Chapter Three

Hindu Nationalism of Savarkar and Golwalkar

‘Hindutva’ and Savarkar’s Hindu Nationalism

We have seen earlier that Gandhi was in England for four months. Gandhi also refers to Colonel Wylees’ assassination by Madanlal Dhingra. Gandhi felt uneasy because of revolutionary activities of youth. Savarkar was there in England at that time he enjoyed a position as important as that of a officiating priest at the time of sacrifice. When they both were in London in 1909, the ‘Dasara’ gathering was celebrated. Gandhi presided over the programme and Savarkar had delivered a brilliant speech. As a result of his activities he was arrested on 13th March 1910 in London and deported to India for prosecution. Two separate tribunals sentenced him, on 23rd December 1910 and 30th January 1911, for two life imprisonment of twenty five years each. British Police took him to Andamans in order to serve two life imprisonments, that is, for fifty years. He remained there up to 2nd May 1921. As a result of his mercy petitions he was transferred to Ratnagiri jail and finally to Yerwada jail. Keer, his biographer, gives information about the happenings behind his release from jail. He states that conditions of his release were prepared. On 27th Dec. 1923 Savarkar accepted the conditions after changing some words. On 6th January 1924 Savarkar was conditionally released from Yerwada prison. The conditions to which he agreed were that he would reside at Ratnagiri and would not cross the boundaries of the district without prior permission of the Government or in an emergency that of the District Magistrate. The other condition was that he will not engage in any public or private political activities without the consent of the Government, and the condition would be renewed at the will of the Government after a period of five years.

Jal says while commenting on the influences of Savarkar’s ideology, “For Savarkar Hindutva is not Hinduism, but Hindudom. His model was not merely European fascism, but also medieval Europe, especially medieval Europe’s feudal idea of Christiandom. There was nothing indigenous in the thinking of Savarkar…
Their ideas of Nationalisms were borrowed lock, stock and barrel from right-wing thinkers of Western Europe.... Recall Savarkar’s motto, “Hinduize all politics and militarize Hindu-dom.” In this sense the model state for the Hindutvadi’s is Nazi Germany. But it is also Zionist Israel and strangely also Islamic Republic of Iran that serve as their models.” (Jal 2015:19)

‘Hindutva’ is the book Savarkar wrote when he was undergoing his life sentence in Andaman jail. According the publisher of the second edition it was sent to the prominent Hindu leaders throughout India. The first edition of the book was published by Shri V.V.Kelkar of Nagpur. The name of the author in this edition was ‘A Maratha’, because Savarkar was still in jail.

The publisher writes about the impact of the book as, “Such eminent leaders as the late Lala Lajpatrai, Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya and several others hailed it as the most original and scholarly contribution to the Hindu ideology. The definition acted as does some scientific discovery of a new truth in re-shaping and re-coordinating all current Thought and Action. (Savarkar 2009:VI-VII) This statement indicates the importance of this book.

Savarkar begins with the Shakespearean statement ‘What is in the name?’ and uses it for the name of religion. He states that it is an elusive term so it poses problems while one attempts to define it. He says, “Hindutva is not a word but a history. Not only the spiritual or religious history of our people as at times it is mistaken to be by being confounded with the other cognate term Hinduism, but a history in full Hinduism is only a derivative, a fraction, a part of Hindutva. Unless it is made clear what is meant by the latter the first remains unintelligible and vague.” (Savarkar 2009:3)

Savarkar wants us to understand that it is extremely difficult to understand the concept of Hindutva still it is equally essential to understand it. He states that the Aryans spread out upto the seven rivers which in Sanskrit is ‘Sapta Sindhus’ and adds that,”.... And not only had they developed a sense of nationality but had already succeeded in giving it a local habitation and a name’(Savarkar 2009:5) The name was chosen as there were seven rivers flowing through the area and this epithet was used for Vedic India. He in this process also claims that the Rigveda is the oldest record of the world. The river Sindhu was, for them, a manifest symbol of the common nationality and culture. Though they moved ahead from that area, they did not leave that name behind became it had bound them steadfastly to a nation. He asserts that
those people used to call themselves as ‘Sindhus’. According to him the letter ‘S’ in Sanskrit sometimes is changed into ‘H’ in some Prakrit languages and adds that the word ‘Sapta’ becomes ‘Hapta’ not only in Indian but also European languages that is ‘Sapta Sindhu’ is mentioned as ‘Hapta Hindu’ in Avesta by ancient Persians.

Savarkar says that this race spread from there far and wide up to Cylon in the South. The Greeks called this land ‘Indus’. Europeans and the Americans also started calling it ‘Hindu’ or ‘Indian’. Huen-tsang, who lived here for a long time also called it ‘Sindhu’ or ‘Hindu’ The foreigners gave the name Hindu and the ancient people who resided here responded. With this he deals with Buddhism and says that after the rise of Buddhism India established ties with countries all over the world. It also resulted in making the epithets popular. He calls Buddhism as a universal religion but notes the reasons of fall of that religion. He believes that philosophical differences between the Vedics and Buddhists were not the reason of the fall neither deterioration in the viharas was the reason of the fall but the political consequences of Buddhism which proved harmful for India. He says, “… the Buddhistic expansion been so disastrous to the national virility and even national existence of our race.” (Savarkar 2009:18-19)

Savarkar believed that Ahimsa, non-violence was preached by the Buddha and it gave rise to weakness and even an attitude to resist sin, crime and aggression was lost due to excess of non-violence by Buddhists.

Some institutions like Varna system evolved which were peculiar to the society and seen nowhere else. Customs like abstaining from sea voyages came into existence in order to protect such institutions. Savarkar believes that center of gravity of the nation had lost in an attempt to reconcile with the Buddhist identity. As it had spread in many countries it had lost it. It was essential to restore it.

Like all the Hindu nationalists Savarkar also stressed the need to return to the Vedas and gave a clarion call of ‘Back to the Vedas’. He says, “In fact it was but the natural consequence of the great war-cry of the national revivalists ‘Back to the Vedas’. The Vedic State based on and backed up by the Vedic Church must be designated by the Vedic name, and-so far as it was then possible- identified with the Vedic lines.”(Savarkar 2009:29)

Savarkar states that Sindhu in Sanskrit does not only mean the Indus River but the term is also used to denote sea, the sea which surrounds the peninsular part of the land. He tries to demarcate the land of the nation and states that the land which falls between the Sindhu River on the North-West and Brahmaputra-which for him is a
branch of Sindhu-on the North eastern side and seas on the South. Thus the land between Sindhu-river-and Sindhu-seas was India. This is how he decides the boundaries of the nation. He adds, “But it must not be supposed that the epithet Sindhu recommended itself to our patriots only because it was geographically the best fitted; for we find it emphatically stated that the concept expressed by this word was national and not merely geographical. Sindhus than was not merely a piece of land but it was a nation which was ideally if not always actually a state.” (Savarkar 2009:32) Emphasizing its origin he clarifies that Sindhus than was the ‘Best nation of the Aryans’ which had a distinct identity which differentiated them from the Mlechasthan, the land of foreigners. Still he cautions against believing that this distinction was based on theological or religious grounds. He also describes his concept of Arya at this point and states that, “The word Arya is expressly stated in every verse to mean all those who had been incorporated as parts integral in the nation and people that flourished on this our side of Indus whether Vaidic or Avaidic. Brahmana or Chandal, and owing and claiming to have inherited a common culture, common blood, common country and common polity; while Mlechaha also by the very fact of its being put in opposition to Sindhus than meant foreigners nationality and racially and not necessarily religiously.”(Savarkar 2009:33) Thus Savarkar attempts a broader definition of Aryas. He does not lay down restrictions on including people in the term of Aryas.

**Language:**

Savarkar points out that Sanskrit was the language of Aryas, but with the advent of Buddhism vernacular languages developed rapidly and Sanskrit assumed the status of classical and religious language limiting itself to a small section of the society. People used Prakrit language in their day to day life. He states that we come across words like Sindhu and Sindhus than in Sanskrit literature but the writers in Sanskrit generally preferred the term Bharat. He also states that Prakrit was the eldest daughter of Sanskrit, which was being referred to as Hindi or Hindusthani later on, was language of the Sindhus or Hindus. While describing this process he writes, “As the growth and development of our genuine national tongue was parallel to and almost simultaneous with the revival and popularization of the ancient names
Sindhusthan or Sindhus or Hindusthan or Hindus it was but a matter of course that language being the common possession of the whole nation should be called Hindusthani or Hindi.” (Savarkar 2009:41)

**Invasions:**

According to Savarkar this was the most glorious period of Indian History. There was peace prevailing and prosperity. This led people to relax. They had developed a sense of security and had a habit of residing in a dreamland. The tranquility was disturbed by invaders like Mohamad of Gazani. Describing its effect Savarkar says, “Nothing makes self conscious of itself so much as a conflict with non-self. Nothing can weld peoples into a nation and nations into a state as the pressure of a common foe.” (Savarkar 2009:42-43) Under the leadership of Kasim Mohamedans had crossed the Sindhu but still Savarkar believes that the damage it caused was marginal. The flood of invasions was unleashed after that which included Arabs, Persians, Parthians, Baluchis, Tartars, Turks, Moguls and such variety of invaders. As religion was the only source of inspiration for invasions, prospectus of plunder also inspired them.

These Invaders settled in India and that become the cause of conflict of two cultures. Savarkar holds the view that it also helped in consolidation of Hindus. He states, “Both friends and foes contributed equally to enable the words Hindu and Hindusthan to supersede all other designations of our land and our people. Aryavarta and Daxinapatha, Jambudwipta and Bharatvarsha none could give so eloquent an expression to the main political and cultural point at issue as the word, Hindusthan could do.” (Savarkar 2009.45) The resistance to this invasion came from Prathviraj Raso to Shivaji Greatness of these warriors.

has become a subject for bards to compose epics. Chand Bardai and Bhushan have portrayed their chivalry in their poems. Savarkar gives a list of such brave persons who fought to save motherland and above all the religion. Those included, Bajirao Peshwa, Chhatrasal the king of Bundelkhand, Guru Govind Singh the Sikh leader, Nanasaheb Peshwa, Nana Phadanvis to Mahadji Shinde.

