



Nation and Religion

Perspectives on Europe and Asia

EDITED BY PETER VAN DER VEER AND HARTMUT LEHMANN

NATION AND RELIGION

NATION AND RELIGION

PERSPECTIVES ON EUROPE AND ASIA

Edited by

Peter van der Veer and Hartmut Lehmann

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Copyright © 1999 by Princeton University Press
Published by Princeton University Press, 41 William Street,
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
In the United Kingdom: Princeton University Press,
Chichester, West Sussex
All Rights Reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Nation and religion: perspectives on Europe and Asia / edited by Peter
van der Veer and Hartmut Lehmann.

p. cm.

ISBN 0-691-01233-4 (cl: alk. paper). — ISBN 0-691-01232-6 (pb: alk.
paper)

1. Religion and state—Comparative studies. 2. Nationalism—Reli-
gious aspects—Comparative studies. I. Veer, Peter van der. II. Leh-
mann, Hartmut.

BL65.S8N36 1999

322'.1'09—dc21 98-40357 CIP

This book has been composed in Sabon

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements
of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) (*Permanence of Paper*)

<http://pup.princeton.edu>

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

(Pbk.)

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
1. Introduction	3
<i>Peter van der Veer and Hartmut Lehmann</i>	
2. The Moral State: Religion, Nation, and Empire in Victorian Britain and British India	15
<i>Peter van der Veer</i>	
3. Protestantism and British National Identity, 1815–1945	44
<i>Hugh McLeod</i>	
4. Race in Britain and India	71
<i>Susan Bayly</i>	
5. History, the Nation, and Religion: The Transformations of the Dutch Religious Past	96
<i>Peter van Rooden</i>	
6. On Religious and Linguistic Nationalisms: The Second Partition of Bengal	112
<i>Partha Chatterjee</i>	
7. Nationalism, Modernity, and Muslim Identity in India before 1947	129
<i>Barbara D. Metcalf</i>	
8. Memory, Mourning, and National Morality: Yasukuni Shrine and the Reunion of State and Religion in Postwar Japan	144
<i>Harry Harootunian</i>	
9. Papists and Beggars: National Festivals and Nation Building in the Netherlands during the Nineteenth Century	161
<i>Frans Groot</i>	
10. Religion, Nation-State, Secularism	178
<i>Talal Asad</i>	

11. The Goodness of Nations	197
<i>Benedict R. Anderson</i>	
<i>Bibliography</i>	205
<i>List of Contributors</i>	223
<i>Index</i>	225

Acknowledgments

THIS BOOK is the product of a conference on Religion and Nationalism in Europe and Asia, organized by the Research Centre for Religion and Society, Amsterdam, and the Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte, Göttingen, which was held at the University of Amsterdam, 27–29 November 1995. It received financial support from the Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte, the International Institute for Asian Studies, the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences, and The Netherlands Foundation for Scientific Research, for which we are truly grateful. We want to express our thanks to our colleagues Alf Lüdtke and Peter van Rooden for their organizational and intellectual contributions to the shaping of this conference. We also thank Ingrid van der Broek and Jasper Klapwijk for their attention to the preparation of the manuscript. Finally, we owe special thanks to Mary Murrell and the staff of Princeton University Press for their strong support of this project.

