

## **Relationship between Secularism and Democracy: Liberal View**

Md Jaynal Abedin

*Corresponding Author: Md Jaynal Abedin*

---

**Abstract:** Liberal view about the relationship between secularism and democracy presents the key debates about democracy and secularism. The research has investigated the historical relationship between democracy and secularism. For the investigation, the paper has considered some major aspects of contemporary world politics like religion and democracy, secularism and democracy. The paper evaluates the relationship between democracy and secularism from the liberal and neoliberal aspect. This paper has applied a qualitative research methodology by collecting data from both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include newspapers and periodicals. In terms of secondary sources, this paper examines academic books, book chapters published on the topic, publications in scientific journals and articles. Following the introduction; the second part of the paper discusses the meaning and core values of democracy and secularism. The third part examines the relationship between democracy and secularism. This part also discusses the current conflict between democracy and religion, especially with Islam. The paper has developed an operational understanding of democracy and secularism as a political system, which may help clarify and perhaps reduce differences of opinion among scholars.

**Key Words:** Democracy, Secularism, Liberalism, Religion.

---

Date of Submission: 04-11-2019

Date of Acceptance: 20-11-2019

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The relation between secularism and democracy has attracted much attention to scholars over the years. Surprisingly, there was little neutral and free from biased information on the wider legal frameworks about this subject. It is considerable debate about the link between religion and democracy. Many theorists assume that the two are incompatible, others argue the opposite. The relation between religion and politics is the most debatable phenomenon in world history. Diachronically, from the ancient world up now, religion intervenes in politics, and in many cases, religion played a central role at the state authority. For instance, Islamic states (IS), even today could be an appropriate paradigm of identification of religious and state authority. (Giannis, p. 2) In modern political sciences, the democratic theory has largely neglected religion as a relevant causal factor. This is even more astounding in the field of the comparative politics of immigration and integration in liberal democracies and the resulting fundamental questions regarding the democratic management of cultural pluralism, which to a large extent stems from immigration and multiculturalism in Western societies. (Minkenberg, August 2007: 888) The underlying theoretical interest of this paper is to take a closer look at the question of the relevance or irrelevance of secularism underpinnings of modern democracies, especially in the light of a new religious-cultural pluralism. Of course, religion is a major factor; to identify the relation between secularism and democracy. As Tomas Hammar (1990: 4951) reminds us, citizenship in the pre-modern past was closely connected to religion, and modern citizenship can be seen as one of the results of secularization. Until very recently, some countries like Greece linked citizenship to membership in the Greek Orthodox state church, and the well-known argument by Rogers Brubaker (1992) about the role of 'cultural idioms' for citizenship can also be linked to religious components of cultural and national identities. What will the identity of states; secular democratic or religious it's a burning issue of the contemporary world. The clash between western democracy and religion is the most debatable issue in the contemporary world. The world's largest democracy; India is ruling by the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP).<sup>1</sup> BJP is well known for its Hindu nationalism and fundamentalism.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The BJP is one of the two major parties in the Indian political system, along with the Indian National Congress.

<sup>2</sup>The major ideologies of BJP are Conservatism, Social conservatism, Hindu nationalism, Gandhian socialism, and Integral humanism. Prime Minister Narendra Modi was convicted by allowing Gujrat riot against Muslims in 2002; when he was chief minister of Gujarat. For details see - Majumder, BBC, 22 April 2011.

The constitution of Lebanon distributed the state power within three major religious groups.<sup>3</sup> The influence of post-communist democracy is gradually increasing in Poland. The debate has attracted the attention of political scientists about the Roman Catholic Church's role in this country's past and future political life. (Hundley, November 10, 1994) France, Australia, Canada, Denmark, Switzerland, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom (UK) are currently sites of bitter and divisive debates concerning the presence of small Muslim minorities in their midst. Finally, the current debates of Muslim integration in Western democracies or Turkey's status as a membership candidate for the European Union (EU) vividly illustrate how religious arguments draw distinct dividing lines of access and membership. Research on this topic focuses on theological or juridical aspects of secularism and their compatibility with the principles of modern democracy. Or it involves case studies of particular actors and how they relate to the principles and practice of democracy. This paper expands the perspective on this issue and addresses it from the perspective of liberal democratic theory.

## **II. A GENERAL FRAMEWORK OF DEMOCRACY AND SECULARISM**

The term derives from the Greek *demos* (the people) and *kratos* (authority, rule). (Ober, September 2007: 2) Though the core meaning of democracy is simple - 'rule by the people' from the 5<sup>th</sup> century BC Greek *demokratia* - and democracy is almost universally commended in contemporary politics, the idea of democracy is contested and complex, as are its justifications and practical implications. (Gutmann, 1993: 521) Democracy is occasionally identified narrowly with majority rule (Hardin, 1990: 185) and other times broadly to encompass all that is humanly good, (Macpherson, 1973) but neither view is satisfactory to an understanding of democracy as a social ideal. Majoritarian decision making may be an approximate means of democratic rule, but it cannot be an adequate democratic standard. (Gutmann, 1993: 521) Democracy as exercised in practice is contested and has been interpreted differently in different contexts. Democracy evokes different ideas such as freedom of expression, social security and especially voting rights whereby people can elect their preferred candidates as representatives who will work for the community, for society, and the country. Scott Mainwaring (1989) argues a democracy must meet three basic procedural criteria: Competitive elections must be the principal route to the political office. There must be competitive popular elections for the legislature and there generally are for the president as well in a presidential regime. There must be broad adult citizenship. Democracies essentially provide guarantees of traditional civil liberties for all; minority rights must be secured. On the other hand, Secularism draws its intellectual backgrounds from Roman and Greek philosophers such as Marcus Aurelius and Epicurus; from Enlightenment philosophers such as John Locke, Voltaire, Baruch Spinoza, James Madison, Denis Diderot, Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Paine; and from more recent freethinkers and atheists such as Bertrand Russell and Robert Ingersoll. The British writer George Jacob Holyoake (1896: 51) first used the term 'secularism' in 1851. Though the term was new, the general concepts of free thought on which it was based had existed throughout history. Holyoake invented the term 'secularism' to elucidate his views of promoting a social order distinct from religion, without enthusiastically terminating or criticizing religious belief. The most common definition of secularism is the separation of state and religion. (Aliefendioglu, 2001)

