



Comparative Studies of
SOUTH ASIA, AFRICA and the **MIDDLE EA**

Savarkar's Miscegenous Hindu Race

Journal:	<i>Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East</i>
Manuscript ID	CSA-2022-0060.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, Hindutva, Race, Global Intellectual History, Hindu Nationalism, Caste, Gender, Violence
Subject Classifications:	20th Century, Colonialism, Race, South Asian Studies, India

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Savarkar's Miscegenous Hindu Race

Abstract. This article establishes racial thinking as central to V. D. Savarkar's (1883-1966) founding theory of Hindutva. Savarkar's issue with the Muslims was not that they were irreducibly "other," a foreign race polluting Hindu "blood." Jettisoning racial and caste purity, Savarkar instead grounded Hindutva's myth of a single Hindu race in all-round biological admixture. "Miscegenation," as it was considered by Nazis and white supremacists at the time, buttressed Hindutva's tremendous violence against Muslims, whose annihilation would come through gendered incorporation. Savarkar redefined the caste system as the crucible of the Hindu race, its endless proliferation testimony to a history of intermarriage expired in the present age. To re-establish the broken bonds of the Hindu race, Savarkar championed inter-caste marriage. He offered the same solution to the "Muslim problem." Muslims, who had carved themselves out of the Hindu race, needed to be reclaimed through conversion coupled with (forced) marriage, sex, and reproduction with a Hindu. Yet only Muslim women could be appropriated in this way, as paternity imparted race; Muslim men would be crushed in their potentiality for sovereignty and decimated in war with the Hindus. Savarkar based the Hindu body politic on kinship and a vision of gendered incorporation modelled on war.

Keywords: Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, Hindutva, race, Global Intellectual History, Hindu nationalism, caste

On July 26, 1940, Prem Datta Sharma, a branch post master in Jammu state, brought the matrimonial eccentricities of a "certain friend" before Vinayak Damodar Savarkar (1883-1966), then President of the Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha, for his counsel. Sharma's friend belonged to "a respectable Brahman family" but wished to marry a Muslim girl. The girl was

1
2
3 of age, “ha[d] no objection and [was] willing to be converted in the way our Hindu Dharma
4 allows or permits.” But therein lay the problem. “Kindly,” would Savarkar “say if our Dharma
5 allows such marriages?”ⁱ Dropping the “certain friend” as an alias straight away, Savarkar’s
6 office advised that Sharma “immediately” marry the Muslim girl, for: “He [Savarkar] thinks
7 that marrying with other girls from other religions and getting them converted into Hindu
8 religion is not a sin but a bounden duty of every Hindu youth.” Other religions did so freely.
9 *They* increased their numbers while the Hindus “have lost and are losing their population
10 strength day by day.” Should Sharma find it “impossible” to celebrate his marriage at home
11 (alluding to family and community opposition) the couple should go to Amritsar or Bombay,
12 where the Arya Samaj or local Hindu Sabha would “willingly” assist them. “Anyhow you will
13 not lose this opportunity in marrying the Moslem girl and getting her converted into our Hindu
14 religion.” Remarkably, Savarkar inserted a handwritten, urgently scribbled note into the
15 typewritten letter. It was full of unbridled first-person emotion. “The Hindu,” it charged, “had
16 been silly enough to [...] lose their girls to the Moslem fold over [*illegible*] arguing their
17 religion but to add a girl to Hindudom was a sin! Think of a man who allows [*illegible*] work
18 him as a meritorious act but to earn is a sin! We must give up [this] absurdity!”ⁱⁱ

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 The following themes emerge: inter-communal marriage and conversion (*shuddhi*) into the
42 Hindu fold were Hindu duties. Intermarriage (consensual where possible, forced if need be)
43 proved the primary means for Savarkar to consolidate and increase the Hindus. His Hindutva
44 was consequently at war with orthodox Hinduism. Savarkar strikingly and at every juncture
45 asked “the Hindus” to remodel themselves after his enemy, with whom he intensely identified:
46 the Muslim man. Muslims, his reasoning went, were successful: they would trump Hindus
47 because they did not put miscegenation beyond the pale of sin. Lastly, women were at the crux
48 of Savarkar’s project, which was based on consanguinity. This is a puzzling intellectual
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 inventory to be taken of the chief theorist of Hindutva and arch-antagoniser of India's Muslims,
4
5 but strikes at the heart of "Veer" Savarkar's thought.
6
7

8
9 As the author of *Hindutva*, leader of the Hindu nationalist movement before independence, and
10
11 co-accused of the murder of Gandhi, Savarkar needs no introduction. Indeed, we are currently
12
13 witnessing his canonization as the most controversial of India's Founding Fathers. Savarkar
14
15 was famous even before he wrote *Hindutva*. From boyhood attracted to revolutionary
16
17 nationalism, Savarkar was a student radical in London, where he had come to study for the Bar
18
19 in 1906.ⁱⁱⁱ His activism for Indian independence, headquartered at Shyamji Krishnavarma's
20
21 (1857-1930) famous India House, and his implication in yet another political assassination in
22
23 which he did not pull the trigger earned him a transportation for life to the Andamans in 1910.
24
25 On the ship over, at Marseilles, Savarkar attempted a spectacular escape. He jumped overboard
26
27 and swam ashore to claim asylum. He was recaptured, but his adventure became a case in
28
29 international law and made Savarkar an international celebrity. So Savarkar was already
30
31 famous as a freedom fighter when, thirteen years later and repatriated to India though kept
32
33 under house arrest and banned from politics, he published *Essentials of Hindutva*.^{iv} It was
34
35 immediately recognised as the pioneering theoretical foundation of Hindu nationalism.
36
37 Savarkar was consequently catapulted to the highest office of President of the Hindu nationalist
38
39 party, the Hindu Mahasabha, as soon as the ban on his political activity was lifted, in 1937.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 In the year of Indian independence in 1947, the British anarchist turned humanist Guy Aldred
48
49 (1886-1963), Savarkar's "comrade" from the London years, likened Savarkar's breakthrough
50
51 in *Hindutva* to overcoming the religious determination of "the Jew." He wrote: "the word Jew
52
53 is not distinct from Christianity but from Gentile. And the word Hindu has a parallel meaning
54
55 to Gentile not to Christian."^v In *Hindutva*, Savarkar fixed and asserted "the Hindu" as an
56
57 identity. He did not do so through conventional definition. Instead, he *named*.^{vi} Savarkar
58
59 defined "the Hindu" as one who possesses Hindutva (lit. Hindu-ness or "the Hindu's
60