So far Savarkar trace the history of the words Hindu and Hinduism from the Vedic period to fall of Peshwas whom he describes as ‘the last of our Hindu empire.’ Now he turns to define the term. He vehemently asserts that we must avoid entertaining the doubts that this name was given to us by Mohamedans, that too, out
of malice. He points out that the name came into existence long before it and states, “Long before Mohamad was born, way long before the Arabians were heard of as a people, this ancient nation was known to ourselves as well as to the foreign world by the proud epithet Sindhu or Hindu and Arabians could not have invented this term, any more than they could have invented the Indus itself. They simply learnt it from the ancient Iranians, Jews and other peoples.” (Savarkar 2009:71) Some people refer to the fact that the term is not found in Sanskrit literature prior to the invasions mentioned by Savarkar. On that Savarkar states that there are many more other names which are typically Hindu still they are not found in Sanskrit literature. This is how he tries to prove that the people who raise doubts are wrong. He also states that some people believed that Hindu was a term which was used as synonym for ‘black’ for indicating the colour of the people but Savarkar says that it was erroneous to believe so. He cites example of the term ‘England’ and describes that it had also attracted contempt on time. It was used derogatively. But Savarkar points out that the people did not discontinue the use of the term and contrary to that they added grandeur to that name and now ruling over the largest empire in the history of mankind. This is because they had a deep faith in their own identity so they did not disown their lineage or the name. Some people look pride in being Aryans and they registered their identity in the census registers as per that, instead of Hindu. Savarkar believes that by doing so they would bring disgrace to it and drag it to the level of meaning a synonym to a term like ‘cooly’. He advises to them who believe in changing names that it would not make any change in their status and reiterates that the name was an invention, not of the Muslims, but of his own ancestors and as indigenous as the Vedas.

Savarkar argues that some people are reluctant to use this name as they have fears that if they use the epithet they would be looked as Hindus, who believe in and practice Hindu dogmas. He explain to such people that, “That a man can be as truly a Hindu as any without believing even in the Vedas as an independent religious authority is quite clear from the fact that thousands of our Jain brethren, not to mention others, are for generations calling themselves Hindus and would even to this day feel hurt if they be called otherwise.”(Savarkar 2009:81)

Savarkar then attempts to finalise the definition of the term ‘Hindutva’ and states that it is a derivative of the word Hindu. He asserts that this appellation* and its origin ‘Sapta Sindhu’ or its colloquial form ‘Hapta Hindu’. He believes that the
geographical sense was primary though the land area did not remain the same as some times it was expanded and to the contrary sometimes reduced. He says, “The most important factor that contributes to the cohesion, strength and the sense of unity of the people is they should possess an internally well-connected and externally well-demarcated ‘local habitation’, and a ‘name’ that could, by its very mention, rouse the cherished image of their motherland as well as the loved memories of their past. We are happily blessed with both these important requisite for a strong and united nation.” (Savarkar 2009:82)

Savarkar says that the boundaries of this land are very closely marked by nature that has made this land distinct from other territories. This perfect demarcation of boundaries also reflects into its inhabitants and creates an appeal of the motherland. Savarkar states, “Hindusthan meaning the land of Hindus, the first essential of Hindutva must necessarily be this geographical one. A Hindu is primarily, a citizen either in himself or through his forefathers of ‘Hindusthan’ and claims the land as his motherland.” (Savarkar 2009-82)

While discussing the intrinsic presumptions of Hindutva he states that it is essential to understand the actual situation before going on to decide the future plan. So he warns these who intend to define the term that we must take into account the actual meaning of the term which is in vogue in present times. He suggests that meaning of the word Hindu means only Indian there is a danger of calling a Muslim a Hindu as he resides in this country. He cautions us not to overlook the realities which are stringent. Savarkar adds that, As long as every other ‘ism’ has not disowned its special dogmas, whichever tend into dangerous war cries, so long no cultural or national unit can afford to loosen the bonds, especially, these of a common name and banner, that are the mighty sources of organic cohesion and strength.”(Savarkar, 2009:84) Savarkar explains that An American could be called a Bharatiya or Hindi and could be treated as a fellow citizen, but at the same time states that there are conditions to fulfill in order to do so. The American must adopt our culture, share our history, inherit our blood and not only love the motherland but worship it. He determines two conditions for being recognized so, apart from being a citizen of the land by himself or through his ancestors there should be a bond of blood which is common to the land. He explains, “They are not only a nation but also a race-jati. The word jati derived from root Jan to produce, means a brotherhood, a race determined by a common origin, possessing a common blood. All Hindus claim to have in their
veins the blood of the mighty race incorporated with and descended from the Vedic fathers, the Sindhus.” (Savarkar 2009:84-85)

Savarkar states that some people raise question that do Hindus belong to a single race. This is because of several invasions belonging to different races had resulted in mixture of blood and they are divided in several groups. Instead of answering to the query he poses a counter question that does there exist a thin called as the English blood, or the French blood or the German blood. He insists that they are consistently infusing foreign blood in to their race. If they qualify to be called a race, then the Hindus also could be called a race. He emphatically states that though there are castes that divide the society, they have not prevented from mixture of blood because there is a provision of Anuloma and pratiloma marriage system in which marriages of people belonging to different castes were granted a social sanction. Such marriages gave birth to new castes. Castes such as Ugraa, Shvapacha and Chandala are the result of such marriages. In short according to him there was an ample scope for them to be recognized as a race. In this context speaking about the caste system he states, “All that the caste system has done is to regulate its noble blood on lines believed-and on the whole rightly believed –by our saintly and patriotic law-givers and kings to contribute most to fertilize and enrich all that was barren and poor, without famishing and debasing all that was flourishing and nobody endowed.” (Savarkar 2009:86) He adds that the intermarriages were not restricted to the chief four castes, he means to say four varnas, but also had percolated down to the castes and tribes also. He cites many examples to support his view. He states that the custom of intermarriages was not limited to the Vaidic Hindus but it had taken the other sects in their sway. During the Buddhist period one could find a Buddhist father, Vedic mother and a Jain son could be found in a single family. Though Savarkar believed in Aryan descent and even glorified it he was liberal in the sense he did not differentiated people on its basis. On the contrary he states that, “Some of us were Aryans and some Anaryans; but Ayars and Nayars-we were all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us are Brahmans and some Namshudras or Panchamas; but Brahmans or Chandalas- we are all Hindu ans own a common blood. Some of us are Daxinatyas and some Gauds; butGauds or Saraswats-we are all Hindus and own a common blood. Some of us were Rakshas and some Yakshas; but Rakshas or Yakshas-we are all Hindus and own a common blood.”(Savarkar 2009:89) Not only he refuse to acknowledge the distinction of caste and race but also states that he was
not prepared to make distinction between Jains, Jangamas, Naras, Kinnaras, Vanaras, monists, pantheists, theists, atheists and all such divisions. For him all of them were members of a Jati or race so there existed a feeling of fraternity among them.

Savarkar was of the opinion that throughout the world only one race exists and that is human race for him. He makes the most important statement that, “Sexual attraction has proved more powerful than all the commands of all the prophets put together.” (Savarkar 2009:90) This, according to him, had led to admixture of blood and comingling of the races leaving none pure as some claim. He is so confident of his view that he states that even the people belonging to the tribes in Andamans may have Aryan blood in their veins.

**Common Culture:**

Savarkar, in this way, states that there are two prerequisites for one nation and one race they are, a common fatherland and a common blood. Speaking about Muslims he says that if they get rid of prejudices which are harboured out of ignorance and express their love for the fatherland. He also reminds that as they have undertaken conversions on mass level it was difficult to forgive them but accepts that the same blood flows through their veins. Though this was the case, he refuses to accept them as his own because only love for common fatherland or common blood are not the only condition to make them Hindu but there is one more thing and that is love for common civilization.

**Civilization:**

After stating need for a common civilization Savarkar tries to define the term. He describes it as, “Civilization is the expression of the mind of man. Civilization is the account of what man has made of matter. If matter is the creation of the lord, then civilization is the miniature secondary creation of man. At its best it is the perfect triumph of soul of man over matter and man alike. Wherever and to the extent to which man has succeeded in moulding matter to the delight of his soul, civilization begins.” He adds that, “The story of the civilization of a nation is the story of its thoughts its actions and its achievements. Literature and art tell us of its thoughts; history and social institutions of its actions and achievements. In none of these can man remain isolated. Savarkar was of the opinion that human beings have developed
by borrowing and emulating each other’s cultures. Hidus are not an exception to this still, their civilization is so characteristic that it looks distinctly different from that of others. Though there are dissimilarities among the Hindus they are less in number than the similarities among them. So it would be proper, according to him, that they could be recognized as a cultural unit. He disagrees with the people who believe that Hindus have no history and gives an elaborate description of the history. He anticipates a question that, if there are so much of common things among the Hindus, then what are the reasons of the wars with which the history is replete? Instead of giving an answer he asks a counter question that in England also there were wars like the War of Roses. Such instances were witnessed in the history of almost all the European countries, still they are supposed to possess a common history. If they do so in spite of so many fights India could also be said to possess a common history.

Savarkar further states that the literature tells the story of his race and claims that Sanskrit was the language of the literature. And describes that their Gods spoke the language and the poets also wrote in the same language. Explaining its importance he says’ “To millions it is still the language of their gods; to others it is the language of their ancestors; to all it is the language *par excellence*; a common inheritance, a common treasure that enriches all the family of our sister languages.”(Savarkar2009:95-96) He gives the list of works by different sects in Hiduism as well as that of Jains and others. He mentions writers and poets writing in different Indian languages and from different states and how they have united and bound the people into one nation.

