HINDUTVA MOVEMENT: BURKEAN EXAMINATION OF VIOLENCE AS RETRIBUTIVE

JUSTICE

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Department of Communication

By

Ramya Chandrasekaran

In Partial Fulfillment
for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

Major Department: Communications

May 2012

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

The Hindutva Movement: A Burkean Examination of Violence as Retributive Justice

By

Ramya Chandrasekaran

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this ***disquisition*** complies with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Dr. Zoltan Majdik

Chair

Dr. Mark Meister

Dr. Ross Collins

Dr. Andrew Mara

Approved:

June 26, 2012	Dr. Mark Meister
Date	Department Chair

ABSTRACT

The thesis examines the Hindutva movement as a rhetorical text to understand how it contributes to the rhetorical study of social movements. The Hindutva movement is a mass movement that has grown in influence and in number in the last thirty years and its final goal is to wage a battle to create a Hindu rashtra (nation) in India with a monolithic Hindu culture. The rhetorical texts of V.D. Savarkar and M.S. Golwalkar are analyzed with Burkean guilt-redemption-purification cycle. These rhetorical tools provide an insight into the guiding question of this thesis: how Savarkar and Golwalkar use rhetoric in ways that justify and motivate audiences to accept violence in order to restore a Hindu Nation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

On February 7th, 2002, a train caught fire in Godhra, killing 59 Hindu pilgrims inside one coach. Numerous possibilities including arson by a Muslim mob were cited as possible causes of this incident. This resulted in communal violence. But no one has been brought to justice over this event. The death of the 59 Hindu pilgrims which cOnsisted mostly of women, children and seniors prompted retaliation against Muslims on a large scale, in which 790 Muslims and 254 Hindus were killed, 223 or more people were reported missing. Numerous places of worship were damaged. The nature of this event is politically controversial in India, and various commentators have described this incident as a state sponsored genocide, while other sources claim that the dead victims were merely killed as a result of the violent nature of the riots.

In the aftermath of the Godhra train burning of the Hindu pilgrims, the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP), a Hindutva organization called for a statewide bandh to protest the Godhra train burning. The state which was run by the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the political party that represents Hindus, imposed a curfew due to the fear of communal clashes throughout the state. Attacks by large Hindu mobs took place and the lack of intervention by the police force, fire brigade and even the ambulance proved problematic since Hindus as well as Muslims were victims of the riots. The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) which is known for its communal politics is closely affiliated with Hindutva organizations and has often worked in tandem through the years. India's National Human Rights Commission reprimanded the Gujarat State government for not just failing to prevent riots but for also fomenting and participating in it complicity with VHP which is a prominent Hindutva organization.

The above incident demonstrates that the Hindutva movement has resurged in India with a vengeance and played a crucial role in the demolition of Babri-Masjid in 1992, the Gujarat

1

riots in 2002, and the attack on Christian missionaries during recent times. Hinduism is renowned for its tolerance, non-violence and diversity for many centuries, but has now been usurped by a provisional social movement that claims to embody Hindu principles and a "Hindu way of life" or "state of mind" based on certain cultural and spiritual ethos. The guiding question of this thesis is to research and analyze how the movement rhetorically motivates Hindus to accept violence as a justifiable political choice. The instances that I have described in the last paragraph shows that the Hindutva ideology has left a powerful impact on present day India and is still relevant in Indian culture today. The primary reason that this movement is rhetorically interesting and relevant is because "many Hindu political activists seem bent on dismissing the tolerant parts of the Hindu tradition in favor of a unique ascertained view, which they demand must be accepted by all" (Sen, 2005, p. 47-48). According to Dr. Sen, the Hindutva movement is belligerent, because it takes away any room to engage in thoughtful discussions about nationalism, as they would have people accept their repeated public proclamations which is a bellicose and insular ideology, led by particular parts of the Hindutva movement (Sen, 2005, p. 49)

Since Hindutva is a multi-faceted movement, this thesis focuses specifically on the rhetorical texts of select few polemic ideologues that shaped the major strands of the movement through their work. This thesis focuses on the works of V.D. Savarkar and M.S. Golwalkar because their ideologies provided a new lease of life to the Hindutva movement. Until the eighties, the main enemies of the Hindu nationalists were Indian Muslims, but they also openly declared their animosity for Indian Christians since the nineties. While Christianity was always on the list of its enemies, the movement was spending more of its energy on Muslims than Christians for historical reasons. The movement's final goal is to wage a battle to realize its goals

of creating a Hindu rashtra (nation) in India with a monolithic Hindu culture by emulating old icons and borrowing tactics that gives people an illusion of unbroken continuity with the past.

This introductory chapter focuses on the importance of studying this social movement as a rhetorical text, and on outlining what studying this movement will contribute to the rhetorical study of social movements. The Hindutva movement is a potent mass movement on the rise on political and social front in India. The movement existed before independence, but stringent measures were eventually taken by Jawaharlal Nehru to curb its influence. Everyone at the time believed that the movement had come to its end and that India would remain a secular nation for years to come. However, the movement has returned with a renewed vigor and become formidable. Kuruvachira (2006) explained that Hindutva has been resilient in enduring many changes and may not die the natural death of other ideologies. He points out that it is unwise to overlook the past, and that we should exercise caution in dismissing the movement as an extinct entity because it resurrected itself in the eighties. It is now a national movement with a frightening influence and renewed enthusiasm to realize dangerous designs. The proponents of the movement are often schooled in militant tactics and are motivated to create a Hindu nation out of India without any ethical considerations. They resorted to militancy, extremism and terrorism in the past to achieve their ends and they are not going to hesitate to do it today (p. 4). Hindu ideologists use various ideological mascots and unethical methods to achieve their end. Hindu nationalism has a longer history than the Hindutva organizations and has been a part of people's psyche for several centuries. Savarkar and Golwalkar have nurtured and propagated this ideology, and this thesis focuses on how they have rhetorically structured and composed their ideological statements in ways that justifies violence.

Social movements traditionally have been studied by rhetorical scholars according to certain parameters. The Hindutva movement, however, breaks the mold and the preconceptions of most social movements. Therefore, this social movement is rhetorically interesting because it does not conform to the norms of prevalent social movements. The Hindutva movement does not have one prominent leader at its helm because numerous leaders emerged at different times in history to constantly address pertinent questions about Hindu identity and history. According to Griffin (1958), movements are linear in structure: their inception occurs when people become dissatisfied with a situation, and then make efforts to change their environment, which results in some kind of success or failure. The Hindutva movement is an anomaly because it had and continues to have emerging leaders at various points in Indian history for a long time. It is not necessarily a linear movement because numerous organizations emerged almost simultaneously with different leaderships under the umbrella of the *Sangh parivar* (family).

Just like Griffin, Simons (1970) focused on the nature of leadership of reformist and revolutionary movements along with leader-centered conception of persuasion in social movements. Simons argued that studying a movement involves many challenges like evaluating a single speech or discerning the speaker's intent .Therefore, few rhetoricians undertake the difficult task of analyzing the role of persuasion in social movements (p. 2). In addition to the numerous problems with respect to analysis, the magnitude of the unit of study is often problematic. The problematic nature of the Hindutva movement aligns with the same problems that many critics face while studying movements which span many years and several stages. It has been around for many decades, uses a variety of unconventional symbols and media, and has not one but numerous leaders with many followers belonging to competing factions (p. 2). The

4

standard tools of rhetorical criticism are ill-suited for dealing with the complexity and the grand flow of the discourse of this movement (p. 2).

Simons (1970) provided various rhetorical requirements that both the leaders and a social movement are required to meet. First, a social movement should constantly work at attracting, maintaining and molding workers or followers into an efficiently organized movement. The Hindutva movement constantly works towards attracting followers through recruitment activities such as conversion, religious processions, training centers and a number of organizational factions that focus on women, youth and social service to mold followers to function in an efficient manner in society. A hierarchy of authority and division of labor is established and social pleasures are sacrificed to serve the nation (p. 3).

The second important requirement cited by Simons (1970) is that an established or external order adopts the product or ideology of the social movement. The product of any movement is its ideology, and the Hindutva movement's ideology is being adopted by the government on various occasions to formulate laws that pander to the majority. The Cow Protection Act is an example of a law that came into existence because of the prominence of the Cow Protection movement initiated by Hindutva groups. This led to the formation of several cow protection societies in different regions of India that held large public meetings to highlight the plight of cows. This movement became a source of antagonism for Muslims because it demonized those who sacrificed and ate cows. The cow is a sacred animal in Hindu mythology. The sacrifice of cows and goats by Muslims on the Bakr-id festival was perceived by Hindus as a threat because they did not bow down to the demands of the majority. The cow protection sentiment triggered communal antagonism and riots against the working class and helped establish the Cow Protection Act. The ban on cow slaughter is a religious sentiment which was

skillfully transformed into a national and a legislative issue that was predominantly anti-Muslim in nature. The Hindutva movement's ideology and program for change seizes on conditions of real deprivation and discrepancies between the conditions and expectations of the Hindu population. It paints Hindus as victims whose sentiments are subordinate to the unreasonable demands of the religious minority. This movement possesses the reformist urge to change laws, customs, or practices to revolutionize society to regenerate old or "true values" as per ancient Vedic texts.

The third requirement according to Simons (1970) is that a social movement has to evoke a reaction from a larger structure towards the movement (p. 4). Simons pointed out that a social movement generally garners reactions from the establishment which may be "too kind" or "too restrictive" and the movement needs to constantly adjust to the backlash and pseudo-supportive reactions (p. 4). The Hindutva movement demonstrates this particular requirement very well because different ideologues have emerged at different times to deal with the reactions from the establishment and other external entities that monitor and analyze the movement. After examining why the Hindutva movement is a social movement, we will focus on why the traditional means of evaluating movements are inadequate.

Simons (1970) pointed out that no theory in rhetorical criticism is to be applied in a predictable manner or tested rigorously through the analysis of a particular case (p. 2). Rhetorical theory can be used most effectively and usefully when a movement fulfills both the descriptive and the rhetorical requirements of a social movement. Rhetorical theory provides parameters and directions to the critic, which enables him/her to use his/her own perspective and imagination to bear on analyses of particular movements (p. 2). Simon's provided a leader-centered conception of persuasion in social movements, rooted in sociological theory, which

assumes that the rhetoric of a movement emerges from the very nature of the social movement (p. 2). Hence, while the Hindutva movement fulfills the three major requirements of a social movement prescribed by Simons, it also presents us with certain rhetorical problems that do not allow the application of tools advocated by him to critically assess the movement. First, the movement lacks a cohesive structure in terms of having one leader and many followers, which in turn has spawned different kinds of ideologies within the Hindu nationalist movement. Simons pointed out that this kind of situation leads to cross-pressures that complicates the role of the leader and poses difficulties between expedient and ethical choices. The movement lacks a single dominant overarching idea, which led to numerous conflicts because each leader managed to provide or discover a new dimension to strengthen it. As seen earlier, the two ideologues provided a new lease of life for the movement with different ideologies. Savarkar was at his revolutionary and literary peak from 1909 to 1948 and did his most salient work in the twenties and thirties. Golwalkar's association with the *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh* (RSS) began in 1932, was actively involved in nurturing the organization for 33 years and wrote numerous books during the course of his life. He propounded European right wing views in *We, Our Nationhood Defined* in 1939 to define who is a 'Hindu' and build the socio-cultural framework for Hindu society. These dimensions enabled the movement to revive itself at critical junctures and become more powerful and influential over the years.

Apart from the lack of a single leader and one unifying ideology to define the movement, the tactical methods used by the organizations are challenging to analyze because they used methods from far right wing nationalist ideologies emanating from Europe such as Fascism and Nazism to structure strategies that integrate ordinary people into their ideological framework. For instance, Savarkar's Hindutva in the twenties barely mentioned Europe and was confined to

defining Hindu identity through the parameters of 'history', civilization, race and religion, whereas his Hindu nationalism of the thirties draws consistently and heavily from Nazism which explains his fixation on war, militarism and minorities (Bhatt, 2001, p. 106). These themes also influenced Golwalkar's definition of Hindu nationality in terms of establishing a militant conception of a Hindu nation. The establishment of numerous training schools and charitable institutions across India and abroad has enabled the organization to mask its true motives and garner support among persons with dissimilar views. The techniques of training and recruiting are unconventional which makes it less possible to use Simon's tools for critical analysis.

Additionally, this movement is nothing like other social movements because it has created a membership base by resorting to moderate and militant strategies without addressing the inconsistencies between the two entirely antithetical approaches. For instance, the political face of the movement, known as the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), uses persuasion, reason, civility, and decorum to deal with external threats and opposition as an alternative to actual force. The BJP uses soft power to bring the fruition of Hindutva agenda in the political arena because the Hindutva organizations shun political power and describe themselves as vanguards of Hindu society and culture. The movement also uses militant tactics by giving tacit approval for violence through the rhetoric of justification that enables people to act on the clash of interests between Hindus and other religious minorities. They use rhetoric as an expression, an instrument, and an act of force. Unlike most movements, the Hindutva movement has not degenerated but has embodied both militant and moderate strategies effectively despite contradictory rhetorical conceptions. Since the movement uses both militant and moderate strategies, it has been able to appeal both to the "power-vulnerables" and "power-invulnerables" (Simons, 1970, p. 9).

"Power-vulnerables" include leaders, elected officials and appointed officials in the government, corporate and educational sectors that are most vulnerable to pressure tactics because they are obliged to apply high-standards in dealing with external threats (Simons, 1970, p. 9). "Power-invulnerables" are those who have little or nothing to lose by publicly voicing their prejudices and acting on their self-interests (p. 9). The movement has been able to win sympathizers from both objects of influence. The movement ultimately combined the two kinds of influences; however, the ideologues have managed to do this without embodying a higher wisdom or a more profound sense of justice by using ambiguity, insincerity and distortion to push their agenda (p. 9). The movement's notion of power is attributed to implementing justice which is not at its best when it is against peace and love (p. 10). The need to establish Hindu dominance at the expense of other religious minorities goes against the notion of secularism and democracy. The Hindutva movement goes against the grain of how other social movements have managed to win respect and reconcile differences through intermediacy with those that do not share the same ideological framework.

Thus, the unconventional leadership model of the Hindutva movement cannot be adequately addressed with the existing methodological or theoretical frameworks used to study social movements. As Cathcart (1972) aptly argued, new approaches are required to get over two major hurdles that hinder the study of social movements. Development of a sound methodology for the criticism of movements requires appropriate tools whose creation depends on knowing what the critic is examining while studying it (p. 82). Cathcart pointed out that the standard tools of rhetorical criticism are ill-suited to deal with the kinds of complexity that is found in the Hindu nationalist movement (p. 82).

For Cathcart, these tools are not found in sociological or historical views of movements (which tend to emphasize linear structure and distinct leaders), but in how movements rhetorically position ideas about morality, purpose, and perfection. Cathcart (1972) pointed out that both the historical and rhetorical movements in Western research are dynamic in nature and have linear structure in terms of inception, progression and termination or consummation. The definition provides a limited perspective for numerous reasons. First, this definition is too confining and is limited to human interaction that occurred in the past (p. 83). Second, the perception of the movement in linear terms is not enough to permit rhetoricians to isolate a movement from other human interactions that occur simultaneously (p. 84). Third, the onus is placed entirely on the rhetorical critic to differentiate between the historical and rhetorical parts of the movement (p. 84). Traditionally, Western rhetorical critics have always justified examining a movement by studying public addresses as historical events (p. 84). Critics often draw a close relationship between history and rhetoric to justify such an examination. Cathcart argued that few historians tackled the definition of movements as a serious problem because they often looked upon movements as being the same as an "epoch," "era," or "period."

Cathcart (1972) argued that using a historical approach to study social movements contributes to a spokesman or leader-centric model of analysis that suits the traditional speaker-speech analysis (p. 84). Social psychologists define social movements as a form of collective movements that have a shared value system, a sense of community, norm of actions and organizational structure that influence the social order by achieving definitive goals. Since traditional resources provided by Simons for analyzing movements rhetorically are inadequate, Cathcart's arguments for looking at how movements rhetorically frame moral striving for salvation and perfection, based on historical and social-psychological perspectives, are more

useful for examining Hindutva movement. The theories of Kenneth Burke provide a starting

point for this because he viewed a movement like a drama that involves the act of transformation

and the achievement of salvation in which the moral strivings for salvation bring human agents

into conflict (p. 87).

Burke's understanding of rhetoric ties into Cathcart's argument that critics should

perceive movements as a moral striving for salvation and perfection. Burke designated rhetoric

with a function of persuasion, identification, and communication to an audience of some sort and

believed that no human action exists beyond the scope of rhetoric. Burke explored the

relationship between rhetoric and psychology to explain how people constantly strive for moral

perfection through rhetoric. He talked about the human need for hierarchy and perfection, which

based on Cathcart's account, lies at the heart of human conflict in society. Burke provided the

dramatistic model to investigate the motives of the speaker uttering the words in a particular

scenario.

Rhetorical Texts

The justification of violence behind the speaker's words can be deciphered by analyzing

their seminal rhetorical texts that have defined and contributed to the growth and evolution of the

movement. The proponents of the Hindutva movement are motivated to create a Hindu nation

out of India without any ethical considerations. They resorted to militancy, extremism and

terrorism in the past to achieve their ends and they are not likely to hesitate to do it today (Bhatt,

2001, p. 4).

Hindu nationalism has a longer history than the Hindutva organizations like *RSS* and the

Sangh Parivar. Golwalkar and Savarkar wrote important texts that encapsulated their respective

ideologies, which we will examine briefly in this portion of the introduction. Golwalkar is

heralded by the *RSS* as the 'prophet of a resurgent India', and wrote one of the most controversial books on the principle of Hindu nation and nationalism titled *We or Our Nationhood Defined*, which provided the philosophical basis to understanding Hindutva of *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh* (Islam, 2006, p. 12). When Golwalkar was the leader of the *RSS* during 1940-1973, he produced the official definition of Hindu nationalism inspired by Savarkar's conception of modern theory of a Hindu nation in a book titled *Hindutva* which appeared in 1929 (p. 12). Savarkar's seminal work postulates this theory of Hindutva which was restricted to Hindus, who apparently had the right to be a part of the 'eternal Hindu nation' (p. 12). I will focus on Savarkar's seminal work and examine its contribution to the militaristic and xenophobic facet of the Hindu nationalist movement.

These rhetorical texts are often cited and referred to by other ideologues within the Hindu nationalist movement in various parts of the world. Savarkar and Golwalkar have nurtured and propagated this ideology and this paper focuses on how their ideologies pose a great threat to secular society and the multicultural fabric of Indian society. Their narrow vision of Indian culture does not go beyond Hindu religion, Hindu culture, Hindu rashtra (Islam, 2006, p. 5).

Thesis Outline

The thesis consists of five chapters. The introductory chapter sets the premise of the study, provides a rationale by pointing out the shortcomings of the movement and introduces relevant concepts that are explained in other chapters later. The second chapter will focus on the historical overview of the Hindu nationalist movement and address the major ideological schisms that occurred at different times, which was a fertile ground for the development of militant and intolerant groups. The third chapter will focus on the literature review/theoretical framework. The fourth chapter will describe and analyze the major rhetorical texts by Golwalkar and

Savarkar through the Burkean framework. The fifth chapter summarizes the findings and contribution to the study of social movements, along with a discussion of implications for future research.

Studying this movement is important because it contributes to the study of rhetorical theory when used to analyze a kind of social movement. The movement is not lead by one prominent leader and whose historical and rhetorical components don't have a linear or traditional progression because it has undergone evolution consistently (Cathcart, 1972, p. 83).

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE HINDU NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

This chapter deals with the historical evolution of the Hindutva movement since 1920, the discussion and justification of the texts that I will analyze, and focus on how certain influences in history have contributed to the rhetorical lineage of this movement. Since the movement is assimilative and non-linear, its growth is measured in certain predominant themes that guide its course.

Hindu Nationalist Movement

The Hindutva movement in itself is a multi-dimensional movement which does not conform to the norm due to the numerous fissures and cleavage that developed as it evolved and transformed since 1850. Today, the Hindutva movement has become synonymous with cultural nationalism that poses an intellectual and political challenge in contemporary India. Given the ambiguous understanding of the term 'Hindutva', there is little consensus about the meaning of terms even among its followers. Some say there is hardly any distinction between 'Hindutva' and 'Hinduism', whereas its opponents strongly object to 'Hinduism' from being identified with 'Hindutva.' The proponents of 'Hindutva' claim that it is 'Indianess', where the Hindu element forms the core of an Indian identity which in turn provides the movement with a sense of logical continuity (Sharma, 2004, p. 1). The critics view 'Hindutva' as an assertion of 'Bharatiya asmita' or 'Indian selfhood', defined largely in Hindu parameters (p. 1). The opponents of the Hindutva movement believe that Hinduism cannot be combined with ideologies that cater to destructive nationalism by giving rise to racial, ethnic, and religious hatred (p. 1).

The nineteenth century saw the rise of numerous ideas with respect to national belonging and national destiny which arose from the higher ranks of the caste system. The Hindu nationalist movement emerged and developed due to influences of various nationalisms that

advocated primordial theories which developed due to the threat of progress of 'secular' nationhood. India, during the nineteenth century was undergoing various changes and was influenced by various complex national, regional and religious changes fueled by numerous social and economic upheavals in society. Chetan Bhatt (2001) described this transitional battle between the traditional and the new influx of ideas in *Hindu Nationalism: Origins, Ideologies and Modern Myths*:

> The religious reorganization and reformation of the 'traditional' structures of northern Indian caste Hinduism, Islam and Sikhism manifested powerfully and problematically in what is called the 'revivalist' or 'reformist' movement. The intellectual import of these changes for the formations of secular, religious or regional forms of nationalism is complicated by 'external' intellectual influences which were primarily from Europe. European nationalist ideas subsequently shaped varieties of secular or religious nationalism in nineteenth century colonial India. A variety of intellectual currents moved back and forth between Europe and India since the eighteenth century. Nationalism in colonial India is categorized as 'derivative discourses' or 'invented traditions' which acquires power only when it is purged from all the indigenous religious and communal influences under a disagreeable 'foreign' secular Western nationalism. (p. 8-9)

The Hindu Nationalist movement is not a linear movement and is in fact a complex web of ideas that originated from within and outside the country. I will examine how closely related European strands of Nation building like Fascism and Nazism are to the Hindu Nationalist movement later. Apart from the European influence, the strand of archaic primordial Hinduism was always a predominant strand of the Indian national movement long before the twenties which is why the Indian definition of secularism is so skewed. The notion of 'secularism' has not been defined

clearly and an absence of debate on this subject is mostly due to a lack of an ideological and cultural basis for founding a secular civil society. Secularism was conveniently reduced to a Western custom imposed by those in power like the British and is usually used to define the politics during Nehru's political ascension. Therefore, 'secularism' which was supposedly a Western concept co-existed with other religious ideologies but the former did not contribute to the accelerated growth of the Hindu nationalist movement in isolation.

After examining the origins and the conception of the Hindu Nationalist movement, we will proceed to study external influences that affected and shaped the Hindutva movement in detail.

