramjanmabhumi Issue* (pp. 122-140). New Delhi, India: Penguin Books.
- Bose, Sumantra. (1998). 'Hindu Nationalism' and the Crises of the Indian State: A Theoretical Perspective. In S. Bose & A. Jalal (Ed.), *Nationalism, Democracy and Development : State and Politics in India* (pp. 104-64). Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. (1986). *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World : A Derivative Discourse*. London, U.K. Totowa, N.J: Zed Books for the United Nations University US distributor, Biblio Distribution Center.
- Desai, A. (1998). *Recent Trends in Indian Nationalism : Supplement to Social Background of Indian Nationalism*. Mumbai: Popular Prakashan.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kedourie, E. (1970). *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*. London: Frank Cass.
- Nandy, A. (1995). *Creating a Nationality : The Ramjanmabhumi Movement and Fear of the Self*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, A. (2010). *Nationalism : Theory, Ideology, History*. Cambridge, UK Malden, MA: Polity.
- Tharoor, S. (2006). *India : From Midnight to the Millennium*. New York: Arcade Pub. Distributed by Little, Brown and Co.

\*\*\*\*\*