1
2
3 essence”^{vii}), and “Hindutva” is what the Hindu possesses – a circular argument, brilliant in its
4
5 simplicity. In other words: rather than defining *what* the Hindu is, Savarkar asserted *that* the
6
7 Hindu is. Savarkar’s immediately recognised achievement lay in emancipating the Hindu from
8
9 the notoriously undefinable Hinduism, which, instead of defining the Hindu, should designate
10
11 all that a Hindu may practice and believe, or be jettisoned as a concept: “Hinduism means the
12
13 ‘ism’ of the Hindus,” no more.^{viii} In *Hindutva*, Savarkar managed to constitute the Hindu as a
14
15 plausible political subject for the very first time by making “the Hindu” and his [*sic*] essence,
16
17 Hindutva, absolute.
18
19
20

21
22 Savarkar’s fixing of Hindu identity was in many ways set against the other defining political
23
24 question of the time: the question of Indian Muslim political identity. Muslims, as countless
25
26 scholars have remarked,^{ix} straddle an ambiguous position between inclusion and exclusion in
27
28 *Hindutva*. They are included as indigenous converts, having what Savarkar calls their
29
30 “fatherland,” *priTRIBHUMI*, in India. But they are excluded by India’s jealous requirement of
31
32 being one’s only *PUNYABHUMI*, or “holyland;” Muslims, according to Savarkar, have their holy
33
34 sites in Palestine, Mecca, and Medina. Most scholars,^x and even some of Savarkar’s
35
36 contemporaries,^{xi} have explained this ambiguous belonging by a reversal of Savarkar’s position
37
38 on the Muslim question from inclusion to exclusion in the fourteen years that elapsed between
39
40 *The Indian War of Independence of 1857*,^{xii} Savarkar’s youthful work of the London years that
41
42 is a story of Hindu-Muslim cooperation against the common British enemy, and the publication
43
44 of *Essentials of Hindutva*. But this is misleading insofar as Savarkar never contemplated
45
46 Hindu-Muslim unity in a Gandhian frame.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 For Savarkar, both at the time of writing *The Indian War of Independence* and restated
54
55 throughout his career,^{xiii} the prerequisite for Hindu-Muslim unity in 1857 was the rebirth of
56
57 Hindu sovereignty and prior destruction of Muslim sovereignty in India.^{xiv} The Mughals’
58
59 defeat at the hands of the Hindu Marathas in the eighteenth century was key here: Note that
60

1
2
3 Savarkar used the pseudonym “An Indian Nationalist” in 1909 but substituted it for “A
4 Maratha” in *Hindutva*, whose publication he promptly followed up with a history of the
5 Maratha empire, *Hindu-Pad-Padashahi*.^{xv} This certainly seems to underscore Vinayak
6 Chaturvedi’s recent suggestion that “Hindutva is history,” a violent one:^{xvi} the name and history
7 of a war, for Shruti Kapila.^{xvii} Through the Maratha episode, Hindu-Muslim relations had been
8 set right and Hindu ownership of “Hindusthan” (as Savarkar called it) had been reasserted,
9 crucially, as a direct dyadic confrontation between Muslim and Hindu power, before the British
10 and not triangulated by them. Hindu victory had made Hindu-Muslim alliance possible in the
11 uprising against the British 1857, in Savarkar’s 1909 account. In the following decade and a
12 half, Savarkar realised that the Indian Muslim potentiality for sovereignty was not dead. The
13 Khilafat movement more than anything convinced him of this. Subsequently, for Savarkar,
14 only once Muslim power was defeated, and Muslims had sacrificed their separate ambition,
15 could Hindus “join hands” with them as the “brothers by blood” that he always knew them to
16 be.^{xviii}

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 “The Hindu” so boldly asserted by Savarkar as master of the house was, in reality, far from it.
37 Colonial governmentality and above all the Census had turned Indians into a majority (the
38 Hindus) and a minority (the Muslims).^{xix} But the ostensible majority struggled to keep the
39 margins from breaking away – Sikhs, Dalits (then called Untouchables), Adivasis (tribals), the
40 millions following popular, syncretic religions.^{xx} At a fundamental level, Hindus were only
41 ever a theoretical majority as long as they were riddled by caste. Muslims, in turn, might
42 constitute a minority at the all-India level but found themselves in the majority in some
43 regions.^{xxi} Crucially, the superior power of Hindus over Muslims in India was tied to their
44 population strength, and this could flip, fuelling a numbers game and fears over relative
45 demographic decline among Hindus.^{xxii} Savarkar responded by pulling the Hindu into an
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 integral union that mimicked and replaced the “nation” of Indian nationalism: capable not only
4
5 of consolidating the Hindus but – and this is my point – of imbibing Muslims, too.^{xxiii}
6
7

8 Savarkar forged Hindus into a national race from sexual and reproductive unions across caste
9
10 and religion. This was socially transgressive in India and would have been considered
11
12 “miscegenation” by the race ideologists of the time. The issue for Hindutva’s architect was not
13
14 that Muslims were a foreign race that polluted Hindu blood, nor was his aim to exclude the
15
16 Muslim “other.” Nevertheless, Savarkar’s project was emphatically about race, as most
17
18 recently explored by Vinayak Chaturvedi.^{xxiv} However, Aryanism, purity, and eugenics had
19
20 nothing to do with it; the template of Nazi racism applied by many scholars to Hindu
21
22 nationalism is seductive but misleading,^{xxv} as are ubiquitous conflation of race with colour.
23
24 Instead of purity or pedigree, Hindutva’s race-ism was about kinship and biological relation.
25
26 Savarkar projected “the Hindu” as a future consummation, to be achieved through social and
27
28 biological amalgamation. The Muslim, this article seeks to demonstrate, signposted its frontier
29
30 rather than its border. In stark contrast to Gandhi’s known anxiety about racial and religious
31
32 miscegenation and the “lust” that founded them,^{xxvi} Savarkar championed intermarriage to glue
33
34 together the Hindu race. Not social or metaphorical but *reproductive* intermixing was his
35
36 solution, not only to caste, but to the “Muslim problem.” India’s Muslims sprang from the
37
38 Hindu race; mixing with them was, for Savarkar, the means to reclaim and erase them. Hindu
39
40 racism, it is usually understood, must mean casteism.^{xxvii} This article offers a fundamental
41
42 critique of this view. Savarkar’s thought pushes us to consider caste thinking outside of a good/
43
44 bad binary and complicates the meaning of “race” in the global fascist moment. Hindutva’s
45
46 genocidal logic functioned through life rather than only death, as conventionally argued.^{xxviii}
47
48 The metabolism of conversion, marriage, and reproduction would break down a particular kind
49
50 of life, the Muslim woman, and reassemble her as a Hindu. This reproductive conquest
51
52 mirrored, reversed, and avenged Islam’s historical conquest of India.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Miscegenous Origins of the Hindu “Race”