External Influences on Hindutva Movement: Oriental Scholarship and Primordialism

The relationship between the Hindutva movement, primordial nationalism and Oriental scholarship is a complex one that unfolded over many decades. According to Bhatt (2001), Savarkar and Golwalkar borrowed liberally from primordialist ideology and a strong association came to exist between exclusivist forms of primordial ethnic nationalism and eighteenth century varieties of nationalist thinking. The assimilation of Western ideologies became more complicated due to exchange of ideas and thoughts that took place when Western intellectuals turned to archaic Hinduism. Bhatt (2001) discussed this complex web of ideologies that eventually lead to the present day Hindutva ideology perpetrated by the likes of Savarkar and Golwalkar:

> The association between exclusive forms of ethnic nationalism and ideologies of primordialism gathered force within Europe in the 19th century, further complicated by the discovery of archaic Hinduism which is linked to the upper class elite. 'Primordialism' refers to an ideological grid rather than a linear development of an

16

essential ethnic unity among populations in India. Linear temporality characterizes these primordialist projects in which viewing the past in linear terms was the first step towards imagining an overintegrated national future. Primordialism comes into existence through the process of appropriation, interrogation and negotiation with Orientalist and colonial scholarship related to the origins, languages and religions of India. 'Orientalism' is important not for its (allegedly) heremetic imagination of the non-West, but because of the complicated, indeterminate effects it had on those who were its willing or otherwise subjects. (p. 10-11)

Primoridalism glorifies Hindu religion, culture and sacred texts to prove that Hinduism is the progenitor of all civilizations. It creates an awareness that the power, glory and history of India's past is unrivaled by any other civilization. Essentially, primordialism creates a 'memory' or a history that the Western Indologists believed was lacking among Indians in the nineteenth century. There was a conscious attempt and a concentrated effort to cultivate knowledge about India's historic past for a long time.

The glorification of Hinduism and India's archaic past was perceived as an essential component of creating a strong national identity and unity. The linear history which is characteristic of primordial nationalism is concocted to forcefully be written into the imagined history of India during the first decade of the twentieth century. Bhatt (2001) explained this point in more detail in the following passage:

From the mid-nineteenth century, but especially after early 1870s, this was evident in the conscious cultivation of the 'memory', in fact affective remembrance of India's archaic past by numerous writers and societies. This resulted in glorification of India's archaic Hindu past and its knowledge and philosophies demonstrated the superiority of its

17

religion and culture. One aspect of Orientalist and primordialist nationalist thinking

concerned the invention of Vedic Aryanism as an ideological basis for either Indian or

Hindu nationality. The 'Aryan myth' became prominent as a result of eighteenth century

discoveries of commonalities between archaic Latin, Greek and Sanskrit and the

similarities between mythologies and gods of ancient Greeks and Indians. (p. 12)

Both race and Aryanism in colonial India signified wide range of meanings. The explicit racial or

white supremist understanding of the term 'Aryan' was rejected by Hindutva ideologues but their

Aryanist paradigm conveniently omitted any significant contributions made by the tribals and

untouchable communities in India. There is a purposeful silence about these populations among

nineteenth century writers who accommodated them as deteriorated beings who mistakenly

deviated from original Vedic Aryanism. The silence betrays a widespread nineteenth century

view that perceived Brahmins, Kshatriyas, and Vaishyas as intellectually, morally, culturally or

ethnologically superior to the non-Aryans (Bhatt, 2001, p. 15). Primordialism basically created

an imagined history that restored the vitalism, dynamism and resilience of ancient Hindus, which

is compared to the current state of Hindus who are described as degenerate and lacking in

national fervor.

Bhatt (2001) divided primordialism into three main categories within which varieties of

primordialist thinking rose to prominence namely Dayanand Saraswati's *Arya Samaj* movement,

the *Bengal 'Renaissance'* which combined Hinduism with nationalism and Bal Gangadhar Tilak

who coalesced regional Maharashtrian nationalism with politicized martial-devotional Hinduism

(p. 15). Despite being the three divergent articulation of Hinduism, their configuration of archaic

primordialism illustrates the themes mentioned in this section.

18

Arya Samaj

The *Arya Samaj* is an example of an overarching nineteenth century 'Hindu Renaissance' or 'revival' movement, founded by Dayanand Saraswati in Mumbai in 1875 and is sometimes described as the modern fundamentalist movement to have emerged out of Hinduism (p. Bhatt, 2001, p. 16). The name '*Arya Samaj*' translates as 'the Society of Aryans' or is also known as 'The Society of Nobles' and the term 'arya' oscillates between an ethnological or racial concept and noble virtuousness (p. 16). The physical geography of India is closely linked to the distinctive qualities of 'virtuousness' and 'nobility' of its inhabitants which cultivates the notion of hereditary privilege and nobility. This is crucial because it creates a difference or a division among people that eventually results in hierarchy.

The *Arya Samaj* worked consistently to create the 'us' versus 'them' criteria among Indians which enabled them to demonize Indian Muslims as a dangerous threat to the Hindu community. This is described by Bhatt (2001) in this passage:

The *Arya Samaj* portrayed Islam as a sexually perverse and corrupt religion based on war, violence, theft and deception to inculcate this one-dimensional view based on colonial and Orientalist pedagogy. The anti-Islamic activities of the *Arya Samaj* proselytizers were certainly important and significant since it led to extensive Hindu-Muslim violence. The substitution of Christianity with Islam became the norm from the first decade of the twentieth century after the Hindu societies (Sabhas) and the Hindu Sangathan movement came into existence, even though the latter were to focus squarely on Christianity. The impact of this neo-Aryan ideology and its instinctive religious nationalism eventually became extraordinary and wide-ranging in the twentieth century

despite the fact that the original movement was both uncharacteristic and parochial. (p. 21-23)

According to this quote, the *Arya Samaj* stereotyped non-Hindu religions in ways that perpetuated threat and hate which led to the eventual scapegoating of Muslims and Christians across the nation.

Arya Samaj's approach towards nationalism and patriotism proved attractive to the English educated and 'upper' caste Hindus who were typically disillusioned by the Hindu orthodoxy. The first generation Arya Samajists expanded preaching and propagation activities which did not have precedence within Hinduism but became the norm for Hindu organizations like the *Vishwa Hindu Parishad* (VHP) later (Bhatt, 2001, p. 20). This is a turning point because both the Arya Samaj in the 1890s and the VHP in the 1990s, which were unrepresentative, parochial, minority groups developed entirely outside traditional Hinduism, believed they had the legitimacy, authority and competence to speak for and act on behalf of Hinduism (p. 20).

The Bengal Renaissance

The Bengal renaissance emerged with the growth of a regional, vernacular intelligentsia in Bengal in the latter half of the 19th century in the aftermath of the partition of Bengal in 1905 (Bhatt, 2001, p. 23). This movement which combined Hindu cultural nationalist ideas with ideas of nationalism, emerged within sections of elite Bengal community with an aim to unite all Hindus under the concept of a Hindu nation based on Hindu religions, customs and 'memory' of ancient glories (p. 24). Like the Arya Samaj movement, it too sought to create communal divide among Indians by willfully excluding Muslims on the basis of their religion and traditions.

The movement, according to Bhatt (2001), focused on finding solutions to social reform from the precedence of ancient Hinduism instead of seeking answers from 'evil' external influences. Bhatt described the movement in greater detail in the following passage:

> The early stirrings in Bengal are important for crystallizing both an anti-colonial patriotism and a 'Hindu communal consciousness' among the emergent Bengal intelligentsia. The merging of religion with nationalism deployed a powerful affective dimension as an integral component of what Hindu belonging to the motherland must mean. The theme of love for a suffering motherland was often crudely supplemented with the Hindu Nationalist discourse with past glories, the present need for militant action against perceived enemies and future redemption. (p. 27-28)

The movement celebrated violent Hindu struggle against Muslims and glorified Hindu religious-territorial nationalism which is an anthem for contemporary Hindutva movement. The unification of the archaic-Vedic nationalism with popular-devotionalism is an important component of Hindu nationalism.

Tilak's Nationalist Movement

Bal Gangadhar Tilak is described as the 'Father of the Indian nationalist movement' by many scholars and is credited with introducing the concept of 'self-rule' to Indians. He is also credited for analysing 'Karmayoga' in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, which is central to the teachings of the Vedas and the Upanishads. The ominous notion underlying Tilak's philosophy is the view that the 'common factor' that binds Indian society is the 'feeling of Hindutva' because Hindus adhere to *Hindu dharma* (Bhatt, 2001, p. 36). Hindu dharma and the 'feelings of Hinduness' became transcendental ideas that have permanence beyond the histories of societies (p. 36). Tilak conceptualized nationalism by connecting it to Hindu religion because to be a nationalist is

21

synonymous with being religious. The development of the 'sacred nation' is a distinctly powerful theme in Tilak's ideology. Bhatt (2001) quoted Tilak's ideology in the following passage:

> Religion is an element of nationality… During Vedic times, India was a self-contained country. It was united as a great nation. The unity has disappeared bringing great degradation and it becomes the duty of the leaders to revive that union. A Hindu of Benaras is as much a Hindu as one from Bombay or Madras. The study of the Vedas, Gita and Ramayana produce the same ideas throughout the country. Are not these – common allegiance to the Vedas, Gita and Ramayana – our common heritage? If we lay stress on forgetting all the minor differences between different sects, we shall ere be long able to consolidate all the different sects into a might Hindu nation. This ought to be the ambition of every Hindu. (p. 36)

The above passage demonstrates clearly that Tilak's nationalist ideology was not devoid of religious fervor or flavor and clearly defined nationalism as having the 'feeling of Hindutva.'

After examining the three distinct categories of the Hindu Nationalist movement based on primordialism, I will focus on the rise of the coherent ideology of Hindu exclusivity, supremacy and nationhood that can be traced back to the historical scholarship of 1919 to mid 1920s.

Hindu Nationalism in Pre-Independent India

The period of 1919-24 was significant in Indian history because it was during this time that an exclusive militant ideology was developed to further the progress of Hindutva movement. The founding and crystallization of V.D. Savarkar's ideological framework in the Hindu Mahasabha grew into the Hindutva movement of today. Certain events occurred which created an atmosphere that was ripe for the ideology of an exclusivist 'Hindu nation' or 'Hindu government' to emerge. In the twenties, the appalling acts committed by Muslims of forcibly

22

converting some Hindus to Islam led to nation-wide anger and counter violence against the Muslim community. Gandhi's support for the Khilafat movement and the incidents of forcible conversions of Hindus in Kerala prompted some Hindus like Savarkar to support the two-nation theory.

Apart from these social changes, Bhatt (2001) also cited the major ideological schisms related to nationalism. Some Hindu nationalists for instance dismissed the notion of nationalism completely as an 'external' or 'Western' understanding which is not indigenous to India and its inhabitants. This notion of a secular nation-state has been challenged repeated by various key figures in the Hindu nationalist movement as they perceived it as an imposition of Western standards on Indian people. Several of these thoughts which were articulated by other Hindu nationalists are found very clearly in Savarkar's writings too. Bhatt (2001) emphasized this point in detail in the following passage:

The 'Hindu Nationalist' had asserted that the concept of nationalism was a modern, European idea that could be appropriated by Hindus in their project of coming to nationhood. Lajpat Rai disagreed both with the view that the origins of the national idea were to be found in Europe and with the view that Hindus had possessed no sense of nationality. Lajpat Rai dismissed the idea that the term 'Hindu' was a Persian term invented by 'Mohammedan invaders'. He argued that it had a more ancient history, and only became a pejorative term under Muslim rule because it signified the fall of a 'Hindu nation'. However, (as Savarkar was also to reiterate) it was used in ancient times as a name that others – such as the Persians – used to describe the inhabitants of India. This formative idea that the term 'Hindu' was a patronymic that been conferred by a constitutive outside, rather than emergent from within Vedic or other religious texts, is

both significant and proved repeatedly troublesome for later Hindu nationalists who

could find no such name in the archaic texts of 'Hinduism' itself. (p. 51-57)

The idea that Hindus were a nation and had a shared history from time without beginning is

perpetuated by various nationalist leaders at different times in the movement. The ideas have

evolved and changed but the gist is essentially the same and was used by Savarkar and

Golwalkar to solidify the Hindu base.

The Hindutva ideologues also use Herbert Spencer's critical combination of the

"collective survival of the fittest" with "individual liberty from domination" which enabled the

growth of naturalistic, physiological, and biological theory of anti-colonialism (Bhatt, 2001, p.

53). They claimed that Hinduism demonstrates the ability to survive many tumultuous changes

and has continued to wield the same power even after being under siege for twelve centuries by

Islam and Christianity which is proof of its endurance and power. Yet, they also obsess about

why the Hindus have failed to repeal the advances of antagonistic forces given that they have the

ability to resist and survive invasions. This deceptive yet powerful dichotomy in Hindus has been

used by likes of Savarkar and Golwalkar to voice the guilt in the Hindu psyche. Bhatt (2001)

elaborated on how the Hindutva ideologues use this powerful argument to address what they

perceived as the weakness of Hindus in the following passage:

What then was the cause of the downfall of Hindus and Hinduism, demonstrated most

clearly by the elementary fact of British colonial domination? This was primarily

because of *individual* selfishness, greed and calculation that prevented organismic

consciousness of greater society and nation. The political remedy was to inculcate a

'sense of responsibility', which requires each and every member of organism to place the

interests of the community or the nation over and above those of his own. While

individualism is identified with selfishness, there is another sense in which individual

political rights and economic and social progressive individualism were problematised. A

political sociology of collectivity, drawing on influences such as Spencer, were mobilized

to provide an organic view of overintegrative capacities of Hinduism, the latter indeed

dovetailing into extant colonial discourses about Hinduism's amalgamating properties.

(p. 54)

When individualism is associated with selfishness, it problematizes people's desire to fight for

their political rights as well as their economic and social possessions. The individual is always

deemed subordinate to society and to the nation which undervalues personal happiness and

ambition in favor of collective goals and a collective vision for the country. Apart from

examining the weakness of Hindus and establishing methods of reform, the Hindu nationalists

also blamed the Hindus for the possible 'dying of the Hindu race' due to their inability to stand

up to Muslim conquerors and Christian missionaries.

The issue of conversion by the religious minorities was perceived as a threat to the

existence of the Hindu population. This became effective propaganda machinery for the

Hindutva movement because they portrayed Muslims and Christians as groups that imposed their

religions on disenfranchised Hindus through conversion by violence, force, fraud and

inducements. The Hindutva ideologues argued that the solution to the existential threat is the

conversion of the marginal population including the 'tribals' and 'untouchables' to Hinduism

because they are easy targets for Christian missionaries and Muslim fanatics. This presented an

opportunity to knit together a political programme that will help consolidate Hindu political and

numerical strength. The important point is that the Hindutva ideologues don't believe that the

lower caste deserve greater freedoms and liberties because it is their fundamental right. Rather, it

is a reaction to the comparative 'privileges' which are enjoyed by Indian Muslims and Indian Christians at the expense of the lower caste Hindus who happen to be a part of the vast majority.

Hindu Nationalism and Indian National Congress

The Hindutva movement has had a contentious relationship with Indian National Congress and continues to target the Congress for being supportive of political minorities and sometimes even pandering to them to win electoral votes. Hindutva ideologues believed that the Congress always submerged Hindu sentiments and interests under the guise of 'Indian grievances'. The communal self-organization of Hindus happened to further and strengthen Hindu interests without any consideration for the welfare of the interests of the minorities in India. The Hindutva organizations originated to provide the weak Hindu community with the ability to fight for their interests within the legislative and administrative machinery of the government.

Hindu Mahasabha and the Hindu Nationalist Movement

According to Bhatt (2001), the Hindu Mahasabha viewed Hindus as a collective entity that is above any doctrinal or sectarian differences within Hinduism. They turned their attention to two major aspects, namely religious conversions and *shuddhi* or purification ceremony to reclaim 'neo-Christians' and 'neo-Muslims' and uplift the tribal communities in India (p. 61). 'Conversion' is the means by which the Hindu nationalist movement encouraged Hindus to take active steps to resist attacks and attempts against forces that destroy their unity by removing, strengthening and reforming injustices, irrationalities, disorganization and disunity in the Hindu community. The new 'Hindu community' is not seen as a secular entity but a large part of organic, ancient Vedic machinery (p. 61).

Hindu-Muslim Conflict and Indian Partition

The Indian Partition is a crucial historical event that occurred in 1947 which left an indelible impact on the Hindu psyche. The discussion about the gathering strength and momentum of the Hindutva movement remains incomplete if we fail to discuss the events that led to the Partition and its aftermath in the forties. The Indian partition was one of the most fiercely religiously motivated political conflicts in early nineteenth century when the Hindu nationalist movement refused to represent the interests of Indian Muslims and Indian Hindus equally (Bates, 2011). As independence from the British Empire drew near, the Hindu-Muslim divide widened to the point where they could not be a single nation. Muslims were afraid that they would be ruled by a Hindu majority but the Indian partition did not resolve the problem since the two countries continue to be at strife even today. The Partition of India was in the Indian Independence Act in 1947 which resulted in the dissolution of the British Raj and the formation of India and Pakistan (Bates, 2011). It led to the displacement of 12.5 million people, which created an environment of violence and mutual hostility (Bates, 2011).

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the Muslims were suspicious of the Hindu majority Indian Congress and complained that the Muslims did not have the same rights as the Hindu majority. The Muslim League proposed a separate nation for Muslims in 1935 under the leadership of Muhammad Ali Jinnah after the political position of Muslims was under threat in the areas of Hindu majority. The Muslim nationalist movement emerged in 1906 much later than the Hindu nationalist movement because Muslims were far less influenced by Western thought and felt marginalized by the growing radicalization of certain factions of Hindu community. In spite of the numerous peacemaking attempts by Gandhi, the Muslims eventually negotiated with the British for a separate Muslim state. International events in 1939 led to the

Second World War and the British declared India's entrance on the side of the allies without consulting the Hindu or the Muslim political parties. The Indian National Congress quit its power in the Indian government and tried to use the war for immediate independence from the British. The British council negotiated a deal after the war whereby the northwestern and far eastern sections of India were to become Pakistan and the remaining territory would belong to the Hindus. This threw the country into turmoil because millions of Hindus and Muslims living on the wrong side of the border fled their homes and the violence on both sides led to a large number of casualties. While the British are partially held responsible for misjudgment and haste that led to Partition, Hindutva ideologues like Savarkar argued that the division between Hindus and the Muslims was inevitable. He blamed the Muslims for the vivisection of the country and claimed that this was done with the sole aim of establishing a Muslim nation.

Savarkar was the first to propound the two-nation theory based on the idea that the country should belong to and be ruled according to the will of the Hindu majority in which the minorities will live without asking for rights, political clout and protection. He unequivocally stated that Hindus and Muslims could not co-exist because they don't possess "the unity of thought, language and religion" and don't consider India as their Holyland and Fatherland (Ravishankar, 2002). The Indian partition essentially set the tone for the manner in which the Hindutva movement will continue to establish the dominion of a dictatorial Hindu government at the cost of the rights of ordinary citizens.

After focusing on the Indian partition and the role of the Hindutva movement in the historical proceedings, I will examine the background of Savarkar and Golwalkar who are credited with formulating and establishing the foundations of the Hindutva movement

respectively. The next section analyses the nature of the texts that are considered to be the blueprint by various Hindutva organizations.

Two Central Leaders of the Hindutva Movement

Savarkar

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar was an Indian freedom fighter, revolutionary, politician and writer credited with developing the national political agenda of Hindutva. His ideology has many philosophical underpinnings but utilitarianism, rationalism and pragmatism are the most relevant and prominent. Savarkar's revolutionary activism began when he was studying in England where he established student societies including the A*bhinav Bharat Society* and *Free India Society* for gaining Indian independence through revolutionary means. The *Essentials of Hindutva* in 1923 openly spoke about his vision of what constitutes Hindu identity and how India's future can be secure under Hindu ownership. Savarkar became the President of the Hindu Mahasabha, an organization that represented Hindu interests and endorsed the notion of the ideal Hindu nation in the thirties and forties. While Savarkar provided the conceptual political framework for the Hindutva movement, Golwalkar is credited with galvanizing social and cultural organization of the movement.

Savarkar powerfully articulated the need for Hindus to constitute an exclusive and self-governing nation by melding Hindutva with Hindu identity. The ideological strands, political demands and mass activity derived from Savarkar's ideology were articulated eighty or ninety years ago. In spite of the popular image of Indian nationalism being primarily non-violent, violent forms of revolutionary nationalism were dominant within the movement both well before and after Gandhi emerged as a political leader. Revolutionary nationalism legitimizes violence

29

and masculine aesthetics, both of which are embraced by the Hindutva movement in present times.

Some of the formative ideas that I discussed with respect to the Hindu Nationalist movement became central to the discourse of the Hindutva movement. Like other ideologues, Savarkar too established the idea that Hindus are a nation by themselves and have a shared history and culture. He rejected the notion that the term 'Hindu' was conferred by 'others' instead of emerging from the ancient Vedic texts. According to Bhatt (2001), the Vedic text used the word *Arya*, expressed in Aryan battles against other local groups like *chandalas, dasyus and mlechchas* (p. 48). He explicitly situated the birth of 'Hindu nationality' in the Aryan Vedic period and argued that the history of India is yet to be written from a Hindu perspective (p. 48). Just as the idea of an archaic Hindu nation preoccupied Savarkar, Spencerian philosophy also permeated his ideology.

Spencerian ideas were central to Savarkar's ideology. Bhatt (2001) explained the relationship between Savarkar's ideology and Spencerian evolutionist political sociology in detail in the following passage:

A throughgoing influence of Spencerian evolutionist political sociology which associates 'hard struggle' with the 'the law of progress' deceptively encapsulates both 'Hindu weakness' and 'Hindu strength' which is foundational to post-independence Hindu nationalism. Various Spencerian ideas are part of the Hindutva movement namely Spencerian evolutionary biology and ideas of absolute liberty combined with social engineering which form the core of the political slogans for revolutionary nationalism. 'Resistance to aggression is not simply justifiable but imperative. Non resistance hurts both altruism and egoism' and 'Everyman is free to do that which he wills, provided he

infringes not the equal freedom of any other man.' The intellectual influence of

Spencerian evolutionalism and functionalism was extremely important for the general

ideological framework of Hindu nationalism and how the latter conceived the nature of

society, state and colonialism. Spencer was certainly important for Savarkar's social and

political philosophy, particularly for the 'rationalist' and 'scientific' stress Savarkar

placed on national evolution and the importance of extreme aggression and military

strength for national survival. (p. 81)

In this passage, the notion of relative non-violence takes precedence over absolute non-violence

in Savarkar's ideology, which borrows liberally from Herbert Spencer's philosophical

framework. Conflict and violence are deemed essential to the growth, development and strength

of Hindu civilization.

Savarkar focused on developing 'Indian identity' by rejecting the notion that Hindus are

defined primarily through their personal or collective religious beliefs and used 'Hindutva' as a

substitute to demote religion as the foundation to the identity of a Hindu. Savarkar based the

content of Hindutva on the strategic primordialization of Hindu identity on eighteenth and

nineteenth century European understanding of Hinduism which describes the history of India as

an unchanging, ancient and gradualist entity immune to time (Bhatt, 2001, p. 86). Savarkar

explains that Hinduism has a primordial origin because it has remained impervious to change,

unless threatened by external events such as invasions, conquests and wars directed at Hindus.