Words such as liberty, liberal, libertarian and libertine all trace their history to the Latin *liber*, which means 'free'. The first use of liberalism as the word appeared in English. In Spain, the liberals, the first group to use the liberal label in a political context, fought for the implementation of the 1812 Constitution for decades. From 1820 to 1823, during the Trienio liberal, King Ferdinand VII was compelled by the liberals to swear to uphold the constitution. By the mid of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, liberal was used as a politicized term for parties and movements around the world. (Kirchner, 1988) Liberalism is a political philosophy or worldview founded on ideas of equality and liberty.<sup>4</sup> Liberal scholars uphold a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these values, but usually, they support notions and programs such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, civil rights, free markets, democratic society, secular government, and international cooperation. (Liberal International) The dominant liberal democratic model refers to a specific set of concepts that should epitomize a democracy and emphasizes formal procedures and electoral processes. These include the primacy of elected representatives and free, fair and frequent elections, the 'Rule of Law,' the 'Division of Powers,' 'Checks and Balances,' a competitive market economy and independent civil society. Before we discussed that, values of liberalism and secularism are not conflicting so secularism is more preferable for leading liberal thought. Liberal democracy is an ideology under which the democratic process is inseparable from liberal values. (Khan, 1997: 64) Liberal democracy is not simply a vehicle for holding an election and

---

<sup>3</sup>LEBANON, "International Religious Freedom Report for 2011," United States Department of State, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/193107.pdf> January 4, 2019.

<sup>4</sup>With a note to Robert Trivers' (1971: 35) definition of altruistic behavior, Satoshi Kanazawa (2010: 38) defines liberalism (as opposed to conservatism) as "the genuine concern for the welfare of genetically unrelated others and the willingness to contribute larger proportions of private resources for the welfare of such others."

permitting elected majorities to implement their campaign promises and policies. (Ibid) It is a substantive ideology rooted in secularism, free-market values, and individual liberties. (Ibid) Liberal democracy was championed as the agent of development and capitalism as the only feasible economic system: ideological conflict, it was said, is being gradually displaced by universal democratic reason and market-orientated thinking. (Fukuyama, 1989; Habermas, 1982; Held, April 1993) But such a view is quite insufficient in several respects. Modern liberal and liberal democratic theories have continuously sought to rationalize the sovereign power of the state while at the same time justifying limits on that power. (Held, 1992) The history of this attempt since Thomas Hobbes is the history of arguments to balance right and might, power and law, rights and duties. On the one hand, states must have a monopoly of coercive power to provide a secure basis on which commerce; trade; religion and family life can prosper. while liberal democracy acknowledges a role for an independent civil society and some state responsibility for social welfare, neoliberal democracy emphasizes an even more limited, depoliticized role, leading Chomsky to conclude that neoliberalism's political doctrine is the 'enemy' of participatory democracy. (Chomsky, 2011) Fung and Wright (2003) argue that the institutional forms of liberal democracy that developed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century have become unsuitable to the complexities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Jürgen Habermas (1994) address the new model of 'deliberative democracy'. The main idea of this model is that in a democratic polity political decisions should be reached through a process of deliberation among free and equal citizens. (Mouffe, 2000: 113) Most of the supporters of deliberative democracy are not anti-liberals. They reinterpret popular sovereignty in inter subjective terms, redefining it as 'communicatively generated power'. (Ibid) With this model, Habermas critiques both the liberal and republican conceptions of democracy. Democracy in the liberal vision is a system of institutions which aggregate the collective will of all citizens into proportionally representative blocs and translates it into the policy that compromises or synthesizes accordingly. He said, "Democracy requires that a polity exist, and thus the Liberal vision will never be truly democratic. Government under the Republican vision is essentially teleological: the fundamental role of political institutions in society is not as guardians of the market but as mechanisms for generating social change." Jürgen Habermas suggests that democracy be attained through the establishment of a formal deliberative sphere, sanitized of the power inequalities contained within society as a whole, in which individuals reach a normative consensus based on the principles of reason alone.