The Hindus, wrote Savarkar in *Hindutva*, were “not only a *rashtra* [nation] but also a *jati*,” meaning “a common blood,” a “race.”^{xxxix} He could draw on nineteenth-century conceptions of the manufactured, self-willing nature of national races, which combined “acquired” and “inherited” aspects of race.^{xxx} Savarkar had assimilated Orientalism and the classics of evolutionary and race theory – Darwin, Herbert Spencer, Thomas Henry Huxley, John Tyndall, and Ernst Heinrich Haeckel.^{xxxi} He also showed interest in newer researches into “heredity and race.”^{xxxii} From nineteenth-century anthropology, Savarkar took his overwhelming focus on kinship and reproduction. He particularly shared anthropology’s paradoxical approach to reproduction through the lens of paternity, which overwrote heredity in the female line, but ultimately reaffirmed women as reproductive “biocapital.”^{xxxiii} His keen understanding of the crucial importance of women to a consanguine political order ultimately motivated Savarkar’s grotesque violence towards them. Savarkar secured “the Hindu” through reproduction somewhere between biology and metaphor. His thought in a non-trivial sense anticipates the genetic turn of the second half of the twentieth century, with its diffusion of racial purity into natural variation within national populations. But ultimately, Savarkar’s was a fictional project of kinship. The consolidated “Hindu” was a future consummation, established through Hindu *sangathan* (organisation), *shuddhi* (“purification,” or (re)conversion to Hinduism), and miscegenation.^{xxxiv}

For Savarkar, the Hindus were a race, not because they were uniform in phenotype or origin, but because they were all related. What connected them as a race was all-round miscegenation, as the racists would call it, “intermarriage” in India. But how could *all* Hindus be biologically

1
2
3 related given their division into castes? The answer Savarkar offered in *Hindutva* was that the
4 caste system was not what it was made out to be. Colonial anthropologists and orientalis
5 tists
6 agreed that the caste system reflected a racial divide stemming from the ancient conquest by
7
8 (white) Aryans of (dark) indigenous Dravidians. Caste indexed racial division, which had
9
10 prevented Indians from fusing into a nation and thus disqualified Indian nationalism.^{xxxv} For
11
12 Savarkar, by contrast, caste was fusion itself. Restating the Brahmanical theory of the origin of
13
14 *jatis*, or subcastes, from (il)licit unions across the four divisions of *varna* (lit. “colour”) and the
15
16 fifth division of outcastes, Savarkar came to a radical conclusion. Rather than division or
17
18 degeneration, the proliferation of castes gave “testimony to a common flow of blood from a
19
20 Brahman to a Chandal.”^{xxxvi} In other words, Savarkar turned the multiplication of subcastes
21
22 into a historical index of biological relation. Different castes were not different races. Instead,
23
24 the totality of the caste system constituted a single, if heterogeneous, race (also, *jati*). The caste
25
26 system, for Savarkar, gained the cohesion of what I call a “reproductive network,” as ubiquitous
27
28 exogamy (despite Brahmanical injunctions) produced a common bond of blood. “Sexual
29
30 attraction” had assured the triumph of “[n]ature” over religious prohibition, causing blood to
31
32 flow to foreign blood with such force that there really was “but a single race – the Human
33
34 race.”^{xxxvii} Yet Savarkar did not throw the baby out with the bathwater. He acknowledged
35
36 mixture across all humankind, but not to deconstruct “the Hindu.” Rather, he argued that from
37
38 the crucible of ancient race-mixture the Hindu had risen as an alloy so deeply bonded that its
39
40 only equal in a world of lesser-fused mongrel nations was the Jewish race.^{xxxviii} Miscegenation
41
42 (intermarriage) had established genetic union.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 In 1945, the African American scholar Oliver C. Cox (1901-1974) perceptively teased out the
53
54 implications arising from a caste-based conception of national race. Drawing on the colonial
55
56 anthropology of India’s castes and tribes, Cox argued that caste distinction was not the same
57
58 as racial distinction: “The world view of the caste is turned in-ward, and its force is centripetal;
59
60

1
2
3 that of Negroes is turned outward, and its force is centrifugal.”^{xxxix} Mixed-race unions in
4 America consequently blended the racial divide, according to Cox eventually leading to the
5 complete disappearance of “Negroes.” In India, however, female hypergamy (*anuloma*
6 marriage) only produced more castes without breaking the caste system itself.^{xl} No fusion took
7 place; difference merely proliferated.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 In the proliferation of castes, where Cox saw proliferating separation, Savarkar saw mixture
16 *deepening*. His crucial manoeuvre was to counter the dominant theory deriving the caste system
17 from the Aryan conquerors’ self-imposed endogamy in India, with his own theory of caste as
18 a centripetal force of incorporation, which forced exogamy onto all within Hindusthan.
19 Savarkar had woken early to a re-evaluation of the biology of caste that was beginning to dawn
20 on scholarship in the first half of the twentieth century. Theorisations of caste made on the
21 basis of the Sanskrit record had begun to show a breakdown of caste endogamy, from the Aryan
22 conquest onwards.^{xli} Away from Brahmanical idealisation, ethnography revealed the complex
23 interplay of exogamous and endogamous rules that structured lived marriage customs.^{xlii} In
24 Calcutta, coming out of the Zoological and Anthropological Survey of India, the assumption
25 of caste purity would eventually give way to the discovery of ubiquitous, graded mixture
26 between castes.^{xliii} At a time when eugenics still dominated discussion in India’s leading
27 anthropological journal, *Man in India*, in the 1920s and 1930s,^{xliv} therefore, Savarkar
28 anticipated the new, statistical concept of “race,” which would convert race and caste in India
29 from anthropological ideal types into statistically related variables. Caste could be increasingly
30 viewed as adaptive and even miscegenous,^{xlv} to the point that finally, in 1940, Benoy Kumar
31 Sarkar (1887-1947), one of India’s most formidable social scientists at the time, would invite
32 “investigations with the naked eye” to see that all around was and had always been *varna-*
33 *sankara* (“fusion of colours”), or caste mixture, making racial kin of the social high and low.^{xlvi}
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Savarkar founded his national myth of origin on general admixture.^{xlvii} Mixing the conqueror