The *Essentials of Hindutva* barely discussed the actual histories, substantive contents of or

beliefs within Hinduism and links Hindutva with 'history' to temporalize and 'secularize' Hindu

religion (Bhatt, 2001, p. 86). Savarkar highlighted the consistent tension that existed between an

unchanging transcendental Hinduism in the absence of war and a Hinduism that only changes

31

through temporal and secular processes in a gradual manner which forms the crux of Savarkarism. In fact, Savarkar made it a point to say that Hindutva defies rational analysis and encompasses Indian history in all its myriad forms. Bhatt (2001) explained this point in some detail in the following passage:

> The idea and ideals, the systems and societies, the thoughts and sentiments which have centered around this name [Hindutva] are so varied and rich, so powerful and so subtle, so elusive and yet so vivid that the term Hindutva defies all attempts at analysis. Forty centuries, if not more, had been at work to mould it as it is. For indeed, is it not the resultant of countless actions – of our whole race? Hindutva is not a word but a history.
>
> Not only the spiritual or religious history of our people, but a history in full. (p. 86)

This passage really explains the fact that the Hindutva defies logic and rational analysis and has much more to do with creating 'collective feelings of belonging" through sharing of a common religious and spiritual history. It symbolizes hereditary, ancestry and legacy that belongs exclusively to Hindus and is something that religious minorities like Muslims and Christians can never inherently possess since they are 'outsiders' who assimilated into Indian society after having failed to conquer the Hindus.

The history of Hindus was depicted by Savarkar, as having existed prior to Egyptian and Babylonian civilizations, when the 'fearless' Aryans crossed the river Indus and entered India. He argued that Hindus were always a nation of and by themselves since time without beginning and had in fact brought civilization to the Indian subcontinent through the benign means of cultural assimilation and civilizing influence. He presented people with the picture that the culture, beliefs and values of the Aryans were superior to the indigenous tribes that inhabited the Indian subcontinent. Savarkar claimed that the Aryans first entered Punjab and Sind and

developed a sense of nationality. Bhatt (2001) focused on Savarkar's depiction of Aryans as the superior racial and cultural counterpart in the following passage:

> Savarkar unlike Golwalkar and other Hindu nationalists, stated his belief, at least in his Hindutva, of an Aryan immigration into India, with its implication that the origins of Hindutva, were not autochthonous to India. However, Savarkar believed that it was the commingling of the blood' of the Aryans and the people they encountered that gave rise to the Vedic-Hindu civilization. It is very clear that it was the infusion of Aryan blood, ideas and culture is the basis of Hindu nationhood. Savarkar did not discuss any belief systems that may have existed before the Aryan immigration into India, nor how they have influenced or changed Aryan-Vedic culture. (p. 87-88)

In the above passage, the idea of fair-skinned Aryans entering and civilizing aboriginal tribes has manifested in a sharp differentiation between the 'masculine' civilizations and weak 'feminine' civilizations. The Aryans are associated with possessing vitality, dynamism and martial spirit which enabled them to improve the indigenous tribes they encountered. The historical origin of the term 'Hindu' and the reasons for the degeneration of Hindus were also discussed in detail by Savarkar.

Savarkar used taxonomies, definitions and nominal reasoning to provide an ancient definition of the term 'Hindu' which has always been a source of contention among Hindu nationalists (Bhatt, 2001, p. 88). He did not propose a clear or definitive origin for the term 'Hindu', but he indicated that it may be Sanskritized version of an aboriginal name for the Indus River (p. 88). He concluded that Hinduism was the product of Vedic-Aryan conquest and was in constant conflict with other races and nations.

33

Savarkar's historical imagination provides a clear perspective on the reasons for the degeneration of Hinduism. He laid the blame of Hindu degeneration on the expansion of Buddhism which inculcated qualities such as love, compassion and peace that made Hindus less martial, more docile and effeminate in the face of invasions and oppression. Savarkar's abusive disposition towards Buddhism is ironic because the Hindutva movement considers Buddhism as a natural and indigenous offshoot of Vedic Hinduism in present day India.

Savarkar's imagined history provided the Hindu movement with a historical framework in which the Hindus fought wars and achieved glory against invaders. Savarkar used the mythological content of the *Bhavishya Purana*, semi-mythological religious accounts of exploits of Gods, Kings, royal dynasties and their mythological lineages to extol the achievements of ancient Hindus (Bhatt, 2001, p. 91). Savarkar regarded the Puranas as a reliable record of Hindu history based on an epistemic and methodological claim that all myths are actual historical events (p. 91). An expansive and open-minded intellectual approach to examine the Puranic content is evaded by the movement. The movement uses Savarkar's interpretation of these ancient texts to deal with current issues which does not encourage critical thinking or analysis. Savarkar glossed over vast historical changes which are incongruent with his version of Hindu history.

Savarkar's take on Indian history is crucial to the manner in which Muslims are demonized by the Hindutva groups in present times. Savarkar paralleled the period between eleventh century and the nineteenth century as a single monumental war between 'indigenous Hindus' and 'Muslim invaders' and described it entirely in religious terms. Bhatt (2001) emphasized this point in the following passage:

The Hindutva writers were to considerably extend Savarkar's imaginary of Muslim

invasion, tyranny and persecution to present a predominant vision of Hindu 'victimhood'

and 'suffering'. Savarkar's goal was twofold, namely to present a monologic history of

the overwhelming innocence and oppression of monolithic nation of Hindus and the

power and vitality of Hindutva as the grand motor force of history. (p. 93)

Savarkar's conception of Hindu history mobilized political identification by cultivating

'nostalgic' remembering of the past which is not based on logic or factual evidence. He evoked

Hindu guilt and shame by raising the issue of Hindu 'weakness' which led to a millennium of

oppression, violence and genocide.

Savarkar's version of nationalism has numerous defining features that influenced the

movement over the years. The first feature of Savarkar's ideology is his definition of Hindu as

one who considers India as his/her Holyland. The first requirement is citizenship of paternal

descent within the territory of India (Bhatt, 2001, p. 94). The second requirement is the 'bond of

common blood' which means a true 'Hindu' must be a descendent of Hindu parents (p. 94).

Savarkar's novel use of '*jati*' should be noted because the word usually represents a sub-caste

typology but he used it to encapsulate a general view of inherited descent or lineage of larger

'racialized' populations (p. 94).

Savarkar and Caste/Race

Savarkar's perspective on 'race' and caste' plays a crucial role in the manner in which he

defined these terms to create 'us' versus 'them' scenario between Hindus and other religious

minorities. Savarkar defended the caste system founded on a hierarchically conceived nobility

and purity of 'upper' caste; in essence, Vedic-Aryan 'blood' which lends credence to the view

that the Hindus are undifferentiated and discrete racial unit (Bhatt, 2001, p. 95). Instead of

rejecting the race paradigm, Savarkar articulated an over integrated conception of Hindu race mirroring the racial supremism of British colonialism (p. 95). He repeatedly stated that the race inheritance of Hindu blood is the most important characteristic which attributes to affective and mysterious dimensions of Hindutva, a recurring theme in Savarkar's writing. This affective dimension depends on the mystery of sentiment and feelings of attachment which allows epistemic imprecision in Savarkar's Hindu nationalism (p. 95). A person may lose one's caste but not one's Hindutva since the blood would manifest itself as an affective structure by which a person would realize his/her racial affiliation to ancestors and fellow brothers (p. 96). This hierarchical paradigm based on hereditarianism allows the transmission and inheritance of the vital impulse, culture, civilization, religious mythology and metaphysical knowledge (p. 96). Savarkar pointed out that all Hindus, regardless of their caste share a common culture and civilization as a collective entity.

Savarkar initiated regressive logic to ensure that Muslims and Christians would never satisfy the requirements of the Hindu nationalist imagination. The Muslims and Christians are considered inherently treacherous who can demonstrate their loyalty and love only by abandoning their faith and adopting the Hindutva ideology.

Savarkar and Retaliatory Violence.

Savarkar revitalized Hindu pride by inculcating the 'martial spirit' of Hindus. Savarkar drew equivalence between the morality of violence and the survival of the Hindu race. He argued that 'absolute non-violence' is impractical and immoral since it discourages people from fighting back in self-defense. Bhatt (2001) explained Savarkar's stand on violence in the following passage:

Savarkar's hatred for Gandhi's nonviolent direct action was based on his view stated in

1941 and unchanged since the early 1900s, that resistance to aggression in all its possible

and practicable ways is not only justifiable but imperative. Non-violence for Savarkar,

was not simply wrong but actively immoral whereas 'justifiable aggression' is

appropriate to protect and maintain individual and collective 'morality'. He remolded the

ethical premise of 'disinterested violence' from the *Bhagavad Gita* to draw equivalence

between 'morality' conceived in terms of survival and violence conceived in terms of

dynamic hostility and aggression towards non-Hindus. This violent vision was

foundationally anti-democratic and was promoted by Savarkar after Independence in

1961. Claiming that military strength was the only criterion of greatness and that it was

the religious duty of Hindus to die while killing the 'enemy', Savarkar stated that against

'useless, impotent and coward' rulers who represented democracy in India, he would

prefer the 'great leader' Hitler. (p. 104)

Savarkar believed that Hindutva is synonymous with 'genuine' secularism' rather than pseudo-

nationalism because it represents and protects the Hindu majority by advocating violence and

military might which are essential to deal with aggressive forces that oppose its growth.

Savarkar and other Hindutva ideologues have referred to the *Gita* to justify retaliatory

violence. The *Gita* is a contradictory text because it advocates violence as well as non-violence

with inconsistency. How are these two ends of the spectrum reconciled by Hindus? The

traditional take on this contradiction is that non-violence in one's personal conduct is the ideal

but an individual must use violence to preserve the social order (Burns, 2008, p. 14). The

Hindutva ideologues base their justification of violence entirely on the literal understanding of

the *Gita*. While the *Gita* provides a mandate to fight and engage in battle, it also encourages

37

people take the higher road of "ahimsa" or non-violence. This disparity allows people to use the *Gita* to support both the hawk and the dove perspectives which has led many to wonder if the text indeed promotes war (Rosen, 2002, p. 9).

The Hindutva ideologues use *Gita* to persuade Hindutva followers to engage in acts of violence because their war is legitimate and is supposedly fought in self-defense. Rosen (2002) explains the notion of violence in the Gita as an act of focus or meditation on the task before him/her in the battlefield (p. 20). Waging a 'just war' born out of self-defense never equals aggression because it is waged to protect Hindus and establish 'God consciousness' (p. 22). It is implicit that the devotees of God are inherently non-violent because they refrain from hurting other living entities in the normal course of their lives but when a war is fought for God's cause, violence becomes a necessary means to establish peace (p. 27). According to Rosen (2002), absolute pacifism is often derided because it does not address a course of action when one's life, values, and loved ones are threatened to near extinction. True ahimsa in Hindu terms is not "non-violence" but "non-aggression" because to act violently in some situations with the spirit of 'ahimsa' is considered an act of non-violence (p. 24).

The literal interpretation of the *Gita* encourages people to act in a way that transcends fear and personal desires by carrying out passionate action on God's behalf dispassionately with as much "non-attachment" as possible (Rosen, 2002, p. 29). The Hindutva ideology focuses on non-attachment which is not about fatalism or emotional distance, but about performing work free from fear and materially motivated desires akin to offering everything as a flower at the feet of the Lord (p. 29). This encourages people to take up arms without worrying about the negative repercussions on society. The relativist approach justifies violence under specific circumstances,

which is misused by the likes of Savarkar and Golwalkar to advocate "purification" of society as a viable solution to problems.

Savarkar's writings and speeches in the thirties were influenced by right wing nationalist ideologies emanating from Eastern and Western Europe. Savarkar's displacement of a civic-territorial conception of Indian nationality was directly and intimately connected with his view of the nationality of Sudeten Germans and the German Jews (Bhatt, 2001, p. 106). He drew comparisons between Hindus and ethnic Germans and between Indian Muslims and German Jews which critically transformed his perception of Hindutva from the parameters of 'history', land and civilization to fixation on war, militarism, and minorities drawn heavily upon European examples (p. 106). Savarkar claimed that the Germans had become a mess and had numerous problems after being artificially placed with Czechs, Slovaks, Poles and Hungarians despite the linguistic, cultural, racial and historical affinities with the German people (p. 106). The association between Savarkar's Hindu Mahasabha and German Nazism and Italian Fascism was not unique and it has been pursued by other nationalist leaders. While Savarkar conceived Hindutva, Golwalkar is single-handedly credited in the strategic organization of Hindu society.

Savarkar and Totalitarianism

The Hindutva movement grew rapidly around the Second World War and an organization like the RSS developed a fascist character due to the direct contacts that existed between the main Hindutva organizations and Fascist Italy. The journal by Maria Casolari (2000) consists of archival evidence entitled *Hindutva's foreign tie-up in the thirties* which provides a succinct view of the Hindutva movement's domestic roots as well as foreign influences that shaped it. Hindu nationalism had much more than an abstract interest in the ideology and practice of Fascism. Fascism as per the Hindu revolutionaries was an example of conservative revolution

which if applied could result in India becoming a super power instead of being a backward

country (Casolari, 2000, p. 219). They were convinced that Fascism had restored order in a

country previously upset by political tensions. From 1924 to 1935, the Marathi press frequently

published editorials and articles that described the state of Italy, which transformed from a liberal

government to dictatorship as a shift from anarchy to order occurred where social struggles did

not have a reason to exist (p. 219). The press gave considerable mileage to the political reforms

carried out by Mussolini such as replacing the parliament itself with the Great Council of

Fascism which created a political and social climate that "bans subversive parties, limits the

press and expels disaffected people from public posts" (p. 209). Casolari makes the case that the

aspects of Fascism that most appealed to Hindu nationalists was the militarization and the real

transformation of society from chaos to order. The anti-democracy was a positive alternative to

democracy which was typically viewed as a British value.

With Savarkar's entrance on the political scene, there was an attempt to search for new

contacts with the totalitarian regimes. Savarkar was declared the president of the Hindu

Mahasabha from 1937-42 and his presidentship covered the most sensitive period of both Indian

and international history in this century. Two main topics that are central to his presidential

speeches are namely the international situation and Hindu-Muslim relations. He emphasized the

point that the political system must correspond to the nature of the respective population which is

inspired by a deterministic conception of Race, similar to the conception of Race in Europe

(Casolari, 2000, p. 223). When World War II was imminent, Savarkar openly declared that any

nation that helped India or was friendly towards its freedom struggle is its friend and any nation

that opposed its growth is its foe (p. 223). Savarkar repeatedly defended Germany's position

regarding the Sudeten problem and argued that people of the same race must co-exist in the same

country because democracy itself demands that the will of the people must prevail in choosing their own government (p. 223). This means that a Nation is formed by its majority which entails the minority to have almost no protection or rights in the country. The Hindu-Muslim unity was also an issue that preoccupied him during this time and he drew parallels between Hindus and Germans in dealing with minorities (p. 223). He claimed that the unity between Hindus and Muslims is not possible because neither Hindus nor Muslims believe they belong together in the same nation.

Even when the totalitarian regimes revealed their true colors, the Hindutva movement continued to regard Fascism and Nazism with benevolence in spite of the already if partially known atrocities committed by Hitler and Mussolini. They praised the dictators and their regimes and seem to have been inspired by them in dealing with the so-called "internal enemies" like the Muslims, Christians and the Congress. Casolari (2002) argued that ideologically, the most meaningful effect of fascist influence is represented by the way in which Hindu nationalism developed its own concept of diversity by transforming 'diverse' people into enemies (p. 227). Although the concept of an 'internal enemy' was already implicit in Savarkar's Hindutva, the continuous references to German racial policy and the comparison of the Jewish problem in Germany with the Muslim problem in India reveals the evolution of this concept along fascist lines over considerable period of time.

After examining Savarkar's impact on the Hindutva movement and the crucial issues he discussed in his foundational text, we will focus on Golwalkar's contribution to establishing the foundational and organizational infrastructure of the movement.

Golwalkar

Golwalkar was the second supreme chief of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and the force behind the formation of Hindutva organizations referred to as *Sangh Parivar* or family that comprise of a large network of socio-cultural activities in the entire country. Golwalkar was known for his academic brilliance. He completed Bachelors and Masters in Science in 1926 and 1928 respectively. He was closely associated with the RSS and became convinced that the solutions to all social problems are available in the Indian conception of society. Gowalkar believed that Indian society is one living body whose facets work in tandem with each other. He frequently reiterated this idea in his books, interviews and speeches to awaken this inner feeling in every Indian citizen. Golwalkar wrote *We or Our Nationhood Defined* in 1939 where he discussed what constitutes Nation, Nationality and Nationalism and the manner in which Hindus constitute a Nation by themselves.

We, Or Our Nationhood defined in 1938-39 links Savarkar's conceptions of Hindutva, Hindu nation and Hindu war with a political sociology and xenophobic racism (Bhatt, 2001, p. 126). Golwalkar took over the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) in the mid sixties, a body committed to organizing religious Hinduism under an overarching and violent Hindutva ideology (p. 132).

Nation, Nationality and Nationalism

Golwalkar defined 'Nation' as a cultural entity and the 'state' as a political one. He argued that they are fundamentally different because the state is subsidiary to the national concept (Bhatt, 2001, p. 127). Golwalkar identified Hindus with the Aryans in the 'Vedic period' but he rejected the hypotheses that argue that Hindu-Aryans have originated outside India. Like

Savarkar, he believed the Hindu nation degenerated as the consciousness of 'Hindu Race' dwindled due to 'over individualization' caused by Buddhism.

Golwalkar's definition of nation and nationality played a major role in how Hindutva groups view Indian Muslims and Indian Christians today. Bhatt (2001) explained that nation, for Golwalkar, is composed of what he called five 'unassailable' and 'scientific' units, namely, country, race, religion, culture and language (p. 128). 'Race' (*jati*), for Golwalkar was the foundational component of a nation:

> It is superfluous to emphasize the importance of Racial Unity in the Nation state. A Race is a 'hereditary society' having common customs, common language and common memories of glory and disaster, in short it is a population with a common origin under one culture. Such a race is by far the most important ingredient of a Nation…We will not seek to prove this axiomatic truth, that the Race is the body of the nation and within its fall, the Nation ceases to exist. (p. 128)

His conception of citizenship was based on racial totality which was inherently xenophobic because it constantly excludes people who don't fit within the five-fold limit and encourages the one-dimensional perception of religion and culture in society. Golwalkar believed that religion and culture creates a 'Race consciousness' that interweaves religion into every aspect of life. He combined theocratic and racial conception of a nation. Golwalkar employed metaphysical, rather than biological conceptions of 'race' that defy rationality and scientific analysis. He believed that the traditional past opens the way for the future whereas the abandoning tradition and 'race spirit' endangers the nation's life soul and social fabric (Bhatt, 2001, p. 133). Golwalkar articulated spiritual nationalism and spiritual racism which encapsulated both degeneration and complete regeneration of Hindutva (p. 133). Golwalkar believed that the purity of the Hindu

43

race can be maintained only if Hindus look to their ancient history and culture which holds all answers to the issues that plague the nation.

Golwalkar's views on minorities are not different from the views held by Savarkar. Like Savarkar, Golwalkar believed that minorities don't deserve any rights because they are outsiders and citizenship is conditional on Hindu racial, cultural and religious affiliations. Golwalkar proposed that all minorities should become Hindus against their will and conviction under a palpable threat.

Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS)

The RSS is a technical-rational social organization with a vanguardist imagination (Bhatt, 2001, p.133). This technical rationalism commenced with the need to 'create the proper type of man' who is assigned a place in an integrated social order based on the caste system marshaled by religious texts (p. 134). The RSS views the caste system simply as a reflection of 'natural law', a supreme and scientific social order based on the division of labor. It legitimizes its existence through anti-caste ideology to new recruits and outsiders while retaining its pro-caste ideology at the core. The organization frequently reiterates the importance of banishing the word 'untouchability' and prevents disenfranchised group from falling prey to 'foreign missionaries.' According to Bhatt (2001), Golwalkar believed that the caste system is essential for the welfare of the Hindu Race in spite of the drawbacks and discrimination that results from it:

Golwalkar was explicit that the ideal social order should be *varnashrama*, 'the best order for achieving human happiness' and argued that even those who loudly trumpeted individual liberty had to accept collectivism and the 'doctrine of hereditary.' What he termed as inequality had, he claimed 'crept' into the caste system and was not 'proper'. Despite this nominal admission of the injustices of caste, he argued that 'the Gita tells us

44

that the individual who does his assigned duties in life only worships God through such

performance.' (p. 134)

As seen in the above passage, caste is central to Golwalkar's imagination of state and nation. The

RSS believes that the role of the state should be subsidiary to maintaining the caste based social

order.

Besides arguing that the caste system was an ideal form of social organization, Golwalkar

aimed for an idealized and undemocratic government in which every aspect of the social order is

governed by *Integral Humanism* (Bhatt, 2001, p. 135). Golwalkar argued that when the state is

determined by the strong and enduring social structure, any form of government ranging from

monarchy to democracy will function effectively. Under Golwalkar's ideological spectrum, RSS

is gender biased, the women's wing and the men's wing connote that the women are servants to

the nation and men are volunteer servers of the nation. The RSS celebrates Hindu masculinity in

distinctly violent forms and ignores women unless they fall within its patriarchal configuration. It

reduces women's life to being a daughter, wife, mother and sister while their emotions,

characters, duties and aspirations are designed and molded for domesticity. After examining the

gender wings of the RSS, I will focus on the influence of Fascism on Golwalkar's ideology.

Golwalkar and Fascism

The first Hindu nationalist who came into direct contact with Fascism was M.S. Moonje,

a politician strictly related to the RSS who advocated key fascist methods of indoctrination like

physical exercise, paramilitary training and drills and parades (Bhatt, 2001, p. 210). Moonje

described his observations of fascist organization in Italy after meeting Mussolini in the

following words:

The whole idea is conceived by Mussolini for the military regeneration of Italy. Italians, by nature, appear ease-loving and non-martial like the Hindus generally. They have cultivated, like Indians, the work of peace and the neglected the cultivation of the art of war. The idea of fascism vividly brings out the conception of unity amongst people. India and particularly Indians need some such institution for the military regeneration of the Hindus so that the artificial distinction so much emphasized by the British of martial and non-martial classes among Hindus may disappear. (p. 210)

It is safe to say that the entire circle of militant Hinduism must be influenced by Moonje's Italian experience. Moonje's opinions on war and violence mirror those of Mussolini's views on the subject. He examined the relationship between violence and non-violence quite deeply which gets reflected in Savarkar and Golwalkar's perspectives. He drew many examples from Indian history and Hindu holy books that favor organized violence and equated non-violence with renunciation and cowardice. Moonje'a views on violence were influenced by Mussolini and they were in agreement about perpetual peace. This is reflected in the ideology of Savarkar and Golwalkar who also believed that war is a fact of life and the idea of perpetual peace is nothing short of misguided idealism. Mussolini unequivocally stated that he believed neither in the possibility nor the utility of perpetual peace. He repudiated the doctrine of pacifism "as something born of renunciation of struggle and an act of cowardice in the face of sacrifice" (Bhatt, 2001, p. 221). If the basic premise of the Hindutva movement is based on the inevitability of war, then the logical progression would be the inculcation, impregnation and familiarization of young people with the concept of war (p. 221). The influence of Fascist ideology went beyond the main organizations of Hindu militant nationalism and extended to the wide and intricate net of secondary militant centers of physical education and paramilitary training.

