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3.1. Introduction

The term Hindutva has become commonplace in scholarly analyses of India, with a vast corpus of research focused specifically on cultural, religious, and ethnic nationalisms. It is commonly perceived as the predominant form of Hindu nationalism in India being propagated by many Hindu Nationalist Organisations. It is interchangeably used with Hindu nationalism, Hindu fundamentalism or Hindutva. Different scholars define it differently. Some look at it as modern phenomenon. Others locate its root in Indian history.¹ The common position is that it is the dominant part of political discourse in Indian society today. For the purpose of this study both Hindu and Muslim brands/variants of communalism need to be examined in some details. In this chapter Hindutva is focus of examination.

3.2. Definition of Hindutva

Hindutva is a term having no specific meaning. It is used in different context and connotations. What exactly it stands for has essentially become a contestable issue. Attempt here is try to ascertain the real sense of its meaning. The word ‘Hindutva’ is derivative of the two terms “Hindu” and “tattva” which literally mean “of Hindu Principles” or “Hinduness.” It denotes to the ‘state of mind’ that is based on cultural and spiritual character having roots in Indian culture and civilization.² The Oxford English Dictionary defines that Hindutva is the state or quality of being Hindu; ‘Hinduness’. In its later use, it defines Hindutva as an ideology seeking to establish the hegemony of Hindus and the Hindu way of life.³ According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica “Hindutva (‘Hindu-ness’) is an ideology that sought to define Indian culture

in terms of Hindu values.” 4 This does not give it any precise meaning and character leaving it to contestable interpretations.

A website on Hindutva says that the Hindutva has roots in the last thousands of years of Indian history. According to it in the last thousands of years Indian civilisation was mutilated, altered, and raped by various powers. 5 According to the advocates of Hindutva it has come to redeem Hinduism and restore the lost glory of their nation Bharat. Vinayak Damodar Savarkar was the first person who coined the term of Hindutva in his 1923 writing entitled Hindutva: Who is a Hindu? to describe the movements advocating of Hindu Nationalism. 6 In his another writing Essentials of Hindutva he asserts that “Hindutva is not a word but a history and which is 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.” 7 It does not mean only the religion Hinduism; it covers the complete Hindu civilization and history. He used the term Hindu to refer to the collectivity of the people of India - Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Parsees etcetera. He further asserts that “the Hindu is one who regards this land spread from the river Sindhu to the seas as his fatherland (Pitrubhumi) and the holy land (Punyabhumi).” 8 For Savarkar, the first two essentials of Hindutva –‘nation’ and ‘Jati (race)’– are clearly related by the word ‘Pitrubhumi’ while the third essential of Sanskriti is pre-eminently implied by the word ‘Punyabhumi,’ as it is precisely Sanskriti including Sanskaras , that is, rites and rituals, ceremonies and sacraments, that makes India a Holy land. 9 Therefore he says that ‘Hindu’ is not only a concept but a ‘nation.’ Golwalkar also believes that India is a Hindu nation and naught else. 10 It distinguishes the unique ethos and principles of this nation (Bharatvarsha) that is rooted in inclusiveness and its assimilative qualities.

6 “Hindutva,” Veda.
9 Jacob, “Reflection: The Birth.”
10 Ibid.
The issue of Hindutva was also attended by the Supreme Court of India. Justice Jagdish Saran Verma in a 1995 judgment ruled that... “No precise meaning can be ascribed to the terms ‘Hindu’, ‘Hindutva’ and ‘Hinduism’; and no meaning in the abstract can confine it to the narrow limits of religion alone, excluding the content of Indian culture and heritage.” The Court also ruled that... “Ordinarily, ‘Hindutva’ is understood as a way of life or a state of mind and is not to be equated with or understood as religious Hindu fundamentalism. A Hindu may embrace a non-Hindu religion without ceasing to be a Hindu and since the Hindu is disposed to think synthetically and to regard other forms of worship, strange gods and divergent doctrines as inadequate rather than wrong or objectionable, he tends to believe that the highest divine powers complement each other for the well-being of the world and mankind.” This ruling of the Court does not ascribe any specific meaning to the term Hindutva leading to various descriptions and use by different peoples and organizations to serve their parochial interests to which the Court itself warns and points out in the last para of the judgment: “The mischief resulting from the misuse of the terms by anyone in his speech has to be checked and not its permissible use. It is indeed very unfortunate, if in spite of the liberal and tolerant features of Hinduism recognized in judicial decisions; these terms are misused by anyone during the elections to gain any unfair political advantage. Fundamentalism of any color or kind must be curbed with a heavy hand to preserve and promote the secular creed of the nation. Any misuse of these terms must, therefore, be dealt with strictly.”

Let the manipulators of the word Hindutva realize that articulating it with religious connotation is in violation of the letter and spirit of the Supreme Court judgment. This view of Hindutva holds that it is a mindset shared by all Indians, in larger or lesser degrees. It can also be viewed as an abstract value system rooted Hindu or Indian culture and shared by all Indians irrespective of their religious affiliations. Hindutva is a civilization concept. It is not hostility to any religion nor does it proclaim its superiority over any religion. It is the shield of security and freedom for all religious minorities. The other perspective explains this all differently.

This perspective on Hindutva commonly describes it as geo-political term denoting to
the residents of the Indian sub-continent. Ram Jeathmalani in this regard says that
Hindutva word is rooted in the word of ‘Hindu’ that historically refers to the people
living beyond the Indus, not to any religion.\(^{13}\) The term Hinduism was not existence
before 1830. It was created by the British colonialists. There is no mention of terms
‘Hindus’ or “Sanatana Dharma” in the Vedas, Puranas or any other Hindu religious text
prior to 1930 nor are they found in any writing in any record of foreign travellers to India
before the British rule. The term “Hindustan” was first used in the 12\(^{th}\) century by
Mohammad Ghauri, who entitled his new concern/subjects/residents “Hindus.”\(^{14}\)
Throughout the ancient Indian History, the word Hindu was never related to the religion.
Some historians argue that it is just only a geographic and culture term used by the
Greek, Persians and Arabs.\(^{15}\) It derived from the ‘Sanskrit’ Sindhu to describe the people
living beyond the river of Sindhu. This word Sindhu was more modified by the Greeks
to the “Indos” further edited by the Persians who erased the letter ‘S’ from Sindhu and
started calling people as “Hindus.”\(^{16}\) It became a label to refer to the original inhabitants
of the land. When British organised the first census of Indian population in 1871 after the
Revolt of 1857 deliberately used the term ‘Hindus’ for those people who were not
Muslims, Christians, Buddhists to accentuate identity differences and create conflict
between the Muslims and the Hindus. The colonialists started official use of the term
Hindu to connote religious identity. The term that originated to give geographical and
cultural identity to a people, morphed into a word connoting a Hindu religion
community. This is what is commonly believed today it stands for.\(^{17}\)

Ram Puniyani, however, argues that the term “Hindutva” was born in the late 19\(^{th}\)
century with the rise of communal politics in opposition to the up-and-coming of Indian
National Movement (INM). In opposition to the Indian National Congress (INC) which
was formed in 1885 the Muslim and the Hindu feudal classes opposed it segmenting
their own communal reflective ideologies. The one belonging from Hindu communal
stream was virtually called Hindutva and which was/is basically and famously attached
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with the V. D. Savarkar. Sunny Jacob argues that “according to Hindutva concept, the various causes such as the feeling of threat about insecurity which was created among the ‘some sections of the Hindus’ (upper castes and upper-class Hindus) during the powers of Muslim rulers, the British Colonial period and its Christian Missionary activities, attitude regarding no discrimination on the basis of Dalit and Backward caste in jobs and education and western cultural impact on Indian psyche were all became the strong facts for strengthen the Hindu resurgence mind set mean the glory of Hindu nationalism or Brahmanic era.” The very formation of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) in 1925 was for building a Hindu nation, and not India. This was in contrast to the approach of the Indian National Congress (INC) and its foremost leader Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhi had a secular approach in mobilising all sectors of society against the British. This caused dissatisfaction among a large number of upper castes, Brahmins in particular. In 1920, with the entry of Mahatma Gandhi into the political arena, the dynamics of the anti-British movement got tremendously galvanized. He brought into the struggle, women and men, of all religions, castes and creed. With this, Brahminical domination in the Congress started declining. At this time the upper castes and the Brahmins, supported by Zamindar elements and Banias, in order to reassert their hegemony on the political and social scene, came up with the idea of a religion-based national organization, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS).