Chantal Mouffe proposes a new description of fundamental principles of democracy that allow for conflict, passion, and politics. She criticized most commonly spread forms of deliberative democracy. She focused on the way that neutralizes and reduces political pluralism and abuses the democratic goals of legitimacy and rationality. She argues about normative political theory. This theory was inaugurated by John Rawls in 1971 with the book of *A Theory of Justice*. Rawls wants to elaborate democratic liberalism which meets the claims of both liberty and equality. There are two issues which Chantal take to be particularly relevant. First, the 'political liberalism' advocated by Rawls, which is political, not metaphysical, and independent of comprehensive views. A clear-cut separation is proposed between the realm of the private and the realm of the public. Jürgen Habermas claims that Rawls cannot succeed in this strategy of avoiding philosophically disputed issues because it is impossible for him to develop his theory in the free-standing way to which he aspires. According to Chantal, both thinkers are right in their respective criticisms. Rawls's position is not as independent of comprehensive views as he believes. On the other, Habermas's position is not as purely proceduralist as he claims. (Ibid: 119) Chantal proposes the alternative 'agonistic pluralism'. To clarify the new perspective she argued, a distinction must immediately be made between 'politics' and 'the political'. According to 'agonistic pluralism,' the aim of democratic politics is to construct the 'them' group in such a way that it is no longer perceived as an enemy to be destroyed but as an 'adversary': i.e. as somebody whose ideas we combat but whose right to defend those ideas we do not call into question. AMY Gutmann (1993) gives a fundamental idea about democracy. He argues democracy assumes that people "need a process for arriving at binding decisions that takes everybody's interests into account." He classified democracy by six types; schumpeterian democracy, populist democracy, liberal democracy, participatory democracy, social democracy, and deliberative democracy. (Gutmann, 1993: 521-31) Schumpeterian democracy; a procedural minimalist approach, which, though it makes it easier to classify what is a democracy and what is not, also leaves us with little cause to care whether we are a democracy because it takes out the ideals. Robert Dahl (1989: 121-22) points out, Schumpeter's understanding "leaves us with no particular reason for wanting to know whether a system is "democratic" or not. Indeed, if a demos can be a tiny group that exercises a brutal despotism over a vast subject population, then "democracy" is conceptually, morally, and empirically indistinguishable from autocracy." Gutmann (1993: 523) argues populist democracy; besides the importance of Schumpeter's procedures, there is also value in ensuring that rule is popularly based. Therefore, to be sure that democratic decision rightly reflects the will of the people; democracy must protect free speech, the rule of law, full enfranchisement, and so forth. Problem: some significant constraints, such as independent judicial review, have no place in a truly populist democracy. Liberal democracy; the popular rule isn't the supreme value; protecting liberties is, especially liberties such as in Rawls's Theory of Justice (1971): speech, thought, press, property, religion, vote, hold

office, freedom from arbitrary arrest/seizure, and so on. This leaves scope for judicial review, checks, and balances, and so on to calm the popular will. Populist and liberal democracy isn't all that different. Populists also want to protect sufficient liberties to ensure continued populist democracy. (Ibid: 523-24) Participatory democracy; giving people the freedom to voice their opinions is unimportant if nobody cares. What necessities attention is educating people about politics and involving them in it. Participation is essential to prevent the abuse of power. (Ibid: 523) About social democracy, he argues, "Social democracy extends the logic of liberal democracy to realms that traditional liberals considered private and therefore not subject to democratic principles," like firms and families, inspired by a need for "avoidance of the tyrannical threat over individual lives that accompanies concentrations of power." Deliberative democracy; is an integration of populist and liberal ideas. What's significant is the less popular rule than that people take part in the democratic process through argument, evidence, and persuasion of others.

Ahmet T. Kuru (2007) addresses the question of why secular states pursue substantially different policies toward religion. The US, Turkey, and France are secular states that lack any official religion and have legal systems free from religious control. While the French and Turkish (for details see - Tok, 2009) (now Turkey has taken off the obstacles from headscarves) states have banned students' headscarves in public schools, the US has allowed students to wear religious symbols and attire. Kuru argues that state policies toward religion are the result of ideological struggles. In Turkey and France the dominant ideology is 'assertive secularism,' which purposes to eliminate religion from the public sphere, while in the US, it is 'passive secularism,' which permits public visibility of religion. He claims whether assertive or passive secularism became dominant in a specific case is the result of the particular historical conditions during the secular state-building period, particularly the presence or absence of an ancient régime based on a combination of monarchy and hegemonic religion. Veit Bader (2007: 25) explores issues of religion and state. He describes the role of secularism in government and society and how the state can deal fairly with the various religions. By discussing different institutional models of democracy and religious governance he claims that institutionally pluralist arrangements provide better chances for minorities and, at the same time, for increasing the actual degree of relational state impartiality and for finding more fair and even-handed solutions. Bader proposes an alternative approach to problems of governing religious diversity associational governance as a way of overcoming the inherent deficiencies of the predominant models. He claims that a moral minimalist position can be identified. He cites political theorist, D. Miller, who states that "at a sufficiently fundamental level...we should expect conceptions of need to converge." (Bader, 2007: 71) Bader says that "completely independent, impartial, neutral and objective knowledge is impossible..." (Ibid: 68) Endeavoring to exclude religion from the public sphere is both biased and fails to recognize the need to focus on supporting democracy says, Bader. The state necessities to foster support for democracy from all its citizens whatever their belief. (Ibid: 84-85) Bader points out that not even France and the US practice strict separation of state and church. (Ibid: 63, 84) For example, the French government funds some religious schools and the United States Congress has a chaplaincy service and its sessions are opened with a prayer. He argues that liberal-democracies do not need to align themselves to a specific world-view whether it is secularist or otherwise. (Ibid: 48-9) Nader Hashemi (2009) challenges the widely held beliefs that have been used to argue the incompatibility of religion and liberal democracy. He focuses on Locke's use of religion in support of democracy. "For obedience is due in the first place to God, and afterwards to the Laws," is a narration attributed not to an Ayatollah, but John Locke, a pre-eminent thinker-if not the father of modern liberalism. Today, secularists, as well as pro-and anti-democracy Islamists in the Muslim world all, depending on interpretations of religious sources (what Hashemi calls "dueling scriptures"). Hashemi notes that secularism in the West is associated with positive developments. Many Muslims, on the other hand, associate it with the colonial/imperialist agenda, repressive regimes and hostility to religion as represented by the more rigid (French) *laïcité* version. What needs to be defined, he asserts, is the precise relationship between secularism and liberal democracy. He recommends, echoing others, that there is considerable latitude in the form of secularism. Hashemi sees an opportunity in this elasticity to use Alfred Stepan's groundbreaking concept of 'twin tolerations'. The idea that religious institutions and the state must diagnose and respect "the minimum boundaries of freedom of action" is at the basis of this paradigm. Hashemi maintains that this form of mutual accommodation (more tolerable secularism) may be more palatable. David Beetham (2004) focuses on a civil society-based programmed and framework for democracy assessment. He explores the intellectual underpinnings of the assessment approach in the universal validity of democratic norms and a common imperative for democratization in developed as well as developing countries; and argues for the framework's effectiveness in teaching as well as research. Jonathan Fox and Shmuel Sandler (2005) re-examine the relationship between religion and politics using the Religion and State (RAS) dataset. They focus on domestic politics, specifically the extent or lack of separation of religion and state in western democracies and the Middle East. The authors examine the correlation between religion and democracy through the comparison of the Middle East, the world's most autocratic region, with western democracies, the most democratic states in the world. Theoretically, they ask whether the predictions of eighteenth and nineteenth-