Common laws, Rites and institutions provide ground to unite people according to Savarkar. He states, “The Hindu law with the underlying principles of Hindu jurisprudence whatever the superficial differences be and howsoever contradictory a detail here or an injunction there may seem to be, is too organic a growth to lose its individuality by the manifold changes wrought by times and climes.”(Savarkar2009:97) He mentions the festivals celebrated by the people as they weld them together. He also adds that these festivals are celebrated by some in order to observe the customs, some look upon them as a religious duty while celebrating them, yet others feel that they are social amenities. Whatever might e the reason of the celebration but it helps in creating common as well as corporate life of the race.
After giving the above description he attempts a definition of the term Hindu. He states, “A Hindu is then who feels attachment to the land that extends from Sindhu to Sindhu as the land of his forefathers-as his fatherland; who inherits the blood of the great race whose first and discernible source could be traced from Himalayan altitudes of the Vedic Saptasindhus and which assimilating all that was incorporated and ennobling all that was assimilated has grown into and come to be known as the Hindu people; and who, as a consequence of the forgoing attributes, has inherited and claims as his represented in a common history, common heroes, a common literature, common art, a common law and a common jurisprudence, common fairs and festivals, rites and rituals, ceremonies and sacraments.” (Savarkar2009:100) He differentiates between Hindus and Muslims and Christians. He also tells that those who are Christian and Muslims today were very recent past Hindus. So they might possess the same blood and as they reside in the same land they have a common fatherland also but they do not share the civilization as they have converted. He then pin points the three essentials of Hinutva they are a nation or rashtra, race or Jati, and civilization or Sanskriti. He then states that if one leaves out a section of the society while defining it the section goes out of the fence, so care needs to be observed while defining the term and gives a definition of Hinduism. He writes, “Hinduism means a system of religious beliefs found common amongst the Hindu people. And the only way to find out what those religious beliefs of the Hindus are, i.e., what constitutes Hinduism, you must first define a Hindu. Attempt to answer the question proves to be absurd some times because the attempt hurts feelings of people belonging to many sects in India. Keeping this in mind he states that, “Hinduism is a word that properly speaking should be applied to all the religious beliefs that the different communities of the Hindu people hold. But it is generally applied to that system of religion which the majority of the Hindu people follow. It is natural that a religion or a country or community should derive its name from the characteristic feature which is common to an overwhelming majority that constitutes or contributes to it.” (Savarkar2009:105) He then specifies that majority of the Hindus believe in the religion propagated by Shruti, Smriti and Puranas or Sanatan Dharma. Having thus confirmed that the religion of majority is to be treated as Hinduism he tries to confirm the authority of the Vedas. Describing it as the earliest record not of the Indian community but of the mankind itself he tells that the people who resided on the banks of the Saptasindhu branched out in many groups and continued with their forward march. These branches
many times formed their distinct sect so we have so many sects. Though they had their unique identity, there was unanimity on the issue of common land, for all of them it was their fatherland or Pitrabhu and holy land or Punyabhumī. On this count he differentiates Muslims and Christians and says that India is a fatherland for them but their holy land is situated outside India.

Finally he gives a definition which is near perfection according to him. It is, “A Hindu, therefore, to sum up the conclusions arrived at, is he who looks upon the land that extends from Sindhu to Sindhu- from the Indus to the seas,- as the land of his forefathers- his Fatherland (Pitribhu), who inherits the blood of that race whose first discernible source could be traced to the Vedic Saptasindhus and which on its onward march, assimilating much that was incorporated and ennobling much that was assimilated, has come to be known as the Hindu people, who has inherited and claims as his own the culture of that race as expressed chiefly in their common classical language Sanskrit and represented by a common history, a common literature, law and jurisprudence, rites and rituals, ceremonies and sacraments, fairs and festivals; and who above all, address this land, this Sindhusthan as Holyland (Punyabhu), as the land of prophets and seers, of his godmen and gurus, the land of piety and pilgrimage. These are the essentials of Hindutva- a common nation (Rashtra) a common race (Jati) and a common civilization (Sanskriti).” (Savarkar2009:115-116) In brief he asserts that a Hindu is a person who regards Sindhusthan not only as his Fatherland but also as his Holy land. To regard it as his Holyland he must belong to a faith originated in this land. So whose Holyland is situated outside the boundaries of this land ceases to be a Hindu. One more condition suggested by him in the definition is civilization or Sanskriti. It includes all the rituals, rites, Customs, habits, ceremonies and sacraments. The combination of all these factors makes a Holyland. So those outside the pale of this civilization cease to be Hindus. Thus he defines the term which tries to encompass all the sects that go by the name of Hindu as well as those who have established a separate sect but have their roots in this land. At the same time he excludes those who do not fulfill these conditions.

Different sects came in to existence as the founders disagreed with some of the tenets of the religion or believed that they have found something new which needs to be introduced. Savarkar does not have an objection as long as they believe in harmonious coexistence. Some of these sects transgress this limit which is
 unacceptable to him. For example Sikhs started demanding separate representation during the constitutional reforms, as a separate entity. Savarkar disapproves it and states, “The fact is that the protest that is at times raised by some leaders of our Sikh brotherhood against their being classed as Hindus would never have been heard if the term Hinduism was not allowed to get identical with Sanatanism. This confusion of ideas and the vagueness of expression resulting therefrom, are at the root of this fatal tendency that mars at times the cordial relations existing between our sister Hindu communities.” (Savarkar2009:25-126) Savarkar gives freedom to the Sikhs to reject anything in the religion. They could even have freedom of discarding the authority of the Vedas and states that by denouncing and rejecting the shastras they could cease to be a Sanatani but not a Hindu. He agrees that it was not a place to discuss the issue of special representation but adds that Sikhs were eager to protect their interests as distinct community. For him their claim was untenable and the plea that they are non-Hindus was suicidal. He also suggests that there is no harm in Sikhs being categorized as Sikhs as far as religion is concerned but racially and culturally they should be classed as Hindus only. He is anxious to convince such people that, “Will they disown their seed, forswear their fathers and sell their birthright for a mess of pottage? God forbid! Let our minorities remember that if strength lies in union, then in Hindutva lies the firmest and yet the dearest bond that can effect a real, lasting and powerful union of our people. You may fancy that it pays you to remain aloof for the passing hour, but it would do incalculable harm to this our ancient race and civilization as a whole—and especially to yourselves. Your interests are indissolubly bound with the interests of your other Hindu brethren.”(Savarkar2009:127)

Hindutva is the foundations of Savarkar’s political, social and religious thought. Hindu community had lost its vigour. It was Savarkar’s intention to bring the community to rationality and unite it vigourous in comparison with other communities. In order to achieve this he plans to put an end to the divisions that existed among the Hindus of Vedics and Avedics which generated debates for centuries together and resulted in a deep cleavage in the community. His theory of nationalism rests on the principle of common blood. So he does not attach much value to the differences which spring from competing ideologies among the Hindu fold. His religious thought was the foundation of his political thought. He was of the opinion that in order to make the nation strong it was essential that Hindus form a strong
organization. The ultimate aim of his politics was to make India a super power in the world. We find the traces of this ambition in this book. To achieve this Savarkar propounds the theory of common blood which, he feels, would bind the Hindus together across the lines of the Varna, caste, sect, language or region. He portrays the braveries of the heroes of the race and also describes the superiority of this race compared to other races.

Savarkar’s concept of Hidutva was different from his contemporaries on one more ground. He advocated scientific thinking. Scientific outlook was an essential thing for him. His was so insistence strong that he assigned secondary position to the Vedas also. While defining rationalism he states that while solving the problems in life to make use of only two tools, objective knowledge and human logic is rationalism. He asserts that science should become the Veda of our nation. (Savarkar1964:165) While stating so it becomes imperative to give a secondary position to the Vedas. Though in the book he glorifies the Vedas as the first literature of the human race he explains to those who take pride in the fact that the Vedas are five thousand year old that they are backward by those many years. (Savarkar1964:359) He gives a suggestion to lock the scriptures in the museum. (Savarkar1964:363) After French revolution the victorious revolutionaries discarded the old deities and took out a procession of the Goddess of reason in the streets of Paris. Savarkar appreciates it. (Savarkar1964:229) His views on cow worship are also different from other nationalists of his time. He believed that cow is a useful animal and nothing more. He states that a human being should regard only the things which are higher than him in all the qualities. A donkey may, if he wishes, regard the cow, which is higher than it in qualities as a goddess but human beings should not do so. (Savarkar1964:165) As a custom of worshipping cow as the mother among Hindus Svarkar very candidly states that if at all cow is somebody’s mother it is of the ox, not of a Hindu. (Savarkar1964:167) There is a rite in which five products of the cow were consumed in order to purify oneself that included cow dung and its urine, commenting on it he says, to eat dung is an abuse in Marathi, not a rite. (Savarkar 1964:169)

Equally unique were his views on caste system and concept of pollution related to it. He quotes the article 17 of the constitution which states that, “Untouchability is abolished and its practice in any form is forbidden. The
enforcement of any disability arising out of untouchability shall be an offence punishable in accordance with law.” He comments on it that the day this announcement was made was a golden day in the history of humanity as well as from the viewpoint of organization of the Hindus. This announcement is so important as to be carved on a pillar like Ashok Stanbha. (Savarkar 2012:241) Savarkar appreciated the resolution passed in the programme of the Ratnagiri Chitpawan Sangh that, “None of the activities of this society shall have any connection with any movement for the creation and furtherance of disparity based on birth. He ridicules the caste system while describing how some of the castes came into existence. He narrates an incident in which a boy accidentally trampled a piece of egg shell of a sparrow. A boycott was clamped on the family which resulted in formation of a new caste. (Savarkar 2012:104) In the same article he narrates the stories of the origin of two castes, Kachole and a sub caste among Shimpis which are equally ridiculous.

**Golwalkar’s ‘We or Our Nationhood Defined’**

Various factors like introduction of English education in 1835 rise of demanding class (which included merchants, bankers, landlords, industrialists, professionals etc.), increase in communication facilities like railways and telegraphs, racial treatment by British officers, revolutionary role of press in spurring the national conscious of Indian people and economy exploitation etc. contributed to the development of the concept of nationalism. Efforts of all regional associations for fulfilling demands of newly emerged classes within the frame of newly arisen national consciousness culminated in the formation of Indian National Congress in 1886. On the other hand Sir Syed Ahmed propagated the view that Congress is for the betterment of Hindus only and begun to form Muslim group. Believing in British government he supported the nomination of elites instead of representation in government. From 1870 group of landlords and professionals provoked the anti-Muslim sentiment and opposed the unifying, secular stand of Congress. Sensing this community discontent British government chose the policy of ‘divide and rule’ as a major strategy to maintain their rule in India. Arya Samaj’s ‘Shuddhi’, Muslim peoples ‘Tabligh and Tanzim’ intensified the communal atmosphere in the society. In Maharashtra there is also an influence of anti-Brahmin movement led by Phule and the reformist movement by Agarkar and Ranade. These anti-hegemonic activities
made Brahmins insecure about their position in society. This feeling was worsened by the introduction of ‘Sarva Dharma Samabhav’ and Hindu-Muslim unity in Indian politics by Gandhi – Followers of Hindutva were absolutely sure that due to Gandhi’s liberal policies, concept of democracy will take roots and how to remove this obstacle of Gandhi was the factor worried them. (Kasabe 2002:48). Hindus and particularly Brahmins felt the necessity of organizing themselves into a diehard Hinduwadi group to retain authority and power in Indian political field. Death of Tilak had already created a vacuum in their aspirations for gaining dominance in politics. All these activities culminated into foundation of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangha in 1925 by Dr. Hedgewar in Nagpur. It was “an exclusively upper caste, male, dictato-torial (following the principle of Ek Chalak Anuvartita: Single Supreme Leader) organization.” (Puniyani 2009:25) After non-cooperation movement India faced upsurge of lot of communal riots, multiple violence and rise of peasant’s revolts etc.