The RSS perspective on Indian society was clearly influenced by Fascism. RSS idealized India as an organic, disciplined and integrated social formation based on the consolidation of a strong, Hindu majority (Bhatt, 2001, p. 140). Consequently Indian society needs to be recreated in the mould of RSS. The RSS is therefore not a religious organization because it disowns the existing practices of Hinduism as fundamentally deficient and defective in comparison to its own ideology. It's 'utopian vision' for Indian society is different from other Hindu nationalist movements because the latter focuses on freedom, liberty, equality, diversity and independence which runs contrary to the former's obsession with the fetishization of discipline, order, organization, compliance, regulation, uniformity, obedience and hierarchy (p. 140). The organization's 'man-molding' activities stem from its mechanistic-algorithmic view of the human personality which differs from the Spencerian historical sociology (p. 141). According to Spencer, society is an organic entity whereas Golwalkar believed that society should be painstakingly fashioned according to Hindutva philosophy. The *shakha* is a training ground for ideological inculcation and 'character-building' of the *swayamsevaks* who are ideologically indoctrinated from a young age into becoming a Hindu as per RSS requirements.

The RSS uses various strategies to "mold characters" in an effective manner. For instance, young children who are not properly socialized and don't possess distinct social or political worldviews are trained by combining responsibility with amusement. The purpose of "man-molding" and "character building" in the *shakha* is to 'imprint' the RSS worldview in people's psyche. According to Bhatt (2001), Golwalkar used the metaphor of cellular destruction to describe the *shakha*:

Golwalkar employed the metaphor of cellular destruction to describe the shakha regime. He claimed that the human body, every cell not only identifies with the entire body but is

47

ready to sacrifice itself for the sake of the health and growth of the body. The cells in the body are compared to the RSS members. They had to undergo self-annihilation and sacrifice for the sangh and eventually the Hindu society. Notwithstanding the biological inaccuracies, of which Golwalkar would have been aware of, significant is his rather hostile and dismissive characterization of the Hindu personality and body which had not achieved the requisite level of *sangh* training. (p. 143)

In this passage, Golwalkar associated the ordinary Hindus without *sangh* training as effeminate, weak and disorganized group of people. Golwalkar's indifference to individuality among the Swayamsevaks is definitely a concern because modern ideas like 'freedom of thought' and 'freedom of speech' are deemed negative influences on the minds of young people.

Hindutva and Secularism

Golwalkar held ambiguous views towards Indian secularism. He equated 'secularism' with Hinduism and argued that Hinduism tolerates a wide range of religious beliefs, so it cannot be anything but inherently secular. Equating secularism with majoritarianism runs contrary to the ideals of democracy because a fixed constituency of the 'majority' cannot become a permanent law (Bhatt, 2001, p. 147). A democratic pluralist society cannot be established on the basis of protecting the rights of a 'religious majority' because it is foundationally based on protecting the civil and citizenship rights of the minorities (p. 147). These conditions cannot be fulfilled by the ideology espoused by Golwalkar and Savarkar as is obvious in the RSS organizations.

Barely four years after Independence, RSS officers and cadres organizationally created Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) in 1951. Between1949-1965, the RSS launched several national organizations which flourished at the national and local levels. These organizations indulged in an extraordinarily wide range of activities that reflect a distinct sociological strategy of political

labor in the national, local and state levels (Bhatt, 2001, p. 149). Golwalkar retained the non-political ideology for RSS while loaning RSS workers for political activities. The decline of the Hindu Mahasabha due to Savarkar's unpopularity during the forties created a political vacuum for Hindu communalist tendencies to emerge (p. 151). Nehruvianism represented non-communal orientation and the determination to 'secularize' India by making the lives of the post-partition Muslim minorities secure in society. The defining feature of Golwalkar's ideology is that an individual exists only so far as he or she sacrificed and served society because the social systems in which individualism reigns supreme is soundly rejected by him. Golwalkar considered the individual a natural living organism with a definitive 'national soul' or 'ethos' and fighting strength that accompanies and protects the 'national soul' (p. 155).

Golwalkar's ideas on governance were based on the Dharma or 'innate Law' which sustains and upholds the subjects of a society. The state is deemed subsidiary to the nation's soul in accordance with the principle of Rashtra-dharma or the "innate law of nationalism" (Bhatt, 2001, p. 157). The state cannot assume authority or powers over people in breach of 'Dharma', in which case, people who act in accordance with 'Dharma,' have an obligation to oppose the state (p. 157). A well-organized society with a 'well-awakened nature would not tolerate government acting against the doctrine of 'Dharma' (p. 157). The RSS goal of Hindu Rashtra is focused on the fulfillment of 'Dharma.'

The imagined 'Hindu Rashtra' represented by Hindutva organizations is problematic precisely because it consolidates Hindu nationalism around a new, post-independent symbolic territory of a powerful India premised on a permanently aggressive stance towards external and permanent enemies (Bhatt, 2001, p. 159). The claim of Hindu superiority over 'other' religions is

problematic it considers Indian Muslims and Indian Christians to be under the sway of a false

ideology against which Hinduism can be measured as a pre-eminently superior religion (p. 160).

After examining Savarkar's and Golwalkar's point of view about nation, nationality and

secularism, I will examine the Hindutva ideology in further depth in the fourth chapter. This

chapter provides the historical context for the Hindutva movement and the manner in which

various internal and external influences have contributed to the militant and violent nature of its

ideology.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the method that is used to study the Hindutva movement. This chapter accomplishes two major things. First, it determines which of Burke's methods are best equipped to study this movement. Burke provided rhetorical critics with a wide range of approaches to texts, not all of which are suitable for all types of texts. First part of this chapter will be about determining which methods are unsuitable for this particular text, and why. Second, this chapter ascertains why the guilt-redemption-purification cycle is the most appropriate methodological approach to understand the motivations and nature of the philosophical ingredients of the rhetoric used by the Hindutva ideologues to persuade and justify violence to restore Hindu honor. Burke's methods enable us to understand how ideologues use rhetoric to unfold narrative events of human drama by creating perceptions about key events in Indian history and Hindu mythology.

Form

A rhetorical critic should pay attention to form, which is an important Burkean analytical tool used to study rhetoric. Burke considered "form in literature as a means to arouse and fulfill desires and any part of a rhetorical text which leads its audience to anticipate another part, to be gratified by the sequence" (Chesebro, 1999, p. 170). Since the purpose of communication is for the speaker to find a common ground with the audience, form plays a crucial role in the symbol-using process. Burke classified four major kinds of forms along with several "minor and incidental ones" (p. 170). The first is the "syllogistic progression" which is a "perfectly conducted argument that advances step by step", the second is "qualitative progression" in which "one quality prepares us for the introduction of another", the third is "repetitive form" in which one principle is consistently maintained "under new guises" and the fourth is "conventional

51

form" which involves the "appeal of form as form" (p. 171). There are many types of minor forms but paradox and contradiction are most relevant to the Hindutva movement (p. 171). The question is whether any of these forms account for communicative and rhetorical activities of the movement.

The Hindutva movement is an atypical movement, which has managed to resurrect itself due to numerous designated leaders that emerged at different times. The movement does not follow the syllogistic form, a perfectly conducted argument that advances step by step on the basis of a cause and effect paradigm in which everything neatly falls into place. One can also define this as a kind of rationalization, i.e. if one were to go from point A to E then one has to go through stages B, C and D to obtain this form. The syllogistic form basically forces a conclusion based on certain premise. This does not pertain to the arguments made by Savarkar and Golwalkar because they don't follow the expectations of the audience. The arguments by Savarkar and Golwalkar follow cyclical patterns, which are more akin to the patterns found in what Burke described as the guilt-redemption-purification cycle. The arguments posed by Savarkar and Golwalkar do not follow qualitative progression because they do not sustain a certain attitude to establish an aesthetic end by putting the audience into a state of mind that another state of mind can follow. Savarkar and Golwalkar's works consist of some celebratory overtones but their primary effort was to transform many historical events into deliberative or political stages in which Hindus were subjugated and humiliated by the enemies. Since the repetitive form focuses on achieving a single principle, Burke's ideas of form are not applicable to analyzing the rhetoric of these ideologues.

The rhetorical texts of Savarkar and Golwalkar do not adhere to the conventional form that involves "categorical expectancy" because they don't follow a linear form. Burke's idea of

form was linear, based on the understanding that an idea progresses from one manifestation to another (Chesebro, 1999, p. 176). Understanding in the Western linear pattern is equated with recognizing the specific and discrete stages of an idea that has passed from its origin to a subsequent and altered state (p. 176). Both Savarkar and Golwalkar belong to a culture that uses spiral form of reasoning in which understanding is equated with recognizing how an idea is a reflection of and a product of diverse associations and contextual possibilities (p. 176). Spiral form engages in the quest to understand the essence, integrity, nuances and comprehensiveness of an idea (p. 176). While Burke argued that audience expectations determine the nature of form, the Western form inherently possesses the common feature of linear progression which implies an analytical and dichotomous orientation that is not natural to the Hindutva movement or ideology. The rhetorical arguments of Savarakar and Golwalkar depart from Burkean progressions because they are not based on reasoning from spatial metaphor that casts ideas as sequential movements from one location to another (p. 177).

The Pentad

The Burkean pentad is a popular method of analyzing social movements, but it is primarily useful if the critic wants to analyze which motivational aspect of the movement is more dominant or more important than the others. The pentad follows the linear patterns of causality in which one element determines another. The pentad is based on the dramaturgical approach and is a structural model that focuses on communication as a social action. It consists of five elements—namely, the act, scene, agency, agent and purpose—which enable a critic to compartmentalize human behavior and motivation in five categories. It makes the assumption that human beings always engage in action and asks of any action "what was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how it was done (agency) and why it was done

(purpose) (Roundtree, 1998). The pentad thus is less unsuitable to studying the Hindutva movement.

The Hindutva movement does not speak to a monolithic audience that shares the same perspectives, values, attitudes and economic or social backgrounds. While Savarkar and Golwalkar speak to their core followers, they also address disenfranchised groups of Hindus belonging to backward castes, tribal groups and the middle class to unite them against other religious minorities perceived as a threat. A second drawback of the pentad apart from its linear pattern is that it provides insight into an overall phenomenon but suffers from a lack of detail because I would have to exclude certain aspects to fit various components of the movement under the pentadic categories.

The pentad establishes connections between terms in pairs or ratios, which enables us to analyze the implications with grammatical relations thoroughly (Roundtree, 1998). The rhetorical power of grammatical limitations occurs when one characterizes a given situation by prescribing a range of acts that seem reasonable, implicit or necessary in that situation (Roundtree, 1998). One's characterization of a room as "ablaze" does not determine the reasonable act of fleeing because such characterizations are terministic in suggesting how actions are supposed to be interpreted (Roundtree, 1998). The relations among grammatical terms function as rhetorical constrains that do not dictate action but only shape the interpretation of action (Roundtree, 1998). The manner in which one term shapes another depends on their terministic relationship, and these relations have general and specific dimensions that reflect cultures and philosophies of action, which differ corresponding to types of understanding of general dimensions and relationships among terms (Roundtree, 1998). The manner in which people interpret events is based on the application of a certain type of a terministic screen; this

makes the pentad an ineffective tool to study the Hindutva movement, which relies on interpreting historical, political and cultural events to shape perceptions.

Terministic Frames

Another Burkean approach is the use of frames as a means of understanding human motives. It states that a theory of action is implicitly present in the theory of motives since people judge themselves and others by collaborating with them or against them in accordance with their own attitude (LeBaron Jr, 1992-2010). The frames are described as "symbolic structures by which human beings impose order upon their personal and social experiences." Frames serve as perspective s from which all interpretations of experience are made" (Carlson, 1986, p. 447). Frames identify both "friendly" and "unfriendly" forces because they basically fix and prepare people for "attitudes for combat" by drawing the lines of battle in a confrontation (LeBaron Jr, 2010). People's perspective plays a crucial role because it determines the frame from which the movement operates, which suggests that the critic can achieve a better understanding of a movement if he/she is willing to analyze the movement's frame of reference (LeBaron Jr, 2010). Burke identifies two frames in his book *Attitudes towards History* (1937), namely the tragic or debunking frame and the comic frame (LeBaron Jr, 2010).

The tragic frame captures the nuance and motives of the Hindutva movement. The movement uses past historical experiences in which Hindus let external forces subjugate them to create guilt. The victims, in this case, is the Hindu community which could not avoid suffering because of its inherent weaknesses which means Hindus require a sacrificial scapegoat who suffers, dies, or is banished by society in a symbolic attempt to cleanse itself of chaos, disease and impurity. On the other hand, the comic frame exposes the logical fallacy of the Hindutva movement in persuading its followers to believe that they can create a "perfect" and an "ideal"

Hindu society by excommunicating Indian Muslims and Christians. While the tragic frame forms

the basis of the movement, it fails to explain the cyclical nature of the movement that can spiral

into a never ending cycle of violence to establish 'retributive justice.' 'Retributive justice' is

based on the idea that it is morally acceptable to mete out punishment in proportion to the crime

that has been committed with the aim to provide the "victim" with the satisfaction and

psychological benefits. The comic frame unlike the tragic frame is devised to achieve change by

pointing to and ridiculing the faults and flaws in the system and the agents who uphold the

system (LeBaron Jr, 2010). Burke (1937) described the comic frame as a method that is "neither

completely euphemistic, nor wholly debunking–hence it provides a charitable attitude towards

people that is required for the purpose of persuasion and co-operation, but at the same time

maintains shrewdness concerning the simplicity of cashing in" (p. 166). It acknowledges the

contradictory aspects of human nature meaning everyone is susceptible to making mistakes and

engaging in erroneous behavior. The purpose of the comic frame is to raise "maximum

consciousness within man from which he can transcend himself to recognize and correct his own

foibles" (p. 171). The Hindutva movement does not operate from the comic frame because it

believes that it is necessary to sacrifice or kill the scapegoat to chastise individuals (Le Baron Jr,

2010) The tragic frame leaves no room for people to mend their faults and does not allow them

to return as participants in the system (LeBaron Jr, 2010).

Guilt-Redemption-Purification Cycle

Given that the movement is cyclical in nature and has spanned many decades, the guilt-

redemption cycle provides a holistic picture that integrates its different dimensions and facets. It

provides an alternative "ordering" which does not eliminate hierarchy but certainly reduces it to

examine possibilities for connections between words and people that exist outside the simple linear arrangements to deal with the dangers of violence done with words (Brock, 1999, p. 139).

The guilt-redemption cycle is appropriate for the study of this cyclical movement because guilt is the root cause for the vicious cycle of violence being perpetrated by this movement's ideology. Burke identified that the ultimate motive for human action is purging oneself of guilt, which manifests in the form of tension, anxiety, shame, disgust, embarrassment and other similar feelings. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar created identification by focusing on collective guilt of Hindus which can be relieved by redemption to establish the hypothetical natural order.

The guilt-redemption-purification rhetorical pattern conceived by Burke is based on "constitutive practice", which means that the rules are inseparable from the behavior they govern and are therefore inseparable from the language that people use to describe them (Bobbitt, 2004, p. 33). The existence of guilt is based on the notion of hierarchy, which is made possible and necessary by socio-political order that exists due to social differences and stratifications. The purpose of hierarchy is for people to find a common ground but it invariably leads to social disparity among groups which in turn leads to guilt and conflict. Burke asserted that people are "goaded by spirit of hierarchy" because they equate 'hierarchy' with 'order' in the 'pursuit of perfection' and everyone struggles to maintain a position in the system. Burke argued that hierarchy is the main reason for people's guilt because their failure to achieve a particular order is perceived as a failure. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar speak to this notion of hierarchy when they describe "Hindusthan" as the cradle of all civilizations and Hindus as the original inhabitants or 'masters' of the country.

Burke explained the guilt-redemption-purification cycle in simplistic terms as a cycle in which "disruption of order leads to guilt, needs redemption, and redemption needs a redeemer,

57

that is, a victim. Therefore, the cycle moves from order through guilt to victimage" (Burke, 1969, p. 5). The cycle's catalyst, guilt, is ontological and unavoidable because people's symbol-using nature inescapably constructs hierarchy, the idea of the negative, and the concept of perfection. Language leads to the construction of a social order, which gives rise to guilt about one's place in the social order because people higher up in the hierarchy will feel guilty about their privilege while those in the lower rung will feel guilty that they have not risen in the social order (Bobbitt, 2004, p. 34). Guilt also comes from the notion of the negative: the human tendency to establish hierarchy through principles, which people eventually fail to obey, resulting in guilt (p. 34). The fact that human beings feel guilty creates the need for redemption, and purification is achieved through any means that leads to the achievement of redemption (p. 34). The Hindutva ideology is particularly pernicious because there is a never-ending need in humans for symbolic purification which means redemption is a mere illusion (p. 34).

Prior to guilt comes mystification which is based on the rhetorician's ability to "use language to create symbolic and verbal deception." Mystification is essential to obscure the structure that supports social hierarchy, causality and inequality in society to romanticize the ideologue's true intentions. The reality of a situation is mystified through ambiguous terms, which are dangerous when people are motivated to strive towards the fulfillment of the potential of these ideas. Obscuring reality in favor of affecting positive change occurs at the cost of seeking the truth in the situation. Here, Burke's mystification has negative connotations because these ambiguous terms are not defined and manage to obscure "specific motives" that warrant action.

Burke states that "guilt is an ontological sense of anxiety, separation from others and the failure to live up to standards imposed by self and society" (Bobbitt, 2004 p. 35). He defines it in

58

terms of anxiety, sin, disobedience and disorder and perceives it as a "profound social disrelationship" that arises out of differences between the ideal and reality (p. 35). Eventually, people expiate guilt to achieve a state of redemption to "sublimate guilt" in socially constructive ways (p. 35). Because guilt is an ontological condition, according to Burke, it is not exclusive to Western culture or individuals. Just as individuals have conscience and their respective identities, which are measured against standards of other individual identities, nations also have a collective conscience and identities which are measured against other standards of national identities (p. 35). Guilt runs very deep in India with respect to Hindu identity since some Hindus feel that their voice is not recognized in the political domain in spite of being the numerical majority. The Hindu identity came under a greater threat when Muslims and Christians started having political representation and a political voice to ascertain their rights. In this instance, guilt is a potent manifestation of the shame, feelings of alienation and marginalization of Hindus in the political, social and economic arena. Guilt is being used by the Hindutva movement as an effective strategy to call upon alienated Hindus to participate in the process of creating a new identity.

Burke claimed that human beings are consistently trying to expiate guilt because it represents varieties of divisiveness in the social body in terms of fear, failure, resentment, frustration, etc. Since human beings want to identify with others in an attempt to pursue perfection, we are constantly trying to purge guilt through mortification and scapegoating. Guilt reduces social cohesion and gives people the impression that they are less than whole, so they strive to remove this guilt through redemption (Brock, p. 186). The guilt is keenly experienced during misfortune which in turn also creates self-guilt because any 'external misfortune' is a result of one's own conduct or thought. This perspective affects individuals and societies and

59

could be characterized as the basis of the neurotic symptoms exhibited by the Hindutva movement (Leff, 1973, p. 327).

According to Burkean redemptive identification, a consubstantial bond exists between groups in this kind of a rhetorical transaction which involves shared guilt and a common self-conception of sinfulness (Leff, 1973, p. 330). Since human beings want to live in a perfect society, we want to purge this guilt through the act of purification. The act of purification occurs either through 'victimage' or 'mortification' or may occasionally involve both the processes to transform the 'self' and the 'other.' 'Victimage' is the purging of guilt through a scapegoat who serves as a 'receptacle' or a 'symbolic vessel', for the "inequities of those who would be cured by attacking it" (Leff, 1973, p. 330). The scapegoating process pits the opposites against each other that arise from division and synthesis in society. The scapegoat is the sacrificial animal on whose back the burden of societal evils is loaded ritualistically. The dialectic structure of the scapegoating process involves three major steps (Leff, 1973, p. 330). The first step is the original state in which the scapegoat merges with the persecutors by sharing the inequities (Leff, 1973, p. 330). While the followers of the Hindutva movement consider Hindus responsible for the demise of the Hindu empire, they also scapegoat the Muslims and Christians for asserting their rights as minorities. The second step involves the symbolic division of the victim from its persecutors based on ritualistic alienation (Leff. 1973, p. 330). The Hindutva movement focuses on the ritual of alienation frequently by severing ties between Hindus and other religious minorities by categorizing them as "outsiders" that have inherent traitorous cultural and religious affiliations. The third step is when the second merger occurs, which results in the "unification of those whose purified identity is defined in dialectical opposition to the sacrificial offering" (Leff, 1973, p. 330). While a "perfect society" is an excellent ideal to aspire to, it is impossible to achieve

because the preconditions given by Savarkar and Golwalkar does not make it possible for Muslims and Christians to become true patriots. They can redeem themselves by giving up their culture, religious beliefs and customs and adopting the Hindutva way of life. So, they can never really achieve the "perfection" or redemption being advocated by the movement. Similarly, even the Hindus that follow the ideology of non-violence and compassion cannot achieve "perfection" unless they follow the militant and exclusivist Hindutva ideology.

Scapegoating is developed through the process of externalization because some individual or group is selected and all of society's problems or its sins are blamed on the chosen group due to which an "us-versus-them" antithesis is established. Scapegoating is of two different kinds namely "symbolic slaying" and "banishment" from society. Symbolic slaying is done through artistic images and religious rituals or cultural events whereas banishment occurs when the society redeems or restores itself by exterminating the scapegoat like the Jews were in Nazi Germany (Leff, 1973, p. 330). The Hindutva movement has repeatedly used the strategy of symbolic slaying of the "enemy" to restore Hindu honor and glory by employing "conversion" activities and religious events. The tactic of "banishment" asks Muslims and Christians to leave India for their respective "Holyland" if they refuse to give up their religious and cultural affiliations. Burke emphasized the ubiquitous nature of scapegoating which is not easily discernable in people's daily existence but eventually becomes summations of truth. Since the process of scapegoating is implicit in public discourse, it is the responsibility of the rhetorical critic to expose it to the public because the symbolic slaying cannot be accomplished without identification. Scapegoating is an important facet of the Hindutva ideology as it enables the Hindu community to transfer its guilt to an external vessel namely the Muslim and Christian

communities. When the scapegoat's identity is changed, then guilty individual's identity will change. Therefore, the process of scapegoating forms a crucial part of the guilt-redemption cycle.

Successful victimage is followed by redemption. Burke's idea of redemption or a redeemer stems from the punishment that is inflicted upon the guilty individual because to pay for one's wrongdoing by suffering punishment is to "redeem" oneself and cancel one's debt to society (Bobbitt, 2004, p. 93). The notion of a redeemer is implicit in the idea of redemption, which is why it is also referred to as "vicarious atonement" (p. 93). Rhetoric's capacity to affect redemption or create a new identity is temporary because even if the Muslims and Christians pay for their sins, they will be suspect for disrupting the existing hierarchy and displacing Hindus from their rightful place in society. The human understanding of sin and guilt is that once it occurs, that individual or group is more susceptible to indulge in this repetitive behavior.The existence of the "negative" in the use of language causes guilt, which in turn leads to victimage. Thus, redemption begins all over again because when a group is completely cleansed, it is still fallible and forever suspect which makes the situation all the more precarious for Muslims and Christians in India.

After establishing the idea that guilt-redemption purification cycle is the appropriate methodological lens to study the Hindutva movement, I will analyze pivotal texts written by ideologues like Savarkar and Golwalkar in the next chapter. I will analyze how these texts rhetorically name, identify, and frame events, objects, people, and situations in ways that place them within this Burkean guilt-redemption cycle. To do so, I go through Savarkar's *Hindutva* and Golwalkar's *We or Our Nationhood Defined*, which are seminal texts that articulate a clear definition of what constitutes the 'feeling of Hindutva' and who constitutes a 'true Hindu.' These texts envision a clearly exclusivist and militaristic worldview that excludes religious minorities

from the being considered 'true patriots' and citizens of the country. The goal is to then understand how the particular arrangement and organization of events, objects, people, and situations identified and framed by Savarkar and Golwalkar within this guilt-redemption cycle motivates audiences to think about them in terms of necessary hierarchies, violation of hierarchies, and thus justifications for the use of violence in restoring hierarchies.