Harmut Lehmann
Peter van der Veer

NATION AND RELIGION

Introduction

PETER VAN DER VEER AND
HARTMUT LEHMANN

THANKS TO Benedict Anderson's influential book on the topic, it has become almost a cliché to suggest that the nation is an imagined community.¹ To argue that a religious community is an imagined construct will not surprise anyone either. Yet to analyze nation and religious community as cultural constructs, as products of the social imagination, does not detract from their efficacy in everyday life. In fact, it is hard to miss the social force of both religion and nationalism in many contemporary movements all over the world. When dealing with religion and nationalism, it is necessary to offer an analysis of their social force that cuts across conventional dichotomies. Social theory as well as Western common sense have often been content to assume an ideological a priori distinction between the nationalist and the religious imagination. As the argument goes, nationalism belongs to the realm of legitimate modern politics. Nationalism is assumed to be "secular," since it is thought to develop in a process of secularization and modernization. Religion, in this view, assumes political significance only in the underdeveloped parts of the world—much as it did in the past of the West. When religion manifests itself politically in the contemporary world, it is conceptualized as *fundamentalism*. This term, derived from early-twentieth-century American evangelicalism, is now taken by scholars and media as an analytical term to describe collective political action by religious movements.² It is almost always interpreted as a negative social force directed against science, rationality, secularism—in short, against modernity.³

The dichotomy between religion and nationalism is an ideological element in the Western discourse of modernity.⁴ It functions not only in the Western perception of the Non-West, but also in the way the West understands itself. The most influential philosophical exposition of that self-understanding appears in Hegel's *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*.⁵ Based partly on this philosophical notion of the rationality of the West is the current but much less sophisticated idea that Western Europe and the United States have had a unique historical experience of secularization, whereas Asia (and South Asia in particular) has had a his-

tory of dangerous politicization of religious difference. This impression is plainly wrong, since it perpetuates the old, mistaken view of the great divide between the modern West and the backward Rest. The present collection of essays on both the Western European (that is, British and Dutch) and the Asian (that is, Indian and Japanese) historical experience problematizes the understanding of Western modernity and its function as a model for the rest of the world.

It is important to realize that both "nation" and "religion" are conceptualized as universal categories in Western modernity and that their universality is located precisely in the history of Western expansion. The modernity of the concept of the nation needs little discussion beyond mentioning the relationship between the ideas of "nation" and "ethnicity" as raised by the reference to "birth" in the very word *nation*.⁶ The modernity of the concept of religion, as applied in the modern era to Hinduism, Shintoism, Islam, but also Christianity, is much less an accepted truism in the social sciences.

In a recent critical reflection on Clifford Geertz's celebrated ahistorical and universal definition of religion, Talal Asad argues that it ignores the genealogy of the modern Western understanding of religion.⁷ In his view universalization of the concept of religion is closely related to the dawning of modernity in Europe and the expansion of that modernity over the world. The modern understanding of religion, which Geertz's essay exemplifies, is very different from what medieval Christians would have regarded as such, and this is still more the case for Muslims, Hindus, and other non-Christians. This discrepancy raises the broad, historical question of the ways in which Western modernity has assumed universal importance and, more specifically, how a modern Western category such as religion has come to be applied as a universal concept.⁸ The project of modernization that is crucial to the spread of colonial power over the world has provided new forms of language through which subjects understand themselves and their actions. It is therefore almost impossible to escape from categories, originating in Western modernity, such as "public" and "private," "religion," or "history" when writing the history of other societies.⁹

This situation does not have to force us into an "epistemological hypochondria," to use the Comaroffs' phrase. It asks for a social and comparative history of religion with an emphasis on the social conditions of particular discourses and practices. Only through historical analysis can one deconstruct the commonplace dichotomy of a supposedly secular and modern West and a religious and backward Rest. The location of religion in the modern world should, in our view, be addressed in relation to the historical emergence of the modern idea of the nation and its spread over the world.

Let us briefly recapitulate the accepted social science view of nationalism and its relation to religion. The emergence of the European nation-state is commonly seen to depend on three connected processes of centralization: "the emergence of supra-local identities and cultures (the 'nation'); the rise of powerful and authoritative institutions within the public domain (the 'state'), and the development of particular ways of organizing production and consumption (the 'economy')." ¹⁰ In an influential book, Ernest Gellner connects these three processes in a characteristically sweeping manner. ¹¹ He argues that modern industrial society depends on economic and cognitive growth, which in its turn requires a homogeneous culture. A crucial factor in his scheme is the centralization of resources by the state to run an educational system that imparts a standardized, literacy-based high culture. Industrial division of labor requires a shared culture; that shared culture is nationalism; and nationalism holds together an anonymous, impersonal society with mutually substitutable atomized individuals. ¹² Such a culture of nationalism is by definition secular, since economic and cognitive growth are possible only when the absolutist cognitive claims of the literate high cultures of the agrarian (preindustrial) age are replaced by open scientific inquiry. ¹³ Nationalism comes thus in a package with individualism and secularism, as required by the industrial transformation of an agrarian world.