The members of R.S.S. were staunch defenders of Hinduism, they were strongly oriented to the goal of founding Hindu Nation. According to them it was an attempt to rejuvenate Hindu religion on the basis of their personal character and love for motherland. Glorifying the ancient Hindu culture and traditional inheritance they wanted to revive Varna-system and Manusmurti in India. At the time of foundation of R.S.S its ideological basis was not discussed thoroughly. It was organized by fomenting Hindu sentiments particularly. Nostalgia of Hindu Vedantic past, opposition to congress’s secular policies, and ridicule of democracy were the building blocks of the organization. Contribution of Dr. Hedgewar was mainly limited to building the organizational setup of R.S.S. After him Golwalkar provided the R.S.S its own ideology and casted it into mould of cultural nationalism. “Golwalkar was influenced by Swami Vivekananda’s call to worship the Motherland. He also admired Bal Gangadhar Tilak, for making culture so central to national identity and self assertion.” (Guha 2010:371) His thoughts and lectures were collected mainly into books first ‘Bunch of Thoughts’ and ‘We or Our Nationhood Defined.’ He was very influential ideologue of R.S.S who guided it for thirty-three long years with zealous and ardent commitment to making of Hindu Nation. Their anti-democratic stance goaded them to take inspiration from fascism.

Cultural nationalism includes the concept of nation where common ideals, emotions, commitments and traditions with one culture are shared by that particular
group of people, resulting into their specific lifestyle. People residing on particular land share common memories of past experiences, enmity and friendliness with mutually shared interests.

“The articulation of cultural nationalism revolves around first, the beliefs concerning the distinctness, integrity, uniqueness and the superiority of one’s culture and second, the claim that such a culture is the proper and legitimate repository of collective and determinative power. The culture is named and identified, its contours delineated and lineage traced, its rise and fall in history noted and potential threat to it identified.” (Aloysius 2008:131)

In India cultural nationalism emerged substantially during the latter decades of the eighteenth century and was focused on Aryan myth, the Sanskrit language, and the sacred texts of Hindu religion. Identification of Hindus with Aryan myth in Germany attracted R.S.S to the influential personalities of Hitler and Mussolini. Resultantly it became necessary to present values and principles of Hinduism as extremely opposite to European, British imperialism. In spite of this opposition Sangha Parivar never supported the movement of freedom struggle. They remained aloof for building their own Hindu Nation quietly in seclusion by giving physical training to their Swayamsevaks. “What adds to the R.S.S appeal is a basic simplicity of its ideological message, preached in a style that deliberately avoids complexities and debates, and inculcated simultaneously via a whole battery of rituals and symbols. No major intellectual effort, or mastering of difficult texts, is required – unlike, say, in Marxism.” (Basu et al. 1993:36)

Ideology of R.S.S is a very clear, perfectly unanimous, disciplined with no confusion because there is no apace for individual expression as it is in military; Sangha always demanded the dissolution of individuality for collectivity. They strongly recommended sacrifice of individuality for the sake of Hindu Nation.

In the backdrop of all these issues Golwalkar presented his concept of nationalism in ‘We or Our Nationhood Defined’. He deliberately insists on using the word ‘Hindu’ instead of ‘Indian’ because Indian is related to Vedic classless period, prior to the emergence of state and devoid of Brahmanical hegemony. The word Hindu is related to class and Brahmanical dominance. In the prologue he says that we are all in a state of degeneration, merely in existence not living. We should examine
our goals whether we want ‘independent and glorious’ nation or merely a state with few political powers. There is need to perceive clearly our own idea of nation and so he analyzes the concept of nation.

The life of a nation cannot be measured in days it can be of many centuries also. The Vedic literature is still alive today expressing then existing cultured and developed civilization. Western scholars do not have that much knowledge which Vedic civilization had. Here Golwalkar calculates the historical period from which the Hindu race is in existence. Measuring the period from the time of Gita, birth of Buddha and epic of Mahabharata with its picture of complex and organized civilization, he comes to conclusion that Hindus are residing on this land from 8,000 or even 10,000 years before any foreign invasion. This civilized land of Hindus i.e. Hindustan is the mark from which history begins. Nobody can prove our immigrant status. White race has their own superiority complex and they are not generous and committed to truth. So these allegations are meaningless. If they with Hindus are considered as descendents of Aryan race then nobody is indigenous and right of possession of this land becomes an issue of superior and mighty nation. European nation will not cease deceiving us into believing that we are not the real possessor of this land. He refers to the lecture delivered by Dr. Birbal Sahni from Banares Hindu University in which Dr. Sahni gave the information about moving of North Pole. Based on that information Golwalkar argues that perhaps Hindus did not leave Arctic pole for coming to today’s Hindustan, the Arctic pole itself moved from its position and left the Hindus in Hindustan. But then Golwalkar rejects all hypotheses and firmly asserts that Hindus are the original indigenous children of this soil. He also refers to the reasons behind the decline of in the civilization after Mahabharata, came the period of Buddha and the great emperors of the Gupta dynasty, Ashoka, Harshavardhan, Pulkeshi and others, invasion of Alexander was merely a ‘scratch.’ After that in vision, sense of security benumbed the Hindu society for centuries. Here Golwalkar argues that influence of Buddhism wiped out from the minds of Hindu people adherence to their religion and culture. Growth of individual freedom encouraged the independent thought processes and explorations for searching self made individual more prominent than society. In 1936-37, while narrating the incidence with Swami Akhandananda Golwalkar said “…. Nothing ought to be kept for oneself – neither heart nor body nor even mind. Everything ought to be handed
over to the collectivity of which one is a part. An individual ought to be like a stone which can be placed anywhere without its offering the slightest resistance.” (Sharma 2007:5) After that Muslims invaded Hindustan to face the chivalry and bravery of Rana Pratap of Chitor was ardently committed to Hindu religion. Then he describes the glorious period of Shivaji with great Hindu revival who shattered the Muslim role and contribution of Guru Govind Singh. After the invasion of Muslims, Hindu Nation raised its voice strongly in 1857 revealing the contribution of great Hindu patriots. From the moment of invasion of Muslims till today Hindu Nation is fighting. In the defeat also race spirit is wakening and so this nation has a very glorious and prosperous future. He says in ‘Bunch of Thoughts’, “The root cause of our national tragedy then, a thousand years ago, and now, 1000 years later is the same – the utter lack of organized and unified life among the Hindus, the children of the soil…. Every page of our history of the past thousand years is a mute witness of this bitter truth operating on our national plane.” (Golwalkar 2000:215) He glorifies the national consciousness, the race, spirit of Hindus at the time of the struggle and also Hindus rallying with ‘Bhagwa Dwaja’. Congress choosing ‘Tiranga Flag’ for India was an act of ‘politicians patchwork’, ‘political expediency’ for Golwalkar. He says “It was not inspired by any national vision or truth based on our national history and heritage…. Ours is an ancient and great nation with the glorious past he did then, had we no flag of our own? Had we no national emblem at all these thousands of years? …. Then, why this void, this utter vacuum in our minds?” (Golwalkar 2000:238) He discusses the wrong ideas deliberately spread in people first that history of Hindus begins with the rule of Moghals. This Hindu Nation was never unified nation but mingling of fighting clan leaders. He names this allegation as ‘designedly distorted narrative’ and second idea that it is the first time under the British rule that we are living a national life as a one nation, striving for freedom by constitutional means. But his regret is that to fight against the British, Hindus to ally with Muslims, their old invaders and enemy. The real affliction is Hindus are allowing themselves to be deceived, they are joining hands with their foes i.e. Muslims under the name of nationality and shattering that idea of true, sacred nationality. This is the real danger. Muslims are as our enemy as Britishers are. This kind of nationalizing will mislead us from our goal of national presentation foundation of real democratic state is merely a fantasy, it’s not real, making us to go astray. He writes “our own ‘denationalization’ under the name of
nationality is nearing its consummation. We have almost forgotten our Nationhood.” (Golwalkar 1939:15)

Later on he states that the concept of nation according to democratic state is merely disorganized state of ‘friend and foe, master and thief’ means different races and religions (including Muslims, Buddhists etc.) which according to him lacks authenticity. He tries to analyze the concept of nation by giving various definitions by Prof. Hole-Combe, Burgess, Bluntsley, Getel and Gumploc. He presents the gist as ‘Nation’ comprises five important factors to give it perfect wholeness 1. Country, 2. Race, 3. Religion, 4. Culture, 5. Language.

Four a nation to exist territory is required. It should be its own with as far as possible by naturally demarcated boundaries. Acquiring new country i.e. territory a nation can be established. Losing our own land is losing our nation. Jews left their own country to save their lives and lost the ‘Nation’. He gives the example of Parsis who with fixed determination left Iran to escape from tyranny of Muslim leaders. They landed in Hindustan and were received with generosity and friendliness. Now they have lived and prospered here and with perfect integrity of religion and culture. But no one can say that their nation is Iran, they don’t have a country of their own. According to Golwalkar for a Nation ‘hereditary’ territory is essential.

Race is again hereditary society with common origin and one culture. People of other foreign races must merge themselves into not only economic and political fields of mother race but also in its religion and culture. If it does not happen, they are considered as merely members of political state. He will never be the integral part of the national body. Existence of nation depends on the existence of race.

Discussing the concepts of religion and culture he says it is difficult to distinguish between them. Culture is a product of age-old customs, tradition, historical situation, and mainly religious notions. Nations like Turkey and modern Russia have evolved their own culture independent of religion. It is different in the Hindustan we perform every act of our life according to religion. “Our race-spirit is a child of our religion and so with as culture is but a product of our all comprehensive religion, a part of its body and not distinguishable from it.” (Golwalkar 1939:22)
People who don’t have any respectable or praiseworthy religion can only assert that religion is an individual issue unrelated to public and political field. According to him religion regulates and directs the lives of people transcending their lives from material to spiritual plane and hence it should have a place in politics according to its contribution. Compared to religion politics is a very small factor “…. To be considered and followed solely as one of the commands of religion and in accord with such commands.” (Golwalkar 1939:24) Achievement of social and political goals is the first stage in our journey towards progress. Severing ties with religion means betrayal of our own ideal and mission.