By keeping all these threats the upper-class Hindus laid the foundation of ‘Hindu nationalism’ and gradually the spirit of Indian Hindu awareness started taking shape by the help of reinterpretation of history, for glorify the historic of the Brahmanic era like as, Tilak popularised the festivals like Ganpati and festival in honour of Shivaji, Bankim Chandra Chatterji, with popular ‘Vande Mataram,’ Swamy Dayananda Saraswati who started ‘Arya Samaj,’ Swamy Dayananda Saraswati who started ‘Arya Samaj,’ aimed at taking Hinduism ‘back to the purity of Vedic age,’ it also became a channel for Sanskritisation, Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyaya in his novel ‘Sitaram’ urged the Hindus to fight against Muslims. Sumnta Benerji argues that the ideologues of ‘Hindutva’ invoke providence and search through history and mythology,
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to be able to claim as the heirs and continuers of all that was exalted and heroic in the past.  

By making all efforts they became successful in framing a distinct kind of Hindutva ideology under the head leaders like the Savarkar and Hedgewar. They shaped the Hindu identity on communal background which resulted in the spread of Arya Samaj, Brahm Samaj, Hindu Mahasabha (HM), and the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) which directly and indirectly became responsible for the separate identity of Hindu and Muslim in India. Since then Hindutva became the source principle which shaped the ideology of Hindu Nationalism in the future politics of India. After Independence this variant of communalism, however, has been continuously on rise gaining gradual acceptability in the society, politics and governance. Thus, Suhit Sen argues that “at the root of the ideological postures of the Hindu Right was the notion that the Indian subcontinent and ‘nation’ had some kind of an inherent ‘Hindu’ essence and those not prima facie Hindu had to absorb and inculcate it to be truly Indian. This idea remained undertone for various reasons particularly because that the project adopted by the Hindu Right was not academic, nor was it theological or moral; it was primarily political.” The term Hindu that originated to give geographical and cultural identity to a people has been deliberately given communal meaning. Savarkar put forward the idea of ‘Hindutva’ as the basis for politics, which stood for nationalism based on Hinduism which transformed the course of Indian politics especially after Independence of India. To understand it in detail it is needed here to examine the Hindutva’s main ideology, myths/tactics.

3.3. Ideology of Hindutva

Hindutva is commonly identified with the guiding ideology of the Sangh Parivar. The Sangh Parivar is a family of Hindu organizations proclaiming themselves as Nationalists.
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Their mother organization is the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) founded in 1925 by Keshav Baliram Hedgewar consisting mostly of upper-caste male Brahmins dedicated to the protection of Hindu political, cultural and religious interests. However, the term Hindutva was not used to describe the ideology of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS); it was Hindu Rashtra (Hindu nation). The official constitution of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), adopted in 1948, used the phrase Hindu Samaj (Hindu Society). In the words of a Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) publication, “it became evident that Hindus were the nation in Bharat and that Hindutva was Rashtriya, that is, the nationalism. The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) presents itself as a cultural, not a political organization that nevertheless advocates a Hindu nationalistic agenda under the banner of Hindutva, or “Hindu-ness.”

V. D. Savarkar was the ideologue of Hindu Nationalism. The three essentials of Hindutva were said to be the common nation (Rashtra), common race (Jati) and common culture/civilisation (Sanskriti).29 Hindus thus defined formed a nation that had existed since antiquity, Savarkar claimed, in opposition to the British view that India was just a geographical entity. His notion of Hindutva formed the foundation of Hindutva nationalism, which included in its fold the followers of all Indian religions including Buddhism, Jainism and Sikhism, but excluded the followers of foreign religions such as Islam, Christianity, Judaism and Zoroastrianism. Accordingly the natives of India share a common culture, history and ancestry.30 Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar, the second Sarsanghchalak of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) believes that India’s mixture in terms of customs, traditions and ways of reverence was its exceptionality and that this diversity was not without the strong underlying cultural basis which was/is essentially native. His belief was that the Hindu community with all their diversity, shared among other things the same philosophy of life, the same values and the same aspirations which formed a strong cultural and a civilisational basis for a nation.31 Similarly, Savarkar postulates that the Indian subcontinent, which included the area south of the Himalayas and the Hindu Kush, or “Akhand Bharat”, is the homeland of the

Hindus. For him Hindus were/are those who consider India to be their motherland, fatherland and holy land, hence, describing it purely in cultural terms.\textsuperscript{32}

This exclusionary and discriminatory ideology was/is built by Savarkar around a complex and ingenious definition of “who belongs” or “does not belong” to the Indian nation, the most explicit characterization of the question of “belonging” was/is outlined by Golwalkar. He writes: “The foreign races in Hindustan (India) must either adopt the Hindu culture and language, must learn to respect and hold in reverence Hindu religion, must entertain no idea but those of the glorification of the Hindu race and culture, that is, of the Hindu nation and must loose (sic) their separate existence to merge in the Hindu race, or may stay in the country, wholly subordinated to the Hindu Nation, claiming nothing, deserving no privileges, far less any preferential treatment — not even citizen’s rights. There is, at least, should be, no other course for them to adopt. We are an old nation; let us deal, as old nations ought to and do deal, with the foreign races, who have chosen to live in our country.”\textsuperscript{33} Golwalkar writes, in his famous book \textit{Bunch of Thoughts} that the Muslim and the Christians are threat saying that “It has been the tragic lesson of the history of many a country in the world that the hostile elements within the country pose a far greater menace to national security then aggressors from outside.”\textsuperscript{34} This postulate contradicts the popular understanding of religion of Hinduism and instead, frames Hinduism as a culture and Hindus as a race who adhere to a Hindu culture.

On the same lines the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), advocating for Hindutva, states that it believes in a cultural connotation of the term Hindu. “The term Hindu in the conviction as well as in the constitution of the RSS is a cultural and a concept of civilization and not a political or religious term. The term as a cultural concept will include and did always include all including Sikhs, Buddhists, and Jains. The cultural nationality of India, in the conviction of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), is Hindu and it was inclusive of all who are born and who have adopted Bharat as their


Motherland, including Muslims, Christians and Parsis. The answering association submits that it is not just a matter of RSS conviction, but a fact borne out by history that the Muslims, Christians and Parsis too are Hindus by culture although as religions they are not so.”

The meanings and connotations given to the term Hindutva mark it as an ideology preaching for and establishment of Hindu way of life in the Bharatvarsh, the Homeland of Hindus. This representation of Hindutva by Sangh Parivar is viewed and analysed by many others differently disputing the meaning given to it by the Parivar.

They consider Hindutva ideology as a euphemistic effort to conceal communal beliefs and practices. Many of them describe the Hindutva movement as fascist in classical sense, in its ideology and class support specially targeting the concept of homogenised majority and cultural hegemony. Prabhat Patnaik writes that the Hindutva movement as it has emerged is “classically fascist in class support, methods and programme.” He identifies the ingredients of classical fascism present in Hindutva as the attempt to create a unified homogeneous majority under the concept of the Hindus; a sense of grievance against past injustice; a sense of cultural superiority; an interpretation of history according to this grievance and superiority; a rejection of rational arguments against this interpretation; and an appeal to the majority based on race and masculinity. Dilip Simeon says that such nationalism can be “defensive or imperialist, tolerant or chauvinist, universalist or racist,” depending on the social forces which articulate it. Ram Puniyani, Shamsul Islam and others regard Hindutva ideology as the reflection of Fascism (Germany) of Hitler because the Hindutva camp admires by Hitler, Mussolini and dictators like them by projecting the idea of them “one flag, one leader, one culture
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and one ideology.”