century philosophers like Voltaire and Nietzsche that religion's influence on public life would decline in modern times have come true. They examine five aspects of the separation of religion and state: the structural relationship between religion and the state (the existence of an official religion or the legal position of religion within the state); the status of minority religions (restriction or banning of or provision of benefits to some religions but not others); discrimination against minority religions; regulation of the majority religion; and legislation of religion. They find that most western democracies do not have a full separation of religion and state. Only the US has no government involvement in religion. The authors argue that liberal democracy is thus compatible with religion, and the separation of religion and state in the US seems to be the exception rather than the rule. The authors also explore the relationship between Islam and democracy and find that: religious democracy, including Islamic democracy, is possible. Michael Minkenberg (2007) addresses the issue of the compatibility of Islam and democracy from the angle of empirical democratic theory and in a broad historical and comparative perspective. It includes the argument of, and evidence for, a Christian rooting of modern democracy. Religious traditions and institutions provide constraints and opportunities for liberal democracies and processes of democratization. Within the Christian tradition, distinctions between Orthodox Christianity, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism (also within Protestantism) matter, and so do different degrees of secularization or specific patterns of Church-State relations. Religions that encompass and prescribe a holistic view of society, mainly Islam, Orthodoxy and Catholicism, tend to confine the emergence and development of liberal democracies, and civil liberties in particular. On the other hand, the inborn 'multi-vocality' and the changes of religious traditions (e.g. Catholicism) which, in themselves, are enormously affected by political institutions, already demonstrate that there is nothing deterministic about religion's affiliation to democracy. This relation is also shaped by uneven processes of secularization and by increasing religious multiplicity within the West.

### **III. THE RELATION BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND SECULARISM: LIBERAL VIEW**

There are some basic concepts or components of the modern democratic political system like sovereignty, freedom, liberty, equality, type of government or state and religion. These components make a direction about the relationship between democracy and secularism. The state is most debatable variable to define the relationship between democracy and secularism. Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan (1996: 17) said, "Democracy is a form of governance of a modern state. Thus, without a state, no modern democracy is possible." (Linz and Stepan in Koenig-Archibugi, 2011: 11) On the other hand, the secular state is ideas of secularism, at where a state rationales to be formally unbiased in the matter of religion, neither support religion nor irreligion. (Madeley, 2003: 14) In the 21<sup>st</sup> Century debate about the character of the state has attracted all of the lights of social science. Scholars variously argued about this subject. A secular state similarly claims to treat all its citizens equally regardless of religion. It also claims to avoid prejudiced treatment for a citizen from a particular religion/non-religion over other religions/non-religion. Secular states don't have a state religion or equivalent, though the absence of a state religion doesn't essentially mean that a state is fully secular; however, a truly secular state should steadfastly uphold national governance without influence from religious factions; i.e. Separation of church and state. (All about History) Jean Baubérot argues secular states become secular either upon creation of the state like the US or upon secularization of the state like France or Nepal. Movements for laïcité in France and the separation of state and church in the US defined modern concepts of secularism. He further claims historically, the process of secularizing states classically encompasses preventing public funds to be used for a religion, granting religious freedom, disestablishing state religions, freeing up the education system, freeing the legal system from religious control, accepting citizens who change religion or abstain from religion, and permitting political leadership to come to power regardless of religious dogmas. (Baubérot) Bob Lewis argues many Christians support a secular state and may acknowledge that the conception has support in Biblical teachings, particularly the statement of Jesus in the Book of Luke: "Then give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's." Though, some Christian fundamentalists (particularly in the US) oppose secularism, often claiming that there is a "radical secularist" ideology being adopted in current days and see secularism as a threat to "Christian rights" (Lewis, 2007) and national security. (Falwell, 2001) Richard Teese (May 1986: 247-259) said, "Not all legally secular states are completely secular in practice. In France for example, many Christian holy days are official holidays for the public administration, and teachers in Catholic schools are salaried by the state." In some European states where secularism confronts mono-cultural philanthropy some of the main Christian sects and sects of other religions depend on the state for some of the economic resources for their religious charities. (Twinch, 22 June 2009) It is common in Charity law and corporate law to forbid them from using those funds to organize religious worship in a separate place of worship or for conversion; the religious body itself should provide the religious content, educated clergy, and lay-persons to exercise its functions and may select to afford part of their time to the separate charities. Bader (2007: 84-85) argues, attempting to remove religion from the public sphere is both unfair and fails to recognize the need to focus on supporting democracy. The state necessities to foster support for democracy from all its citizens

whatever their belief. He (Ibid: 63, 84) points out that not even France and the United States practice strict separation of church and state. For example, the United States Congress has a chaplaincy service and its sessions are opened with a prayer and the French government funds some religious schools. Bader (Ibid: 48-9) says that liberal-democracies do not need to align themselves to a specific world-view whether it is secularist or otherwise. In modern liberal democracies, peoples are the sovereign power of a state. Most of the political scientists agreed that there are more similarities between democracy and secularism in the concept of sovereignty.