Language is also an important component of the concept of nation which is indistinguishable part of the race spirit and nationality. Loss of ancient language is synonymous with loss of nationality. Language carries with it its own literature. Country, Race, Religion, Culture and Language together form the concept of Nation.

Considering the issue of ‘Minority Treaties’ he says, the definition of the word minority, as people differs from the majority in Race, Religion and Language proves the fact that every nation has its own Race, Religion and Language. Culture and Religion are same so they do not need to be mentioned separately. He states that any minority to claim any rights “…. Should not be at an upstart, a new voluntary settlement, and it should not be below 20% of the total population of the state.” (Golwalkar 1939:30)

Some political thinkers want the building of nationality by not taking into account the term religion but on the basis of common traditions and aspirations. Golwalkar asserts that traditions are nothing but cumulative effect of religion, culture, language and aspirations and are framed by the race spirit, the traditions of our ancestors. So this is only change of words. To build a Nation country, race, religion, culture and language are indispensable. Even England has its own state religion that is Protestant Christianity and it tries to strengthen it. He supports Germany’s expansionist desire to win over its previously lost states like Austria, to bring under one reign its hereditary territory, because it justifies the necessity of country factor for building a nation. He does not condemn Germany for its Jews’ massacre but defends it by saying that it is really impossible for two races or cultures, so different, to assimilate under one nation. He says “Race pride at its highest has been manifested
here. Germany has also shown how well-nigh impossible it is for races and cultures, having differences going to the root to be assimilated into one united whole, a good lesson for us in Hindustan is to learn and profit by.” (Golwalkar 1939:35)

Modern Germany has fulfilled the requirement of nation idea with state language, religion (President’s oath is religious, religious holidays) country, culture and race. In case of India this race pride was related to Aryan race from Vedic period. Influenced by the fascist philosophy of Germany and Italy they made this race ego as the basis of their building Hindu Nation. Sangha Parivar wanted to bring back the ‘Golden age’ of Hinduism. Ram Puniyani says “‘We’ or ‘Our Nationhood’ heavily draws from the German Nazi’s fascism, appreciating most of their concepts. It upholds racial pride, brutal methods to deal with the ‘other’ (in this case non-Hindus), calls for adoption of Hindu culture as national culture, exhorting people to glorify Hindu race and nation, treating others as subordinates to Hindus, curtailing ‘other’ privileges and citizen rights.” (Puniyani 2009: 28) The Vedic period was many years before the arrival of Hindu period. When classes came into existence and one class tried to assert its domination over the other in the Vedic period, the Vedic religion began to extinct and to maintain their hegemony over the society Brahmins conceived an evolved Hindu religion. The pride of Aryan race later developed into pride of Hinduism.

Golwalkar then ascribes five essential criteria of concept of Nation to India. He describes the India with ideal territory limited by, Himalayas on one side and ocean on the other three sides. Its ancient race of common traditions, memories and experiences with glorious culture, guided by religion, manifested in all the walks of life. He describes the rich cultural inheritance of India expressing itself in various arts. In India several languages are spoken. Each province has its own language so any one language cannot be declared as the language of the nation. But it is not the reality. There is but only one language and that is Sanskrit. All other languages are of offsprings of Sanskrit. It is the ancient language of Hindustan that assists in formation of Nation. Asserting Sanskrit as the language of the Nation, Golwalkar ignored the large sections of Indian population who are not allied with this language. Shamsul Islam in his introduction to ‘We or Our Nationhood Defined’ says “Golwalkar’s claim that Sanskrit was the mother of all Indian languages was also not based on facts. India has languages like Tamil and Malayalam which are older than Sanskrit and have great
literacy heritage. In fact, by declaring Sanskrit one of the five constituting elements of Hindu Nationalism, he was keeping large areas of India and large sections of Hindu population, which did not subscribe to its language, out of Indian nation.” (Golwalkar 2011:17)

According to him, only those people are nationalist patriots who aspire and strive towards glorifying their Hindu race and Hindu Nation and others are ‘traitors’ and ‘enemies’ or ‘idiots’. His concepts of Hindu Nation, Hindu race are exclusive concepts. People who do not fit in these criteria of five factors Nation theory are outside the sphere of nationality. Unless they cast aside their differences and embrace the religion, the culture and language of the Nation and completely blend themselves into the National Race they are not permitted to be the rightful citizen of the Nation. They will be regarded as foreigners if they will not discard their own racial, religious and cultural differences. They must internalize the past of the race and its aspirations for the future. J. Sharma writes “Only Hindus, who were the progeny of this land, could be masters of this nation. Muslims and Christians could never be either the children are masters of the nation because they were attackers. The Muslims had even encroached on the territories of Hindustan and had cut the motherland into pieces. For this reason alone, they could not even be considered ‘national’. The nation, affirms Golwalkar had to be clearly and ambiguously Hindu.” (Sharma Jotirmaya 2007:77)

If these minorities with different religion, culture and language do not merge themselves into mainstream nationality, they will be considered as outsiders. There are only two options available for minorities (Muslims, Christians etc.) first to assimilate in the national race adopting its culture or second to live ‘at its mercy’ without any rights or preferential treatment or to quit the country depending on the will of the Nation. The foreign races should feel respect for the religion, culture and forgetting the consciousness of their separate existence, they should merge into the main culture of India. Shamsul Islam says “Total assimilation or ethnic cleansing was the mantra prescribed by Golwalkar to deal with the problem of minorities in India. The R.S.S since its formation in 1925 never lost sight of it. According to him, old-nations solved their minorities’ problem by not recognizing any separate elements in their polity.” (Golwalkar 2011:19)
If these minorities do not merge in India they will have to accept the secondary status in country without claiming any privileges, preferential authorities – ‘not even citizen’s rights’. Golwalkar criticizes League of Nations for formulating minority treaties securing protection and justice for minorities. He refers to the speech delivered by Paul Fauchille and warns that such a protection and justice for minority people will provoke separatist tendencies for independent states by increasing their coherence and strength.

Golwalkar stressed on the formation of exclusive Hindu Nation because according to him all other religions were inferior to Hindu religion. Like Savarkar he was not willing to accommodate other minorities like Muslims and Christians in Hindu Nation. He always considered Hindus superior than others. Organization of Hindus was constructed on the basis of arousing sentiments of fear and insecurity. He was not only against Muslims and Christians were not together rejected the separate identity of Sikhism, Buddhism and Jainism. Ramchandra Guha comments on Golwalkar’s anti-minority stance as “The R.S.S itself was projected by Golwalkar as the chosen vehicle for this national and civilization renewal of the Hindus.” (Guha 2010:371)

This antidemocratic, anti-secular and reactionary stand adopted by Golwalkar always made him distrustful of any diverse city. He was only proud of Hindu religion and Hindu culture considering it as ancient, glorious and highly developed. He thought the existence of Hindus is absolutely based on the existence of God and may be due to that in many phases and forms of the development of Hindu religion there can be observed a unifying tendency. Golwalkar writes in ‘Bunch of Thoughts’ “We were the people who knew about the laws of nature and the laws of the Spirit. We built a great civilization, a great culture and then unique social order. We had brought into actual life almost everything that was beneficial to mankind. Then the rest of humanity were just bipeds and so no distinctive name was given to us…. We are called ‘the enlightened’ – the Aryans and the rest Mlechhas.” (Golwalkar 2000:55)

According to him Christian authorities have a plan for conversion to Christianity all over India. He condemned Christians for spreading their religion by forcing it on the poor people. He blamed communists as ‘a sworn enemy of
democratic procedure’. And they are responsible for ‘a serious failure of democracy’. Communism spreads due to the hatred in people not due to economical disparity.

Hence he asserts later on that from ancient times Hindus already knew the concept of nationality, it is not a borrowed idea. The word ‘Rashtra’ expresses the concept of Nation. To complete the concept of Nation (Rashtra), country (Desh), race (Jati) or people (Janpad) are essential. There is no separate mention of religion, culture and language but the concept of Janpad is inclusive of them. Golwalkar asserts the love for the country as one of the essential factors for the national life of Race. From the period of Ramayana it is alive in the minds of Hindu people. “Nothing can be holier to us than this land. Every particle of dust, everything living or nonliving, every stock in stone, tree and rivulet of this land is holy to us.” (Golwalkar 2000:88) This adoration for motherland was the legacy of Vivekananda and regional nationalism of Savarkar who attempted to define the word ‘Hindu’ on the basis of their habitation.

According to him another factor vital for the good Nation is society with its all four classes. These four classes are four Varnas and this society should not include those who do not adhere to Hindu religion and culture i.e. ‘Free-booting hunters’ but particularly ‘Mlechhas’. As this concept of Rashtra was discussed in ancient religious works it is evident that creators of those works conceived the religious and cultural unity of the people leaving as a Rashtra.

Describing Varna system Golwalkar wrote the Hindu people are like Virat Purusha, manifestation of God. It is described in Purusha Sukta that sun and the moon are His eyes, Brahmin is head, kings (Shaktriya) are His hands, Vaishya are his thighs and Shudras the feet and stars as well as skies are created from his nabhi (navel). Those are manifestations of intellect, might, money and labor. According to Golwalkar “This supreme vision of Godhead in society is the very core of our concept of ‘nation’ and has permeated our thinking and given rise to various unique concepts of our cultural heritage.” (Golwalkar 2000:37) Accepting Varna system Golwalkar rejected the modern democratic system. According to him Varna system was the ideal system for Nation to prosper. The root cause of present deterioration of Hindu society is abandonment of Varna system of Vedic period and they became characterless and lost ‘Purushartha’ (male prowess). If you want to build a powerful and accomplished
nation, you have to rejuvenate and protect the Hindu religion. This system was created according to Golwalkar, for maintaining order and efficiency in the society. There was perfect equality of status, no one was high and low. The distribution was based on jobs and tasks. Golwalkar felt regret that such harmonizing efforts were criticized by modern thinkers. Golwalkar praises Vedic period for its liberal atmosphere where deities from nature were situated in open and for all. But he does not admit that it was a primitive, barbaric and pre-state period. Hindu period came many years after Vedic period. Hindu period is not the Vedic period. While considering Hindutva as the basis of Indian nationalism and glorifying its ‘Chaturvarna System’ the history Golwalkar presented was not factual/authentic but only a verbose dodging (Kasabe 2002:12). Caste system has not been detrimental for our country on the contrary it has been beneficial for it is the major theme of his ‘Vichardhan’.