A. G. Noorani claims and mentions some important facts and documents supporting the view that ‘Hindutva’ having a strong link with the ‘Fascist’ ideology. He also quotes that Nehru remarked “Hindu communalism was the Indian version of fascism, and in the case of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), it is not difficult to perceive certain similarities.”

This characteristic of Hindutva has also been analysed by some other scholars locating into it in the seeds of fascism. In this regard Marzia Casolari an Italian researcher, who has done a tremendous work on the basic roots of Hindu nationalism, concludes “Hindutva ideology in three main points as: (a) The main historical organizations and leaders of Hindu nationalism had a distinctive and sustained interest in fascism and Nazism; (b) fascist ideological influences on Hindu nationalism were present and relevant; (c) to a certain extent, these influences were channelled through direct contacts between Hindu nationalists and members of the Italian fascist state.”

Suhit Sen also argues that “the Hindutva project has an additional fascist dimension as it essentialists an exclusionary Hindu nation and disempowers those excluded.”

This is/was also viewed as a form of ethnic nationalism by Clifford Geertz, Lloyd Fallers and Anthony D. Smith. Christophe Jaffrelot states that Savarkar’s idea of Hindutva marked a “qualitative change” in Hindu nationalism. Gyanendra Pandey points out that Savarkar’s formulation of Hinduism was regarded in his time as akin to a scientific discovery, a “revelation.” He emphasises that the Hindutva is reverence for “common culture (Hindu culture) and common civilization (Indus Civilization)” and it he wishes to dominate the socio-political of the Indian society. Its ideologues summarise the idea of Hindutva in a cherished slogan towards strengthen of Hindutva
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that is “Hinduise all politics and militarize Hindus.” They encouraged the Hindu people to organise and work for their dream that is the “Hindu Rashtra or Hindu Nation.” Gowalkar’s the meaning of a nation was more authoritarian than Savarkar, because Hindus appear in his writing’s “as the nation in India.” He writes that the “foreign races in Hindustan must either adopt the Hindu culture and language, must learn to respect and hold in reverence Hindu religion, must entertain no ideas but those of glorification of the Hindu race and culture ... or may stay in the country, wholly subordinated to the Hindu nation, claiming nothing, deserving no privileges, far less any preferential treatment—not even citizen’s rights.”

The Sangh Parivar defines the Hindu nation on cultural criteria—as a people united by a common cultural heritage. Savarkar’s definition of a Hindu is plastic and manipulative enough to include anyone into Hindu nation, but the condition that one regard India as the ‘Holy Land’ largely excludes both Muslims and Christians. This definition equates Hindu identity and Indian nationalism, meaning that religious minorities are not only ‘aliens’, but because of their ‘extraterritorial loyalties’ to holy lands in Arab world, they are also potential traitors. Examining Golwarkar’s race ideology A. G. Noorani said that his race ideology is the reflection of fascist doctrine because according to him, ‘Race was taken as the model to be adopted to solve the Muslim problem of India, as Hitler did with Jews case and for this purpose Hindu organisations adopted two main political agenda over the period between 1920 and 1940, one is the ‘race’ issue was maximised, in the light of Hindutva ideology and other to make an effort to realise the public opinion that the Hindu community need a sense of militancy, with an anti Muslims extant and from 1920’s onwards, Muslims became the main target of Hindu policy.”

---
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Nussbarm argues that “no one should be surprised that right wing Hindus has embraced ethno-religious cleansing’ and since the 1930s, ‘their movement has ideally emphasis that India is for Hindus and both Muslims and Christians are foreigners who should have second class status in the nation.”

Hindutva in practical way is a maliciously atrocious ideology which survives by inculcating false stories amongst the Hindu population against of Muslims and other minorities and then tending that anger to ignite Communal Violence with the ultimate purpose of cleansing India from non-Hindus. Arvind Sharma argues that as “Savarkar’s real motive was to create a conceptual category for “Indian religions” but his aim now constitutionally reached and it soon advanced the expression of Hindu culture, from within the space inside “Indian religions” to embrace all other religions practised in India, in a symmetrical way as it was engaged by Savarkar to humiliate all “Indian religions” while situated within Hinduism, through the concept of Hindutva.”

So it could be says that this Hindutva ideology is the ideology of Hindu pride, Hindu patriotism, Hindu fundamentalism, Hindu revivalism, Hindu chauvinism, Hindu fascism or Hindutva. This description of Hindutva as fascist is counter argued by pro-Hindutva authors who claim that the ideology of Hindutva meets none of the characteristics of fascist ideologies. The leadership of the Sangh Parivar makes no efforts at denying any relation to Nazi Germany. It also does little to explain the distinction between its ideology and that of Nazi Germany. They instead describe Hindutva as a form of revolutionary conservatism or ethnic absolutism.

The received wisdom is that, it is an exclusionary ideology seeking to establish India as a Hindu Rashtra (Hindu Nation), and rejecting the notion of a composite Indian identity brought about by a synthesis of different cultures and faiths. What is commonly accepted is its exclusionary and discriminatory nature. However, the communal propaganda machinery relentlessly disseminates “Hindutva” as a communal word, something that has
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also become embedded in the minds and language of opinion leaders, including politicians, media, civil society and the intelligentsia.\textsuperscript{58} It mobilizes a support base through discourses of ‘othering’, particularly of Muslims and Christians. “It oftentimes ‘communalizes’ pre-existing social relations. This is predicated on an imagination of a Hindu Rashtra (Nation), personified in the figure of Bharat Mata (Mother India).” It is an agenda: a lab where ideas are manufactured for the set objective. The whole idea of Hindu, Hindutva and Hindu Rashtra is very deliberate and a part of political agenda.\textsuperscript{59}

3.4. Myths of Hindutva

Hindutva which is interpreted differently by different persons commonly believed stands for common culture (Hindu culture) and common civilization (Indus Civilization). This project of Hindutva is the idea relentlessly being pursued by Sangh Parivar using different means and channels. To achieve the goals of Hindutva, the followers of it under the banner of Sangh Parivar have been busy in creating different kinds of false stories, myths, hate speeches and slogans etcetera against of the minority communities (Muslims and Christians) to provoke and communalise the Hindu masses sometimes resulting into Communal Violence. K.N. Panikkar says that “myth is a way in which the human mind comes to grips with reality, and therefore, it can be said that it refers to reality, although myth in itself is not a reality.”\textsuperscript{60} Ram Puniyani argues that “on a larger and bigger scale the leaders of Hindu communal organizations, kept always harping on creating social common sense chosen from the British communal historiography, where Muslim kings were demonised, labelled as aliens or foreigners etcetera. and around which various clichés and myths were formed.”\textsuperscript{61} Badri Narayan also believes that historical incidents and events sometimes are placed in conflict form with each other, but Hindu communal organisations are always involve into mobilising the Hindu community, by creating aggressive memories and identities against minority communities. But now these kinds of myths became the permanent strategies ever since the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), a political wing of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) attached with the political

\textsuperscript{58} Jethmalani, “Hindutva is a Secular.”
cultism. The perceptions are created/being created about the threat to the majority community is the bedrock of the communal campaign and cunningly intelligent political moves to further strengthen the polarizing communal politics. These myths and prejudices against the minorities are based on a series of grievances (real and imaginary), on half-truths and blatant distortion of reality. Some of these are analyses here:

3.4.1. Muslims got ‘their’ country that is Pakistan, now they should leave ‘our’ country.

Or Hindustan is for Hindus alone.