1
2
3 with the conquered, the Aryan with Dravidian, Brahmin with Dalit, Savarkar created his “pan-
4 Hindu” by blunting the lower-caste critique of caste.
5
6

7
8 It should not have taken Vikram Sampath’s panegyric to remind the larger public that Savarkar
9 was anti-caste and vehemently opposed to Untouchability.^{xlvi} He preached against casteism
10 and publicly interined with Dalits. Caste had been identified as the major impediment to
11 Hindu consolidation, which was forged against perceived Muslim unity by an earlier generation
12 of Hindu nationalists. But Savarkar was more radical than his forerunners. When the
13 Mahasabha’s conservative founder Madan Mohan Malaviya (1861-1946) appealed for the
14 removal of untouchability in his 1923 presidential address, “of course he did not force the high
15 class Hindus to eat with them or to inter marry [*sic*].”^{xlvi} Not so Savarkar, who prided himself
16 on having led an “Anti-caste Society’ movement” since 1924, in a letter sent to a regional
17 Mahasabha functionary in 1943. He was writing explicitly in his personal capacity as leader of
18 this movement, rather than in his “official capacity as President of the Hindu Mahasabha which
19 takes neither side in such matters.”^{li} His correspondent, a Brahmin, had some time previously
20 intercepted Savarkar at a railway station and asked his blessing for his son’s marriage to a girl
21 from the scheduled castes. Their marriage was not a matter of love but of principle, wrote the
22 proud father, whose twenty-three-year-old son had fully consented to the marriage, for “[h]e is
23 more your devotee than me.”^{li} Savarkar had given his blessing and the father had been
24 encouraged to write to him. In his reply, Savarkar recommended “intercaste marriages” as
25 “most helpful to consolidate the Hindu race and inculcate the Pan-Hindu spirit through
26 Hindudom.”^{lii} For Savarkar, caste was the womb and frontier of the pan-Hindu.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Savarkar aligned his position on caste with B. R. Ambedkar’s, Gandhi’s famous adversary on
53 the issue of the annihilation of caste. In a note congratulating Ambedkar on his birthday on
54 April 14, 1942, Savarkar praised the Dalit leader’s “Herculean efforts” in raising the depressed
55 classes.^{liii} But he dismissed Ambedkar’s “occasional anti-Hindu utterances and attitude.”
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Predicting that caste would be inevitably “swept away within a couple of decades,” Savarkar
4
5 imagined a future in which only the “Pan-Hindu cause” prevailed. Savarkar was serious about
6
7 the removal of untouchability. But, representing just the stickiness of the Hindu fold that
8
9 Ambedkar had come to resent, he derailed and appropriated the Dalit movement for his own
10
11 cause of Hindu-making.
12
13

14
15 Savarkar almost uniquely viewed the solution to caste in sex-reproduction, rather than in the
16
17 social digestion of prejudice. Marriage being a key social alliance, and sex central to ritual
18
19 purity, Savarkar deliberately stabbed at sanctity. Hindutva required the destruction of (lived)
20
21 Hinduism, which Savarkar defined by its obsession with purity. To this end, as Vikram Visana
22
23 has recently demonstrated, Savarkar embraced “shamelessness” as an attack on Brahmanical
24
25 injunctions against pollution, especially of bodily functions. Hindu political community,
26
27 Visana argues, was forged through such transgression.^{liv} Naturally, Savarkar alienated
28
29 orthodox Hindus. Savarkar’s sizeable incoming correspondence, which is kept at Nehru
30
31 Memorial Museum and Library in New Delhi, forms an archive of the resistance to his pan-
32
33 Hindu from across its constituents: Jains, Arya Samajis, Buddhists, Sikhs, and others whom
34
35 Savarkar petitioned to register, for example, as “Jain Hindu” in the Census to bulk up Hindu
36
37 numbers.^{lv} But the main opposition to Hindutva came from “sanatanist” or orthodox Hindus,
38
39 who opposed Savarkar’s abolition of caste. In the words of the general secretary of the
40
41 appropriately named All India Varnashrama Swarajya Sangh (*varnashrama* designating the
42
43 fourfold caste order): “Mr Savarkar usually gives out that our agreement is 95 p.c. and
44
45 disagreement is only 5 p.c. This percentage is fixed by giving Vaidic Dharma & Culture very
46
47 small Value.”^{lvi}
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **The female-specific mode of absorption**

59
60

1
2
3 It is no coincidence that the only non-Indians who, for Savarkar at the time of writing *Hindutva*,
4 had managed to transform themselves into Hindus, were women. Sister Nivedita, born in
5 Ireland as Margaret Noble (1867-1911) and inspired by Swami Vivekananda himself to
6 dedicate her life to India, was a Hindu celibate (*brahmacharini*). So was the British-born
7 Theosophist Annie Besant (1847-1933),^{lvii} who had separated from her husband and lost
8 custody of her children. For Savarkar, they were the “exception” to the “rule” of Hindutva’s
9 consanguine foundations. Savarkar could accept these white women as Hindus because they
10 were celibates without family ties, who had come to India as new brides into the Hindu joint
11 family. No foreign man or couple could convert to Hinduism as a closed-off reproductive unit.
12 Hindudom could, however, accept and be replenished by progeny naturalised into it by a Hindu
13 father. These would be racial Hindus and their status, unlike Nivedita’s, hereditary. A Hindu
14 husband made up for the lack of Hindu racial patrimony in the female convert: “The sacrament
15 of marriage with a Hindu which really fuses and is universally admitted to do so, two beings
16 into one,” made a woman’s race.^{lviii}