VIOLENCE AS RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

This chapter focuses on the analysis of canonical texts written by Savarkar and Golwalkar along with the important speeches and interviews given by them during the course of their respective lives. Before I proceed to analyze their ideology, this chapter will briefly recount their contribution to the movement, describe the canonical texts that shaped the Hindutva movement, and analyze the manner in which they used rhetoric to perpetuate and justify violence to establish Hindu supremacy in India.

Both Savarkar and Golwalkar use rhetoric to create a guilt-redemption cycle that justifies violence for the purpose of establishing Hindu dominance in India. As discussed in the third chapter, the guilt-redemption cycle is fundamentally a result of disruption of an order/hierarchy in society, which results in feelings of guilt. In order to assuage this guilt, redemption becomes necessary and requires the existence of a victim. Put differently, placing events, objects, and situations into a guilt-redemption cycle rhetorically motivates audiences to think about those objects and situations in terms of hierarchy, guilt, and redemption. The analysis will show that the Hindutva movement exhibits this cyclical structure, moving from order through guilt to victimage, in a way that makes violence the only or most suitable option to achieve redemption.

The first part of the guilt-redemption cycle involves a rhetorically envisioned order and hierarchy. In the next section, I will examine the manner in which Savarkar and Golwalkar create an ideal order/hierarchy which was eventually disrupted by external threats aeons ago.

Hierarchy

Guilt is based on the idea of an existing hierarchy that is a necessary motive for the socio-political order to exist. The purpose of hierarchy is for people to find a common ground with others through differences that exist between people: hierarchy allows us to understand our

64

position and purpose in the world around us. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar focused on creating

an idyllic hierarchy that perpetuates the idea of Hindus having a rightful ownership of the

country due to being indigenous inhabitants of the land, unlike Indian Muslims and Christians.

They systematically defined the meaning of Nationality and Nationalism in the *Essentials of*

Hindutva and *We or Our Nationhood Defined*. The categories that define the meaning of a true

patriot are hierarchical, which creates an order that gives Hindus an upper hand in terms of birth

right and a monopoly of establishing a political, cultural, and religious dominion over India at

the cost of religious minorities. Savarkar and Golwalkar created hierarchy through three means:

how they defined nationalism, how they defined rightful patriotism, and how they defined the

characteristics of a true Hindu.

Defining Nationalism

Savarkar stated that the first step of establishing ownership involves changing the name

of the country from India to Hindusthan or the 'land of the Hindus.' Since Hindus are the vast

majority in the country, it is only logical that the name be representative of the majority. Words

grow stronger when they are associated with something that garners longevity because the thing

that mystically becomes entwined with the word becomes as significant as the thing it describes

(Savarkar, 1923, p. 3). Since names imply a complex ideal that lives and grows like an organism,

they live longer than generations of human beings (p. 3). Savarkar established the meaning of

'nationality' and 'nationalism' to create the impression that Hindus are the true owners of the

land and are therefore the true patriots of the country.

Golwalkar, on the other hand, discussed and clarified the tantalizing ambiguity among

terms like nation, nationality and nationalism in *We or Our Nationhood Defined*. Nation is

derived from Latin word 'Natio' meaning birth or race which signifies a tribe or social group

united on the basis of common ancestry (Golwalkar, 1939, p. i). Golwalkar believed that true progress involves adapting an idea of the past to contemporary times instead of destroying and annihilating the foundations of the past (p. iv). In repudiating the annihilation of nationalism by the West, Golwalkar argued that India is different from other Western nations that conflated the notions of 'state' and 'nation.' The two concepts are vastly different from each other. Nationality is capable of evolving even when an independent state does not exist as a sovereign entity and is not just the result of race or geography because it is a result of social circumstances and cultural traditions that exist without political unity (p. vi). Golwalkar defined nationality as "a subjective corporate sentiment that gives a distinctive unity to the majority of the members of a particular civilized section of humanity that possess certain collective attributes like language, religion, history, culture or traditions" (p. xii).

Mystification' refers to language used to create symbolic and verbal deception to obscure the structure that supports the status-quo and establish Hindu dominance in every arena of Indian society. These terms are not defined and described in a specific manner because these "feelings" or "sentiments" are ambiguous, lack empiricism; defy logic and obscure "specific motives" which manipulate people to engage in violence to assert Hindu dominance in India. Savarkar and Golwalkar mystified terms to create an illusion that anything is justifiable in the pursuit of a perfect Hindu society.

India as 'Fatherland' and 'Holyland'

Savarkar and Golwalkar perpetuated the idea that a true citizen would accept Hindusthan as their "Fatherland" and "Holyland." Crucially, however, these terms are not explained or defined categorically except as a biological instinct or emotional affinity shared by Hindus. Savarkar (1949) attempted to explain these concepts to a certain extent in the following passage:

66

I shall content myself at present by stating that Hindudom is bound and marked out as a people and a nation by themselves. They accept Hindudom as their common Holyland by birth and as their Fatherland by ties of a common culture, a common language, a common history. It is these two constituents taken together that constitute our Hindutva and distinguish us from any other people in the world. That is why the Japanese and the Chinese do not regard and cannot regard themselves as fully identified with Hindus. The Japanese and the Chinese have a different ancestry, language, culture, history and country of their own which are not so bound up with us as to constitute a common national life. (p. 4)

True nationalism is associated with accepting India as the 'Holyland' and 'Fatherland' which is problematic because thousands of Indian Muslims and Indian Christians consider India their ancestral home and share common history, languages and culture with Hindus. Savarkar argued that even if the minorities like Muslims, Christians, Jews and Parsees accept India as their 'Fatherland', they don't accept it as their 'Holyland' and therefore cannot be trusted. This is ironic because religion cannot be restricted to a geographical location as there are numerous Hindus living outside India who consider India as their 'Holyland'. National sentiment in Golwalkar's estimate is embedded in the genetic code of Hindus which cannot be inculcated by merely residing in a geographical territory. Accepting India as one's 'Fatherland' and 'Holyland' is associated with an inheritance of sympathy or instinctive attachment that a child has for its mother. Golwalkar explained national sentiment as a "belief on the part of people that they have certain things in common which constitutes them as a distinct and separate group with peculiar group possessions or characteristics which makes it desirable that they live a common group life" (Golwalkar, 1939, p. xi). The vagueness of 'Hinduness' is bandied about as a qualification for

being a true patriot and a nationalist. 'Hinduness' is synonymous with nationality and is a malleable concept used to question, scapegoat, and persecute Indian Muslims and Indian Christians who supposedly don't possess this trait. 'Hinduness' is categorized as a "state of consciousness" inherent in people who are indigenous to the nation. The Hindutva movement uses another mystified term called 'Dharma' which is broadly defined as "righteous duty" to persuade ordinary law-abiding citizens into using retributive violence to avenge wrongdoings that occurred eons ago.

Dharma

Dharma is a natural law that governs the universe and combines moral laws with spiritual discipline to guide individual and social well being. Dharma is interchangeably used with religion because it assimilates everything that supports the Hindutva cause and excludes everything that questions or opposes its dangerous designs. 'Dharma' when used in the humanistic sense enables benevolence but when misused can easily lead people to use 'righteous duty' as an excuse to unleash violence. When taken a step further, 'Dharma' is used to create an ambience of "righteous war" in an epic like Mahabharata.

The *Bhagavad Gita* is a chapter in the Mahabharata which advocates participating in war as a righteous duty of an individual especially if he is fighting for justice and maintenance of social order. The *Gita* has traditionally been associated with upholding the principles of non-violence but makes exceptions for violence under certain circumstances. *Dharma yuddha* is a war fought in defense of justice and righteousness which distinguishes it from other forms of violence that are not sanctioned in Hinduism. For instance, violence perpetrated in the name of greed, power and pleasure to gain conquest and control over others does not qualify as *dharma yuddha* (Rambachan, 2003, p. 2). *Dharma yuddha* involves waging a war to defend justice by

not demonizing the opponent or indulging in hatred or contempt since "good" and "evil" are not qualities that people can monopolize in a clear manner (Rambachan, 2003, p. 2). In the context of *dharma yuddha*, violence is permissible as a last resort after all peaceful means have been exhausted to resolve conflict (Rambachan, 2003, p. 2). These facets of "righteous war" are conveniently glossed over and manipulated by the Hindutva ideologues to convince people to avenge justice for the Hindu community. The ambiguity around terms like 'Hinduness' and 'dharma' arise because their meaning is relative to the context in which people use them. These terms can adopt different meanings in different circumstances and are easy to manipulate. While mystification is not a part of the guilt-redemption-purification cycle, it is used as a tool by Hindutva ideologues to create and sustain an atmosphere of fear, anxiety and uncertainty about the future of Hindus.

The Hindutva response to disruption of a perceived idyllic society due to internal and external factors is guilt. The Hindutva ideologues use the disruption of the so-called order to create the guilt that exists in the Hindu psyche. How did the powerful Hindu empire that once ruled India become a second class community that does not have an upper hand in the political and cultural climate of India? How did religious minorities like Indian Muslims and Indian Christians get preferential treatment and privileges at the expense of the majority? These questions center on the political and social identity of Hindus in relation to other religious minorities in Indian society. The Hindutva movement draws a relationship between social identity and personal humiliation which gives rise to religious violence as the means for retributive justice. Religious violence is a device for symbolic empowerment, an assertion of masculinity and a recovery of public virility that is at once sexual, social and political in nature (Burns, 2008, p. 66). Masculine virility and symbolic empowerment is the primary focus of the

69

Hindutva movement to 'masculinize' the Hindu primordial antiquity as opposed to its 'feminization' by other influences that led to its degeneracy.

Both Savarkar and Golwalkar provided a checklist of criteria that people have to fulfill in order to be considered citizens and the true patriots of the country. These criteria create an illusion that an imaginary order has existed since time without beginning when the country was prosperous and peaceful until it was usurped by Muslims and Christians.

Hindus are the True Patriots of the Nation

Savarkar and Golwalkar argued that Hindus are the indigenous rulers of the land and have been its inhabitants since time without beginning. Creating an illusion of an original order in which Hindus were the original residents or "masters" of the country is necessary to persuade their audience about the reclamation of this ancient mythic ideal in current times. Savarkar cited oriental research to argue that an intrepid band of Aryans first came to the banks of the Indus River long before the ancient Babylonians or Egyptians to establish the Vedic civilization (Savarkar, 1923, p. 4). The Aryans were described by oriental historians as adventurous and intrepid enterprisers who lay foundations of an enduring civilization and gave it a 'local habitation and name' (p. 4). The Aryans had supposedly called themselves 'Sindhus' which is a derivative of 'Sapta Sindhus' or seven rivers that surrounded their nation and sustained life (p. 4). Savarkar explained that the word 'Hindu' is a derivative of 'Sindhu' since the letter 's' in Sanskrit was changed into 'h' and the word 'Sapta Sindhu' eventually transformed into 'Hapta Hindu' by ancient Persians (p. 5). Savarkar believed that the scattered native tribes must have known Aryans as Hindus in local dialects and even predicted that Vedic Sanskrit gave birth to the local languages which became spoken languages of the majority of descendents of Sindhus

70

(p. 5). The cross-bred castes may have called themselves Hindus without any foreign influence (p. 5).

Golwalkar, like Savarkar, wanted to prove the organic origin of the term 'Hindu' to persuade Hindus to perceive India as a Hindu nation where majority should set the rules of governance and dictate the way of life for everyone. Golwalkar argued that it is difficult for people of Hindusthan to point out when they discarded the state of nature and began to live life in an orderly, organized and cultured manner (Savarkar, 1923, p. 4) The Vedas are deemed as reliable evidence for the Hindutva vision to perpetuate the idea that Hindus were never uncivilized since they contain ideas that cannot possibly be expressed by anything but a civilized population. Golwalkar cited various Hindu Epics like the Mahabharata and Ramayana to demonstrate that Hindu civilization has existed for over 8,000 to 10,000 years before the land was invaded by any foreign race (p. 5). Golwalkar dismissed other historical accounts by stating that history did not dare to venture into the unknown past to scratch the surface of the glorious and advanced heritage of Hindu civilization. Aspersions are cast on Western scholars when Savarkar and Golwalkar implied that scholars deliberately concocted a different account to fulfill and justify the imperial designs of the West. They argued that the scholars of the West, in their desire to assert superiority of Western civilization over Hindu civilization, fabricated and manipulated facts about Hindu civilization.

Golwalkar (1939) provided two major reasons for the supposed surreptitious fabrication of historical events by Western scholars. First, after 2,000 years of progress, the West has scarcely washed off their barbarous tendencies, whereas the Hindus had already evolved intellectually, spiritually and socially as a civilization (p. 6). Second, he argued that neither Hindus nor the Europeans are real natives who can claim possession of the land and to claim

otherwise is just a strategy for West to claim superiority to trespass anywhere in the world (p. 7). Golwalkar argued that the facts presented by Western historians are mere hypotheses that should be debated, disproved and altered to suit the Hindu cause.

Golwalkar (1939) attributed the downfall of Hindus to complacency and carelessness, which led to a united and indivisible nation splitting into numerous principalities (p. 9). The disunity among Hindus was attributed to external influences like Buddhism, which weakened the Hindu virility and martial spirit with teachings of universalism, compassion and non-violence. Savarkar (1923) believed Hinduism had defeated Buddhism and banished it because its core ideology had endangered the national life:

> As long as the whole world was red in tooth and claw and the racial and national
>
> distinction so as to make men brutal so long if India had to live at all a life whether
>
> spiritual or political according to the right of her soul, she must not lose the strength born
>
> of national and racial cohesion. (p. 11)

Savarkar argued, fallaciously, that the loss of 'national and racial cohesion' was because of Buddhist principles and teachings that attracted and aggravated the wrath and animosity of external forces. Golwalkar also blamed the weakening of 'Hindu conscioussness' on Buddhism. Golwalkar argued that Buddhistic influence had a harmful effect on the masses because it made them less tenacious in their adherence to Hindu faith because over-individualization in Buddhism stresses individual self-seeking at the cost of society (Golwalkar, 1939, p. 10). Golwalkar believed nothing could save Hindus except revival of the Hindu spirit which enables people to realize that the Hindus were not the 'degenerate', 'downtrodden', 'uncivilized' slaves as they are made to believe today (p. 13).

72

Molding Hindu (National) Character

The Hindutva movement perpetuates the idea that Hindus can reclaim their birthright as heirs of the land if they had a better understanding of their history, heritage, and their true mission. Savarkar pointed out that Hindus should cultivate a deep understanding of their national glory, disasters, and eons of a common life. Savarkar (1949) emphasized this in the Presidential speech in 1937:

> Verily Hindus as a people differ most markedly from any other people in the world than they differ amongst themselves in the world. All tests whatsoever of a common country, race, religion and language that go to entitle a people to form a nation, entitle the Hindus with greater emphasis to that claim. And whatever differences divide the Hindus amongst themselves are rapidly disappearing owing to their awakening of the national consciousness and the Sangathan and the social reform movements today. (p. 11)

Savarkar argued that Hindus are entitled to act as a collective national entity since they share a common culture, heritage and ancestry. He believed that Hindus can rejuvenate their 'national consciousness' by following the prescribed guidelines formulated by him in the pursuit of "the maintenance, protection and promotion of the Hindu race, culture and civilization for the advancement and glory of the 'Hindu nation'" (Savarkar, 1937, p. 11). He deemed that the love that Hindus have for the land is undivided and absolute because they consider it their 'Holyland' as well as their 'Fatherland' and don't cherish extra-territorial allegiance. Savarkar observed that since India is the only homeland of the Hindus, it makes sense that they be the trusted champions of her cause. Since the Hindus have no other abode besides India, their allegiance to the Nation is unquestionable.

Golwalkar (1939) cautioned that just because Hindutva's perspective of 'Nation' and 'Nationalism' does not conform to Western political standards, they cannot be deemed invalid. 'Nationality' in Western political theory is a combination of "geographical unity or territory" and heritage of memories, tradition, history, and "linguistic unity" (p. 18). Both Golwalkar and Savarkar explore each component of being a 'true Hindu' in great detail.

Characteristics of a 'True Hindu'

Savarkar believed that people have to fulfill these criteria to be considered real patriots of the country. Hindus, according to the Hindutva ideology should share a common geographical, racial, religious, cultural and linguistic heritage that is unique to them and must also share an inherent biological trait that is exclusive to them. This section examines each criterion in more detail.

Geographical Unity

Both Savarkar and Golwalkar explicitly stated the requirements that the minorities have to fulfill to gain legitimate citizenship in India. A nation should have its own geographical boundaries inhabited by a race that develops its own culture and indissoluble bonds of community (Golwalkar, 1939, p. 18). The second category is 'Race' which is a population that has common origins, customs, languages and memories of glory (p. 20). When people of foreign origin reside in India, they must assimilate with the mainstream political, economic, religious, cultural and linguistic landscape and give up their religious affiliations that originated in other parts of the world (p. 21). Racial unity is the second ingredient that complicates things further for the religious minorities in India.

Racial Unity

Racial unity plays an important role in defining Hindus as original citizens of India because it is about being united by a shared love for their motherland along with bonds of common blood that they share with one another. Savarkar and Golwalkar described nationality in terms of 'Jati' or brotherhood which is determined by the possession of a shared common origin and common blood (Savarkar, 1923, p. 31). Savarkar (1923) argued that Hindus are a race onto themselves because common Aryan blood courses through their veins:

> We are well aware of the objection that carpingly questions but are you really a race? Can you be said to possess a common blood? We can only answer by questioning in return, 'Are the English a race? Is there anything as English blood, the French blood, the German blood or the Chinese blood in this world? Do they who have been freely infusing foreign blood into their race by contracting marriages with other races and peoples possess a common blood and claim to be a race by themselves? If they do, Hindus also can emphatically do so. (p. 31)

Savarkar argued that Hindus are a race by themselves because the caste system regulates noble blood lines, ensures fertilization and enrichment of all that was barren and poor without debasing the noble qualities of Hindus (p. 31). He argued that intermarriages between castes have been prevalent for many centuries which made all the castes equal to one other because all of them possess the common Aryan blood in their veins (p. 32). The Hindutva ideologues attributed the consolidation and stabilization of Hindu society to the caste system which emerged spontaneously to preserve the purity of blood ties, community life and tradition. He advocated that everyone should assimilate into the caste system to be a part of 'national consciousness.' If the race ceases to exist, then nation also ceases to exist.

75

Religion and Culture

Common culture and religion is the third important characteristic that defines a nation. According to Savarkar, Hindus are bound by ties of love that they share for their 'Fatherland', and Hindu culture which is the chosen means of expression to preserve all that is best in that culture (Savarkar, 1923, p. 33). Savarkar defined "Sanskriti" or civilization as a nation's story of its thoughts, its actions, its achievements and its historical and social institutions (p. 33). The Hindutva ideologues described religion and culture as two inseparable components that have co-existed for many centuries. Religion in India has a distinctive feature and functions as the sole incentive for melding all spiritual and worldly affairs in society (Golwalkar, 1939, p. 21). Culture is the culmination of age-long customs, traditions, historical and religious beliefs that contribute to the creation of 'Race Spirit' (p. 21). Golwalkar argued that separation of religion and culture is a sign that the religion's stronghold is weakening over the nation (p. 22). India is a nation where religion is an all-absorbing entity eternally woven into the life of the Race and everything occurs according to religious injunction (p. 22). Golwalkar believed that a national religion is not about individual choice and does not pertain to other-worldly matters since the Hindu religion in the Indian context is not a few set of opinions being dogmatically forced down everyone's throat without consideration for individual aptitudes or incompatibility with knowledge and reason (p. 23). Golwalkar asserted that Hindu religion must regulate society's myriad functions since it makes room for personal idiosyncrasies and provides suitable ways for people to rise from the material to the spiritual plane (p. 23). Politics cannot be exempt from operating on religious principles because the primary focus of religion is to achieve perfect individual, societal and political prosperity (p. 23).

Every nation develops its own language that reflects its culture, its religion, its history and its traditions which is the final component of a Nation's identity. Religion and culture are inseparable in an Indian context and are completely intertwined in a manner that allows the Hindutva ideology to permeate all aspects of Indian life. Apart from religion and culture, language was perceived as a vital unifying component of an entire nation.

Language

The Hindutva ideologues recommended that Sanskrit be the official national language since it originated in Hindusthan and supplanting it would be dangerous for the Race Spirit and the nation. Language is intertwined into the very being of national life and the two cannot be severed without fatal consequences (Golwalkar, 1939, p. 26). Golwalkar (1939) explained how the loss of national language can destroy national sentiment and create mental servility among Hindus:

> Take away from a Nation its ancient language, its whole literature goes with it. All know that loss of their ancient language would forever kill out their dear national sentiment and with it wipe out any possibility of their building up independent national life. One of the best evidences of an enslaved people is their adoption of the language and the customs of their conquerors. Language is inextricably woven in the all round life of a Race as an ingredient of great importance in its nationality without which the nation concept is incomplete. (p. 26-27)

Golwalkar associated the destruction of Sanskrit with the destruction of Hindu culture.The Hindutva ideologues adopted Hindi as the national language because it is derivative of Sanskrit and a sacred possession that embodies the noble aspirations and pure foundations of the Hindu race (Savarkar, 1923, p. 18). The growth and evolution of Hindi as the national tongue runs

77

simultaneous with the revival and popularization of ancient names like Sindhusthan or Hindusthan (p. 18). Savarkar concluded that the national language is an outward manifestation of the inward unity and harmony of national life (p. 19).

These are the criteria that the Hindutva ideologues deem essential for Indian citizenship and order. Next, I will examine how Savarkar and Golwalkar move this rhetorically constructed hierarchy and order into the guilt-redemption-purification cycle, which leads to the systematic and violent exclusion of Indian Muslims and Indian Christians. These criteria create a hierarchy that reduces citizenship to a product of Hindu racial, cultural and religious inheritance, which results in mystification, which justifies hierarchy and persuades people to use unethical means to achieve unattainable ideals.

The idea of an existing order since time without beginning is a strategic primordialization of Hindu identity that perpetuates the idea of a gradualist history of India. The Hindutva movement cited these requirements for citizenship to create a hierarchy that enable Hindus to achieve all this by sheer birthright whereas Muslims and Christians will never be able to fulfill these demands. The Hindutva movement uses mystifying terms like 'Fatherland', 'Holyland', 'Hindutva' and 'Dharma' to create an impression that the Hindus are born with a genetic disposition for an indefinable love for their country. 'Hindutva' cannot be inculcated because it is not something that can be learned, developed or understood by religious minorities which puts Indian Muslims and Indian Christians in a catch twenty-two situation. Mystification is a powerful and dangerous tool because it gives Hindus a sense of entitlement about taking back what is rightfully theirs and at the same time portrays Indian Muslims and Indian Christians as inferior or disingenuous factions who will never truly accept or care for India as their own.

Next, the Hindutva movement evokes guilt by focusing on how Hindus are directly responsible for the sheer complacency and innate weakness that lead to the demise of the idealized Hindu 'order' or 'hierarchy.' The focus on the problems among Hindus gives the movement an opportunity to assuage guilt through mortification, by introspectively changing Hindu character itself to help achieve the ideal of a Hindu nation. More importantly, the movement manifests guilt in the form of scapegoat, whose removal or subjugation gives more power and legitimacy to the Hindu community.