It is said that the ideological goal of Hindu nationalists is to build Hindu Rashtra around the ideology of Hindutva where Muslims and Christians are considered the foreigners. Eamon Murphy argues that “especially Muslims are as the most dangerous community, because they are the only largest single minority and for the very extreme advocates of Hindutva ideology, the choice for Muslims living in India are very clear, ‘either go to Pakistan or to be killed’.” Savarkar also argues that “it is useless to simply declare to the Muslim League communal, that is no news. The fact is that the Muslim community is communal, including the Congressite Muslims.” M. S. Gowalkar believes in more cruel way, “...Stay in the country wholly subordinated to the Hindu Nation, claiming nothing, deserving no privileges, far less any preferential treatment—not even citizens’ rights.”

Following two great leaders of Hindutva, Hindu nationalists always use hateful comments and slogans against the Muslims especially using different phrases like Babar ki santan, jao Pakistan ya Qabristan (the Muslim community; go to Pakistan or to the graveyard), “Maro, kato,” (“Kill them, Cut them”) and “Mian ko maro” (“Kill

64 “Black Sunday.”
67 Golwalkar, We or Our, 47-48.
these were commonly shouted by Hindu mobs in Bhagalpur riots-1989, Gujarat riots-2002 and most of other riots. In the 1980s and 1990s, sometimes described as Hindu nationalism era, different types of slogans appeared over and again against of the Muslim community in the speeches, pamphlets and newspapers, and on city walls as: Hindustan main reha hai, to hmse milkar rehna hoga (if you wish to live in Hindustan, you will have to live like us) / Hindustan main reha hai to Vande Mataram kehna hoga (those who wish to live in Hindustan will have to say “Vande Mataram”), that is, Victory to the Mother; the mother goddess, who is also Mother of India, Hindustan Hindu ka nhi kisi k baap ka (India belongs to Hindus and nobodies father), Hindi Hindu Hindustan, Mulla bhago Pakistan (Hindi, Hindu for India; Muslims clerics must flee to Pakistan).

In Muzaffarnagar Communal Violence of 2013, Nivedita Menon reports that mob was shouting “Har Har Mahadev” and other slogans “Har Har Modi” in favour of Narendra Modi when they were attacking Muslims. Frontline reported that they shouted the slogans such as “Jao Pakistan, warna Qabristan (Go to Pakistan or graveyard), Hindu ekta zindabad (Long live Hindu unity), and Ek ke badle ek 100 (for one life, we will claim 100 lives).” The latest on this line is “all those who do not identify with Lord Ram are Haramzade (Illegitimates) and the country belongs to Ramzade’s (Sons of Ram) only, others are to be treated like aliens,” stated by Cabinet Minister of Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) ‘Sadhvi Niranjan Jyoti,’ during the Delhi Assembly election campaign in 2015. She further says “Modi has given a mantra that we will neither take bribe nor let others take bribe. Now you have to decide whom to
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choose. Will you choose the sons of Ram or those who are illegitimate?” During
addressing a convention organised in Bhopal as part of the golden jubilee year
celebrations of the Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) former Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh
(RSS) pracharak and Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) organising secretary Dinesh
Chandra also said, “Hum Hindu Hain, Hindustan Hamara Hai, Hum Yahan ke
Malik Hai (We are Hindus, Hindustan belongs to us, we own the country). We have
been living here for thousands of years unlike the followers of Islam and Christianity.”
This is not the end of this hateful propaganda. This has become rather a normal course of
activity implicitly encouraged and endorsed by the institutions of states including the
Government openly impregnating the Indian society with the atrocities of communalism.

3.4.2. The population of Muslims community rapidly increasing because they are
allowed to have four wives and produce 10 Children and soon Hindu
community will be a minority community.  

Or

Muslims will overtake Hindus.

The Sangh Parivar has been pursuing this myth as propaganda through pamphlets, social
media posts, blogs etcetera. They propagate to believe that Muslims are polygamous and
their fertility rates are higher than Hindus and that they are anti-National and one day
Hindus will become minority in their own land. In their support they also claim that
Muslims are growing in number across of the world. The census of data 2011 was
exploited to suite the designs of Hindu nationalist communalists. In this census which is
based on the religion category, it was reported that Hindu population has fallen below 80
per cent for the first time since Independence. The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh
(RSS) joint secretary Dattatreya Hosabale appealed Hindus to start having more
children. The Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP), Rakesh Sinha an Rashtriya Swayamsevak
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Sangh (RSS) ideologue, also commented that “the Hindu population going below the mark of 80 per cent means the Indian way of living is in danger. It was a psychological mark for Hindus. It is extraordinary that their population has fallen below 80 per cent for the first time since independence. The Hindu population is continuously declining, whereas Muslim numbers are going up.” The Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) joint secretary Surendra Jain demanded a uniform population policy across all states, because “Muslims are increasing their population as a mission and we must restrain this psychology.”

The Bharatiya Janata Party’s (BJP) Sadhvi Prachi commented that “who inculpate the Muslims of giving birth to “40 dogs” each and “trying to convert Hindustan into Darul Islam.”

Not only this Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) Member of Parliament Sakshi Maharaj and Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) leader Sadhvi Prachi restate it by appealing to Hindu women to produce four or more children, announcing honour for all Hindu women who produced more than four children.

Praveen Togadia also said that “Why all this fuss over the matter of producing four children? When Muslims produce children, no one says a word. Muslims keep four wives and produce 10 children. If you talk about having two children, then make a law and take action against those who have more than that, we want to protect Hindus today and 1,000 years from now and we will ensure that the population of Hindus in the country increases from 82 per cent to 100 per cent.”

The Sangh Parivar website also posted as, “…in 2035, Muslim will become absolute majority in India (total population: 197.7 crore). Conversion, threatening, rioting, slaughtering, terrorism, intrusion, polygamy, no birth control are being the major tools for Muslim to reach that figure within the told period.”

They are allowed to marry four wives so that their population, which stood at 25 million in 1947, shot up to nearly 170 million, their high growth-rate was also due to unwillingness to adopt family planning. The family planning scheme, it is argued, is covertly if not openly forced upon the Hindus while the Muslims and Christians are allowed to procreate without limitation.
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All these irrational and unsupported statements serve their purpose to create a sense of separateness among different communities of Indian society. However, if one accepts the figures from the 2011 Census are accurate that Hindus grew at an average annual rate of 1.4 per cent between 2001 and 2011 and for Muslims, the proportional figure was 2.2 per cent and if assume in future both communities continue to grow at this rate, than Muslims will catch up with Hindus by 2220 – in around 200 years \(^{88}\) not by 2035 as posted and claimed by the Sangh Parivar website. (Figure: 3.1).

![India's population forecast based on 2001-11 growth rates](image)

Figure: 3.1. Source: Daniyal, “5 charts.”

A data collected by the National Family Health Survey (NFHS) conducted in 1991-92, 1998-99 and 2005-06 explores the truth that there has been a steady decrease graph in the fertility rate of Muslim women during the past 15 years.\(^{89}\) (Figure: 3.2).
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Figure: 3.2. Source: Naqvi, “The Myth.”
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A 1975 report on the ‘Status of Women in India’ points out that the number of polygamous marriages was greater more among the Hindus than the Muslims. According to it 5.06 per cent of Hindu marriages were polygamous and 4.31 per cent of Muslim marriages. According to this report as many as one Crore Hindu men had more than one wife as opposed to just 12 lakh Muslims. In fact, according to the 2011 census, 66 lakh women even are still in bigamous marriages. Against the reality, however, this myth, time and again is maintained, sustained and propagandise through different ways to give it a communal colour.