Justifying the caste system Golwalkar argues that Rana Pratap, Prithviraj, Peshwe were defeated by inadequate representation of history. Pushymitra Shunga who seized Samrat Ashoka’s empire was Brahmin. Ramdev and Mahipal Jogi, serving under Prithviraj, who betrayed him, were Brahmins and Brahmins opposed Shivaji’s coronation ceremony. These were the facts which had been twisted as the organized conspiracy of Golwalkar and Sangha Parivar. On the contrary history proves that not only castes but the sub-castes also ruined the strength and integrity of the nation. II Bajiraw, Chitpawan Brahmin was prohibited to have bath on the banks of Godavari by Deshastha Brahmins, also another sub-caste of Brahmins. (Kasabe 2002:64) So the arguments that due to casteism, integrity of India was maintained are idle believing that they are inherited from Aryan race and Muslims are another race, they also create the fictional representation of history. Murzban Jal explains the facts that “one needs to highlight two things. First, that the Indo-Iranian genealogy of ‘Hinduism’ is forgotten by the Indian fascists and the bizarre form of cultic-territorial nationalism is constructed. This point was repeatedly stressed by Phule who condemned all types of Hindu Nationalism as forms of pretentious nationalism, while stressing that the Brahman’s were descendents of the Indo-Iranian warring tribesmen who attacked and colonized India with their bizarre type of caste hierarchy, ideology of ritualism, patriarchy and anti-humanism.” (Jal 2015:101)
To wipe out the caste system from the historical representations and to hold various invaders responsible for the exploitation and the preservation of Dalit Jati are the major objectives behind the rewriting of history. An affiliated organization of R.S.S. had conveyed a seminar of hundred history scholars to think over rewriting the history, obviously from their view of history and it is heard that casteism was one of the important issues among them. (Gatade 2015:24-25)

Gita also talks about ‘Swa –Dharma’ the allotted jobs and tasks to every individual. It is expected that it is the duty of every individual to perform his task, even not fearing the death and if he avoids his duty he will face disorder and degradation of himself. Golwalkar admits that Casteism is the perverse form of Varna-system. But he argues it was a fine balance between individual satisfaction and discipline. On the contrary both the systems, Varna system and Caste system were initiated deliberately to maintain the hegemony of Brahmin class. Even if the creators of those systems argued that the classification of society was based on jobs, in reality it was based on birth. “Castes there were in those ancient times to, continuing for 1000 years of our glorious national life. There is no way to any instance of its having hampered the progress or disrupted the unity of society. It is in fact, served as a great bond of national cohesion.” (Golwalkar 2009:109) He argues that castes saved Hindu people from foreign invasions. Castes were never an obstacle for national unity. On the contrary he blames Buddhism as the factor responsible for the suspension of the caste system in northwestern and northeastern area that resulted into their easy defeat by Muslim invaders.

“We know as a matter of history that our Northwestern and Northeastern areas, where the influence of Buddhism had disrupted the caste system, fell an easy prey to the onslaught of Muslims.” (Golwalkar 2000:109) Distributory system of Varna resulted into discriminatory system needed classes of people are transformed into rigid and suffocating compartments. The upper castes enjoyed privileges at the cost of exploitation of lower castes. Shamsul Islam writes in his introduction to ‘We or Our nationhood Defined’ that Golwalkar always emphasized the superiority of North Indian Brahmins than others Brahmins of remaining parts of India. According to Golwalkar it was the superior race. It was published in ‘Organizer’ that in his lecture in Prime University of Gujarat, he explained the concept of crossbreeding of human beings prevalent ancient India. “Now let us in the experiments our ancestors
made in this sphere. *In an effort to better the human species through Namboodri Brahman’s of the North were sated in Kerala and a rule was laid down that the eldest son of a Namboodri family could marry only the daughter of Vaishya, Kshatriya or Shudra communities of Kerala. Another still more courageous rule was that the first offspring of a married woman of any class must be fathered by a Namboodri Brahmin and then she should beget children by her husband. Today this experiment will be called adultery but it was not so, as it was limited to the first child.”* (Golwalkar 2011:30) Emphasis added by Shamsul Islam. This statement before the educated people in Gujarat proved that first only Namboodri Brahmins were superior second there were inferior Brahmins also and third women were used as instruments of breeding by intercourse, such an intimate and private act, with alien male. Feudalism also compelled newly-wed women of lower castes to spend her first night with the landlord of the upper caste. These were the traditions in which Golwalkar took pride and intended to build Hindu Nation on. By Brahmansim in their writings Hedgewar was not ready for inter-dining with Dalit Swayamsevaks. He opposed those inter-dinings organized by reformist people. (Gatade 2015:13)

Golwalkar blamed the people, antagonist to the caste system that they were the only people who were responsible for making it more ‘rigid and perverse’. He says “Anti-caste tirade has verily become a mask for them to strengthen their own positions among their caste fellowman. To what extent this venom has entered our body-politic can be surmised from an incident which occurred some years ago. There is a ‘Victory Pillar’ near Pune, raised by the English in 1818 to commemorate their victory over the Peshwas. An eminent leader of the Harijans once addressed his caste-brethren under that pillar.” Here the eminent leader was Dr. Ambedkar. In 1966 also Golwalkar was not ready to acknowledge him as a learned scholar and also maker of the Constitution. He did not name it. So biased and fanatic was he.

Golwalkar declared adherence to Hindu codes with ‘enriching’ Varna system is real nationalism. Defenders of Varna system always argue that apart from India other countries also have these kinds of classifications for management of society according to jobs and professions. That is merely a classification not social system. In India this classification has a basis of social system which makes differences on the basis of birth, which has strong foundation of religion disallowing any flexibility or mobility. S.H. Deshpande in his book ‘Savarkar te Bha.Ja.Pa’ explains that there may
be two contradictory principles as the basis of social system first, ascriptive status where birth determines the status and opportunities in the life of an individual and second, achieved status where status and opportunity is determined/decided on the ground of his qualities and competency. A social system based on the first alternative comprises individual freedom. (Deshpande 1997:193)

Varna system in Hindu religion expresses nuances of meanings related to supremacy of collective on individual, authoritarianism of traditions, prevalence of antidemocratic tendencies, fatalism and rebirth’s idea based on karma and hegemony of Brahmins which were the building blocks of the philosophy of R.S.S.

Golwalkar explains the meaning of Jati as Race emphasizing spirit of oneness and cohesion among its people. Religion is the most potent force which shapes the destinies of the human race. Then he explains Janpad which includes the Country and the Race but for explaining the nature of the race, Culture and Religion also need to be considered. He says Janpad is “…. The place where a people ‘characterized by Varnas and Ashrams’ enriches itself. Characterized by Varnas and Ashrams that is, following the Hindu framework of society, obeying the Hindu codes, in short subscribing to the Hindu Religion and Culture – that is important. The people in the country must be Hindu by Religion and Culture and consequently by language, to be really included in the concept Janpad, a component of Rashtra idea of the ancient Hindus.” (Golwalkar 1939:54-55) So it is evident from the description that Janpad, Jati and Desh with an anticipation of religion, culture and language form the concept of Rashtra. So the emanation of the idea of nationality and national consciousness was not the gift of British reign but it was constantly active in ancient Hindus. Golwalkar declared that in any doubtful or difficult situation people should follow the code of Manu. “…. Where any of these people had any doubt they came to Hindustan, the cradle of Religion and Culture to take their instructions. It is this fact which made the first and the greatest law giver of the world – Manu, to lay down in his code, directing all the peoples of the world to come to Hindustan to learn their duties at the holy feet of the “Eldest-born” Brahmans of this land – ” (Golwalkar 1939:55-56) Manusmruti always adored Brahmins as a very superior caste of people. He converted division of work or professions into caste system. He assigned Shudras and women the lowest position in the society to be the victims of their coercion and exploitations by the caste system. Brahmins were the Gods of the Manu originated system and Shudra’s
duty was to serve them to the last drop of blood without demanding any rights. “Golwalkar is forthright in his praise of Manu and his laws regarding them to be the major contribution of Indian thought to the world.” (Puniyani 2009:28) Manusmruti was glorified to heighten and maintain the status of priest class and Brahmins in the society after its fall in the Buddhist period. R.S.S always expressed its unconditional appearance for Brahmins to exalt their position in the society. It was an attempt to bring back the ‘Golden age’ when Brahmins enjoyed the utmost supremacy. Baba Adhav writes in ‘Sanghachi Dhongabaji’ that it is a systematic maintenance of orthodox, Brahmanical culture hemmed by aggressive nationalism. They waste their ‘Purushartha’ (male prowess) in glorifying unscrupulous conduct and ritualism…. They want to make advances in the history. Sangha people want to outrightly overlook the burning issues before nation…. Their meaning of Hindutva is very limited. Ritualism of Brahmanical cultures is their agenda, they provide only lip service to the issues of untouchability, casteism, issues of tribals, slavery of women, economic inequality.” (Aadhav 1977:14-15) The Hindu culture which R.S.S wanted to rejuvenate had constantly given a subordinate status to the women. The burden of obeying morality, religion and metaphysical well-being was entirely on the women. As the dominance of priest class from the period of Rugveda to period of spread of Brahmanism increased, the position of women in the society significantly deteriorated. According to Dr. Samant Muranjan, due to ideas of purity and impurity in Brahmin family women suffered from forced widowhood (Kasabe 2002:85). Brahmins glorified the tradition of sati and Manusmruti had an authoritative sanction for this injustice and oppression of women and R.S.S wholeheartedly supported ‘the first and greatest law giver of the world’, Manu, women were not given entry in Sangha.