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Savarkar’s later showcase of a non-Indian Hindu was Savitri Devi (1905-1982) of Calcutta, the
37 “distinguished, learned, patriotic Hindu sister” whom he invited to the 1941 Tilak celebration
38 in Pune, all expenses covered.^{lix} Born in France as Maximiani Portas, Savitri Devi’s desire for
39 intimacy with the “Aryan” brought her in the 1930s to adopt India as her “second motherland”
40 – “my motherland,” as she wrote in a crossed-out Freudian slip in a letter to Savarkar dated
41 December 1, 1944.^{lx} Portas believed India to have preserved the original Aryan civilisation that
42 would be rebuilt in Nazi Germany by the *avatar* of Rama and Krishna and saviour of the race,
43 Adolf Hitler.^{lxi} Rhapsodising about Savarkar’s recent reception of a blood transfusion in the
44 same letter, Savitri Devi confessed that she “env[ied]” the “noble young man who gladly gave
45 his blood to prevent the Hindu Nation from losing such a valuable soldier as you.”^{lxii} The
46 mingling of Savitri’s with Savarkar’s blood would have made for a literal co-mingling of blood
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to supplement the marital, metaphorical. It is entirely in line with Savarkar's ideology to have
4
5 accepted this defilement by non-Brahmin blood.
6
7

8
9 We are thus dealing with two distinct forms of incorporation into the Hindu body politic in the
10
11 female mode: one is compacted by marriage, based on heterosexual sex and, at least potentially,
12
13 on fertility. This form is applicable on a large scale. The other is the "exception" of a single
14
15 female individual, on whom it imposes infertility. Both are at the same time metaphorical,
16
17 legal, and highly somatic events constituting what I purposefully call an "adoption." Adoption,
18
19 like marriage, voided existing patriarchal power. It stripped a woman of her native kin and
20
21 appropriated her for a different set, as was not possible for men. While social contract was
22
23 dissoluble, the Hindu was compounded through kinship bonds and gendered adoptions that
24
25 totally committed one's sexed body and reproductive future.
26
27
28
29

30 Savarkar took the ability to absorb as an index of national strength. Finding contemporary
31
32 Hindus lacking in this regard, he had in a letter from the Andamans to his brother shown himself
33
34 "deadly opposed" to (male) Hindus marrying European women "at this stage in our national
35
36 life."^{lxiii} Further incorporations still threatened the kind of consummation that Savarkar was
37
38 trying to achieve in 1923. This was in stark contrast to the virile absorption (combining Aryan
39
40 masculine virility with what Ronald Inden has called Hinduism's "feminised ability to absorb
41
42 and include"^{lxiv}) shown in the Hindu past. Just days from the beginning of the Second World
43
44 War, Savarkar reiterated his long-held belief that Hindus had historically always "welcomed
45
46 even non-Hindus" into their fold. He cited, again and again, as proof the mass conversion of
47
48 Greeks under Chandragupta and the emperor's own marriage to a "Greek" princess.^{lxv} Hindu
49
50 history had gone wrong, Savarkar held, when Hindus had lost the ability to expunge the enemy
51
52 by absorbing them. It was the development of a Brahmanical worldview that sounded the death-
53
54 knell for intermarriage. Thinking with Chaturvedi's postulation of Hindutva as "a history in
55
56 full"^{lxvi} constitutive of Hindu Being,^{lxvi} the history of gendered incorporation into the race, for
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Savarkar, was the history of a power lost. *Shuddhi*, for the Arya Samaj that misappropriated
4 this rite of purification to turn Hinduism into a proselytising religion in the 1880s,^{lxvii} and for
5 Savarkar, was the means to re-establish this lost power.
6
7

8
9
10 *Shuddhi*, Savarkar was never shy to admit, was a “new-fangled movement,” but justified by
11 the need to combat the “ancient” conversion rites of other religions.^{lxviii} The invention of a
12 *shuddhi* ritual was a “pious fraud,” for the scriptures contained no precedent: Savarkar even
13 urged a correspondent in 1941 to “[i]mprovise” one.^{lxix} *Shuddhi* and *sangathan* were
14 Savarkar’s major campaigns of Hindu consolidation,^{lxx} complemented during the Second
15 World War by the Hindu militarisation campaign designed to train Hindus for eventual battle
16 with the Muslims for the control of India.^{lxxi} In 1944, Savarkar still considered one *shuddhi*
17 performed more fruitful than twenty working committee meetings.^{lxxii} White women were not
18 its main targets, however, but those at the margins (oppressed castes) and beyond the pale of
19 Hindu society, in particular, Muslim women.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Reproducing Hindus or Muslims?**

42
43 Savarkar predicated Hindutva on the very thing that masculinist imaginations of the nation and
44 state excluded: consanguinity, women, and the family. None other than Sister Nivedita offered
45 a theorisation of the neglected, gendered aspect of nation-making, which merits exploring here
46 succinctly as scaffolding for Savarkar’s own. Speaking at the First Universal Races Congress
47 held at the University of London in 1911, Nivedita delivered a remarkable address on the
48 “Eastern” concept of nationhood. Unlike the Western “civic ideal”, she argued, the Eastern
49 concept of nationhood was based on the “family ideal,” on consanguinity. Had Eastern thought
50 been left undisturbed by foreign influence, it would have in time evolved a concept of political
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 community predicated on race instead of nationality. Race, which scaled from family and group
4
5 up to caste, then from caste to “*ecclesia* or *samaj*,” and finally up to race, was a natural
6
7 extension of the “[c]ommunity of blood and origin” within which marriage was possible. For
8
9 Nivedita, this racial principle of nationhood was epitomised by Islam, which encouraged
10
11 intermarriage between all coreligionists.^{lxxiii}

12
13
14
15 Muslims were particularly gifted race- and nation-makers for Savarkar, too,^{lxxiv} and the focus
16
17 of his acute envy and enmity springing from intimate identification.^{lxxv} In contrast to Hinduism,
18
19 Islam was outward-facing and imperial.^{lxxvi} Islam’s power of imperial growth had trumped
20
21 Hindusthan’s traditional power of incorporation. For Savarkar, there was something in Islam
22
23 that imparted nationality by the touch of conversion. He later described this as an instant
24
25 fanaticism, which made Hindu converts to Islam set themselves apart and turn against their
26
27 own blood.^{lxxvii} As a consequence, and vexingly for Savarkar, caste’s reproductive network had
28
29 not been able to reverse the Muslim conquest as it had all earlier invasions. Speaking in 1938,
30
31 Savarkar argued that the leaders of the 1921 Moplah Rebellion had shown the true basis of
32
33 nationality to lie not in territory but in “religious, cultural and racial unity,” namely, when they
34
35 took to forcibly converting Hindus.^{lxxviii} Appropriating Islam’s power to make a national race,
36
37 Hindutva aimed to reverse the direction of consanguine nation-making: from making Muslims
38
39 to reproducing Hindus.