3.4.3. It is an established fact that the Babri Masjid was built after destroying the Ramjanam Bhoomi temple. 

In the countless media and the intellectual explanation, the Ayodhya issue is introduced with the description that “the Hindu nationalist claim that the Babri Masjid had been built in forcible replacement of a Hindu temple.” The reality of Babri Masjid and Ram Janam Bhoomi is more mythical than historical. It was created by British for their own purposes aimed at destroying the unity among of Hindus and Muslims. The controversy created was ‘Babar’ had destroyed the Ram temple to build the Babari Masjid at that place. They often referred to the Masjid in their files as the “Janmasthan Mosque of Ayodhya” and calling it the monument “wiwad grast” (disputed area). The Sangh Parivar invoking the communal understanding of Indian history established its validity by back-projecting it onto a popular story to mobilise its adherents to communalise the issue of the Babri Masjid which did not simply exist for the majority of Indians for most of the pre-Independence period. Udayakumar argues that actually this myth was built up as a strategy by the Hindutva nationalists with an aim to use it for political purposes in post-independent politics of India.
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The controversy is more mythological than historical. It is a matter of more of faith than fact. Since the issue stands on popular culture and not on recorded history, it becomes even more prone to manipulation and politicisation. Tanika Sarkar argues that the Sangh Parivar at the levels of both institutions and individual always construct the past out of the present interests and the needs of the Sangh. Actually for it past is a tool for the present politics and hence, it needed to be an operative past rather than a real one. Irfan Habib comments that “The Babri Masjid versus Ram Mandir issue should never have been viewed as an issue between Hindus and Muslims. It was in fact a confrontation between the forces of secularism and humanism on one side and the forces of communalism on the other.” The Sangh Parivar exploited this disputed issue for political purposes.

This resulted into politics of hate. This politics of hate challenged the rule of law and the spirit of the Indian constitution causing bloodshed in the form of Communal Violence with no end in sight for the resolution of the controversial issue. This issue at the times of elections is more popularised by Sangh Parivar making promises to build the Ram temple at the disputed site which is dealt separately in the next chapters.

3.4.4. The ancestor of Muslims and Christians were basically Hindus

The idea is that all Indian have common ancestry in the sense that they are/were originally Hindus irrespective of the fact what they are today like Hindu, Muslims, Christian etcetera. The Sangh Parivar believing in this idea work to bring them all into Hindu fold/flock by re converting them to original faith of their forefathers. The Arya Samaj opposed the conversion of Hindus to Islam and Christianity. It advocated re-conversion of recent converts back to Hinduism. It began a Shuddhi (purification) movement in the late 19th century to bring the non-Hindus back to Hinduism. This
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movement with its militant implication made the role of religion greatly vulnerable to communalism in India. Ram Puniyani argues that “the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) extemporise the word Shuddhi and coined the new word Ghar Wapasi (Back to Home) in place of Shuddhi as a clever move to veil its forcible conversion drive.” He further says that “today’s ‘Hindus’ are not a regional-national identity; it is basically a religious ensemble. It is the tenuous trick of them, in calling everybody ‘Hindu’ is to first talk of geographical identity, common ancestors and now says that since we are all Hindus.” The “Ghar Wapasi” programmes are sensitised and organised by organisations like Dharam Jagran Samiti (DJS) et cetera. The work is distributed between different Hindu outfits called “Sahyogi Sangathan”. Uttar Pradesh Dharam Jagran Samiti (DJS) head Rajeshwar Singh Solanki says that “his group will demonstrate against any church baptisms performed on the holiday with ultimate aim to ensure that Islam and Christianity “cease to exist” in India.” In this regard Yogi Adityanath point out that, “those being subjected to Ghar Wapasi will be given the Gotra and caste from which they converted!” The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) Chief Mohan Bhagwat’s states that “all of us are Hindus, this is Hindustan” and “those who have lost their way were separated from us. If they want to return home, we will bring them back to home.” Subramanian Swamy gives a new outlook for conversion. Announcing the formation of Virat Hindustan Sangam (VHS) — an organization that would articulate Hindutva values through the effort of youth and academic forums and find “Hindutva solutions” for national issues, Swami states that
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science had also proven that the Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) of Hindus and Muslims in India was the same and that Hindustan was for those who were Hindus” and “this organization is for Hindus and all those who “acknowledge their ancestors were Hindus.” This drive delivers a scaring message for the religious minorities of India. The Ghar Wapasi agenda in reality is serving the cause of communalisation of Indian society harming its social cohesiveness.

3.4.5. Love Jihad issue

The idea of Love Jihad is an unproven/ campaign defined as an activity under which Muslim men target women belonging to non-Muslim communities for conversion to Islam by feigning love. The origin of the term is unknown but attributed to the Sangh Parivar. It has been coined to use it as their hate strategy to polarize the two communities to image them in communal colours. A Hindu Forum believes that Love Jihad is the agenda being pursued by the some Muslim organisation to train handsome Muslim boys for enticing the Hindu girls first in love then to marry them so as to convert them forcefully in the Muslim religion and to increase the Muslim population. The Hindu converted daughters are like a ‘free wombs’ to produce more Muslims. Then they become vehicles of terrorism. It is a global threat.

For this agenda boys have/are given huge money which comes from the West Asian Countries (Arab Countries) for motorcycle, mobile etcetera to impress upon the Hindu girls. The allegation is made that the Muslims families have eight or ten children. They send one or two of them to Deoband and the other handsome ones are selected and trained to fall in love of Hindu girls because they believe that if they do this Allah will be pleased. Their religion says to do this. They do this work of trapping the Hindu innocent
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girls and then to elope with them.\textsuperscript{113} It is a dangerous conspiracy to expand this operation involving maulvis and masjids: “In the beginning, (Muslim) boys would roam around on motorcycles in front of schools and Plus Two Colleges using Hindu names like Sonu, Monu, with a kalawa (sacred thread) tied around their wrists, pretending to be Hindus. A girl who falls in this trap would come to know only later, after eloping with the boy, that she is not with a Hindu. There have been a lot of such cases.”\textsuperscript{114} The Sangh Parivar uses this bogey to communalise the electorate. It is a real threat to Hindu society. This was used in western Uttar Pradesh in 2013 just before the General election of 2014.\textsuperscript{115} The Uttar Pradesh executive unit of Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) also decided to include the issues of ‘love Jihad’ and Conversion (Ghar Wapasi) of Hindus in the agenda for the party’s action plan for the Assembly elections-2017 of Uttar Pradesh.\textsuperscript{116} The issue of Love Jihad was/is part of the Party agenda.\textsuperscript{117} Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister Yogi Adityanath while campaigning in Kerala went to great lengths to argue how Love Jihad is a very real problem not just in North India but also in South India.\textsuperscript{118}

There is no official evidence supporting these claims.\textsuperscript{119} The issue received national attention in 2009 with alleged conversions in Kerala and Karnataka. What is more endangering is the state participation. In the Silja Raj Case of Karnataka the High Court was informed that “there is no organised attempt by any group of individuals to lure the
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Hindu girls/women to marry Muslim boys with the aim of converting them to Islam.”

In 2016 with the case of Hadiya, the issue of love Jihad was popularised more in comparison to others. In May 2017, the Kerala High Court annulled the marriage in a highly controversial order. In August 17, Jahan filed a petition in the Supreme Court. The apex court freed Hadiya from her parents’ custody sending her to college to pursue her studies, even as she pleaded to be allowed to go with her husband. An investigation was instituted in the case by the National Investigating Agency (NIA) to probe the marriage of an educated young Hindu medical student, Hadiya, who converted and married a Muslim man. The National Investigating Agency (NIA) normally looks into issues of national security and terrorism and so how else could one justify their investigating a marriage except by slapping the label of ‘Love Jihad’ on to the pair’s relationship. “The Peoples Union For Democratic Rights (PUDR) believes that the case is being used in order to provide legitimacy to the supposed presence of ‘love Jihad’ or ‘terror marriages following conversion to Islam’ in the country which is nothing more than a communal political agenda being pushed in the name security of the nation.”