It is plausible, of course, that there are significant relations between the emergence of an industrial economy and the gradual homogenization of culture through a state-controlled education system, but Gellner exaggerates the universal success of homogenization and simplifies its nature. His argument subsumes a variety of local histories under the mechanical laws of a universal history, and it is doomed to analytical defeat in the face of any nationalism that is religious rather than secular. The history told by Gellner unfolds itself independent of human agency. It is the story of the victory of a fetishized historical force, capitalism, which celebrates objective imperatives and ignores meaningful and innovative action by individuals and groups who make history in everyday practices. Gellner pays little attention to the contradictions of homogenization as well as the forms of resistance that it meets. The basic flaw in the modernization theory he espouses, as well as in many Marxist analyses of the expansion of capitalism, is the assumption that a common, shared culture (or ideology) is necessary to integrate the social system. While it can be seen that the social constraints of the division of labor as well as the physical constraints of political force produce to some extent what we can call "social order," there is no need to assume (and plentiful evidence against) the assumption that social order depends on common culture and moral consensus. ¹⁴

One reason for the influence of texts that universalize the modernization of Western Europe—and those by Anderson and Hobsbawm are not different from Gellner's in this respect—is that they stylize a picture of nationalism typical not only for social theory but for an entire common-sensical way of thinking.¹⁵ Crucial is the way in which *the* nation-state is presented as *the* sign of modernity. The discussion of nationalism concludes, predictably, with its own axiomatic dichotomy between “traditional” and “modern.” Tradition is what societies have before they are touched by the great transformation of capitalism, and what seems to characterize traditional societies most is that they are under the sway of religion.

Much of the writing on modernity and modernization in the social sciences has been inspired by Max Weber, who in the first two decades of this century published his famous treatises on the role of religious and political as well as social and economic factors in the processes of modernization. Nationalism, however, was not one of the forces he discussed. This omission was not unusual, but indeed a position taken by many other scholars, by Weber's contemporaries, and by the generation that followed. With few exceptions and for many years, the debates about the relationship of modern nationalism and the modern state have ignored the role of religion.¹⁶ Recently, this has begun to change, and attempts have been made to show how the notion of chosenness by God, which had first been experienced by the Israelites and formulated in the texts of the Old Testament, has been adopted by modern nationalist movements.¹⁷ On one hand are studies that examine the ways in which the idea of chosenness served to underscore and justify imperialistic political aims and actions; on the other hand, the same notion has been used to explain suffering and to provide a stimulus for political emancipation and national liberation. In both variations chosenness can be blended with ideas of racial purity and uniqueness: the men who believed that they carried a special burden in late-nineteenth-century British colonial affairs were very consciously both Christian and white, and so were their counterparts in countries like the Netherlands, Germany, or the United States.

Three related concepts developed by nineteenth-century thinkers deserve special attention in understanding the interaction of religious elements, nationalism and the notion of race or special racial qualities. First is this idea of the chosenness of a certain people, which involves and incorporates political and social, as well as religious, ingredients. Second is the theme of the revival or rebirth of a whole nation. Pietists and Methodists had introduced the metaphor of an awakening—a kind of collective regeneration—into eighteenth-century Protestantism. Nineteenth-century Christian nationalists then used the notion of revival in order to explain and advance the idea of a Christian nation, “a nation under God,” as it

was called in the United States. Among those who advocated national renewal in nineteenth-century Europe, Protestants were very typically in the forefront, and even more typical is the fact that, in the German case, they believed in the idea of a symbiosis of Christian and Germanic (or Teutonic) elements. Through this combination, they argued, a new stage of development in the history of the world—as well as a new stage in the history of the salvation of God's true children—could be attained.