Guilt

Burke argued that guilt is an essential component of human nature because language involves symbol-using that is inherently hierarchical. Language creates a social order which gives rise to guilt about one's place in society regardless of whether someone is on top or at the bottom of the social order. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar stoked the insecurities, anxiety and a sense of powerlessness felt by the Hindu majority in the face of the British occupation.

Burke's assessment of guilt is in line with psychoanalytical theory, which distinguishes between shame and guilt. Guilt is associated with an external evaluation of transgression, an internalized sense of justice that makes people think that they have done something wrong that deserves punishment (Burns, 2008, p. 82). Shame, unlike guilt, is associated with self-judgment which has to do with lacking something. Shame stems from feelings of inadequacy and weakness which stimulates aggression since it is "rage turned against the self" which is mirrored in the Burkean idea of self-victimage (p. 82). Shame is more self-referential than guilt because it involves the negative evaluation of the self as inferior whereas guilt focuses on action with the self only indirectly found wanting (p. 82). The Hindutva movement combines shame and guilt, which manifest in the processes of internalization and repression.

79

Guilt by Internalization

Internalization occurs when the fall of the Hindu Empire is attributed to the innate weakness of Hindus that allowed them to adopt ideas, culture and the kind of nationalism that proved detrimental to their collective well being. Golwalkar (1939) explained internalization in the following manner:

Systematic attempts were made to weed out the Hindu National consciousness. The Hindu religion and culture were insidiously calumniated and Hindus were encouraged to discard their heritage as old-fashioned. Their history was distorted and Hindus were educated to believe that they never were a Nation, that they are not the children of the soil who have no better rights than Muslims or British to live in the country because they are not the masters of the land. (p. 57)

The fact that Hindus did not question or resist these attempts to alienate them from their roots made them willing accomplices to the Muslim and the British manipulation and conquest. A lack of self-worth is also cited as the reason for their complacency and docility, which made them adopt values like compassion and non-violence under the influence of Buddhism.

Both Savarkar and Golwalkar attributed the weakening of Hindu virility and militant spirit to Buddhist principles which were adopted by Hindus. If the Hindus had not moved away from their Hinduness, Buddhists, Muslims and British could not have made inroads into Hindu society. Savarkar (1949) questioned how Hindus can possibly recover from this setback:

Of all sides, scores of Hindus ask the questions: How are we to remedy these evils? How is it that we fell? How are we Hindus to rise again to recover as Hindus and recover our position as a Nation great amongst the Nations of the world?" This recent searching of heart is one of the most encouraging signs to show that the soul of our Hindu race is

roused from the swoon of forgetfulness. It is natural that on its return to self-

consciousness it should raise these bewildering questions as to its whereabouts. (p. 37)

In this quote, guilt springs from the fact that Hindus no longer remembered their own great

history, heroism and strength and lacked the desire to protect their Hindu brethren from foreign

aggressors. Apart from forgetting national consciousness, they also forgot that both Muslims and

Christians who came to India were "invaders" and colonial rulers with an agenda to destroy

Hindu civilization. Hindus can redeem themselves only if they awaken to their national

consciousness and purify society of unwanted elements that are against national upliftment.

Savarkar argued that the repression of Hinduness among the Hindus led to the embracing of

Buddhist principles and philosophy. The Hindu psyche apparently embraced non-violence and

universal brotherhood because people did not have a realistic perspective on situations plaguing

the country which undermined the rights of the collective majority to placate the needs of

minorities. Savarkar (1949) argued that every nation is guided by the rules and regulations of the

majority and the minorities must remain satisfied with whatever safeguards they get and not

break up the 'land of the Hindus' under the pretext of fighting for rights (p. 291).

Both Savarkar and Golwalkar chastised Hindus for going against the natural law of the

universe by embracing "absolute non-violence" and repressing their valor and fighting spirit.

They portrayed non-violence as an idealistic fantasy that goes against the laws of nature and

humanity which can only lead to the destruction of Hindus. Savarkar (1923) cited the law of

evolution to prove that Hindus who prescribed to the views of non-violence were rendering

themselves defenseless and helpless in the face of real danger:

81

Immobile forces are the easy prey of the mobile ones, those with no teeth fall prey to those with deadly fangs; those without hands succumb to those with hands, and the cowards to the brave. (p. 17)

Savarkar used the law of evolution to illustrate that adhering to the principles of absolute non-violence is unwise and unrealistic given that the world operates on the adage of "survival of the fittest." Wars should be perceived and waged on the grounds of practicality instead of morality.

Savarkar espoused the rational utilitarian approach by Herbert Spencer that perpetuates the idea that war or violence is permissible as long as it yields net benefit with minimal harm. This relativism is obvious when Savarkar supported India's involvement in the Second World War under the British rule because he believed Hindus needed to promote Hindu interests and help themselves in safeguarding the Hindu cause. He believed that Hindus should know that their true strength lies in their ability to consolidate military prowess inherent in their persona. Savarkar (1949) explained that the principle of utilitarianism is essential if Hindus want to achieve their goal because it is in line with reason and practicality:

Without going into deep waters for the want of space and time to ascertain what constitutes the criterion of moral action, whether morality derives its sanction from Intuition, Revelation or Exigency, the more practical factor and one which ought to be common to all of these schools of moral thought which can distinguish a moral act from an immoral act, a virtue from a vice, the good from the bad is the utilitarian principle that everything that contributes to a given set of circumstances to human good is moral, a virtue and the opposite is immoral, a vice under those given circumstances; that all morality is essentially human. Judged from the practical and yet fundamental test, the principle of absolute non-violence condemning all armed resistance even to the

82

incorrigible aggression cannot but be ruled as impractical, anti-human and therefore

completely immoral. (p. 195-96)

Rational utilitarianism negates morality as a set of absolute principles that guide human behavior because morality is man-made and subject to change. Non-violence operates in the realm of morality because it questions animalistic tendency that makes people disrespect the sanctity of human life to achieve a purpose or an ideal. Savarkar was concerned with effects of actions without judging an individual's motivations or intentions that guide his/her behavior. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar argued that the teachings of Buddhism have been misused by likes of Gandhi to encourage Hindus to neglect their martial prowess and react in "self-defense" against aggressive religious minorities. The Hindutva movement uses utilitarianism to justify the enslavement of a minority in favor of the greater good i.e. the needs of the majority, which is not conducive to protecting human rights. Internalization is accompanied by repression because Savarkar and Golwalkar believed that if Hindus want to rejuvenate their national consciousness, they need to close themselves from all external influences and remove their internal weaknesses detrimental to achieving this goal.

Guilt through Repression

"Purifying the self" is a motto often visible in Savarkar and Golwalkar's demonization of Westernization of India. Both Golwalkar and Savarkar were highly critical of Western or foreign ideologies, lifestyle and methods of governance during their time and made consistent efforts to purge the Hindu mind of these influences by guiding Hindus to the past. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar focused on "man molding" activities for Hindus that would repress their tendency to demonstrate tolerance, compassion and non-violence and increase their propensity to violence. Character building is of utmost importance in the Hindutva ideology because an individual's

conduct in the private sphere manifests in his/her relationship with society. Golwalkar stated that 'purity' and 'austerity' of character is essential to maintain the national heritage.

Personal transformation has been espoused by numerous leaders including Gandhi. But Golwalkar's ideas, while seemingly benign, are deceptive because he viewed individuals as a cog in the wheel or the means to achieve the Hindutva ideal. Advocacy for individuals to transform their life based on utilitarianism is deemed imperative to the well being of society. Lack of personal character is not deemed detrimental to the individual but to collective society which indirectly devalues the individual in the greater scheme of things. Golwalkar believed that molding individuals is crucial for true national reorganization. Golwalkar argued that people's mental revolution or change in their mental attitude is panacea for all national ills. He was interested in bringing about a total transformation in the attitude, thought process and behavior of individuals for an organized national life. Golwalkar's vision for national reorganization involved building national character by awakening Hindu devotion towards their motherland through organized efforts:

> National reorganization fosters those traits that build up national character and cohesion. It is directed towards awakening a passionate devotion to the motherland, a feeling of fraternity, a sense of sharing in national work, a deeply felt reverence for the nation's ideals, discipline, heroism, manliness and other noble virtues. This work of molding minds and building character cannot be done by sermons or administering pledges. The spirit of devotion to the nation is a steady flame, burning day in and day out and year after year. And so people would daily and regularly be in an environment congenial to its growth. (Golwalkar, 1966, p. 295)

This quote demonstrates that the ideals of Hindutva must be a living practice and not just a bundle of irrelevant preaching that lacks real impact in society. The weak national character of Hindus is attributed to the lack of individual character that consists of inactivity, so-called goodness and gentlemanliness which makes them impervious to the joys and sorrows of others and meek in the face of insults and humiliation (Golwalkar, 1966). Golwalkar predicted that this attitude of placing individual goodness and interests above the nation will prove detrimental to the national cause.

The annihilation of compassionate qualities in favor of cultivating more masculine qualities is deemed essential for resurrecting and maintaining a healthy national life. Savarkar and Golwalkar used repression and internalization to criticize the Hindu community for adopting fallacious philosophical and mental attitudes and believed that these approaches should be rectified for the betterment of the country.

Having established guilt, the guilt-redemption cycle motivates audiences to move toward redemption through victimage—the blaming of something or someone for polluting the order—through two means: mortification or scapegoating.

Purification through Victimage

Victimage through Mortification

Both Savarkar and Golwalkar referred to their own personal transformation from being skeptic bystanders to people who ultimately discovered their own 'Hinduness' which was their way of coming to terms with guilt through mortification. Mortification is basically a state in which a person or a community pays penance for exacting self-atonement, which is the core of ritual purification. The self becomes the empty cipher that they fill with guilt and sin so that the Hindutva movement can scapegoat Indian Muslims and Indian Christians for their problems.

85

Savarkar and Golwalkar underwent a transformation from being individuals who were not in touch with their 'Hinduness' to consequently discovering an innate devotion for their motherland. The internal scapegoat atones for sin through self-denial and self-punishment which forms the crux of mortification.

The Hindu guilt stems from being an "oppressed majority." Hindus being the "oppressed majority" feel guilt and shame for the failure of dealing with a negative self-image, perpetuated through history by the British. The Hindus perceive themselves as the majority that does not have political, cultural and economic autonomy in their own country. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar set Hindus up as internal scapegoats through internalization and repression who should exercise themselves in virtue. Both these ideologues spoke of themselves as individuals who became pro-Hindutva over a period of time, who actively participated in the organizations to promote and live the Hindutva ideology. For instance, Savarkar was initially just a young man with anti-British and anti-Muslim sentiments but he eventually formulated the Hindutva ideology in its modern philosophical form. On the other hand, Golwalkar came to the fore as a non-believer and skeptic who eventually founded the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), the 'society' against which the existing Hindu society is measured. Mortification ultimately is essential to the social order in the Hindutva ideology. Therefore, it makes sense that Golwalkar advocated that Indian social formation has to be recreated in the shape of the RSS. The tactics of the RSS involve extreme 'self-denial' and 'self-control' which are essential to molding the whole society into an organized entity. The RSS is associated with a slow, patient, long-term work in civil society which literally creates or molds a new Hindu man whose influence will cascade into existing institutions of civil society (Bhatt, 2001, p. 140). The molding of individuals is

essentially the means to reclaim the 'utopia' of a 'Hindu nation' that is central to the vision of the movement.

Golwalkar's narrative is particularly and obsessively focused on fetishizing discipline, obligation, compliance, uniformity, obedience and hierarchy (Bhatt, 2001, p. 141). The RSS method of engineering Hindu bodies and personalities is somehow portrayed as ingeniously and inherently Hindu. The RSS training group called *shakha* focuses on regular discipline and training of the 'mind, body and intellect' as necessary steps for ideological inculcation and character-building for a person to acquire the correct disposition, 'appearance' or 'face' (p. 142).The *swayamsevaks* are ideologically indoctrinated from childhood into a Hindu identity that focuses on inculcating virile masculinity and valorizing an affective brotherhood (p. 142).These are crucial methods used by the RSS to create the ideal Hindu man which is necessary to creatie an ideal Hindu society.

Besides "man-molding" activities, "self-immolation" is also a crucial component of the Hindutva ideology and not surprisingly the RSS ideology. Golwalkar employed the metaphor of 'cellular destruction' to describe the idea of dedicating one's life to Hindutva. He claimed that in the human body, the cell not only feels its identity with the entire body but more importantly is always ready to sacrifice itself for the sake of the health and the growth of the body (Bhatt, 2001, p. 143). The cells in the human body were compared to RSS members who have to undergo the process of self-annihilation and sacrifice for the *sangh* and the Hindu society (p. 143). The literature of the Hindutva movement and the RSS has a narrative that perpetuates the idea that ordinary Hindus were not 'men' but 'dust' who were undisciplined, riddled with 'bad' and disagreeable habits like being effeminate, weak, unhealthy, indolent, selfish, disorganized and unreliable (p. 143). The strict training of the *shakha* gives an individual the necessary incentive

to rub away his angularities, develop mental discipline and not succumb to emotions that will make him a moral wreck (p. 143). The explicit characteristics that are conducive to character building include 'selflessness', 'dedication to social good', 'highest life values', 'discipline', 'obedience', 'confidence' and 'strength' (p. 144). The man-molding activities address mortification that allows the movement to mold people's mental, physical and emotional states to make them a formidable force in the world.

Purification through Scapegoating

As I explained earlier, mortification addresses the issue of guilt but external scapegoating identifies the urge for a group to create a "chosen vessel" to blame everything that is wrong with society. According to Leff (1973), external scapegoating involves three major steps. First, scapegoating occurs when the grievance of injustices are shared by the aggrieved party and the 'chosen vessel' (p. 330). Second, it involves the principle of division which is ritualistic alienation that separates the aggrieved party from the 'chosen vessel' (p. 330). Third, the unification of the pure identity is in opposition to the sacrificial offering which is essential to achieve redemption (p. 330). The external scapegoating of religious minorities is an effective way for Hindutva ideologues to blame everything that is wrong in society on them and to encourage Hindus to take up arms against them.

Both Hindus and the minority groups like Buddhists, Christians and Muslims share grievances because of a problematic history that they share as a nation. Re-writing history, therefore, plays a crucial role in the writings of Savarkar and Golwalkar because both believed that in order for the Hindus to reclaim their land, they should learn history from the Hindu perspective to recognize their true friends and real enemies. They begin the process by painting

88

Buddhism as a derivative of Hinduism, which had distorted the understanding and application of non-violence and compassion, making the country susceptible to attacks from powerful enemies.

Buddhists

While the Hindutva groups consider Buddhism as an indigenous product of Hinduism, Savarkar does not gloss over the conflict that existed between them and merely categorized these conflicts as part and parcel of a thriving civilization. Savarkar blamed the downfall of Hinduism on Buddhism. The fall of Buddhism, according to Savarkar, was a result of its lack of concern for political integrity of its domain. Savarkar basically sums up the entire period of Buddhism in a single instance when the Buddha had supposedly left his home overrun by invaders and failed to check aggressive forces that attacked his people. He argued that when India became a Buddhist nation, its fate was sealed because it was raided by the Huns and Lichis whose "barbarous violence could not be soothed by the mealymouthed formulas of Ahimsa and spiritual brotherhood, whose steel could not be blunted by soft palm leaves and rhymed chants" (Klostermaier, 1994, p. 379). He argued that Buddhist idealism and its attempt to lay the foundation of the kingdom of righteousness through non-violence and meditation was a big mistake from the military and political perspective. He said that the core Buddhist ideals are impractical and harmful to the well-being of Hindu society because it denounced the importance of cultivating military and political cohesion. Hinduism, on the other hand, is deemed superior because it does not discourage violence when the circumstance calls for it and uses relativism to deal with conflict.

While Savarkar blamed Buddhist ideals for the downfall of Hindus, Golwalkar went a step further and added that none of the religions like Buddhism or Jainism preach absolute non-violence because they support violent retaliation under the mode of self-defense. He concluded

that as long as Hindus were acting in self-defense against Indian Muslims and Indian Christians, they were not going against these teachings (Golwalkar, 1939, p. 10). Buddhism is considered an indigenous brother of Hinduism and is not a threat as long as Buddhists do not assert their identity or propagate the views of universal brotherhood, non-violence and compassion in society. Apart from blaming Buddhism for the problems in Hindu society, Savarkar and Golwalkar blamed Muslims and Christians for numerous social ills plaguing the Hindu community.

The historical relationships between Hindus, Muslims as well as Christians are rife with political conflict. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar scapegoat these non-Hindu groups as external aggressors who entered the country with the design to conquer, subjugate and transform it. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar reiterated that the lack of lessons learned by Hindus from the past continues to make them vulnerable to their deception and plans to usurp their land.

Muslims

Muslims have been demonized by the Hindutva movement for many years as external aggressors who entered the country to conquer only to become its citizens later on. According to Golwalkar, the hostile elements within the country pose a greater challenge to its security because the Hindus allowed Muslims to have opportunistic alliances with political parties and groups to further their narrow interests and internal subversion (Golwalkar, 1971). Golwalkar and Savarkar portrayed Muslims as treacherous enemies who entered the country when the Hindu community had not recovered or consolidated its strength after the catastrophic war that lasted for 800 years. Golwalkar (1939) characterized Muslims as formidable opponents who consolidated their power and maintained their strength:

90

But before the fruits of a great victory had gathered, before Nation even had breathing

space to gather strength, to organize the 'State', an unexpected foe from an altogether

unexpected quarter, stealthily, treacherously entered the land and with the help of

Mussalmans and such traitorous scions of the pedigree of a Jaichand Rathod, still existed

and maneuvered and started taking possession of the land. Exhausted as it is with a long

war, the Hindu Nation put up a gallant fight, till its strength was greatly sapped and the

wholly usurped by new invaders. (p. 11)

Golwalkar used this historical incident to categorize Muslims as devious conquerors and prove

the Hindu society's inherent power and ability to resurrect itself in the face of such invasions.

Golwalkar argued that history is replete with numerous Hindu heroes who appeared time and

again to combat treacherous Islamic designs for power. The outcome of this war between Hindus

and Muslims is yet to be decided in spite of the time that has passed since the Muslims entered

the country.

Savarkar, on the other hand, categorized Muslims as invaders who entered the country

under the banner of peace and invariably left a ghastly wound on the psyche of the Hindu

civilization by repeatedly attacking them from within and without for centuries. While the

Muslims were unsuccessful in subjugating Hindus entirely, they managed to create considerable

damage by converting numerous Hindus to Islam and gained a political voice in the country. He

categorized Islam as an inherently violent religion that masquerades as a religion of peace in the

Essentials of Hindutva:

Nations and civilizations fell in heaps before the sword of Islam of Peace! The first time

the sword succeeded in striking but not killing. It grew blunter each time it struck, each

time it cut deep and it was lifted up to strike again the wound stood healed. Vitality of the

victim proved stronger than the vitality of the victor. The contrast was not only grim but was monstrously unequal. It was not a race or a Nation or a people India had to fight. It was nearly Asia, quickly to be followed by nearly all Europe. Religion is a mighty force. So is rapine. But where religion is goaded on by rapine and rapine serves as a handmaiden, the propelling force that is generated by these together is only equaled by the profundity of human misery and devastation they leave behind in their march. (Savarkar, 1923, p. 19)

Muslims are considered as fundamentally different from other indigenous religions, implying that they are "outsiders" who don't belong in India and can never be trusted completely. He described Muslims as aggressive invaders and Hindus as sacrificial lambs that are going to be slaughtered if they continue to appease them at the cost of national security.

The strategy of Muslim aggression was described by Golwalkar in *Bunch of Thoughts*, as a continual threat to the wellbeing of Hindusthan. He explained that the Muslims work covertly as well as directly to subjugate Hindusthan:

Their aggressive strategy has always been twofold. One is direct aggression in the pre-independence days which was appropriately called 'direct action' by Jinnah resulted in the formation of Pakisthan. Our leaders were party to the creation of a Pakisthan but the naked fact remains that the Muslim state has been carved out of our own motherland. From the day Pakistan came into existence, we in the Sangh have been declaring that it has been a clear case of continued Muslim aggression. (p. 149)

Golwalkar portrayed the Muslim community with an unquenchable desire for power that continually grew ever since they invaded the nation many centuries ago. He pointed out that they failed to enslave the entire nation according to plan because Hindus were naturally resilient. The

92

establishment of Pakistan was considered the first successful step to realize a twelve hundred year old dream of Islamic domination of the Indian subcontinent in the twentieth century. The second kind of Muslim aggression is covert and involves fostering people in strategic locations to attack the country from within.

As per Golwalkar's understanding, the covert operation by Muslims is the most dangerous peril that India faces today. Covert operations are likened to a ticking time-bomb that is well concealed and difficult to find. Golwalkar claimed that Muslims are not above using places of worship for propaganda or increasing their population by procreation to create a majority in different parts of the country for the purpose of cessation. Golwalkar (1949) argued that other states would be the next Kashmir if Hindus did not beware of these covert operations:

> The second front of their aggression is increasing their number in strategic areas of our country. After Kashmir, Assam is their next target. They have systematically been flooding Assam, Tripura and the rest of Bengal for long. It is not because, as some of us would like to believe, East Pakistan is in the grips of famine that people are coming away to Assam and West Bengal. The Pakistani Muslims have been infiltrating Assam for the past fifteen years; does it mean famine has been stalking Pakistan for all these fifteen years? They are entering Assam surreptiously and the local Muslims are sheltering them. As a result the percentage of Muslims there which was only 11 % in 1950 has now more than doubled. What else is this but a conspiracy to make Assam a Muslim majority province so that it would automatically fall into the Pakistan in due course of time? (p. 149)

Golwalkar warned the Hindus that Indian Muslims were working in cahoots with Muslims outside the country to fulfill the age old desire to turn India into an Islamic nation. He invoked

history to prove that the misguided trust of the Hindus has always earned more treachery and dubious promises instead of genuine patriotism. If Muslim aggression remained unchecked, then India will be divided into various Muslim provinces which will eventually secede from India like Kashmir in 1947.

Golwalkar and Savarkar misused history to persuade their audience about the real intentions of non-indigenous minorities who entered the subcontinent with immoral designs. According to Burns (2008), the relationship between the psychology of religion and other aspects of life involves seeing old things in a new way because something is sacred only when it allows people to indulge in idealization (p. 84). Religious fanaticism is generally fueled by idealization and people use religion as an object of idealization to develop and maintain a healthy sense of self (p. 85). The Hindutva movement idealizes history, social order and ownership of the land in religious terms and perpetuates its viewpoint as the absolute truth that splits the world into 'good' versus 'evil' and 'us' versus 'them' categories (p. 85). Casting Muslims as predators who inflict damage on the Hindu psyche and wage covert wars to take over the country is a form of psychological warfare that the Hindutva movement carries out against religious minorities. Golwalkar's demonization of Muslims as the "other" is an important aspect of this psychological warfare against them. Golwalkar (1966) cited numerous examples in which he depicted Muslims as inherently intolerant and violent individuals who systematically curb the freedoms and rights of the Hindus that are an overwhelming majority in the country:

> How is it that they dare to carry out these offensive and anti-national activities openly? It is because our government openly and covertly supports them. Though the high courts have upheld the fundamental rights of the citizens to go in procession with band in all roads, the Government under the discretionary powers vested in the executive for

94

regulating processions in the interest of peace and order, often prevents Hindus altogether

from taking out processions in streets where Masjids happen to be situated. That could set

a premium on those who want to violate peace. The law-abiding citizens are told to

restrict themselves, and those who are out to indulge in violence are given a free hand to

do what they like. This is in a way admitting, though indirectly, that the general law of

the land is to be enforced only with certain modifications and the whims of the

miscreants have to be given the final say. Such pockets have become centers for

widespread network of pro-Pakistani elements in this land. (p. 153)

Golwalkar believed that the reconciliatory and tolerant perspective of Hindus towards Muslims

has made them preys to violent miscreants who took advantage of their generosity. He reiterated

that Muslims created Pakistan in 1947 as a starting point to indulge in further aggression.