Scholars identified five characteristics of secular regimes. First, in secular governments, sovereignty belongs to the nation and not to a divine body. (Aliefendioglu, 2001: 75-76) Since sovereignty belongs to divine power in theocratic regimes, like the former Ottoman Empire, going against the government is equivalent to going against God. (Ibid: 75) Second, religion is separate from the state in a secular regime. (Ibid: 76) Religion does not affect the government's activities, meaning that laws and regulations are not based on religion. (Ibid) Third, a secular regime is neutral towards all religions. (Ibid, supra note 19, p. 76) As such, the government cannot have an official religion and does not protect one religion over another. (Ibid: 26) Likewise, all persons, irrespective of their religion, are equal before the law. (Ibid: 78) Fourth, a secular government requires the education and the legal systems to be secular. (Ibid: 76) The legal system does not contain laws based on religion, and the education system is based on science and logic, not religion or dogmas. (Ibid: 76, 81-82) Fifth, a secular regime requires freedom of religion and conscience. (Ibid: 77) Therefore, secularism does not mean the absence of religion from society. Persons are free to exercise their religions and manifest their religious beliefs in both the private and the public sphere. (Ibid) Finally, a secular regime is based on pluralism, which requires the government's respect for all religions and religious beliefs. (Ibid: 78) It is significant to note that the foregoing characteristics describe a theoretically perfect secular government, which, to our knowledge, does not exist. The most important forces of religious fundamentalism in the contemporary world are Fundamentalist Islam and Fundamentalist Christianity. At the same time, one significant stream of secularism has come from religious minorities who see political and governmental secularism as integral to preserving equal privileges. (Feldman, 2005: 13) Some of the well-known states that are frequently considered 'constitutionally secular' are the USA, (Mount) France, India, (The Preamble of the Constitution of India) Mexico (See - article 3 of the 1917 Mexican constitutions and article 24. See also - Schmitt, (1962) and Blancarte, (2006), South Korea, and Turkey although none of these nations have identical forms of governance. Philosopher Charles Taylor identified three different meanings of secularization in his book titled *A Secular Age*. The first is the diminishing of religious belief and practice. The second is the transformation of belief into one option amongst many that a person chooses to actively pursue in life as opposed to being born into a given faith. The third refers to the emptying of public spaces of God and the waning visibility of religious symbols in public life. Alfred Stepan (2011: 3) emphasizes secularism, in the sense of a state-religion separation, is part of neither the narrow definition of democracy as a power transition through free, fair, and frequent elections with universal suffrage nor the broader definition of democracy elaborated by Dahl's eight institutional guarantees: "1. Freedom to form and join organizations, 2. Freedom of expression, 3. Right to vote, 4. Eligibility for public office, 5. Right of political leaders to contest for support, 6. Alternative source of information, 7. Free and fair elections, 8. Institutions for making government depend on votes and other expressions of preference."(Dahl, 1971: 3; for broader definition of democracy, see - Linz & Stepan, 1996, Chapter 1) Liberty, equality, and freedom; these basic concepts also dominate the relationship between democracy and secularism. Juan J. Linz and Alfred C. Stepan (1996: 11) argue, "Democracy is a form of governance of life in a polis in which citizens have rights that are guaranteed and protected. To protect the rights of its citizens and to deliver the other basic services that citizen's demand, a democratic government needs to be able to exercise effectively its claim to the monopoly of the legitimate use of force in the territory."

Liberty means the state of being free in society from tyrannical restrictions imposed by authority on one's behavior or political views. On the other hand, secularism is the principle of the separation of government institutions and individuals authorized to represent the state from religious dignitaries and religious institutes. Both can only exist in civilized democratic societies. Democracy ensures liberty equality and freedom for all citizens, as well as secularism, emphasizes on these rights. Liberty simply means you own your own Life. Liberty is born out of compassion not out of coercion. Liberty is the proclamation of All man are Equal before the Law and God and No religion or region shall make one better than another. Secularism wants to ensure and protect freedom of religious faith and exercise for all citizens. Now we will discuss how religion reflects the relationship between democracy and secularism. Democracy is the most acceptable political system in the modern world; which prefer secularism to spread its influence. But the honeymoon of democracy and secularism never go peaceful way because religion always reflects this relation. Secularism is habitually associated with the Age of enlightenment in Europe and plays a key role in Western society. During the middle Ages, secular states also existed in the Islamic world. (Lapidus, October 1975: 363-385) Due in part to the belief in the separation of church and state, secularists tend to prefer that politicians make decisions for secular rather