40
41
42
43
44
45
46 Yet Savarkar never strayed from his view that Indian Muslims were indigenous converts of
47
48 Hindu blood. The Mahasabha under his aegis actually used the kinship argument to refute
49
50 Indian Muslims’ claim to separate nationhood, insisting that Hindusthan was not a multi-racial
51
52 state like Russia or the USA.^{lxxix} The issue was that Muslims, though of the blood, did not have
53
54 the *will* to be one with the Hindus. Hence, the Muslim straddled an ambiguity in Savarkar’s
55
56 thought, as racial kin and as the historical enemy, who needed to be reclaimed – or erased. And
57
58 so Savarkar, by the late 1930s unhopful of crushing Muslim political will, formulated his own
59
60

1
2
3 version of the two-nation theory. Muslims, he now alleged, regarded Hindus as enemies and
4 Hindusthan as *dar-al-harb*, “enemy land.”^{lxxx} Division was “maya” (illusion), but if India’s
5 Muslims practiced it, so must the Hindus, who were regrettably always inclined to pursue the
6 Vedantic ideal and relinquish their separate soul, even if their Muslim counterpart was not.^{lxxxi}
7
8 Savarkar’s stance was seconded by fellow Mahasabha leader B. S. Moonje (1872-1948), who
9 was pressed to issue a press statement in a 1943 to quell controversy over Savarkar’s repeated
10 public assertions that Hindus and Muslims were one race. If Muslims insisted on turning
11 themselves into foreigners and enemies of Hindusthan, though factually untrue, Moonje
12 opined, then they deserved to be treated as such.^{lxxxii}
13
14

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 Through political will, the Muslims had made themselves a pseudo-nation, though not a race,
26 apart. Of course, such parasitic nationhood did not entitle India’s Muslims to self-
27 determination, nor could they claim dominion in Hindusthan, which belonged to only one
28 nation-race, the Hindus. This was the context in which Savarkar threatened India’s Muslims
29 with the fate of the Jews, whom he considered a foreign race and a threat in Germany but not
30 in India.^{lxxxiii} Infamously, RSS leader M. S. Golwalkar (1906-1973) gave Indian minorities the
31 blunt choice between complete assimilation patterned on the “all absorbing power of religion”
32 (improbable) and the Nazi purge of the Jews.^{lxxxiv} But unlike Golwalkar, Savarkar’s investment
33 in Muslim incorporation was real. What was at stake for Savarkar was the erasure of the
34 Muslim as a potential site of sovereignty.
35

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Sovereignty, for Savarkar, was gendered male.^{lxxxv} Muslim *men* were capable of sovereignty.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 Savarkar. Muslim men were, albeit converts of Hindu blood. But the Muslim woman could
4 never be an original identity, because the signification of *shuddhi* is that of a *re*-conversion to
5 Hinduism, which takes the Indian Muslim as a convert and the Hindu as the zero point. For
6 Savarkar, women differ from men in their boundless capacity for re-inscription. Woman,
7 unraced, without *gotra*, and having neither religion nor race or nation in the state of nature, is
8 free for male inscription (by the father at birth) and re-inscription (by the husband or abductor)
9 through conversion and marriage. The re-inscription process can theoretically be repeated ad
10 infinitum, as in Savarkar's imagination women were abducted back and forth across
11 community lines.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 That the Muslim woman was only ever a transitory state for Savarkar is illustrated by his
26 attempt to influence Muslim personal law. In the debates preceding the passage of the
27 Dissolution of Muslim Marriage Act (1939), Savarkar (unsuccessfully) advocated that a
28 Muslim woman's conversion to Hinduism should suffice to dissolve her marriage to a Muslim
29 husband.^{lxxxvi} But amazingly, Savarkar did not actually speak of Muslim women in this context.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
By a striking slippage, the Muslim women at issue in this bill became for Savarkar "Hindu
widows, or virgins, or married women having their husbands alive [... but] enticed away by
Muslims and often married to some Muslims."^{lxxxvii} The Muslim woman's conversion becomes
a "rescue," as if from a prior misappropriation. The convert becomes a *revert*: behind her
always lurked the Hindu woman that she had been, could have been, or should, by rights, be.

The figure of the abducted woman, both fictional and real, has received close scholarly
attention.^{lxxxviii} The Hindu Mahasabha engaged in restoring (re-abducting?), reconverting and
remarrying "abducted" Hindu women from the 1920s onwards. When violence escalated into
civil war in 1946, it formally launched its own rescue and defence mission under Syama Prasad
Mookerjee (1901-1953), Savarkar's competitor for control of the Mahasabha.^{lxxxix} But for

1
2
3 Savarkar, recovering “abducted” Hindu women was coupled with teaching Hindu men how to
4
5 “kick in return.”^{xc}
6
7