Muslims will stop being a threat when they assimilate through conversion and adopt Hindu

culture and religion.

The prerequisites stated by Savarkar and Golwalkar can never be fulfilled unless they

absolve all ties to their religious and cultural heritage. Golwalkar argued that religion is a matter

of personal choice and yet denied Muslims any other ancestry or associations that are foreign to

India. The Hindutva perspective is that the majority's way of life should not be subject to

changes or influences from religious minorities. The changes in Hindu customs, traditions,

original dress and thoughts are said to have contributed to the current dilemma in Hindu national

life. The logical fallacy with this perspective is that the so-called individual choices become non-

existent when an individual assimilates, because the Hindutva ideologues consider Muslims and

Christians as original Hindus who were forced to convert to Islam and Christianity by devious

95

and forceful methods. Therefore, they would have to convert to Hinduism through 'shuddhi' to come back to the Hindu fold again.

Savarkar and Golwalkar argued that India can never be a peaceful nation as long as Islam and Christianity remain a major part of the national landscape. They associated Islam with irrationality, intolerance, bigotry and hatred which means it is not conducive to a peaceful national life. By associating Islam with irrationality, Hinduism becomes the alternative and rational option which every individual should follow and accept to become a part of the national life. Golwalkar propagated the idea that Muslims are ruled by irrational ideas and must forego all religious and cultural aspects of their life which are detrimental to the nation. Muslims cannot be a part of the Indian national consciousness while retaining their individual identity because being a Muslim automatically makes someone believes in a foreign religion and foreign culture. The Hindutva movement derides Muslims as a disingenuous community that operates on questionable motives and morals. For instance, Hindutva ideologues cast aspersions on Muslims who were involved in the Indian freedom struggle and attributed ulterior motives to their noble endeavors. He questioned the validity and veracity of Muslim patriotism during and after partition by stating that being a Hindu is synonymous with being an Indian and the two are not mutually exclusive. Muslims would have to adopt the Hindu way of life if they want to be known as true patriots of the country.

Savarkar's perception on Hindu-Muslim identity was not optimistic. He was adamant that Hindu-Muslim unity could come about only when Muslims unite with Hindus to serve the nation without making any anti-national demands. Savarkar (1949) spoke about it from a utilitarian perspective in his Presidential address at the Hindu Mahasabha in 1937:

Let the Hindus remember that the real cause of this mischief is nothing else but the

hankering of the Hindus behind the Will-O-Wisp of a Hindu-Muslims unity. The day we

gave the Mohammadeans to understand that independence cannot be won unless and until

they obliged the Hindus by making a common cause with them, the day we rendered an

honorable unity impossible. When an overwhelming majority in a country goes on its

knees in front of a minority that is so antagonistic, imploring them to lend a healthy

relationship and assures that otherwise the majority community is doomed, it would be a

wonder if the minor community does not sell their assistance to the highest bidder

possible and aim to establish their own political sovereignty in their land. But knowing

full well the anti-Indian designs of the Pan-Islamic movement and bound by their

offensive and defensive alliances as well as their ferocious tendencies to oppress the

Hindus out of religious and racial hatred, we Hindus are not going to trust you with any

more blank cheques. (p. 12)

The Hindu-Muslim unity can be a reality only if the Muslims pursue it without any demands or

compromises and give up their fanatical tendencies to conquer the country under the guise of

self-protection. Savarkar stated that the Hindus have never been wanting in reciprocity when it

comes to the issue of Hindu-Muslim unity and blamed Muslims for making unreasonable

demands and having anti-Indian designs by covertly operating with other Muslim countries to

take over India. Savarkar believed that the Muslims and Hindus cannot co-exist since the two

groups will forever be divided by centuries of religious, cultural and national differences.

The Hindutva movement however does not hold other religious minorities with the same

degree of contempt. Savarkar shifted responsibility from the Hindutva groups for their

problematic attitude towards Muslims by addressing the manner in which non-Muslim minorities

97

did not merit similar treatment because they are not antagonistic towards Hindus. In a speech from 1937, Savarkar (1949) outlined the benign nature of the minorities who were not interested in usurping the country:

> So far as the other minorities are concerned, there cannot be much difficulty in arriving at an Indian National consolidation. The Parsees have ever been working shoulder to shoulder with Hindus against the English domination. They are no fanatics. The Parsees have neither contributed their quota to true Indian patriots but they have also not displayed anything but goodwill towards Hindu Nation which is the veritable savior of their race. Culturally too, they are most closely akin to us. In a lesser degree, the same could be said about Indian Christians who have done little to contribute to the national struggle, yet they have not acted like a millstone round our neck. They are less fanatical and more amenable to political reason than the Muslims. The Jews are few in number and not antagonistic to our national aspirations. All these minorities are sure to behave as honest and patriotic citizens of the Indian state. (p. 13)

Unlike Golwalkar, Savarkar was willing to give all non-Muslim minorities the benefit of the doubt by portraying them as benign influences that are not a threat to Hindu interests. The Muslims were considered an imminent threat to the future of the country after ousting the British. In order for India to remain a unified and homogenous state, no specific group or section of the population should get special weightage or privilege to demonstrate their loyalty. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar concluded that Muslims are a grave threat to Hindus because their communal nature constantly seeks special privileges and rights in exchange for patriotism. The Christians unlike the Muslims have been treated with lesser distrust and contempt by Savarkar

98

but Golwalkar categorized them as a treacherous lot who use the guise of charity and compassion to prey on gullible Hindus to amass more converts.

Christians

The Christians, unlike the Muslims were not always subject to such harsh rhetoric until much later. In fact, Savarkar considered Christians a benign religious minority who did not pose any threat to Hindus. Golwalkar categorizes Indian Christians as people who use 'compassion' and 'service' as a cover to fulfill ulterior motives. Golwalkar (1966) argued that the surreptitious tactics used to convert Hindus to Christianity would demolish the Hindu way of life in *Bunch of Thoughts*:

> Towards that end they feel any tactic, however foul is fair. The various surreptitious and mean tactics they employed for conversion are all too well known. It is through such tactics that they are swelling their numbers day in and day out. Many leading Christian missionaries have declared unequivocally that their single aim is to make this country a 'province of the Kingdom of Christ'. What does all this mean? It means that all the people in this country should be converted to Christianity. That their hereditary, culture, religion, philosophy and way of life should be demolished and they should become absorbed in a world federation of Christianity. (p. 156)

He argued that Christians have political ambition which operates under the guise of compassionate religious service and lacks true religious merit to imbue people with tolerance, compassion and moral rectitude. Using force to make people practice Christianity as a way of life negates choice and true understanding of the spirit of the religion. To rob the 'other' religions of any noble or aspiritational purpose is a way of devaluing it. Golwalkar (1966) does this effectively in *Bunch of thoughts*:

The way they are behaving towards other people forces us to conclude that modern

proselytizing religion have very little of true religion. In the name of God, prophet and

religion, they are only trying to further their political ambition. In true religion, there is

no need for proselytization, no change in the way of worship. Our religious missionaries

who reached distant lands did not force their religion on other people. On the contrary,

without negating their mode of worship, our great teacher tried to make it more sublime

by fortifying it with an all-comprehensive philosophy to inculcate in them noble and

chaste qualities. That was real dharma. Truly, there was but one true Christian and he

died on the Cross! (p. 156)

Golwalkar categorized activities of the Christian missionaries as both irreligious and anti-

national. The Hindutva ideologues consider re-conversion of Indian Muslims and Indian

Christians as an assertion and reclamation of the Hindu might. The work of Hindu missionaries

was conveniently deemed sublime and benign while the actions of the Christian missionaries

were associated with intimidation and temptation since they speak to the disenfranchised parts of

Indian society. The 'shuddhi' movement, popularized by Adi Shankaracharya originated from

the desire to increase the numerical strength of Hindus and fortify their determinacy and self-

worth. 'Shuddhi' was born to elevate those who are part of the lower rungs of the caste system

and condemned the lower caste practices as 'immoral' or 'indecent' to enforce social behavior

and practices that favor 'purity' and 'sobriety'.

Religious conversion is in and of itself problematic in India. The Hindutva movement

demonizes this practice as 'unethical' and yet justifies Hindu conversions as a benign and

necessary tactic of political machination to restore Hindu potency and legitimacy. The practice of

'shuddhi' runs contradictory to the Hindu philosophy which espouses the idea that all religions

are different paths that lead to the same destination. Therefore, all religions merit respect. Savarkar and Golwalkar believed that assimilation of the religious minorities is possible through the practice of 'shuddhi' because it provides a 'rational' and a 'practical' way of accomplishing unity or "oneness" with the nation. 'Shuddhi' in Golwalkar's view enables religious minorities to become one with the ancestral Hindu heritage and way of life without inculcating strict social structures that isolate them from mainstream society. True national integration is possible only if people cultivate a "common emotion" of burning devotion along with feelings of fellowship and awareness of a common heritage, culture, history, ideals and aspirations (Golwalkar, 1971). The underlying point about conversion is the symbolic violence that is inflicted on other religions in the name of protecting and safeguarding the majority in the country.

After mortification and scapegoating, the final step in the guilt-redemption cycle is redemption. Redemption is the motivational 'pay-off' for audiences to engage in victimage (through mortification or scapegoating) to restore order. Redemption unfolds with a "change in identity, a new perspective, or a feeling of moving forward towards a goal or a better life in general" (Foss, Foss and Trap, 2002, p. 211).

Redemption

The Hindutva movement perpetuates guilt in the Hindu psyche through internalization, repression and external scapegoating. The Hindutva ideologues lay some blame on misguided Hindus and provide ways to purge guilt through self-sacrifice, self-imposed denials, restrictions and self-inflicted punishments to destroy impulses and characteristics that lead them to their current predicament. The Muslims and Christians can atone their sins only if they accept their mistakes and merge into the Hindu fold. Purification through victimage is a symbolic means to hold others accountable for their actions, which means that the scapegoats have to undergo

101

punishment for their wrongdoings. Before discussing the redemption of Muslims and Christians, I will focus on how Hindus can rectify their errors and return to the Hindutva way of life through mortification to reclaim their rightful place in Indian society. The notion of "purifying" society is crucial to redemption and the Hindutva movement focuses on accomplishing this either through conversion, which represents symbolic slaying, or through violence if the strategy of 'shuddhi' fails to bring the desired outcome. Therefore, even in mortification, violence is considered an inevitable outcome.

Both Savarkar and Golwalkar believed that the notion of absolute non-violence is completely unsuitable to deal with the social realities that face Hindus today. They pointed out that absolute non-violence is nothing but mere fantasy because the real world operates on the instinct of self-preservation. Savarkar believed that Hindus could survive as a race only by marshaling their virile masculinity, militarism, incredible discipline and complete national unity. Savarkar and Golwalkar believed embracing violence is practical and essential for the existence and self-preservation of Hindus. The following passage by Savarkar (1949) clearly emphasized his position on the inevitability of violence in human history:

> Call it a law of nature or will of God as you like it, the iron fact remains that there is no room for absolute non-violence in nature. Man could not have saved himself from utter extinction nor could have but led the precarious and wretched life of a coward and a worm had he not succeeded in adding the strength of artificial arms to his natural aim. In those Geological periods, he was surrounded by such ferocious brute and serpentine order that he found himself, the weakest being; physically the most unfit to survive in contest during struggle for existence. It was only his capacity to invent artificial weapons to add to the strength of his natural limbs that man should cope with tigers and lions and wolves

102

and serpents and crocodiles and could snatch the mastery of the earth and the water from

his wild enemies. Throughout the Paleolithic periods, the Bronze Age and the Iron Age,

man could maintain himself, multiply and master this earth chiefly through his armed

strength. Verily the Defensive Sword was the Savior of man! (p. 84)

Savarkar perpetrated the idea that violence is the natural order of self-preservation and is integral

to the strength and survival of Hindu civilization. Savarkar argued that human beings should not

tame their natural instincts and must obey it instead of 'conquering' it. Savarkar used this idea to

arouse "fiery inspiration" to sustain faith among Hindus with the conviction that revolutionary

movements involve organized political and military rising to infuse "hallowed martyrdom" into

people.

Savarkar was adamant about moral relativism and believed it is necessary for Hindus to

understand that violence is the natural course of life. He argued that the desire to follow absolute

non-violence is nothing but a misguided fantasy that could destroy Hindus and render them

defenseless in the face of aggression. Savarkar presented a persuasive argument for relative

violence by decrying absolute non-violence as an impractical ideal. In this excerpt from his

Presidential speech during the 22nd Hindu Mahasabha session, Savarkar (1949) used the

utilitarian principle to explain his views on absolute non-violence:

If a serpent finds its way slyly into a pack of children sleeping soundly or a mad dog

rushes all of a sudden foaming with insane exasperation into a crowded fair and you do

not kill it there and then even when you can, on the principle of absolute non-violence,

you abet the murderous violence which the serpent or the mad dog commits by biting

innocent human beings to death, you are criminally doubly guilty in refusing to save the

life to spare the life of the serpent or the dog and leave it free to take more human lives at

leisure. On the contrary if you kill the serpent and the dog there and then you are still guilty of violence from the point of your own principle of absolute non-violence of killing no living being. Even this one illustration is enough to prove that absolute non-violence is not only absolutely impracticable but anti-human and therefore absolutely immoral. What holds good for these individual cases also holds true for a nation. It must be noted in this connection that even those religions which put the virtue of absolute non-violence above all virtues had to admit exceptions and did not or could not assert the absolute non-violence condemning all armed resistance whatsoever even to incorrigible aggression constituted a virtue. (p. 83)

The notion that violence is admitted under certain circumstances is a way for Savarkar to argue that when people are attacked by a snake or a dog, the act of killing the creature is not tantamount to violence if it is done with the purpose of protecting others. Not killing the creature would mean the person is abetting in killing his fellow beings. So, the person who wants to practice absolute non-violence will not be able to put this principle into practice because not killing the animal would make him/her indirectly responsible for the deaths of those individuals that he/she did not protect. Can a person really claim to practice absolute pacifism in the face of threats of injustice and aggression? The Hindutva movement answers this question by deriding absolute pacifism as something that is not observable in nature. Savarkar argued that violence is organic to nature because it is necessary for the preservation of the species. Man has survived danger by using violence as a defense mechanism to protect his kind. Savarkar argued that the best and the most effective offense is defense because acting in defense constitutes being non-aggressive. Savarkar equated relative non-violence with the survival and preservation of the

Hindu way of life. He said that violence has always been a part of the natural order of things and the practice of absolute non-violence goes against reason and morality.

Savarkar even defined when the loss of life is an act of 'self-sacrifice' or 'self-immersion' to encourage people to dedicate their lives to the Hindu cause. 'Self-sacrifice' is crucial to the Hindutva movement's message of loyalty and service to the country. The notion of 'self-sacrifice' or 'self-immersion' has important implications because the sublimation of the individual and his/her personal desires is in keeping with the collective goal of dedicating one's life to building a Hindu Nation. 'Self-sacrifice' is an important ideal that reverberates through Savarkar's writings which is in keeping with the notion of *dharma.* In order to fulfill one's *dharma,* self-sacrifice is imperative to motivate others to participate in a righteous war to achieve retributive justice. He used numerous examples to denote that sacrificing lives for a righteous cause is not tantamount to suicide, but a sacrifice for the greater good, which is bigger than themselves. He explained this point in the following passage:

> Not all acts of willful termination of one's life are condemned as 'suicides'. Those who
> end their lives in a spirit of frustration, dissatisfaction or discontentment and cannot live
> happily even though they so wish are said to have committed 'suicide'. But those who
> happily end their lives with the blessed sense of having fulfilled their life-mission or
> objective are said to have committed self-sacrifice. Though this changing and evolving
> earthly world can never be said to have achieved perfection, blessed souls voluntarily end
> their lives with the realization that they have nothing left to achieve or fulfill. (Savarkar,
> 1964)

This principle of martyrdom is integral to the *Ksatriya* or a warrior in the *Gita* because he sacrifices his life on the battlefield for a just cause. According to Savarkar, the willful

termination of life after having fulfilled one's mission is not tantamount to suicide which is often

committed out of frustration and defeat in life. This recurring theme of foregoing individual

desires and rights in favor of collective unity and national strength is the basis of 'rational

utilitarianism.' The life mission of Hindus is to establish the Hindu way of life in India at the

cost of their individual freedoms, rights and even lives.

While violence is central to mortification, it is even more important to scapegoating if

redemption is to take place successfully. As I examined in the second chapter earlier, the

Hindutva movement was strongly influenced by European nationalistic movements like Fascism

and Nazism. Savarkar's views on violence are very similar to those of Hitler and Mussolini who

derided the idea of perpetual peace in society. Savarkar's reading of Indian history also reflects

this attitude because he described a series of historical events as foreign aggressions to put forth

the argument that Hindu civilization has triumphed over all of them.

Savarkar's emphasis on aggression ensured that the Buddhist period between Mauryan

era (321-185 BC) and the Mughal Sultanate (1526-1858 AD) barely received any coverage in his

historical scheme. The references to Buddhism demonize its universal, non-violent approach as a

reason for emasculating and demeaning the Hindu martial spirit. Savarkar's disinheritance of

Buddhism underscores his opposition to pacifism advocated by Gandhism, which was typified

during the thirties and forties. Savarkar contrasted these "negative ideals" with his cultural

nationalism that is masculine, aggressive, and anti-Muslim based on rationalism and progressive

agenda.

Violence was a constant refrain in Savarkar's recounting of history and he managed to

divide the entire world in terms of 'friend' and 'foe.' It is immaterial who the 'foe' was as long

as an enemy could be found at all times. The Hindutva movement follows this strategy as a

blueprint to create a new enemy to scapegoat. Therefore, external scapegoating through violence

is a natural progression for the movement towards any group that poses a threat to or an

alternative to the Hindutva worldview.

Savarkar's Redemption through Violence

Savarkar made relative non-violence a natural course of action that the Hindus should

adopt to survive attacks from Indian Muslims, Indian Christians and other nations that want to

take over India. He argued that if violence is a natural course of action necessary to preserve the

social order, then it is a rational and moral method to resolve issues in present times. Something

that held humankind in good stead in ancient times is deemed valid for dealing with differences

and conflicts in civilized society. In a speech, Savarkar (1949) argued that the "iron law of

nature", which involves violence cannot be unwritten or changed by man and predicted a

doomsday scenario if Hindus exercise absolute non-violence in their dealings with others:

> What held in man's struggle with the brute world continued to be true throughout his
>
> society in the struggle of clan against clan, race against race, nation against nation. The
>
> lesson is branded on every page of human history down to the last page that nations
>
> which, other things equal, are superior in military strength are bound to survive, flourish
>
> and dominate while those who are militarily weak shall be politically subjugateded or
>
> cease to exist at all. It is idle to say, we shall add a new chapter to history but you cannot
>
> add to or take away a syllable from the iron law of Nature itself. In face of such an iron
>
> law of nature, can anything be more immoral and sinful than to preach a principle as anti-
>
> human as that of absolute non-violence condemning all armed resistance even to
>
> aggression? (p. 85)

Savarkar argued that to tamper with the natural order and way of life is impractical and dangerous for Hindus because the 'inimical forces' within the country are supposedly violent towards Hindus. An implicit message is that violence must be contained and countered with violence if the welfare of the larger society depends upon it. If the "iron law of nature" takes this course of action for the purpose of self-protection and self-preservation, then how can humankind choose to go against this law and validate absolute non-violence? If violence is a natural law of the world, the aspiration to become absolutely non-violent is not a moral doctrine.

Savarkar addressed the reason for why absolute pacifism is held in high-esteem and is perceived as a virtue rather than a vice by society. Condemning absolute non-violence as an impractical aspiration was necessary to remove this doctrine's association with greatness, excellence and superhuman sanctity because this bolsters its legitimacy in the eyes of the Hindu community. He spoke of the dangers of Indian obsession with absolute non-violence in the Hindu Mahasabha Presidential speech:

> Seeing that even their opponents on practical grounds attribute to them a superhuman saintliness owing to the very eccentricity of their doctrine, they grow and have the insane temerity to preach it in all seriousness to the Indian public. The best means of freeing India from the foreign yoke is the spinning-wheel. Not only that but even after India becomes independent there would not be any necessity of maintaining a single armed soldier or a single warship to protect her frontier. Your doctrine of absolute non-violence is not an outcome of any saintliness but of insanity. It requires no ingenuity on your part to tell us that if but all men observe absolute non-violence, there will be no war in the world and no necessity of any armed forces just as it requires no extraordinary insight to maintain that if men learn to live forever mankind will be free from death. We denounce

your doctrine of absolute non-violence not because we are less saintly but because we are

more sensible than you are. (Savarkar, 1949, p. 85)

Savarkar believed that relative non-violence could become a part of the Hindu psyche when

absolute non-violence is rendered impractical and its inculcation is no longer associated with

being noble or saintly. He undermined the moral values, rationality and practicality of the pursuit

of absolute non-violence by calling it an act of insanity that would endanger the entire nation. He

derided the possibility that the doctrine of absolute non-violence can elevate or transform the

fundamental aspect of human nature to engage in violence and wage wars.

Savarkar (1949) argued that Hindus can truly redeem themselves by re-animating their

martial spirit through relative non-violence. The Hindus must denounce the illogical notion of

absolute non-violence which is associated with the cultivation of the 'higher self.' He

encouraged Hindus to re-learn the lessons of virility and masculinity that would make them

unconquerable and also enable them to conquer those who pose a threat to Hindus:

Manu and Sri Krishna are our law givers and Sri Rama commander of our forces. Let us

re-learn the manly lessons they taught us and our Hindu Nation shall prove again as

unconquerable and conquering a race as we proved once when they led us: conquering

those who dared to be aggressive against and refraining ourselves, not out of weakness

but out of magnanimity, from any unjustifiable designs of aggression against the

unoffending. (p. 86)

Savakar believed that the British aided Hindus in their pursuit of non-violence because it made

them less powerful, more vulnerable and a lesser threat to British in the subcontinent. He

enforced the fact that Gandhi and Congress were allowed to preach the doctrine of absolute non-

violence makes it incumbent upon the Hindu Sangathanists to offer legitimate opposition by arousing militant enthusiasm amongst Hindus.