than religious reasons. (Noah, 2005: 6-8) In this respect, policy decisions on topics like abortion, contraception, embryonic stem cell research, same-sex marriage, and sex education are prominently focused upon by American secularist organizations such as the Center for Inquiry. (Kaufman, November 15, 2006) Theorists and political scientists are heavily divided as they gave a different opinion about this debate. Some theorists like Holyoake (1896) said, "Secularism is not an argument against Christianity; it is one independent of it. It does not question the pretensions of Christianity; it advances others. Secularism does not say there is no light or guidance elsewhere, but maintains that there is light and guidance in secular truth, whose conditions and sanctions exist independently, and act forever. Secular knowledge is manifestly that kind of knowledge which is founded in this life, which relates to the conduct of this life, conduces to the welfare of this life, and is capable of being tested by the experience of this life." Schumpeter discusses the classical theory of democracy. He argues democracy has 'religious underpinnings,' in that the belief in the intrinsic and equal worth of all individuals (which can be found in some statements of the 'classical theory of democracy') is nothing but a political translation of the Christian belief in the equality of all souls before God. (Schumpeter, 1976: 266) On the other hand, John Rawls' (1993) Political Liberalism is among the most profound contemporary reflections on the relation between the secular and the religious or metaphysical, on the separation of church and state. Rawls distinguishes between liberalism viewed as a 'comprehensive philosophical doctrine,' and liberalism viewed as a solution to the problem of how citizens who are divided by 'incompatible religious, philosophical, and moral doctrines' can live together. Rawls refers to the latter as 'political liberalism,' and he illustrates the difference between the two views of liberalism by reference to the value of individual autonomy. Rawls (1993: xlv- xlv) said, "This value may take at least two forms. One is political autonomy, the legal independence and assured political integrity of citizens and their sharing with other citizens in the exercise of political power. The other form is moral autonomy expressed in a certain mode of life and reflection that critically examines our deepest ends and ideals, as in Mill's ideal of individuality, or by following as best one can Kant's doctrine of autonomy .... Many citizens of faith reject moral autonomy as part of their way of life."<sup>5</sup> Rawls attempts to draw citizens of diverse religious, moral and philosophical beliefs, what he calls comprehensive doctrines, into a consensus on a political conception of the basic constitution of liberal democracy and its principles of justice. Some theorists argue that secularism is a movement towards the separation of religion and government (often termed the separation of church and state). This can refer to reducing relations between a government and a state religion, substituting laws based on scripture (such as Halakha and Sharia law) with civil laws, and eliminating discrimination based on religion. This is said to add to democracy by defending the rights of religious minorities.<sup>6</sup> (Noah, 2005: 14) Secularism is the principle of the separation of government institutions and persons authorized to represent the state from religious institutions and religious dignitaries. One manifestation of secularism is asserting the right to be free from religious rule and lessons or, in a state declared to be unbiased on matters of belief, from the imposition by government of religion or religious performs upon its people. (Kosmin & Keysar, 2007) Another manifestation of secularism is the view that public actions and decisions, particularly political ones, should be uninfluenced by religious dogmas and/or practices. (Yavuz & Esposio, 2003: xv-xvii) The purposes and arguments in support of secularism vary widely. In European laicism, it has been claimed that secularism is a movement to modernization, and away from traditional religious principles (also known as secularization). This kind of secularism, on a social or metaphysical level, has often happened while maintaining an official state church or other state support of religion. In the United States of America, some claim that state secularism has served to a greater extent to defend religion and the religious from governmental intrusion, while secularism on a social level is less prevalent.<sup>7</sup> (Noah, 2005: 147) Within countries as well, differing political movements support secularism for varying reasons.<sup>8</sup> (Ibid: 25) Barry Kosmin of the Institute for the Study of Secularism in Society and Culture breaks modern secularism into two types: hard and soft secularism. "The hard secularist considers religious propositions to be epistemologically illegitimate, warranted by neither reason nor experience." Though in the view of soft secularism, "the attainment of absolute truth was impossible and therefore skepticism and tolerance should be the principle and overriding values in the discussion of science and religion." (Kosmin, 2006)

---

<sup>5</sup> Rawls solution is to give 'citizens of faith' (believers in religion) a double identity. Qua political persons, individuals recognize the highest interest in autonomy and individuality. Qua private persons, there is no call for them to separate themselves from their enduring religious attachments, loyalties, or self-definition.

<sup>6</sup> "Legal secularists claim that separating religion from the public, the governmental sphere is necessary to ensure full inclusion of all citizens."

<sup>7</sup> "But with the Second World War just ahead, secularism of the antireligious type was soon to disappear from mainstream American society, to be replaced by a new complex of ideas that focused on secularizing the state, not on secularizing society."

<sup>8</sup> "Together, early proto-secularists (Jefferson and Madison) and proto-evangelicals (Backus, Leland, and others) made common cause in the fight for nonestablishment (of religion)-but for starkly different reasons."