8 Savarkar unleashed the full, gendered violence of his Hindutva in the context of the civil war^{xc}
9
10 of Partition. Not only did he justify Partition rapes after the fact and in a literary form, in his
11
12 last and bloodiest book written in sickness and old age in 1963, *Bharatiya Itihasatil Saha*
13
14 *Soneri Pane (Six Glorious Epochs of Indian History)*.^{xcii} But Savarkar actively recommended
15
16 the rape of Muslim women to Hindu Rashtra Dal volunteers (the Mahasabha’s youth and
17
18 military wing) in May 1947, just months away from the Indian Partition.^{xciii} Savarkar
19
20 recommended a war strategy of out-devilling the “devils:” to beat the Muslim “Rakshasas” (or
21
22 demons), Hindus had to become fully like them. Savarkar explained: he distinguished
23
24 “religious warfare” from normal warfare in that it required a strategy of superlative “hyper-
25
26 barbarity.”^{xciv} Both Visana and Jyotirmaya Sharma have convincingly linked Hindutva to the
27
28 collective recovery of *rajas* (passion) as capable of generating Hindu political community. This
29
30 involved cruelty as a form of justified, vengeful excess against perceived victimisation by
31
32 Muslims.^{xcv} After the ancient “religious wars” with the demonic Rakshasas, wrote Savarkar in
33
34 this vein, there had followed entirely “political wars” not requiring the most barbarous of war
35
36 tactics, which was forgotten. When “religious war” commenced anew with the Muslim
37
38 conquest, the Hindus were consequently unequipped to face it. Chivalric values had rendered
39
40 the Hindus’ armed wing, the Kshatriyas, incapable of vanquishing their Muslim foe – by raping
41
42 like him.^{xcvi} Incited by Savarkar to become Kshatriyas in the war against Muslims, Hindus had
43
44 to relearn what I have elsewhere described as “*rakshasa* marriage.”^{xcvii} Hindus had to become
45
46 the abductor, Ravan, the Muslim, in his fight against the hero of tradition, the Hindu husband
47
48 Rama.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 *Rakshasa* marriage by capture was an Anglo-Indian legal construct and an obsession for
58
59 nineteenth-century anthropologists, whose archetype is taken straight from Manu. *Rakshasa*
60

1
2
3 marriage, according to Manu, is the “[m]arriage by seizure of a maiden by force from her
4 house, while she weeps and calls for assistance, after her kinsmen and friends have been slain
5 in battle or wounded, and their houses broken open.”^{xcviii} Savarkar may have encountered the
6 anthropology of *rakshasa* marriage in Herbert Spencer, whose ideas he soaked up through his
7 mentor in London, Krishnavarma.^{xcix} We cannot prove, nor perhaps is it necessary to prove, a
8 straight reception history of “*rakshasa* marriage” leading from Spencer to Savarkar. *Rakshasa*
9 marriage in the state of nature was, like evolution and the progress of human society from
10 primitivism to civilization, simply in the air at the time. Ambedkar, too, engaged with it.^c But
11 the connection with Spencer is suggestive, since it was Spencer who, in the *Principles of*
12 *Sociology* (1874), unequivocally made war the cause of bride-capture and exogamy, as
13 discussed in a long section on the evolution of state and society from “primitive” “domestic
14 relations” that no reader could miss.^{ci} Crucially for Savarkar, Spencer associated exogamy with
15 victorious tribes who stole enemy women to diminish enemy numbers. Ritu Menon and Kamla
16 Bhasin,^{cii} Urvashi Butalia,^{ciii} and Veena Das^{civ} have taught us to view women as the chief
17 victims and battleground of Partition. In Savarkar, we have a theorist who made overt how
18 women’s sexed and reproductive bodies became the stakes, objects, and battleground of civil
19 war. He made women the basis of sovereign violence, by robbing Muslim men of their
20 sovereignty as patriarchal power.

21
22 To repeat, Savarkar regarded Muslims as converts of Hindu blood, but implicit in this was a
23 different framing that would gain ground over time. He gave an intriguing spin to the idealised
24 Muslim hierarchy in the subcontinent between *ashraf* and *ajlaf*, purported descendants of
25 India’s foreign Islamic conquerors and indigenous converts. In 1938, Savarkar raised alarm
26 over “systematic Muslim proselytization” in Burma, where Muslim men fraudulently married
27 Burmese Buddhist (read: Hindu) women to spawn Muslim “progeny.” If unstopped, Muslim
28 proselytism would “break up the Racial, Religious and Cultural homogeneity in the Burmees
29
30

1
2
3 [sic] Nation and divide it as happened in India and mainly through the same process.”^{cv}

4
5 Elsewhere, Savarkar had described India’s Muslims as hybrids who had “forgotten” their
6
7 Hindu mothers, taking instead after their Muslim fathers and swearing enmity on their Hindu
8
9 half-brothers.^{cvi} In *Six Glorious Epochs*, the only book he wrote after independence and
10
11 Partition, Savarkar finally scaled Partition-time abductions up into a new story of the origin of
12
13 Muslims in India. He now argued that a small band of male Muslim invaders had grown into a
14
15 community many millions strong by capturing, converting, raping and marrying Hindu
16
17 women.^{cvi} Savarkar’s late theorisation of gender difference in ancestry made Indian Muslim
18
19 men foreign by patrilineal descent. And it made of Indian Muslim women Hindu women
20
21 captured by Muslim invaders.
22
23
24
25

26
27 In *Six Glorious Epochs*, Savarkar explained how “primitive” African tribes and Indian Nagas
28
29 killed enemy men in war, “but not the females, who are eventually distributed by the victor
30
31 tribes amongst themselves.” Alternatively, killings specifically targeted enemy women, for, “to
32
33 kill one woman who cannot be captured alive is to kill five men” for the purpose of diminishing
34
35 the size of enemy populations. And further: the “excess of cows over the oxen” in the animal
36
37 kingdom enabled maximum reproductive gain.^{cvi} Hindus and Muslims, for Savarkar, had
38
39 become mere animal populations. By the same token, Savarkar demanded that Hindu warriors
40
41 fighting the Muslim sultan should be rewarded with “young, beautiful Muslim girls” who had
42
43 been captured and converted to Hinduism.^{cix} Through war and animal breeding, Savarkar had
44
45 arrived at polygyny (male polygamy).
46
47
48
49

50
51 Switched into full war-mode by 1945 and fully backed by Moonje,^{cx} Savarkar sought to
52
53 enshrine polygyny, which he considered a widely practiced caste custom, as a legal right for
54
55 all Hindus, with the Hindu Code Bill that meandered into law only after independence.^{cx}
56
57 Savarkar knew women to be the decisive factor in population size: polygyny could bring no
58
59 absolute increase of children. But this was not the point. What mattered was a *relative* increase
60

1
2
3 vis-à-vis the Muslims. Polygyny could only increase Hindu numbers if it was assumed that
4 these women would not be snatched from reproductively capable Hindu men, leaving some
5 with harems and others as bachelors, but from Muslims. Crucially, with polygamy Savarkar
6 appropriated the major mechanism that “saffron demography” holds accountable for Muslims
7 out-populating Hindus.^{cxiii} Demanding in his inimitable fashion that Hindus drop their “goody
8 goody attitude” and “mealy-mouthed and spineless gentility,”^{cxiii} Savarkar’s war endorsed
9 marriage’s crudest forms, *rakshasa* marriage and polygamy, that he identified with the Muslim.