The third idea was closely connected with these two assumptions. In context with the notions of chosenness and national revival we can also find the belief in a new messiah, that is, the belief in a savior who is supposedly called by God and who comes in order to resurrect a whole people. Sometimes this new leader is portrayed like Moses, leading his people from servitude to the promised land; sometimes he resembles Jesus (the Jesus of the Second Coming, who inaugurates the Last Judgment). In this context religious elements such as divine election, ordeals as a means of reaching inner strength, and martyrdom are being projected into the lives and careers of politicians in order to outfit them with the aura of a national savior. In examining the sources it is sometimes hard to tell which of these attributes are simply metaphors and which carry a deeper spiritual meaning. Perhaps people in the mid- to late-nineteenth century did not know themselves. In any case, before 1914 even Europeans who had received a secular education were so well acquainted with biblical stories that they were able to imagine political leadership in biblical terms and with the spiritual qualifications explained in the Old and New Testaments.

The belief in chosenness, the belief in rebirth or revival, and the hope for a savior are important for understanding the relationship between the notions of religion, nation, and race in the European, Christian case. Some of these ideas are also salient in the Hindu, Muslim, and Shinto cases, but within entirely different symbolic configurations. The general point we want to make here is that it is essential to follow the transformation of religious notions when they are transferred from a purely religious context to the sphere of national politics.¹⁸ Nationalism feeds on a symbolic repertoire that is already available but also transforms it in significant ways. In the South Asian context this is noticeable in the transformation of specific religious notions of martyrdom and sacrifice but also in broader conceptions of death and the afterlife. A good example of a transformation of conceptions of spirits and demons as well as of the role of spirit possession under the influence of an emergent Sinhalese Buddhist nationalism is given in Obeyesekere's work on the Sri Lankan shrine of Kataragama.¹⁹ Similarly, in the Shinto case, discussed by Harry Harootunian in this volume, there is a sharp transition from folk practices centering around guardian spirits to the nationalist practices of the Yasukuni Shrine focusing on the spirits of the war dead.

When Max Weber began to study non-Christian religion at the beginning of this century, he was guided in his analyses by three convictions: he believed, first, that scholars had to explore the causes of the fact that modern capitalism had risen in the West and nowhere else. He believed, second, that the predominant feature in the course of modernization was disenchantment (*Entzauberung*); and he believed, third, that with his studies on the Protestant ethic he had found the one and only viable answer to these questions.²⁰ Weber's studies deserve much credit because they demonstrate how important it is to look beyond Europe in order to understand the specific role, impact, and variations of religion within Europe. However, Weber used an ideal-typical comparative approach. One of the problems of that approach is that it compares civilizations as unified wholes. It thus tends to neglect the interaction between societies in the capitalist world system, and more specifically, it tends to ignore the colonial process.

The present collection of essays also adopts a comparative approach, but one that is based on the idea that a combination of metropolitan and colonial perspectives should lead to very different kinds of conversations and insights than have previously been possible among scholars who tend to work along the divide of colonizing and colonized nations.²¹ It also suggests that, at least in some cases, comparative work on these issues at both sides of the divide might show that what seemed entirely separate is, in fact, related. This is, at least, the outcome of recent work on literary education in India and Britain.²² In this way the book hopes to revitalize discussion of religion's place in modern society, which theories of secularization have brought to a dead end. It focuses on 1850 to the present, which is the period of both high colonialism and high nationalism as well as their aftermath.