Given the complicity of the state machinery with such fundamentalist groups, the opacity and lack of accountability in the National Investigating Agency (NIAs) functioning (its manner of gathering evidence or methods of investigation, nature and standard of proof that it adduces to establish facts), it could easily arrive at the pre-given conclusion of the existence of such a campaign, indicting some organisations in the process, with next to no conclusive evidence.

Both Hindutva mischief and patriarchal attitudes are at play in her plight. The cleverly crafted ‘Love Jihad’ campaign is based on the patriarchal notions, which are one of the core ingredients of communal politics. The claims of “love Jihad” are exposed as the fevered fantasies and frenzy objections about interfaith marriages and deliberate
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election-time inventions and a campaign to spread religious hatred and false anti-religious propaganda. The word Jihad is being related to the natural and altruistic feeling which we called Love to polarise the society along the communal lines for just electoral purposes. This myth, like many others, is the polarising weapon in the arsenals of Sangh Parivar.

3.4.6. Cow as a Scared/Political Animal

For Hindus, the cow has long been holy. In ancient Hindu scriptures, it is celebrated for its ability to nurture humanity and is compared to deities. The cow is an important Hindu symbol of maternity and fertility. Cow protection has been a serious issue in India. The British Government faced it. The issue of cow protection was petitioned before the Government keeping in view the religious sentiments of the people in India by the people who were apprehensive of the colonial policies endangering traditional Hindu practices, and others who were struggling with increased competition for education, jobs and scarce resources. The cow represented a comforting and benign figure, a guard against evil, and an illustration of good Hindu behaviour. The cow protection was a unifying issue for Hindus of all walks of life. The Hindutva forces have for at least a century made the protection of cows a benchmark, of not only Hinduism, but also Indian-ness. In 19th century Dayanand Saraswati and the Arya Samaj fused the nationalist Hindu forces against cow eating by the imperialists. The Cow served as a hot agenda for the Hindutva forces even before the Independence. This politics received a place in the Constitution of India. The Directive Principles of State Policy (DPSP), Article 48 bans the slaughter of cows, milch and draught cattle. The suggested, non-binding ban under Article 48 is intended to “preserve and promote the breeds” of all milch and draught cattle, including the buffalo, mithun and yak being exploitively used for political interests in the name Cow leading to the demand to ban cow slaughter that is
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now banned in 24 states out of 29 nationally. In Independent India the issue of Cow protection has become most polarising animal or political animal, which was never before, being rigorously pursued by the Sangh Parivar.

Before the 2014 General Elections, the Prime Ministerial candidate of Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) Mr. Modi referred to the danger of a “Pink Revolution” warning the Hindu voters that if the Congress Party gains control it would expand a Pink Revolution of cow slaughter. Since then and with the formation of Union Government by the Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) the secular atmosphere in the country is steadily worsening. The present status of this agenda is that the Hindu extremists are using cow/beef bans to create the political unity among the Hindu community by way of creating hatred between Hindus and Muslims. The Sangh Parivar has polarised this issue propagandising it through sloganeering like “Modi ko matdan, gai ko jeevandan (Vote for Modi, give life to the cow), Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) ka sandesh, bachegi gai, bachega desh (Bhartiya Janta Party (BJP) message, the cow will be saved, the country will be saved).” From the beginning of the Modi regime the cow politics finds belligerent expressions in extraordinary statements made by Hindutva forces like the statement made by Minister of State (Food Processing Industries) Sadhvi Niranjan Jyoti who openly demarcated Indians as “Ramzadas (Hindus)” and “Haramzadas (bastards)” which often result into attacks and lynchings (“Dadri incident”) of Muslims by self-styled cow vigilantes and “gau rakshaks (cow protectionist).” The Rahstriya Swayam Sevak Sangh (RSS) mouthpiece Panchjanya, reported that the “Vedas order the killing of “sinners” who slaughter cows.” Prime Minister Mr. Modi after a few days of Dadri
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incident, during his electoral campaigns in Bihar assembly election-2015 stroked the Mr. Lalu Prasad Yadav, saying that “he was possessed by a “devil” for “insulting” Yadavs, by suggesting they eat beef. He also said that “I come from the land of Gujarat,” where “people worship cows.” This kind of hate politics on ‘cow’ makes the cow not a scared but a political animal which is used for electoral political gains.

There is plenty of evidence of alternate discourses in the Hindu texts, of which the Sangh Parivar has only cited those to its ideological-political benefit. The counter-narrative is not the subject relevant for this study. The Hindutva narrative stands in opposition to the Constitutional values. It advertently claims that if you eat cow meat (beef) or any cattle meat, you are allegedly transgressing Hindu religious laws which are more basic and spiritually just than any Indian law. In other words, Hindutva forces explain “religious laws” are the great laws clearly distinct from secular laws emanating from the Constitution, and the Indian Penal Code (IPC). After all, religion is above all earthly laws. The real issue is not about the religious or legal basis of the cow (and cattle) slaughter, but justifying and endorsing Hindutva on the basis of a deliberate misreading of the religious scriptures and the Constitution to achieve communal agenda.

3.4.7. Muslim Appeasement

The myth is that the Successive Governments pampered and appeased the Muslim community. The Hindu majority is suffering and is being persecuted while the Muslims are being appeased, pampered in the majority Hindu India/Bharatvarsh. It portrays that the Muslim community has been “pampered”, “appeased” or “favored” since the last seven decades by successive Indian secular governments.

Throughout the post-Independent period appeasement propaganda, the Sangh Parivar used various issues to support their propaganda like Uniform Civil Code (UCD), Hindus cannot buy land in Jammu and Kashmir etcetera. Haj subsidy for Muslims figured prominently in the long list of alleged appeasements. It sounds like a legitimate grievance on the face of it. What business is it of a secular state to subsidize religious
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activity? This secular principle, however, has never been the basis for the Sangh Parivar’s reactionary position. The Sangh Parivar has never had any issue with the government subsidizing Hindu Religious Yatras like the Kailash Mansarovar Yatra, Char Dham Yatra and spending money on facilities for pilgrims and on their security by the secular Government. This is a very shrewd move and without a shred of truth. Taken as truth it must stand to reason and this must necessarily be reflected in the socio-economic status of Muslim community. The community should have prospered at a relatively faster rate than the rest. At least large sections of the community, if not all in a horizontally divided society, should be the beneficiaries one way or the other. The reality of the condition of Muslims is well reflected in the Sachar Committee Report.

The report notes that the community exhibits “deficits and deprivation” in practically all dimensions of development. “In fact, by and large, Muslims rank somewhat above the Scheduled Caste (SCs)/ Scheduled Tribes (STs) but below Hindu Other Backward Class (OBCs), Other Minorities and Hindu General (mostly upper castes) in almost all indicators considered.” What adds to the “development deficit,” is the perception among Muslims that they are discriminated against and excluded. The report demolishes several myths about the community. Its findings: only four per cent of all Muslim students are enrolled in madrasas; and Muslim parents are not averse to modern or mainstream education, and would, in fact, prefer to send their children to “regular school education that is open to any other child in India.” 139 The fact is that, over a period of last seven decades their condition has been falling abysmally in all respects of development. In utter disregard to the facts, the appeasement propaganda was successfully used to demonize Indian Muslims percolating into the social-political national understanding serving the Hindutva cause consistently being pursued at various levels through different means.

Far from truth, number of other myths/falls facts are reported, propagated and channelized to communalize the environment at all levels of social existence in India. In this context some of them are briefly mentioned to understand how the communalization is happening all around in India. The one among them is about the religious minority
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institutions. It goes like that the Religious minorities are allowed to run educational institutions with no interference from the government. The bare fact is that all religious communities, including Hindus, are allowed to and do operate educational institutions relatively free of government control and to offer religious education to co-religionists in those institutions.