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Many states that today are secular in practice may have legal vestiges of prior established religion. Secularism furthermore has many guises which may coincide with some degree of official religiosity. In the UK, the head of state is still required to take the 1688-enacted Coronation Oath swearing to continue the Protestant Reformed religion and preserve the established Church of England. The UK also preserves positions in the House of Lords for 26 senior clergymen of the Church of England acknowledged as the Lords Spiritual.<sup>9</sup> Within debate relation between secularism and democracy Habermas (2006: 258) claims that we are entered in the Post-secular society. He argues that the term “post-secular society,” “refers not only to the fact that religion continues to assert itself in an increasingly secular environment and that society, for the time being, but also referred to the continuing existence of religious communities.” This concept is new and criticized by theorists heavily. Many scholars argue that this phenomenon can also become a fact in Islamic countries, as it is fundamentally a dialogue between religion and the state. (Turner, 2012: 135-158) Although Habermas said that, “a post-secular can only be applied to the affluent societies of Europe or countries such as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, where people’s religious ties have steadily or rather quite dramatically lapsed in the post-War period.” He supports that the Islamic countries and the Eastern European countries could not face the post-secular era. Charles Taylor, the eminent Canadian philosopher, extends Habermas’s argument by analyzing the development of secularism in Western or Atlantic civilization. Although Taylor does not use Habermas’s term ‘post-secular society,’ he does not disagree with Habermas’ analysis of religion in our modern world. Taylor offers a revisionist (to use Taylor’s term) description of secularism by scrutinizing the limitations of secularist propositions. Taylor (2007: 19-20) said, “A secular age is one in which the eclipse of all goals beyond human flourishing becomes conceivable; or better, it falls within the range of an imaginable life for masses of people. This is the crucial link between secularity and a self-sufficing humanism.” The secular age is a significant break from the medieval predominance of supernatural force; it allows the flourishing of the human capacity to imagine one’s life with or without subordinating to the supernatural or divine authority. But this secularizing process was explained by social scientists in many different ways.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. Aliefendioglu Y, “Laiklik ve Laik Devlet,” (Secularism and Secularist Government), *Laiklik ve Demokrasi* (Secularism and Democracy) 74 (Ibrahim O. Kaboglu ed., 2001).
- [2]. All about History, “Separation of Church and State,” <http://www.allabouthistory.org/separation-of-church-and-state.htm>, July 29, 2019.
- [3]. Bader V, “Secularism or Democracy?: Associational Governance of Religious Diversity,” Amsterdam University Press, 2007, pp. 84-85.
- [4]. Beetham D, “Towards a universal framework for democracy assessment,” *Taylor & Francis online*, Vol. 11, Issue 2, 2004, pp. 1-17.
- [5]. Baubérot J, “The secular principle,” <https://franceintheus.org/IMG/html/secularism.html>, October 24, 2019.
- [6]. Chomsky N, “Profit Over People: Neoliberalism & Global Order Profit over People,” Seven Stories Press, September 6, 2011.
- [7]. Dahl R, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- [8]. Dahl R A, *Democracy and its Critics*, New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1989.
- [9]. Fox J, Sandler S, “Separation of Religion and State in the Twenty-First Century: Comparing the Middle East and Western Democracies,” *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 37, Number 3, 2005, pp. 317-335.
- [10]. Fukuyama F, “The end of History?” *The National Interest*, No. 16, Summer 1989, pp. 3-18.
- [11]. Fung A, Wright EO, *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*, Volume 4 of Real Utopias Project, Verso, 2003.
- [12]. Giannis KD, “Religion and Politics: Debating secular and post-secular theories,” [http://users.auth.gr/kourebe/Religion%20and%20Politics.%20Debating%20secular%20and%20post-secular%20theories.%20publish%20\(2\).pdf](http://users.auth.gr/kourebe/Religion%20and%20Politics.%20Debating%20secular%20and%20post-secular%20theories.%20publish%20(2).pdf), July 29 2019.
- [13]. Gutmann AMY, “Democracy” *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*, ed. Goodin and Pettit, Vol. 2, Second Edition, Oxford: Blackwell, 1993, pp. 521-31.
- [14]. Habermas J, “A Reply to my Critics,” in Thompson J.B., Held D. ed., *Habermas. Contemporary Social Theory*, Palgrave, London, 1982.
- (1994) “Three Normative Models of Democracy,” *Constellations*, Vol. I, No. I, Blackwell Publishers, 1 & 9 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK and 238 Main Street, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA.

---

<sup>9</sup> “How members are appointed,” UK Parliament, Last accessed on January 7, 2016.

- (1995) "Reconciliation through the public use of reason: remarks on John Rawls's political liberalism," *Journal of Philosophy*, XCII (3), pp. 109-31.
- (2006) "On the Relations between the Secular Liberal State and Religion," H. de Vries-Lawrence S., eds. *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-Secular World*, 251-260. New York: Fordham University Press.
- [15]. Hardin R, "Public choice versus democracy," *Majorities and Minorities*, ed. J. W. Chapman and A. Wertheimer, New York: New York University Press, 1990.
- [16]. Hashemi N, "Islam, Secularism and Liberal Democracy: Toward a Democratic Theory for Muslim Societies," Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [17]. Held D, "Liberalism, Marxism and democracy," *Theory and Society*, Vol. 22, No. 2, April, 1993, pp. 249-281.
- [18]. Held D, "The development of the modern state," in S. Hall and B. Gieben eds., *Formations Modernity*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1992.
- [19]. Holyoake GJ, *English secularism; a confession of belief*, Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1896.
- [20]. Holyoake GJ, "The Origin and Nature of Secularism," London: Watts and Co. 1896.
- [21]. Hundley T, "Post-communist Poland Debates Influence of The Catholic Church," Chicago Tribune, November 10, 1994, [http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1994-11-10/news/9411100067\\_1\\_communist-era-poland-christian-national-union](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1994-11-10/news/9411100067_1_communist-era-poland-christian-national-union), January 4, 2019.
- [22]. Diskin A, Diskin H, Hazan RY, "Why Democracies Collapse: The Reasons for Democratic Failure and Success," *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp-291–309, SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, July 2005.
- [23]. Inkeles A, "Introduction: On measuring democracy," *springer*, March 1990, Vol. 25, Issue 1.
- [24]. Kaufman M, "Think Tank Will Promote Thinking" and "Declaration in Defense of Science and Secularism," *Washington Post*, November 15, 2006, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/14/AR2006111401176.html>, July 29, 2019.
- [25]. Khan A, A Theory of Universal Democracy, *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 1997, file:///C:/Users/Sat%C4%B1%C5%9F%202/Downloads/SSRN-id1017325.pdf.
- [26]. Kirchner EJ, *Liberal Parties in Western Europe*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- [27]. Koenig-Archibugi M, "Is global democracy possible?" *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 17, No. 3, 2011.
- [28]. Kosmin BA, Keysar A ed., *Secularism & Secularity: Contemporary International Perspectives*, Hartford, CT: Institute for the Study of Secularism in Society and Culture (ISSSC), 2007.
- [29]. Kosmin BA, "Hard and soft secularists and hard and soft secularism: An intellectual and research challenge," Session on the Study of Secularism and Irreligion, Society for the Scientific Study of Religion Annual Conference, October 19-21, 2006, Portland, Oregon.
- [30]. Kuru AT, "Passive and Assertive Secularism: Historical Conditions, Ideological Struggles and State Policies towards Religion," *World Politics*, Vol. 59, 2007, pp. 569-594.
- [31]. Lapidus IM, "The Separation of State and Religion in the Development of Early Islamic Society," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 6 (4), p. 363-385, October 1975.
- [32]. Lewis Bob, "'Jerry's Kids' Urged to Challenge 'Radical Secularism,'" The Christian Post, 19 May 2007.
- [33]. Liberal International. "Oxford Manifesto 1997: The Liberal Agenda for the 21st Century," <https://liberal-international.org/who-we-are/our-mission/landmark-documents/political-manifestos/oxford-manifesto-1997/>, August 08, 2019.
- [34]. Linz JJ, Alfred CS, "Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe," Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- [35]. Macpherson CB, "Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval," Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- [36]. Madeley JTS, Enyedi Z, *Church and state in contemporary Europe: the chimera of neutrality*, Vol. 26, Issue 1 of *West European politics*, Special issue, Psychology Press, 2003.
- [37]. Mainwaring S, "Transitions to Democracy and Democratic Consolidation: Theoretical and Comparative Issues," Working Paper #130 - November 1989.
- [38]. Majumder S, "Narendra Modi 'allowed' Gujarat 2002 anti-Muslim riots," BBC, 22 April 2011, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-south-asia-13170914>, January 4, 2016.
- [39]. May JD, "Defining democracy: a bid for coherence and consensus," *Political Studies*, 26: 1978, pp. 1-14.
- [40]. Minkenberg M, "Democracy and Religion: Theoretical and Empirical Observations on the Relationship between Christianity, Islam and Liberal Democracy," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 6, August 2007, pp. 887-909.
- [41]. Mouffe C, "For an agonistic model of democracy," *Political Theory of Transition*, edited By Noel O'Sullivan.