The essays discuss the historical development of religion and nationalism in India, Japan, Britain, and the Netherlands. They do not take the relation between religion and nationalism for granted but explore religion's place in relation to ideas of language, race, and history in the formation of nationalism. They also examine the specific qualities of religious discourse and practice that can be used for nationalist purposes. For example, if the nation is something to die for, religion offers ways to understand sacrifice and to remember and celebrate those who have died for the nation. On the other hand, there are also limits to the nationalization of religion, which are discussed in several case studies.

This volume explores three general themes. First, it examines the nationalization of religion in the modern era. Second, it discusses the relation between secular and religious nationalisms. Third, it explores the ways in which religious views of death and the afterlife are inflected in the commemoration of the violent past of nation and religious community.

The first theme is explored in the contributions by van der Veer, McLeod, Bayly, van Rooden, and Metcalf. They ask to what degree traditional religion persisted within modern nationalism. On one hand, the part played by clergy, Shinto priests, and by churches and shrines seems to suggest such persistence. On the other hand, it seems obvious that the strongest religious energies were discharged by entirely new, voluntary organizations, often headed by laypersons. This indicates that organized religion itself was being transformed and modernized in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While McLeod and van Rooden discuss this process in Western Christianity, Metcalf shows a comparable development in twentieth-century Indian Islam. In fact, the way religion influenced other spheres of life resembled to a certain degree the means by which modern nationalism shaped politics. Modernizing religion and emerging nationalism formed a kind of vibrant symbiosis that produced and provided political values and moral guidelines and that was able, as van der Veer and Bayly show, to adopt and also to incorporate the racial elements within nationalism.

If one argues that modern nationalism itself is a kind of religion, traditional religion is reduced to the role of an example from which proponents of nationalism can borrow certain elements but which retains an autonomous area in theological and spiritual terms. Much depends, furthermore, on how one defines religion and how one describes the constitutive elements of religion. Which of these elements do we find in modern nationalism? To be sure, nationalism defines the past of a people, their future, or salvation, and the sacrifices necessary in order to claim salvation and win the future. Are these ingredients enough to qualify nationalism not as a substitute for religion (a quasi-religion, or *Ersatzreligion*) but as religion authentic and proper? If so, racial elements within nationalism, and in particular the idea of racial purity, would be part of the quest for national salvation. This is true both for the case of British Christian nationalism, as Bayly demonstrates and for the Aryan definition of Hindu India, discussed by van der Veer. It is an open question whether the definition of nationalism as religion should be seen as a part of the process of secularization or whether we should think in terms of a redefinition of religion and speak of a sacralization of the idea of the nation.

The second theme in the volume is a central, comparative one, that of "secularity." Western nation-states are invariably seen as secular, whereas Asian nation-states are seen as either religious or hybrid, that is, in between religious and secular.²³ In this volume we look at Britain and the Netherlands as examples of modern nation-states in Western Europe. As we have seen in our discussion of Gellner, understanding nationalism in the social sciences depends largely on a conceptualization of historical developments in Europe and should therefore fit these two exemplary cases.

It is a fundamental assumption of the discourse of modernity that religion in modern societies loses its social creativity and is forced to choose between a sterile conservation of its premodern characteristics and a self-effacing assimilation to the secularized world. Contrary to this assumption, new and highly original religious organizations proliferated in Britain and the Netherlands in the nineteenth century, as we have argued already. Ideological pluralization, resulting in ecclesiastical and theological strife, only served to reinforce these mobilizations. Similarly, we find throughout the colonized world from the late nineteenth and continuing throughout the twentieth century a revitalization of religious forms of activism in the public sphere. These religious organizations across the colonial divide are crucial for understanding the development of nationalism in the contemporary world.