The other myths are Muslims are invaders. They are sons of Babar. Islam is violent and teaches separatism. It justifies violence against non-Muslims/believers. Muslims refuse to go for secular education and prefer only madrasa education and madrasa education makes them religious fanatics. Madrasas are the factories of terrorism/Jihadies. Not all Muslims may be terrorists, but most terrorists are Muslims. Muslims have always been fundamentalists and are ‘more religious’ than followers of other religions. Muslims always start violence. Hindus only ‘retaliate’ or ‘act in self defense’. Hindus do not kill based on their religion. Only Muslims do, because their religion requires them to. Muslims are united and act together, while Hindus are divided and weak. The Prime Minister Mr. Narendra Modi put it in a different fashion that “wherever there is a Muslim population in the world, the countries live under threat of militancy and terrorism.”

Muslim countries are never secular. Muslims do not tolerate minorities in ‘their’ countries but demand minority rights in other countries. They got ‘their’ country when Pakistan was created, now they should leave ‘our’ country. They oppressed their women. Since Independence the Sangh Parivar has been successfully using these myths to demonize Indian Muslims communalizing the environment. This all provides a welcome fodder to the Sangh Parivar to project the convergent interest of establishing religious hegemony over the existing secular State. Out of this a process of collective myth-making is born by which one community defines its attitudes towards others.

Hindutva politics draws its strength more from the propaganda against minorities: first against Muslims and partly against Christians, not against Sikhs, Buddhists or Jains. Muslims are rather represented as the absolute evil. Hindus are made to feel insecure and therefore inculcate a sense of unity among them born out of a shared feeling of

victimhood. Instilling a sense of victimhood is not just a tool to unify electorates. They perpetuate this kind of politics. History is presented as a perennial battle between Hindus and Muslims. By this perverse logic Muslims are held accountable for what their co-religionists supposedly might have done hundreds of year back in history. The arguments they are able to deploy to cast themselves as victims are the direct result of the political machinations deliberately and consistently being made for decades.

The hostility to Muslims and Islam has always been central to the political logic of the Sangh Parivar. All out efforts are made to rationalize myths, mythicizing reason, logic and rational understanding of social and political issues. The ultimate aim of these nefarious notions/designs etcetera. is to attempt to cultivate anti-Muslim sentiments. In a class-caste driven society with glaring economic disparities the polarization on religious grounds has become an added and pronounced factor today. People are divided as “Us” against “Them.” Ultimately, a whole propaganda package of myths, counter myths, un-reason etcetera. gets fabricated. Through myth packaging the Sangh Parivar exploits the emotions/sentiments of the people to reach down to their unconscious mental layers/levels to de-secularize them. This is the bedrock of the communal politics and a clever political move to strengthen the polarizing politics, surging Hindu majoritarianism, creating new fears and tensions among minorities ultimately aggressively moving towards the realization of Hindutva agenda of turning India into an intolerant de-secularized nation. All of these are signs of growing harmfulness and instability for the unity and integrity of pluralist-secular- democratic India.

In the proceeding part of this chapter an attempt in brief made to analyse the institutional infrastructure of the forces of Hindutva and their role in Communal Violence.

3.5. The Hindutva Organisations: The Forces of Hindutva

3.5.1. The Sangh Parivar: The Institutional Infrastructure of Hindutva

The Hindutva ideology is regulated under the banner of the Sangh Parivar. The Sangh Parivar works as a family made up of hundreds of organizations. At the centre of its organisational structure is Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) established in 1925. Institutionally, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) is itself an organization, largely

open to Hindu Brahmin males, that is secretive and shadowy without specified membership records. It functions primarily through a broad range of organizations that exist in every aspect of socio-political life in India. The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) is the mother organisation around which its political wing Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), its economic forum Swadeshi Jagaran Manch (SJM), its world council—the Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP), Vishva Hindu Parishad of America (VHP-A—Hindutva’s overseas arm), the Hindu Students Council (HSC—VHP of America’s student wing), Bajran Dal (BD), Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad (ABVP), Rashtriya Swayamsevika Sangh, , Bharatiya Majdoor Sangh (BMS), Vanvasi Kalyan Ashrama (VKA), Hindu Jagaran Manch (HJM), Durga Vahini (DV), Bharatiya Yuva Jan Maha Sabha and various other groups are all arrange both nationally and internationally as a Parivar: the family of Sangh.144

Since 1925 the Sangh Parivar has grown many folds in strength and capacity both at national and International level145 working and executing its agenda through its army of Swamsevaks and thousands of publications. From 1980s and especially since its political establishment Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) formed the Governments at states and Union levels its growth has been monumental expanding it’s nationally and internationally, to which Bendiet Anderson calls as a ‘long distance nationalism.’146 Hardliners within the Sangh Parivar, most prominently the Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) and its affiliate, Bajrang Dal (BD), are vocal proponents of religious nationalism wanting the governments to privilege Hindu religious precepts in public policy. The Sangh Parivar hardliners believe that the 1,200 years of slavery had a corrupting effect on Indian culture. They wish to use the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)’s political dominance to reverse Western and Islamic influences, exemplified most recently by the debate over the
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provenance of the Taj Mahal. Jaffrelot examines that the mass communication techniques and especially the Internet facilities, also constitutes a fundamental factor in the development of the Sangh’s foreign networks. On April 14, 1996 the Hindu Students Council (HSC) has announced for the formation of the Global Hindu Electronic Networks (GHEN) and Hindunet.org, introducing it as an inclusive site on Hindu dharma which clearly stated that, Global Hindu Electronic Networks (GHEN) is a resource centre for Hindutva ideology. This web of Global Hindu Electronic Networks (GHEN) in present Internet world shows that the Sangh Parivar having significant place in the online world. The received wisdom among commentators of Indian politics is that the Sangh is a monolith, single-mindedly pursuing a Hindu nationalist agenda.

The Shakha (cell) is actually the core unit of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). It is a place where Swayamsevaks (volunteers) come for physical and ideological training. These Shakhas operate in large numbers of neighbourhoods in India producing a constant stream of Sevaks who become the foot-soldiers for the Sangh’s projects and organizations. B. S. Moonje, the mentor of the founding father of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), Hegdewar, who visited and met with Mussolini to observe and understand the nature of the fascist organizational structure, writes that “The idea of fascism vividly brings out the conception of unity amongst people... India and particularly Hindu Indians need some such institution for the military regeneration of the Hindus: so that the artificial distinction so much emphasised by the British of martial and non–martial classes amongst the Hindus may disappear … Our institution of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) of Nagpur under Dr. Hedgewar is of this kind, though quite independently conceived.”

Moonje is very explicit in acknowledging the centrality of violent militarism to the Sangh Parivar’s strategy. He writes that “This training is meant for qualifying and fitting our boys for the game of killing masses of men with the
ambition of winning victory with the best possible causalities (sic) of dead and wounded while causing the utmost possible to the adversary.”

The Swayamsevaks produced at the Shakhas is linked to the Sangh Parivar infrastructure. They are used for various projects and purposes of every size and shape from student politics, through the Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad (ABVP), to paramilitary operations through the Bajrang Dal (BD). The Sangh permeates every aspect of Indian life.

Besides many instruments of the Sangh Parivar, the Bajrang Dal (BD) is its paramilitary wing to provide muscle and manpower to the Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) agitations. The Bajrang Dal (BD) regularly organizes arms training camps for its members, where it teaches them the use of firearms and other weapons. The training is imparted in order to teach them how to beat those who do not respect Hinduism. This affiliate of the Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) has been at the forefront of Communal Violence against minorities, against artists and intellectuals opposing the Sangh agenda. A Website with name ‘HinduUnity.org,’ being run from the United States claiming itself as the official website of the Bajrang Dal (BD) is famous for its hate-filled and malicious material that it publishes and its provocation for violence against Muslims. A passage on the Website reads that “Revenge on Islam must become the sole aim of the life of every Hindu today. Islam has been shedding Hindu blood for several centuries. This is something we should neither forget nor forgive. This sinister religion has been striking at Hinduism for just too long. It is time we resist this satanic force and kick it back into the same pit it crawled out of.”