Savarkar believed that adoption of relative non-violence is crucial for Hindus to find their 'martial spirit' and become a militarized and industrialized nation. He believed this is the only strategy that would enable Hindus to find redemption. He advocated that if Hindus embraced relative non-violence, they could utilize opportunities available during the Second World War to become an industrialized and militarized nation (Savarkar, 1939, p.86). The Congress party failed to promote or safeguard Hindu military interests whereas the Muslims apparently did not have any inclination to participate in the non-violent, non-resistant, non-cooperation freedom movement and monopolized opportunities to enroll in the Indian army and armed police (p. 86). Savarkar (1939) wanted the Hindus to make the best of the war to have advantage over their foes:

> The Hindus can best utilize the war situation by helping on their part the militarization and industrialization of India which the British on their side are also eager to effect for their own interests. And again, just think of the fact, that even if you Hindus refuse to join the army or the navy or the air force or the factories of war materials, the only immediate result will be that the Moslems will get into the saddle and instead of weakening the British Government you will find that you have strengthened a second enemy who is no less bent upon subjecting you to helotage in your own land. (p. 91)

Savarkar argued that the refusal of Hindus to indulge in industrialization and militarization provides Muslims with the fodder and the opportunity to optimize the situation, accumulate strength, and become lethal adversaries to the Hindus in the future. He suggested that all Hindus should enlist in the army, navy and air force apart from making military training compulsory in

colleges and high schools (p. 93). Apart from being "military minded", Savarkar believed that establishing the Hindu way of life in political, cultural, religious and social spheres is essential for Hindus to reclaim what is rightfully theirs. After examining Savarkar's views on absolute pacifism and Hindu martial spirit, I will explain how Golwalkar justified violence for the purpose of retaliatory justice.

Savarkar claimed that the militarization of Hindus is essential because they are defenseless against enemies like Muslims who in his opinion are formidable because of their social cohesion and valorous fervor guided by political and religious fervor of Islam. Underlying the idea of militarization is revenge which for Savarkar was the establishment of natural law and justice. The only way Hindus can truly redeem themselves is by righting the wrongs perpetrated by their enemies. Revenge is impossible to achieve unless Hindus become more 'manly', discard impractical notions like compassion to embrace a masculine ideology that would consolidate them into a cohesive group. Revenge is emphasized by Savarkar in his writings because he believed that the past wrongs should be accounted for through revenge in present times.

After examining Savarkar's perspective on violence and the manner in which violence is deemed necessary to achieve redemption, we will focus on Golwalkar's perspective on violence.

Golwalkar's Redemption through Violence

Golwalkar's perspective on the use of violence to establish retributive justice is very similar to Savarkar's views because he also used revisionist history to establish the idea that Hindus were a martial race misguided by ideas of absolute non-violence and compassion that made their martial spirit dormant. Golwalkar (1942) talked extensively about the great thinkers, statesmen, warriors and heroes of the Hindu race who had great armies at their command. The lack of national consciousness undermined the Hindu martial spirit and the courageous attitude

necessary to defend their honor. This excerpt from an interview in 1942 emphasized the significance of national consciousness in creating organized strength:

> We never realized the secret of organized strength and hence we lost our freedom and peace though always numerically superior to any invading force, for want of organized life. We had no use of our great Hindu majority which otherwise could have been our unique asset. Do we not find that, even in provinces where the Hindus are in overwhelming majority, Hindus live under a constant dread of a handful of Muslims? Even a solitary Muslim goonda (hooligan) feels confident that he can terrorize the whole Hindu population of a place. Every Hindu feels that he is alone and single-handed though the truth is otherwise. This feeling is responsible for the atmosphere of dread and cowardice prevalent in our midst. Not only that our elders do their best to prevent the younger section from acquiring courageous attitude in this matter, they are always discouraged from doing anything for the defense of their honour. It should be our effort therefore, to fight out these unworthy and perverted ideas and replace them by healthy and proper outlook, if we have to put a stop to our downfall.

Golwalkar like Savarkar believed that Hindus should awaken their martial spirit and acquire courageous attitude. Relative violence propounded by the *Gita* is considered the means by which to defeat aggressive religious minorities who make inroads into Indian politics and ask for minority privileges. The idea that violence is not harmful if people indulge in it for the right reasons is compelling and persuasive to those who are reluctant to indulge in this behavior from a moral viewpoint. Violence isn't really considered violence if it becomes an act of devotion when performed in the line of duty in the interest of maintaining the social order.

Even though Golwalkar did not write extensively about violence, he perceived relative violence as a necessity to deal with those sections of society that don't adopt the Hindutva ideology. His perspective is clear in an interview entitled *Issues with Indian Muslims* in 1970:

> Beating is of two kinds. A mother beating her child and an enemy striking a man. We have not done any beating. But if and when we do teach by beating, it will be like a mother's love and solicitude of the child's welfare.

He made a similar claim in another interview about the position violence occupies in a democracy:

> Q: Is there any place for violence in the life of a society?
>
> A: Yes, but it should be used as a surgeon's knife. Even as a surgeon uses his knife to perform an operation to get rid of an infected portion to save the patient, so also violence in certain extraordinary circumstances can be used to cure the society of any malady that needs such surgical intervention. Further, certain other conditions should be fulfilled. One who applies violence should have perfect control over it, should know when, where, to what extent and how far to apply it, when to end it and how to repair the damage caused, if any.

Golwalkar's notion on violence aligns with the literal interpretation of *Gita* that states that violence is to be used as the last resort to resolve conflicts after exhausting every other tool available to diffuse a situation. Violence, when used to get rid of a specific malady, does not make it a product of animal instinct but an act conditioned by reason and justice. Relative violence in Golwalkar's estimate makes room for 'extraordinary situations' and enables people to 'purify' society by purging its dangerous elements. Simply put, the power of devotion elevates violence into an act of self-surrender, so the people perpetrating it don't have to bear

113

responsibility for it. Golwalkar perceived society as a living organism that manifests the divine, which means individuals must worship society with "inner feeling of oneness" and devote themselves to its betterment without reservations. Since society is the manifestation of the divine, the individual should maintain social order—the hierarchy established initially in the guilt-redemption cycle—and devote to the 'religious duty' of protecting society against the 'evil' and 'aggressive' elements in society. Golwalkar (1949) pointed out that Hindus could only take back what is rightfully theirs if they become a strong nation. He described his foresight on achieving redemption in the following passage from *Bunch of Thoughts*:

> Whatever the external conditions, it is the weak who suffer. No amount of external adjustments or juxtapositions will be able to save a nation if it is inherently weak. To remain weak is the most heinous sin in this world, as that would destroy oneself and also incite feelings of violence in others. Our forefathers have said physical violence is part of the highest religion and for physical survival strength is the only basis. We have begun to look upon strength as 'violence' and glorify our weakness. A person sufficiently strong to practice violence but does not do so out of restraint, discretion and compassion can alone be said to be practicing violence. The atmosphere of our country is charged with such misconceptions and platitudes of self-deception. (p. 212)

Golwalkar associated 'violence' with strength and qualities like compassion with weakness. He encouraged Hindus to become inherently strong so that they will always be able to deal with aggressors with violence when necessary. He argued that Hindus can achieve redemption if they inculcate "strength" and do not embrace absolute non-violence which makes them weak and invites the wrath of the strong.

The persistent theme of 'humiliated masculinity' is always present in the Hindutva narrative of history. The Hindutva revision of history focuses on how Hindus have been subordinated for centuries and their masculinities insulted primarily because they were not aggressive or violent enough to subdue their enemies. While Golwalkar decried the violence perpetrated by conquerors, he encouraged Hindu men to emulate aggressive tendencies and warlike demeanor of their enemies. Savarkar and Golwalkar always emphasized valor, military might and strength of Hindus and undermined any qualities that geared people towards absolute non-violence, compassion and tolerance.

The Hindutva rhetoric thus motivates the pursuit of an idyllic Hindu society where Hindus dominate the political, cultural and historical landscape of the country at the cost of the rights and well being of religious minorities. The pursuit of an idyllic Hindu society is about establishing a hierarchy to ensure that the Hindus are the masters of the country; every time the order is disrupted, the guilt-redemption-purification cycle would ensure that ensuing guilt motivates the tactics of victimage and redemption discussed here.

After examining the various ways in which the Hindutva movement advocates and justifies violence, I conclude with the final chapter that deals with the summary and implications of this analysis.

CONCLUSION

This chapter summarizes the purpose and the implications of analyzing Hindutva movement. I will address the purpose of this study, the significance of studying this movement, the method of analysis and the findings that involve the justification to propagate violence. The chapter also concludes with the implications of studies like this, including how Gandhi's use of the comic frame during Indian independence provides an alternative rhetorical orientation toward addressing Indian character, nationality, and identity.

I chose to study the Hindutva movement because it has become more prominent and has gained greater momentum since the eighties for its communal violence against Indian Muslims and Indian Christians. It has grown more resilient and powerful in recent years by mandating its ideology in every sphere of Indian society, by repeatedly resurrecting itself with renewed enthusiasm to realize its dangerous designs. The movement is rhetorically interesting because it does not conform to the standards of a Western social movement. It does not fall under the umbrella of a particular person or head since numerous people have emerged at its helm at different times to address complex issues regarding Hindu identity and history. The movement does not have a linear structure since numerous organizations emerged simultaneously to take care of different facets of Indian society. The first chapter focuses on the various rhetorical theorists who helped us understand the manner in which definition of a social movement evolved. We discovered that the rhetorical critics have not yet studied such a movement to analyze the role of persuasion in social movements. Traditionally, rhetorical theorists studied movements by focusing on a particular text or a single speech instead of focusing on the bigger picture of a movement that use tools of persuasion to accumulate and motivate followers. The Hindutva movement spans many decades, and has undergone many changes through

unconventional methods of gathering, training, recruiting and communicating with people that belong to numerous factions. I conclude that the standard tools of rhetorical analysis normally used by critics to study Western movements are ill-suited for studying the complexity and the grand flow of Hindutva movement.

The Hindutva movement also presents unique problems that don't allow the application of tools advocated by Western rhetoricians for critical assessment. The movement lacks a cohesive structure, lacks a single overarching idea or ideology, has had numerous cross-pressures which complicate the typical definition of a leader and uses expedient methods borrowed and inspired from other ideological movements to formulate unconventional structures. Given that these unconventional aspects cannot be adequately addressed by the typical rhetorical tools used to study social movements, I shift my perspective from traditional tools that focus on leadership and historical context to focus on moral striving and perfection advocated by Cathcart. I use Burke's guilt-redemption-purification cycle to understand the movement's ability to persuade others to engage in violence.

The guilt-redemption-purification cycle explains how movements use rhetorical devices to motivate an audience to take a particular course of action: victimage that allows for the return to a rhetorically idealized order through mortification or scapegoating. This concept enables me to understand and examine the relationship between Hindutva movement and its audience. I also take into account the fact that Hindu nationalism has a history and an influence beyond the Hindutva movement, which has left an indelible mark on the Hindu psyche for centuries. In some ways, I modeled this study after Burke's own famous 'Rhetoric of Hilter's Battle,' where he set out to analyze a destructive text advocating violence with the intention of identifying the

117

rhetorical structures at work in such a text, hoping to identify and in the future become aware of similar uses of rhetoric.

The second chapter deals with the historical landscape of the Hindutva movement and the influences that have shaped its ideology. The Hindutva movement is a multi-dimensional movement that does not conform to the general perspective of what constitutes a 'social movement' because it has assimilated numerous influences and survived various ups and downs since 1850. This chapter examines the distinction between Hindutva and Hinduism because the former managed to hijack the latter and became a spokesperson for all Hindus. The Hindutva ideologues conflate being a Hindu with being an Indian, which poses intellectual and political challenges to religious minorities. The complex national, regional and religious influences in the nineteenth century that became a part of the Hindutva movement is taken into account to understand how the ideology has come into existence. The movement and the ideology did not arise out of a vacuum and has been heavily influenced by exclusive ethnic nationalism, ideologies of primoridalism and other forms of European nationalism like Fascism and Nazism to formulate strategies, organizational templates and the 'Aryan myth.' These influences resulted in the rise of three major strands of prominent primordialist thinking that argue that India and Hinduism is the cradle of the entire human civilization. These primordialist notions emerged as 'Arya Samaj' movement, the Bengal Renaissance movement and Maharashtrian nationalism which politicized martial devotional Hinduism. The Hindu-Muslim conflict during the Indian partition played a crucial role in Indian history which enabled Hindu and Muslim extremists to pit people against each other along communal lines. This is one of the most well-known and well documented tragedies that led to numerous deaths and also allowed the Hindutva movement to flourish and gather incredible strength on the national scene. The final pages provide the

background of Savarkar and Golwalkar, their philosophical underpinnings and canonical texts that have become the blueprint for Hindutva organizations today.

The third chapter focuses on the Burkean perspective on rhetoric and the manner in which the guilt-redemption-purification cycle provides the most comprehensive picture of Hindutva movement. This chapter accomplishes two major things: it identifies which Burkean approaches are ill-suited to this set of texts, and argues that the guilt-redemption-purification cycle is best designed and applicable to study the Hindutva movement. The guilt-redemption-purification cycle is better equipped to reveal the complex motivations used by these ideologues to persuade ordinary people to embrace violence.

The fourth chapter deals with analyzing canonical texts written by Savarkar and Golwalkar as well as the important speeches and interviews given by them during various events at different stages in their lives. This chapter recollects their contribution to the movement via their ideology by describing and analyzing foundational texts that create the guilt-redemption-purification cycle to perpetuate violent behavior to restore an imaginary order that has been disrupted due to social and political upheavals. The guilt-redemption-purification methodology suits this study because of its cyclical nature which moves from order to guilt to victimage that results in a vicious cycle of violence. I begin by focusing on the existence of a hierarchy whose disruption is inevitable. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar created an 'idyllic' hierarchy in which Hindus were the true owners of India and were eventually displaced by 'Muslim invaders' and the British. This chapter focuses on how they use the notion of 'idyllic hierarchy' to categorize certain characteristics that people are supposed to possess to be true citizens. I use *Essentials of Hindutva* and *We or our Nationhood Defined* written by Savarkar and Golwalkar respectively to

119

describe the hierarchy that is created through these categories to exclude other religious minorities from claiming any affinity or ownership to India.

Next, the Hindutva movement harnesses guilt, which manifests in internalization and repression that are central to Burkean idea of self-victimage. The Hindutva movement combines shame and guilt to produce aggression as a response to perceived challenges to their worldview. Both Savarkar and Golwalkar use mortification, an exercise in "self transformation" to assuage guilt for self-atonement. Mortification and scapegoating are exercises used to get rid of the benevolent, tolerant and non-violent aspects of people's personality to instill virile masculinity, aggression and the Hindutva worldview. While internal scapegoating addresses the issue of guilt, the movement uses external scapegoating to create a 'chosen vessel' to blame someone for everything that is wrong with society. Any sort of identification between Hindus and other religious minorities is destroyed through ritualistic alienation that separates the aggrieved party from the chosen vessel.

The Hindutva movement prescribes ways in which Hindus can redeem themselves. Burkean redemption resembles the idea of sin in Christian rhetoric whereby people who commit sin must purge their guilt by taking corrective action. The Hindutva movement motivates redemption through violence (both in mortification and scapegoating) and argues that there is no way to get around violent means to achieve a perfect Hindu order in current times. The problematic aspect of the guilt-redemption-purification cycle that is perpetrated by the Hindutva movement is that there is no end to perfecting society. Even if one does restore order and create a perfect Hindu society, it does not mean that this order will remain undisturbed because an established order is always susceptible to change from various influences. This means that the guilt-redemption-purification cycle could easily be used by the Hindutva movement to perpetrate

120

a repeated cycle of violence and disruption every time a threat is perceived to Hindu dominance in India.

Lastly, I wish to conclude with two brief notes: one on an alternative (and more positive use) of rhetoric in Indian politics, and the second on the methodological challenges of doing such a study in Indian context. First, the use of rhetoric in Indian political movements need not always be as destructive as is described here. Alternative examples are abound, with maybe the most famous being the use of rhetoric by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. Cheree Carlson (1986) studied Gandhi's strategy of nonviolent resistance from Burke's dramatistic perspective. The dramatistic view, just like the guilt-redemption cycle, perceives movements as vast ritual dramas wherein the disaffected group internalizes and transcends special inequalities through confrontation with the "enemy" (p. 446). But unlike the Hindutva movement that views historical events with the tragic frame, subscribes to the "cult of kill," and concludes that no social change is possible without some form of violence, Carlson shows how Gandhi's movement created action by replacing the tragic frame with Burke's comic frame (p. 447). The comic frame rejects the idea that no social change is possible without violence. Through the comic frame, Burke offers a humane approach to understand and transform social order (p. 448). The comic frame creates "maximum consciousness," meaning people transcend themselves because they are aware of human foibles and concede that human beings are imperfect (p. 448). The fundamental distinctions between tragic and comic rituals lie in their ultimate goals. The former reinforces the belief in a social order, thus ending all doubt and easing the pain of guilt, whereas the latter reaffirms that society "must keep convictions about social means and ends open to reason…it seeks belief but never at the cost of banishing doubt and question" (p. 448). The comic frame ultimately identifies that social ills originate from human error and uses reason

121

to correct them (p. 448). Comic rituals demand reapproachment which enables reformers to recognize the potential clown in all human beings (p. 448). The social distance created in comedy prepares the victim for dialogue and order is restored by joyful reunion (p. 448). Second, Burkean approaches to rhetoric can be useful but can also be limiting to study unconventional social movements. Chesebro (1998) argues that Burke's quest for a universal system is limited by his own cultural conditioning of an Anglical perspective when studying unconventional movements (p. 170). The Hindutva movement is a non-Western movement which, as chapter two showed, limits how it can be approached through a number of Burkean or other rhetorical concepts. The guilt-redemption-purification cycle proved to be among the most fitting because it relies on an ontological condition of hierarchy, perfection, and guilt that transcends cultural and societal differences.

Regardless of what worked for this study and these texts, it became evident to me that critics studying Hindutva texts need to be mindful of differences between the cultural and ideological orientation of the theorist whose concept we use and the texts we study. This does not preclude the use of Western rhetorical concepts, but requires careful evaluation of which do not work (and why not) and which do (and why).

REFERENCES

Arun, J. (n.d.). Conversion and the rise of hindu fundamentalism: A case study from tamil nadu, south india. Campion hall: Oxford university. Retrieved from www.idcrdialogue.com/.../anticonversiontnhindufundamentalism%20...

Bates, C. (2011). The hidden history of partition and its legacy. BBC history. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/modern/partition1947_01.shtml

Bhatt, C. (2001). *Hindu nationalism: Origins, ideologies and modern myths*. New york: Berg.

Bobbitt, D. (2004). The rhetoric of redemption. Rowman and littlefield.

Burke, K. (1937). Attitudes towards history. University of california press.

Burke, K. (1941). The rhetoric of hitler's battle. In *The philosophy of literary form: Studies in symbolic action*. (pp. 191-220). New york: Vintage.

Burke, K. (1969). Rhetoric of motives. University of California Press.

Burns, C. (2008). More moral than god: Taking responsibility for religious violence. Rowman and littlefield publishers.

Cathcart, R.S. (1972). New approaches to the study of movements: Defining movements rhetorically. *Western states communication association*, 36, *82-88*.

Carlson, C. (1986). Gandhi and the comic frame: "Ad bellum purificandum." *Quarterly journal of speech, 72, 446-455*.

Casolari, M. (2000). Hindutva's foreign tie-up in the 1930s: Archival evidence. *Economic and political weekly*.

Chenoweth, E & Young, J.P. (n.d.). Majority rule/minority rights: Essential principles.

Democracy web: Comparitive studies in freedom. Retrieved from

    http://www.democracyweb.org/majority/principles.php

Chesebro, J.W. (1998). Multiculturalism and the burkean system: Limitations

    and extensions. Brock, B. L, (Ed.). Kenneth burke and the 21st century.

    SUNY press.

Foss, S.K., Foss, K.A., & Trapp, R. (2001). Contemporary perspectives on

    rhetoric. Waveland pr inc.

Golwalkar, M.S. (1939). We or our nationhood defined. Bharat publications edition.

Golwalkar, M.S. (1966). Bunch of thoughts. Jagarana prakashan. Retrieved

    from http://hindubooks.org/bot/contents.htm

Golwalkar, M.S. (1970).Issues with indian muslims: Interview with newspaper editors

    at delhi. Retrieved from http://lynk.ly/stories/view/786520

Golwalkar, M.S. (1942). Interview with newspaper editors.

Griffin, M.G. (1958). *The rhetorical structure of the antimasonic movement*. The

    rhetorical idiom. (pp. 356-365). Ithaca: Cornell university press.

Gooptu, N. (2004). The politics of the urban poor in the early twentieth-century

    india. Cambridge university press. UK: Cambridge.

Islam, S. (2006). Golwalkar's we or our nationhood defined: A critique.

    Pharos media & pub.

Leff, M.C. (1973). Redemptive identification: Cicero's catilinarian

    orations. Explorations in rhetorical criticism. Mohrmann, G.P, (ed.). Penn state

    university press.

LeBaron Jr, G. (2010). When tragic and comic conflict: Burkean frames and

the environmental movement. *The garn le baron writing project*. Retrieved from

http://garnlebaron.wordpress.com/when-tragic-and-comic-conflict-burkean-

frames-and-the-environmental-movement/

Klostermaier, K.K. (1994). A survey of hinduism. (2nd ed.). *State university of*

new york.

Krishnamachari, R.T. (2004). Call for an intellectual kshatriya. *South asian analysis*

group, 883. Retrieved from

http://www.southasiaanalysis.org/papers9/paper883.html

Thapar, R. (2000). Hindutva and history: Why do hindutva ideologues keep flogging

a dead horse? *Frontline*. *17* (20). Retrieved from

http://www.flonnet.com/fl1720/17200150.htm

Rambachan, A. (2003). The co-existence of violence and non-violence in hinduism.

Ecumerical review. World council of churches. Retrieved from http://www.wcc-

coe.org/wcc/what/interreligious/cd39-05.html

Ravishankar, R.A. (2002). The real savarkar. Frontline. *19 (15)*. Retrieved

from http://www.frontlineonnet.com/fl1915/19151160.htm

Rosenfeld, B.L. (1969). Set theory: Key to the understanding of kenneth burke's use of

the term 'identification". *Journal of western speech*, *33, 175-183*.

Rosen, S.J. (2002). Holy war: Violence and the bhagavad gita. Deepak publishing.

Roundtree, C. (1998). Coming to terms with burke's pentad.

American communication journal, 11 (3).

Sen, A. (2005). The argumentative indian: Writings on indian history, culture

and identity. Farrar, straus and giroux.

Simons, H.W. (1970). Requirements, problems, and strategies: A theory of persuasion for

    social movements. *The quarterly journal of speech*, *56, 1-11*.

Savakar, V.D. (1949). Hindu rashtra darshan: A collection of presidential

    delivered from the hindu mahasabha platform. Veer savarkar prakashan.

Savarkar, V.D. (1923). Essentials of hindutva. Retrieved from

    http://www.savarkar.org/en/hindutva-hindu-nationalism/essentials-hindutva

Savarkar, V.D. (1964). Suicide and self-sacrifice.

    Retrieved from

    www.savarkar.org/content/pdfs/en/Suicide_and_Self_Sacrifice.pdf

Savarkar, V.D. (1929). Savarkar, the protector of hindu society. Retrieved from

    http://www.savarkar.org/en/social-reforms/conversion-and-shuddhi

Sharma, J. (2004). Hindutva: Exploring the idea of hindu nationalism. Penguin global.

Viswesaran, K., Witzel, M., Manjarekar, N., Bhog, D., & Chakravarti, U. (2009).

    The hindutva view of history: Rewriting textbooks in india and the united states.

    Georgetown journal of international affairs.

Weinstein, D. (2008). Herbert spencer. *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*.

    Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/spencer/

Zarefsky, D. (1977). President johnson's war on poverty: The rhetoric of three

    "establishment" movements. *Communication monographs*, *44, 352-372*.