The assumed secularism of modern British and Dutch societies makes sense only as a colonial theory. One of the strongest legitimations for colonial rule in India was that the British were an enlightened and rational race of rulers who had to lead and develop the Indian people, who were steeped in ancient prejudices and communal violence. An important dialectical element of this argument, as van der Veer shows, was that the British were a secular yet Christian nation who could thus take a rational interest in establishing a utilitarian morality. Hindu society, on the contrary, was completely under the authority of priests and given to endless, absurd rituals.²⁴ The Muslims of India were at the same time "backward" and "bigoted," prone to zealous revolutionary activism.²⁵ The emergence of religious forms of nationalism and the partition of India and Pakistan appear to confirm the colonial view. As Chatterjee shows in this volume, however, the Indian nationalist imagination could produce a rhetoric of Hindu-Muslim brotherhood as easily as one of Hindu resistance against Muslim tyranny. While the historical process seems utterly contingent in this respect, the historical narrative inscribes it in the teleology of religious antagonism. Metcalf clarifies the difficulties one encounters when describing religious movements that do not fit the accepted historical narrative. The spatial imaginations of the pietist Muslim Tablighi Jama'at movement go against the grain of the territorial imaginations of the secular and religious nationalisms of the period.

It is instructive in the context of this comparative volume to consider secularization in an Asian state that has not been colonized. The case of Japan, discussed by Harootunian, makes it abundantly clear that religion's organization, its place in society, and patterns of recruitment are so different in Japan that not only a simple form of the secularization theory itself but also many of the empirical and theoretical problems derived from it in the context of Western Christianity become meaningless. Extremely important for our comparative purposes is the extent to which

the modernization of the state in Japan was instrumental not to the secularization of society but to its sacralization.

The third theme in the volume, that of mourning and commemoration, is discussed by Harootunian and Groot. Given the importance of theological and ecclesiastical strife and conflict, the mechanisms developed to pacify tensions between religious groups in modern Europe merit further study. For instance, since the eighteenth century British and Dutch nationalism were imbued with a generalized Protestantism, which transcended the differences between the various Protestant churches.²⁶ Catholics were the significant Other. Both in the Netherlands and in Britain the formal reestablishment of a Roman-Catholic hierarchy in the 1850s called into question this traditional identification of national identity with an undenominational Protestantism. In the second half of the nineteenth century this religious nationalism came under attack from different directions. Right-wing Protestant movements rejected its enlightened base. Catholics strove to prove their own adherence to the nation. New forms of political discourse endeavored to found the nation on race or history. The Protestant-Catholic divide and mutual antagonism were gradually pacified in the later nineteenth century in both Britain and the Netherlands. A similar pacification has not occurred between Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims on the Indian subcontinent. On the contrary, this antagonism was a major factor in the partition between India and Pakistan and continues to be a crucial element in the various expressions of religious antagonism on the subcontinent.

Pacification of religious antagonism depends crucially on the management of memory and mourning. Groot and Harootunian explore several ways in which the memory of violence is negotiated. Religion gives meaning both to violence and to the suffering incurred by it. Remembering can put things to rest, but it can also reactivate antagonisms by opening old wounds.²⁷ In the Dutch case, analyzed by Groot, the commemoration of past violence has immediate consequences for communal relations in the present. In the case of the Yasukuni Shrine in Japan, discussion about the war dead also implies an externalization of war guilt and thus a political stance of great consequence in the present. Striking in the analysis of mourning and memory in this volume is the extent to which the boundaries between private suffering, public acts of national remembering, and religious rituals are blurred.²⁸ Death and the afterlife form the stuff of which both religion and nationalism are made. This volume explores some of the ways in which these two modern ideological formations feed on each other in dealing with violence and its pacification.