Violence appears to be the core aspect of Hindutva. It has never been shameful of advocating violence for the achievement of its goals of a Hindu Rashtra. It depicts that Bharat Mata is persistently under threat from the forces of Islam and Christianity and pluralism. These forces purged the Hindus in history and continue to pose threats even today therefore justification of violence against Muslims, Christians and advocates of pluralism in India as a form of self-defense. This is presented as the process of regeneration of Hindu manhood/masculinity. This is the daily rhetoric of Hindutva. The
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justification of violence is the strategic appreciation of Golwalkar’s and Moonje’s thoughts, where the violence is essential to eliminate what the Sangh Parivar does not desire and very strategic in ensuring that the minorities live in fear and therefore seek no privileges.\footnote{Ibid, 32.} There is sufficient evidence to emphasize the point that the strategic understanding of violence is ingredient part of the Hindutva project. Number of official reports is indicative of the role that the Sangh Parivar discreetly plays in fomenting Communal Violence.\footnote{Ibid, 33.}

### 3.5.2. Communal Violence and the Role of Sangh Parivar

The history of provocation and carrying out/indulging into violent campaigns goes back to the partition of the subcontinent. Disintegrating the integrated multi-religious society and creating polarized communities of Hindus, Muslims and Christians is part of the agenda of the Sangh Parivar. Swayamsevaks of the Parivar create and spread rumors that may produce conditions conducive for a Communal Violence. They do this by adapting different mechanisms, falsifications and rumours.\footnote{Unmistakably Sangh: The National HSC, Agrawal, Chatterji, Gera, Mathew, Mir, and Rajan, The Foreign Exchange of Hate, 32. M.M. Ali, “Hindu Extremists now Focusing Violence against India’s Christians,” Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, March 1999, 52, http://www.wrmea.org/1999-march/hindu-extremists-now-focusing-violence-against-indias-christians.html (Retrieved January 24, 2016), Jacob, “Reflection: The Birth.”} Their strategy is to polarise the people along communal lines among the Hindus and the Muslims to achieve two main purposes:

- a) A separation among the religious community into its own ghetto, and
- b) To unite Hindu community on the principle of Hindutva ideology.

With this agenda of polarisation and consolidation, the Hindutva has grown powerful gaining State power over the years. Different reports briefly presented here specify the role of the Sangh Parivar in different Communal Violence:

i. **The Raghubar Dayal Commission** argues in the context of Sholapur, Maharashtra, Communal Violence in September 1967 that, the Hindu Maha Sabha and the Muslim League were active in the erupting the Communal Violence, because they wanted to use the incident for their political purpose. The same commission also examined in the Muzaffarpur and Bihar Communal Violence of October 1967 that, the Jan Sangh, the
Hindu Mahasabha and other communal minded Hindus were involved and had contributed to communal tensions.\textsuperscript{157}

\textbf{ii. H.K. Vyas,} in his book “Incendiary Hands of RSS and Jan Sangh behind the Communal Riots” examines that in Ranchi riots of August 1967, Srinagar riots of September 23, 1967, Meerut riots of January 28, 1968 and Aurangabad, Karimganj and other places of riots, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and Jan Sangh both were involved.\textsuperscript{158}

\textbf{iii. The Jagmohan Reddy Commission} reports that in \textit{Ahmadabad riot-1969} that “here was not failure of intelligence and guilty to suppress the outbreak of violence but (also) deliberate attempts to suppress the truth from the commission, especially the active participation in the riot of some Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and Jan Sangh leaders.”\textsuperscript{159}

\textbf{iv. The Justice D.P. Madon Commission} reports in \textit{Bhiwandi, Jalegaown and Mahad riots of 1970} that, organisations like Jan Sangh, Shiv Sena members were involved.\textsuperscript{160}

\textbf{v. The Justice Joseph Vithyathil Commission} examines in \textit{Tellicherry riots of 1971} that the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) has taken active part in exciting up ‘anti Muslim’ feeling among the Hindus of Tellicherry and preparing the background for disruption.\textsuperscript{161}

\textbf{vi. The Jagmohan Reddy Commission} reports on \textit{Ahmadabad riot-197} that, the evidence shows that it was pre-planned and attacks were being made on Muslims properties and the Lorries were used to carry rioters and weapons, the crowed being led and directed by workers of Jan Sangh.\textsuperscript{162}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{162} Gupta, “Communal riots,” 20.
\end{flushright}
vii. The Justice Jitendar Narain Commission report of Jamshedpur riots-April 1979 censures the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) Supremo M.D. Deoras personally for the communal propaganda that had caused the riots. The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) had held a conference there ‘only four days before the Ram Navami festival (when the riots erupted) and the speech delivered by Balasaheb Deoras contributed their full share in fomenting these communal feelings.’

viii. The Justice Venugopal Commission reports that in Kanyakumari riots of 1982, ‘the RSS adopts a militant and aggressive attitude to be the rights of Hindus against minorities. It has taken upon itself to teach the minorities their place and if they are not willing to learn their place to teach them a lesson. The RSS methodology for provoking Communal Violence was also spread rumours to widen the communal cleavage and deepen communal feelings by giving a communal colour to any trivial incident."

ix. The joint report by the justices R.C Sinha and S. Shamsul Hasan of the Patna High Court in Bhagalpur riot-1989 points out the hand behind the riot was of the Sangh Parivar.

x. The Justice B. N. Srikrishna Commission reports on the Mumbai riots-1992-93 that, the Shive Sena played a dominant role in the Communal Violence.

xi. The Campaign to Stop Funding Hate (CSFH) report examines that the nature of Sangh Parivar in the view of several International and National human rights organizations pointing out that the ‘violence’ has been associated with the activities of the Sangh Parivar. Report also calls the Sangh Parivar, “is a
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166“Hindutva’s role in riots.”
family of violent, ultra-right organizations that espouse a Hindu supremacist ideology that is—‘Hindutva’.”167

xii. The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs analyses that “for the establishment throughout India of ‘Hindutva’ the ‘land of the Hindus alone,’ is the main objective of all of the rightwing Hindu religious parties that exist under the BJP umbrella. It is their declared policy to use all tools, including violence, to reach that end.”168 Not to questioning the Gujarat Violence-2002, Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) after the violence openly circulated pamphlets signed by its state general secretary, Chinubhai Patel, promising that “we will cut them and their blood will flow like rivers and we will kill Muslims the way we destroyed Babri Masjid.”169 In 2013 Communal Violence erupted in the Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh just before the general election-2014 in which the Sangh Parivar is believed played a dominant role by exploiting the myth of Love Jihad,170 which will be examine in fourth chapter.

3.6. Conclusion

The gradual but continuous polarization of the religious communities through violence is a fundamental fact of the Sangh strategy. Various reports mentioned above points towards the role of the Sangh Parivar in communalization of Indian society.171 Hindutva, it is learnt, is a phenomenon that shapes and colours everything in communalised fashion from national security to identities: every aspect of Indian life. Its politics are strategic, calculating, instrumentalist, troubling, polarizing, and seem customarily to promote and advance intense debate, at best, rioting and violence, at worst. Its modalities of operation, its reliance on state being accomplice and partner, and particularly its use of primordial theories link it in several different ways to ethno-nationalism, religious fundamentalism,

171 Noorani, The RSS, 39.
and fascism. Hindutva is the exclusionary and discriminatory ideology. Violence is a core aspect of it. It is sectarian surviving on anti-minority programs especially creating the anti-Muslim ethos in the minds of people of India.