Golwalkar kept silence on the question of women except his call to the motherhood. But once he said that “Moreover, there was a real danger in getting married. An individual, who remains in touch with the woman, even if she is his wife, or thinks constantly of his wife, takes on feminine characteristics.” (Sharma 2007:103) Definitely it exposes his demeaning and debasing attitude towards women. He thinks that they are so worthless that being in company with them damages the integrity of men. The mother he adores is also a woman. Golwalkar, in ‘Bunch of Thoughts’ advises women about their special responsibility as mothers. He says
motherhood is not limited to only feeding and clothing children. Mother should be very much careful about Samskars of age or traditions and culture. They should see that children in the family wake up early and salute the elders in the family. By telling them about our deities and culture mothers should shape their mindset in the mold of our cultural standards including their conduct and dress style etc. He says “Modernism has verily banished God from our homes …. ‘Modern’ women think that ‘modernism’ lies in exposing their more and more to the public gaze. What a fall!” (Golwalkar 2000:373). Challenges to the spiritual traditions and integrity of motherland are increasing so there is need to restore our national pride. Women also should feed the hungry, cooperate with the neighbors and serve the needy people. Golwalkar asks women to be vigilant about adoption of modernism because it will dilapidate the traditions of ‘nobility and chastity’ created by the ancient women. “Aping of the glare of Western civilization would spell ruin to the matchless traditions of nobility and chastity set up by the daughters of this soil.” (Golwalkar 2000:374-375) If the real intention behind this warning is unmasked patriarchy associated with Hindu religion and Manusmruti appears in ugly form. According to them chastity and nobility is going ‘sati’ after husband, entering into ‘Johar’ in case of Rajput women, accepting forced widowhood, denying the Consent Bill, sacrificing everything for husband and his family and living over leftovers.

Modernism came into India with demands of equality, education and freedom for women. Golwalkar hence rejects modernism and asks women to obey the ideal of Savitri and asks them to “…. Invoke within themselves such single-minded devotion to the ideal, such purity of character and such peerless heroism!” (Golwalkar 2000:377) He even does not view women as individuals but only as mothers to be utilized for the purpose of shaping ‘Hindu’ generation. Demanding such a measurable commitment and sacrifice on behalf of women is nothing but wish to rejuvenate patriarchy explicitly implied in the Manusmruti.

In ‘Organizer’ on 30th November 1949 Golwalkar wrote “till today Manusmruti is praised all over the world and voluntary obedience to religious rules and principles of equality are created from it. But according to our constitutional experts it is meaningless.” (Gatade 2015:8)
Dr. Ambedkar observing the plight of Hindu women, raised his voice for the rights of women. He demanded the right for share in property and divorce through presentation of Hindu Code Bill. All Hinduist organizations opposed it. R.S.S initially opposed it and organized seventy-nine meetings and rallies only in Delhi as well as burned the effigies of Nehru and Ambedkar. (Gatade 2015:9)

Golwalkar also opposed to India’s tri-colour flag and demanded saffron flag instead. He emphasized on it obviously for it has been a particularly Hindu religion’s flag. According to him there was absolutely no need of finding new flag or Constitution for India. Manusmruti with glorious traditions, culture and religious philosophy of Hinduism were enough for the basis on which Hindu Nation can be built upon. He was antagonist to the concepts of composition nation with federal states. He opposed to the name India by demanding another name after Hindus. Shamsul Islam refers to his writing on the eve of Independence Day in ‘Organizer’:

“Let us no longer allow ourselves to be influenced by false notions of nationhood. Much of the mental confusion and the present and future troubles can be removed by the ready recognition of the simple fact that in Hindustan only the Hindus form the nation and the national structure must be based on that safe and sound foundation …. The nation itself must be built up of Hindus, on Hindu traditions, culture, ideas and aspirations.” (Golwalkar 2011:53)

In the same issue he declared that the tricolour flag would not be venerated and acknowledged by Hindus. The word three conveys evil notions and so the flag would create a very bad ‘psychological effect’ and would be harmful to the country. His ruthless betrayal of inclusive, secular nationalism is evident from his above remarks on flag and also on the Constitution. Golwalkar remarked on the Constitution as, “Our Constitution too is just the cumbersome and heterogenous piecing together of various articles from various constitutions of the Western countries. It had absolutely nothing which can be called our own. Is it a single word of reference in its guiding principle as to what our national mission is and what our keynote in life is? No!” (Ambedkar 1993:721)

He could never be able to express his anger against the Constitution and its federal structure, so he opposed to the formation of states of Maharashtra and Gujarat.
He opposed to secular policies of Congress in political arena because he was against the policies of Congress conferring equal status to minorities. He says about Congress “the other movement (apart from communists) led by the Congress has had more disastrous and degrading effects on the country. Most of the tragedies and evils that have overtaken our country during the last few decades and are even today corroding our national life are its direct outcome.” (Golwalkar 2000:140) He also condemned communists for ruining the democracy in India. According to him they were threats for India as they demanded socialism through revolution like Russia. He sarcastically remarks that those who were willing to sacrifice their lives for freedom of India are now equally ready to make our motherland a satellite of ‘Russia or China’. We are sometimes getting carried away by America sometimes Russia, ultimately leading towards moral and intellectual annihilation. Opposing both Congress and communists he propagated nationalism based on exclusively Hindu culture and traditions saying ‘Hinduism is Nationalism’. He says, “While politicians may play with the words ‘communal’ and ‘secular’ to their hearts content, the fact is that the predominant culture of a country will be its basic national culture.” (Basu 1993:28)

R.S.S consciously remained aloof on the policies concentrating on the building of organization based on ‘Hindutva’ which opposed to the egalitarian, democratic principles and diversity of multiple cultures. Their basis was built by racist, casteist and authoritarian Hindu religious ideas.

Ambedkar’s Critique of Cultural Nationalism

On Gita:

Tilak wrote ‘Gita Rahsya’, a commentary on Gita, which underlines importance of that text for him. Not only Tilak but almost all the nationalist leaders have emphasized its significance. Gandhi has also asserted the centrality of Gita to his thought states.

“I am a devotee of the Gita and a firm believer in the inexorable law of karma. Even the least title tripping or stumbling is not without its cause and I have wondered why one who has tried to follow the Gita in thought, word and deed should have any ailment. The doctors have assured me that this trouble of high blood pressure is
entirely the result of mental strain and worry. If that is true, it is likely that I have been unnecessarily worrying myself, unnecessarily fretting and secretly harbouring passions like anger, lust etc. The fact that any event or incident should disturb my mental equilibrium, in spite of my serious efforts, means not that the Gita ideal is defective but my devotion to it is defective. The Gita ideal is true for all time, my understanding of it and observance of it is full of flares.’(Gandhi 2010:95)

With so much prominence attached to the text, Gita became a centre of attraction as well as reason for curiosity for many. Scholars studied it and tried to understand the whole cannon, so he also studied Gita. He states that several western as well as Indian scholars have studied and consented on that text. Among the western scholars Bhotlingk, Garbe, Hopkin are noteworthy. All these scholars have concluded that the text is not flawless, there are inconsistencies in it. Ambedkar divides Indian scholars in two categories. The first one is the scholars who study it with purely academic interests and the second one is orthodox persons. Telang belongs to the first category and he states that, “There are several passages, in the Gita which it is not very easy to reconcile with one another; and no attempt is made to harmonise them. Thus, for example, in stanza 16 of chapter VII Krishna divides his devotees into four classes, one of which consists of ‘men of knowledge’, whom Krishna says, he considers ‘as his own self.’ It would probably be difficult to imagine any expression which could indicate higher esteem.” (BAWS vol. 3: 358-59) Telang goes on to elaborate on such inconsistencies and gives a long list.

Among the orthodox authorities on the Gita are Shankaracharya and Tilak. They do not agree with the views expressed by the above scholars, whether Indian or foreign. The orthodox believed that the Gita gave three models of salvation. They are karma Marga, or the path of works, Bhakti marga or the path of devotion and the last one is jnana marga, the path of knowledge. These scholars believe that the text upholds all the three ways of salvation and accepts the efficacy of each one of them. Shankaracharya and Tilak disagree with the scholars who say so. According to Shankarqaharya Gita advocates the path of knowledge as the only true way of salvation. Tilak has a difference of opinion on this issue with Shankaracharya and states that the Gita teaches karma marga as the only right path for salvation. Thus Ambedkar brings out ambiguity and confusion that surrounds the text, and states that, “They have gone on a search for the message of the Bhagvat Gita on the assumption that it is a gospel as the Koran, the Bible or the Dhammapada is. In my opinion this
assumption is quite a false assumption. The Bhagvat Gita is not a gospel and it therefore have no message and it is futile to search for one.” (BAWS1987Voliii:360)

Ambedkar then substantiates his views on the Gita. He states that the first and the foremost thing is that it justifies war. As this text has been believed to be an advice by Krishna to Arjuna who was reluctant to fight against his own kith and kin, Krishna offers a philosophic defence to war and killing. There he gives two grounds to do so. The first one is that everything is mortal and perishable. Men are also mortal and so are going to die one day that is why it should not make a difference whether one dies a natural death or killed in a war. It is immaterial. The second argument was more ingenious. They said that body and soul are two different things. Death means an end of the body. Soul never dies, it is described as, weapons cannot break it and fire cannot burn it. The soul is immortal. So it says that when you kill yourself, you only destroy body and the soul remains unharmed. This is how it argues that there is no reason to feel guilty for killing someone.

Other aspect of the Gita is defence of Chaturvarnya which Ambedkar denounces. He states, “Another dogma to which the Bhagwat Gita comes forward to offer a philosophic defence is Chaturvarnya. The Bhagwat Gita, no doubt, mentions that Chaturvarnya is created by God and therefore sacrosanct., but it does not make its validity dependent on it. It offers a philosophic basis to the theory of Chaturvarnya by linking it to the theory of inmate, inborn qualities of men. The fixing of Varna of man is not an arbitrary act says the Bhagwat Gita. But it is fixed according to his inmate, inborn qualities.” (BAWS 1987 vol. III: 361-362)

Ambedkar further deals with the karma Marga and states that in the Gita it means performance of Yajanas as a way of salvation. He sees two abnormalities in this principle. The first one is to encourage blind faith and the second one is that it induces selfishness. He comes to a conclusion that the Gita is a text which endeavors to fortify counter-revolutionary dogmas by supporting it with philosophic defence. He concludes by saying that, “My thesis is three fold. In other words it has three parts. First is that the Bhagwat Gita is fundamentally a counter-revolutionary treatise of the same class as Jaimini’s Purva Mimansa- the official Bible of Counter-revolution.” (BAWS 1987, vol.III:380)

This is how Ambedkar proves that the text that was held by the so called nationalist leaders was in fact an anti-people text which was meant to protect the interests of the elite sections.
The Vedas:

Nationalist leaders right from Swami Dayanand Saraswati to Gandhi have without exception endorsed the greatness of the Vedas and the Vedic tradition. Vedic period was a splendid of the history according to them and they spoke of its glory and always mentioned it accompanied by glowing descriptions. This is more so in case of those who believed in cultural nationalism.