In lieu of a general conclusion, the volume ends with two reflective essays by Asad and Anderson. Asad examines the secularization thesis and its alternatives by showing the ways in which the secular and the

religious presuppose each other in post-Enlightenment modernity. He emphasizes that nationalism requires the space of the secular to make sense. Anderson reflects upon the dead and the yet unborn, collectivities with which the national imagination is much preoccupied. The responsibility the living have toward their ancestors and their progeny constitutes the morality of the nation. This kind of imagination borrows in a number of ways from the religious one, but it is also strikingly different in Anderson's view. These two essays form a fitting epilogue to a volume that does not seek to propose an alternative to the secularization thesis but opens up the question of the multiple relations of secularity and religiosity in nationalism across the colonial divide. There is an obvious danger in scholarly work on both nationalism and religion to reproduce the seamless narratives of the ideologies under study while neglecting the contradictions and tensions inherent in the historical processes that produce the religious morality of the nation-state. This volume attempts to avoid the dangers of a grand synthesis by mapping out the problem areas in this neglected but highly significant field of inquiry.

Notes

1. Benedict R. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2d ed. (London: Verso, 1991).
2. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925* (Oxford: University Press, 1980); Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, eds., *The Fundamentalism Project*, 5 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991–95).
3. Bruce Lawrence, *Defenders of God: The Fundamentalist Revolt against the Modern Age* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989).
4. Peter van der Veer, *Religious Nationalism: Hindus and Muslims in India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
5. See Prasanjit Duara's discussion of the influence of Hegel's text on nationalist thought in his *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).
6. Cf. John Hall, "Nationalisms: Classified and Explained," *Daedalus* 122 (1993): 1–29, esp. 2–3; on ethnicity and "birth," see A. D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986); Marc Shell, *Children of the Earth: Literature, Politics, and Nationhood* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
7. Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System," in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 87–125; Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 27–54.
8. See also S. N. Balagangadhara, *"The Heathen in His Blindness": Asia, the West, and the Dynamic of Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

9. Dipesh Chakrabarty, "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for 'India's' Pasts," *Representations* 37 (1992): 1–26.
10. Ralph D. Grillo, ed., "Nation" and "State" in *Europe: Anthropological Perspectives* (London: Academic Press, 1980), 1.
11. Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983).
12. *Ibid.*, 57.
13. *Ibid.*, 77, 142.
14. Nicholas Abercrombie and Bryan S. Turner, "The Dominant Ideology Thesis," *British Journal of Sociology* 29 (1978): 149–70.
15. Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
16. See, for example, Koppel S. Pinson, *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), and Gerhard Kaiser, *Pietismus und Patriotismus im literarischen Deutschland: Ein Beitrag Zum Problem der Säkularisation* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1961).
17. William R. Hutchison and Hartmut Lehmann, eds. *Many Are Chosen: Divine Election and Western Nationalism* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1994).
18. For attempts to clarify these transformations in the case of German nationalism, see Hartmut Lehmann, "Friedrich von Bodelschwingh und das Sedanfest," "Pietism and Nationalism: The Relationship between Protestant Revivalism and National Renewal in Nineteenth-Century Germany," and "The Germans as a Chosen People: Old Testament Themes in German Nationalism," in *Religion und Religiosität in der Neuzeit: Historische Beiträge* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1996), 205–59.
19. Gananath Obeyesekere, *Medusa's Hair: An Essay on Personal Symbols and Religious Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
20. Max Weber, "Die Wirtschaftsethik der Weltreligionen" and "Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, 3 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1920–21). Of the many works on Max Weber, we would like to mention Hartmut Lehmann and Günther Roth, eds., *Weber's "Protestant Ethic": Origins, Evidence, Contexts* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
21. See Ann Stoler "Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31 (1989): 134–61.
22. Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989).
23. E.g., Louis Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus: Essai sur le système des castes*, 3d ed. (Paris: Gallimard, 1979), 376–95.
24. See, e.g., the discussion of James Mill's *History of British India* (1858) by L. Ronald Inden, *Imagining India* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 90–93.
25. The classic text is W. W. Hunter, *The Indian Musalmans* (London, 1876). See also Gyanendra Pandey, "The Bigoted Julaha," in *The Construction of Communalism in Colonial North India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1990), 66–108.

26. Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992).

27. Cf. Peter van der Veer, "Writing Violence," in David Ludden, ed., *Contesting the Nation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), 250–70.

28. See also Don Handelman *Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).