- [42]. Mount S, ““The Constitution of the United States,” Amendment 1- Freedom of Religion, Press,” <https://www.usconstitution.net/const.html#Am1>, July 29, 2019.
- [43]. Noah F, *Divided by God - America’s Church-State Problem - - and what we should do about it*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, LLC. 2005.
- [44]. Ober J, “The original meaning of “democracy”: Capacity to do things, not majority rule,” Version 1.0 September 2007, p. 2 <https://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/pdfs/ober/090704.pdf>, January 4, 2016.
- [45]. Rawls J, “A Theory of Justice,” Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- [46]. -(1993) “Political Liberalism,” New York: Columbia University Press, USA.
- [47]. -(1995) “Reply to Habermas,” *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 92, No. 3, March, 1995, pp. 132-180.
- [48]. Saward M, “Democratic theory and indices of democratization,” Beetham David ed. *Defining and Measuring Democracy*, Sage Modern Politics (36), London, UK: Sage, 1994, pp. 6-24.
- [49]. Schmitt C, “The Concept of the Political,” New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1976.
- [50]. Schumpeter J, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- [51]. Stepan A, “The Multiple Secularisms of Modern Democracies and Autocracies,” in *Rethinking Secularism*, ed. Craig Calhoun, Mark Juergensmeyer, and Jonathan VanAntwerpen, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- [52]. Taylor C, *A Secular Age*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.
- [53]. Teese R, “Private Schools in France: Evolution of a System,” *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 30, No. 2, May 1986, pp. 247-259.
- [54]. Tok GC, “The securitization of the headscarf issue in Turkey: ‘the good and bad daughters’ of the republic,” The International Studies Association of Ritsumeikan University: *Ritsumeikan Annual Review of International Studies*, 2009, Vol. 8, pp. 113-137, [http://akademikpersonel.kocaeli.edu.tr/gul.ceylantok/diger/gul.ceylantok07.01.2014\\_11.16.11diger.pdf](http://akademikpersonel.kocaeli.edu.tr/gul.ceylantok/diger/gul.ceylantok07.01.2014_11.16.11diger.pdf), July 29 2019.
- [55]. Turner BS, “Post-Secular Society: Consumerism and the Democratization of Religion,” P. S. Gorski et. al. ed., “Post secular in Question: Religion in Contemporary Society,” New York-London: New York University Press, 2012, 135-158.
- [56]. Twinch E, “Religious charities: Faith, funding and the state,” *Third Sector*, 22 June 2009, <https://www.thirdsector.co.uk/religious-charities-faith-funding-state/finance/article/914534>, July 29, 2019.
- [57]. “The Preamble of the Constitution of India,” *The Fact Factor*, [https://thefactfactor.com/facts/law/constitutional\\_law/preamble/656/](https://thefactfactor.com/facts/law/constitutional_law/preamble/656/), July 29, 2019.
- [58]. Yavuz HM, Esposio JL ed., *Turkish Islam and the Secular State: The Gulen Movement*, Syracuse, N.Y., Syracuse University Press, 2003, ISBN 0-8156-3040-9.
- [59]. “1917 Constitution of Mexico,” [https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/eoir/legacy/2013/11/08/constitution\\_22.pdf](https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/eoir/legacy/2013/11/08/constitution_22.pdf), July 29, 2019.

IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 5070, Journal no. 49323.

Deepika. T . " Fertility Indicators with Hill-Valley Variations in Manipur." IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 24 no. 11, 2019, pp. 45-54.