The Vedas have been invested with the power of having all the knowledge of world in it. So it is regarded as the most sacred of the scriptures by the Hindus. Though there is a unanimity regarding its greatness, the genesis of the Vedas has not been confirmed unquestionably. The Vedic Brahmins believe that they are sanatan. The meaning of the Sanatan is ‘eternally pre-existing’. Ambedkar cites Kulluka Bhatt who says that the Vedas are reproduced from memory. So the Vedas being sanatan is not a unquestionable theory.

Ambedkar scrutinize the Vedas in order to verify this view and poses many questions and tries to find answers to them. The first issue he investigates is that who the authors of the Vedas were. Ambedkar reiterates that without doubt the Vedas not only have extremely respectable place in the religion but they are supposed to be so sacred that their authority needs to be accepted unquestioningly. They believe that the Vedas are infallible, that is, they cannot make a mistake. So it follows that whatever they say is a final word for a Hindu. Ambedkar asks that why did the Brahmins, who were the custodians of knowledge and scriptures feel the need to declare the Vedas to be infallible? He answers that this theory rests on the view that the Vedas are Apurusheya means they were not written by man. Vedic Brahmins did not have this belief always. Vishishta Dharma Sutra .Apastambha Dharm Sutra and Budhayana Dharma Sutra had a different view. They believed that (1) Veda (2) Smruti (3) Practice of Shistha and (4) agreement in an assembly were the authorities to resolve and decide on controversial issues. It indicates that the Vedas were not the final authority. He states that, “The Veda was not at all regarded as a book of authority and when the only recognized source of authority was an agreement arrived at in an assembly of the learned. It is only in the time of Gautama that the Vedas came to be regarded as the only authority. There was a time when an agreed decision of the assembly was admitted as one source of authority.”(BAWS1996Vol.iv:27) This way
Ambedkar established that the belief that the Vedas wield final authority is a latter day amendment and did not exist from the beginning.

As the supporters of the Vedas claim that they contain ultimate knowledge, Ambedkar explores them in order to examine the claim. He observes that, “If the Vedas are to be accepted as binding and infallible then what they teach must have ethical and spiritual value. Nobody can regard a rag to be binding and infallible because a philosopher like Jaimini came forward to lend his authority to such a proposal.” (BAWS1996Vol.iv:37)

In his examination Ambedkar observes Prof. Muir’s observation regarding the contents of the Vedas who said, “The whole character of these compositions and the circumstances under which, from internal evidence, they appear to have arisen, are in harmony with the supposition, that they were nothing more than a natural expression of the personal hopes and feelings of those ancient bards of whom they were first recited. (BAWS 1996 vol.IV:37) As prof. Muir is a Westerner and the nationalist leaders believed that the Western persons are unable to grasp the message of the Vedas as they are brought up in a materialistic surrounding and the Vedas were purely spiritual. So Ambedkar quotes some Indian scholars who express almost similar opinions. Firstly, he cited Charvaka who believed that agnihotra and other sacrificial rituals were a costly affair and consumed human energy leaving them exhausted. He also states that the Vedas suffer from contamination on three counts and they are (1) untruth (2) self-contradiction and (3) tautology. He adds that the there are people who fraudulently pose as the scholars on the Vedas and who deceive ignorant people. He quotes a popular saying of his time, “The Agnihotra, the three Vedas, the ascetic, three slaves and smearing oneself of ashes, Brahspati says, “these are but means of livelihood for those who have no manliness nor sense.” (BAWS 1996 vol. IV:38)

Brahspati was another scholar belonging to save school of thought who was more radical and Ambedkar quotes Madhava Acharya who said that Brahspati argued that, “There is no heaven, no final liberation, nor any soul in another world. Nor do the actions of the four castes, orders etc. produce any real effect. The Agnihotra, the three Vedas, the ascetic’s three stages and smearing oneself with ashes… were made by nature as the livelihood of those destitute of knowledge and manliness; If a beast slain in the Jyotishtoma rite will itself go to heaven why then does not the sacrifice forthwith offer his own father?” (BAWS 1996, vol. IV:38)
Ambekar clarifies that Charvaka and Brahspati are not only the persons who had such views. There are ample evidences to this fact in all the schools of Hindu philosophy. He states that above facts substantiate two things. The first is that there was a school of thought which did regard the Vedas as the final authority and the second is that the people who belonged to this school were reputed scholars so that the scholars of the Vedas could not overlook their views.

Describing one more flaw of the Vedas, Ambedkar states that there were many obscene passages and states that, “I may state that I have deliberately omitted a good many observe passages to be found in RigVeda and Yajur-Veda. Those who have any curiosity in the matter might look up the conversation between Surya and Pushan in Rig-Veda Mandal X. 85.37 and between Indra and Indrani in Rig-Veda.Mandal X.86.6. A further obscenity will also be found in Ashwamedha Section of the Yajur-Veda.” (BAWS 1996 vol. IV: 44)

Ambedkar also quotes Prof. Wilson who opines that the Vedas could be useful as a repository of information about the social life of the Aryan people in those days. They have painted a picture of primitive life properly but you do not find anything noble or sublime in it. About Atharva, Ambedkar states that, “It will thus be seen that Atharva-Veda is nothing but collection of sorcery, black-magic and medicine. Three-fourths of it is full of sorcery and black magic. It must not be however assumed that it is only the Atharva-Veda which contains black-magic and sorcery. The Rig-Veda is not altogether free from it. There are Mantras relating to black-magic and sorcery.”(BAWS 1996 Vol.IV:50)

This is how Ambedkar brings out the claims that the Vedas contain sublime ideas, it is the final authority and above all that they have not been written by man.

**Aryan ancestry and social superiority:**

The nationalists in general and the cultural nationalists in particular believed that they belonged to the Aryan stock and had a very high opinion about that race. This led them to their claim of exclusivity. In his the ‘Arctic Home in the Vedas’, Tilak propounds the theory that the original home of the Aryans people was in the Arctic region. He supports his proposition using his knowledge of astronomy and climatic phenomena around the North Pole. He tallies the situation in the North Pole with that in the description of natural phenomena in the myths and legends, included
in the Vedas and concludes that the original home of the Aryans must be in the Arctic region.

Ambedkar appreciates it as an original theory and states that there is one flaw in it. He states, ‘There is only one point which seems to have been over looked. The horse is a favourite animal of the Vedic Aryans. It was most intimately connected with their life and their religion. That the queens vied with one another to copulate with the horse in the ‘Ashwamedha yajna’ shows what place the horse had acquired in the life of Vedic Aryans. Question is was the horse to be found in the Arctic region? answer is in the negative, the Arctic home theory becomes very precarious’. (BAWS1990 Vol.VIII:74) This is how Ambedkar debunks the theory. Ambedkar also records that the word Aryan is used in Rig-veda in two different ways. In the first way the first syllabus is long one where as in the other way the first syllable is short. The first type of word with short syllable is used in the Rig-Veda and it has four different connotations. It is used as a substitute to the word enemy and also as a respected person. It is used as a name for this country and even as an owner, Vaishya or a citizen. It is used in 88 places. The word with long syllable is used in it for 33 times and it does not denote race at all.

The upper caste Hindus nationalists have expressed their pride for being Aryans superior race. They also believed that it is a pure race whose blood is not contaminated due to comingling with other inferior races. Ambedkar quotes the opinion of ethnologists that pure race exists no where, there is a mixture of races in all parts of world. He especially states that it is truer about India. He quotes Bhandarker who claims that no Varna or caste in India which has no strain of foreign blood in it. Bhandarker also adds that the comingling of blood is seen not only among the martial communities like Rajput and Marathas who were Kshatriyas but also among Brahmans who believe that their blood is pure and unadulterated. Ambedkar further makes his point by comparing and contrasting people belonging to different Varna in different states. He asks that if there is a similarity between the Brahmans in Panjab and Brahmans in Madras and the answer is in negative. He asks that if there is a difference between the Brahmans of Punjab and Chamaras of Punjab and states that there is not. He asserts that racially speaking Brahmans of Panjab are closer to chamaras of Panjab than the Brahmans of Madras. The same is the case with the untouchables, the fifth Varna. There is more racial similarity between one of Madras and the Brahmin from the same state than the untouchable of Panjabs. This is how he
discards the theory that various are races and Bhrahmins belong to the superior race and the untouchable belong to inferior race. He also state that Hindus in general are the race of Pigmys and dwarfs whose growth is stunted and who lack stamina due to this physical condition 9/10th of its population is unfit for military service (Ambedkar 2013: 31-33).

Ambedkar proves that no race can boast of being pure but at the same time describes the behavior of Aryan in the ancient times and state that “The Aryan were the race of gamblers. Gambling was developed to science in very early days of the Aryan civilization so much so that they had even devised certain technical terms, the Hindus use the words Krita, Treta, Dwapara and Kali as the names of the four yugas or periods in to which historical times are divided. As a matter of fact originally these were the names of the dices used by the Aryans at gambling. The luckiest was called krita and the unluckiest was call kali. (BAWS 1996 Vol.IV: 108) Ambedkar adds that this vice had not contaminated only the rich people but even the poor were not free of it. It was so widespread that the Shastras had to convince the king to control it by making strict laws.

Gambling was not the only vice from which Aryan suffered. The sexual relations in their society were another major vice. They did not see marriage as a lasting bond between a man and a woman. During a period there were no prohibitions on relations. Even man and women bound by closest relations cohabited with each other. There were Ganikas and Waranganas. Ambedkar states, “Prostitution flourished and has taken the worst form. Nowhere else have prostitutes consented to submit to sexual intercourse in public. But the practices existed among the Ancient Aryans.” (BAWS 1996 vol IV: 109)

Ambedkar describes the third vice in which the Ancient Aryans indulged. It was consumption of alcoholic drinks. He states that they were a race of drunkards. He adds ‘wine formed a most essential part of their religion’ the Vedic Gods drunk wine. The divine wine was called soma. Since the Gods of the Aryans drank wine the Aryan had no scruples in the matter of drinking. Indeed to drink was a part of an Aryan’s religious duty’. (BAWS 1996 Vol IV 109) This is how Ambedkar makes it clear that though one claims an Aryan descent there is nothing to be proud of in their tradition. There is no question of their being a superior race.
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