



collusion with the Indian government on planning the storming of the Darbar Sahib complex well before in the events of June 1984. Despite having become an independent nation in 1947, Indira Gandhi still sought the advice of Margaret Thatcher via secret intelligence and Special Service agents. It is hard to deny that the government's military assault to be anything but a subterfuge. Why not then talk about current politics as an actively duplicitous and deceptive enterprise, with its agents, moles and false flag operations? The existence of taboos, constructed like forts to protect official versions of violent events, is rarely acknowledged as *points of departure* for critical reflection. What are the social forces mitigating against ethically just speech? Behind the West's liberal-democracy is a continuation of the rhetoric of the *civilized-barbaric* asymmetrical relation in its numerous institutional (political, juridical, mediatic, security, scholarly) guises: *freedom-slavery, capitalist-worker, white-black, secular-religious, modern-traditional, developed-underdeveloped,*

violently they will be expressed. However, I conversely argue that it is precisely because the nation is founded on these concepts that it is so violent. I further argue that the popular will to brutalize the other is the obscene underside of Indian nationalism, and its primary mode of operation is "abject/objectification." By "abject/objectification," I mean a process by which a political community tries to