10
11 Savarkar viewed Hindu-Muslim relations under conditions of war, assuring the large-scale
12 killing of Muslim men. With “enemy men” decimated and their political potential crushed, and
13 “enemy women” apportioned to Hindu warriors, Muslim reproduction would be destroyed. I
14 know of only two instances where “enemy-men” are included as objects of large-scale
15 absorption in the same way as women. One was in Savarkar’s 1963 account of the “glorious
16 epoch” of Chandragupta Maurya, when “the nation [had been] valiant enough to absorb not
17 only the progeny of those enemy-women but the whole enemy communities in [*sic*] their own
18 and leave no trace of their origin behind!”^{cxiv} The other instance is truly remarkable, and not
19 literary. On May 25, 1947, Savarkar sent a note congratulating a fellow Mahasabhite for
20 converting eight hundred Muslim families to Hinduism. In it, Savarkar declared that at the
21 touch of conversion, these families had been “assimilated into Hindudom beyond recognition”
22 and deserved “loving and equal treatment.”^{cxv} That Savarkar could applaud the absorption, by
23 conversion, of Muslim families inclusive of their menfolk into the Hindu body politic on the
24 eve of Partition, when he preached war and rape, starkly shows that Savarkar’s war on Muslims
25 aimed at their erasure through imbibition. As likely as not, he would have recommended that
26 the second generation of converts marry outside their group, the better to fuse into the larger
27 Hindu body politic.

Conclusion: Reproducing Hindutva

In India, conversion mended Hindu race. Unlike genetics with its slow temporal order of mutation, gene expression, and reproduction, for Savarkar, conversion-marriage was an instantaneous somatic event. Race as conceived in Nazi Germany, by contrast, could be neither bonded nor expunged by conversion. The tremendous violence of Savarkar's project of race was staked on the demand for complete consanguinity within "Hindust(h)an," as he termed it: meaning "the land of the Hindus," not the nationalists' "India." The key to consolidating Hindus, for Savarkar, was intermixture. Before his death in 1966, he even set aside money in his will for a "*shuddhi* fund."^{cxvi} What was *shuddhi* in Savarkar's time has become *ghar wapsi* ("homecoming"); the alleged Muslim campaign to abduct, convert and marry Hindu women has been rebaptised "love-jihad." Always seeking to emulate his enemy, Savarkar's genocidal project of incorporation was predicated on women being race-less in the state of nature, and ready for (re)inscription by the male agent. As highjacking their fertility erased the Muslimness of women, Muslim men were erased by forced infertility and war. Hindutva as elaborated by Savarkar in his prolific writings, speeches, and personal papers posited a particular vision of Hindu race, which bridged the gap between the opposite registers of *rakhasa* marriage (as exogamy in inter-group conflict) and caste (traditionally understood as endogamy and patriarchal consent). It is here, in relation to gender and race, that Hindutva's violence came into its own.

Instead of purity, it was *miscegenation* that founded Hindutva's myth of blood. In so arguing, this article goes beyond radically revising our picture of Hindutva. It mounts a challenge to the identification of race with purity and colour, and miscegenation with resistance. The idea that

1
2
3 national races needed to be forged (through war, history, cultural assimilation, biological
4 fusion) was integral to nationalism in the eugenic age. Usually, the breeding vision reproduced
5 the exclusion of the unassimilable, African Americans in the USA,^{cxvii} and Jews, among others,
6 in Germany. But Savarkar did not put the relevant “other” beyond the pale.^{cxviii} Instead,
7 Hindutva developed its extraordinary violence primarily through a particular vision of the
8 gendered incorporation of Muslims. The annihilation it envisaged came as incorporation,
9 assimilation, imbibition – biological metaphors that are more than rhetorical ornament. To
10 characterise Savarkar’s project as seeking dominion over Muslims, who would be relegated to
11 second class citizens, still underestimates its scope and capacity for violence. The Hindustan
12 that Savarkar envisioned was no apartheid state. I do not believe that Savarkar’s Hindutva
13 would have recognised the limit, even, of a completely subjugated “minority.”

14
15 Hindutva has produced two opposed yet complimentary biological foundations. One is the
16 foundation that Savarkar posited in relation to the Muslims. This was based on sexual
17 reproduction and violently founded on women. Hindutva’s other biological buttress, the one
18 particularly resonant with the RSS, is the *brahmacharya* ideal that is built on fraternity.^{cxix} It is
19 grounded in celibacy and the exclusion of women from reproduction in metaphorical if not in
20 biological terms. The role of women in the RSS and affiliates was and is to reproduce Hindutva
21 ideology at home.^{cxx} Savarkar’s Hindutva ideology, by contrast, propagated by enacting itself
22 upon Muslim women. The frame for this was always war, rather than the Hindu family. In this
23 way, Savarkar’s conception of the Hindu race combined fraternal and consanguine foundations,
24 as the fraternity of male Kshatriyas forged reproductive bonds with women looted from the
25 enemy community.

Acknowledgments

This article owes a debt of gratitude that cannot be repaid to the intellectual generosity of Shruti Kapila. The article went through many versions over the years. Its final version further benefits from input, at various stages, from Pradip Kumar Datta, Faisal Devji, Taushif Kara, Leena Sabastian, Adam Lewicki, and my anonymous peer reviewers. Leila Essa supported me during the decisive stages of archival research in Delhi. The article was much enriched by audience feedback on various talks on Savarkar that I delivered, most recently, at the South Asian Intellectual History Seminar, University of Oxford, in November 2022, the Anti-Colonial Political Thought Conference, CRASSH, University of Cambridge, in July 2022, the Centre of South Asian Studies Seminar, University of Cambridge, in March 2021, as well as workshops at the University of Cambridge going back to 2015. Any errors are, of course, my own.

References

Aldred, Guy. "'Hindu' Defined." *The Word* 8, no. 10 (1947): 118.

Alter, Joseph. "Celibacy, Sexuality, and the Transformation of Gender into Nationalism in North India." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 53, no. 1 (1994): 45–66.

Ambedkar, Bhimrao Ramji. *Riddles in Hinduism: An Exposition to Enlighten the Masses*. Vol. 4 of *Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*. Edited by Vasant Moon. 18 vols. Bombay: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1979.

1
2
3 Andersen, Walter. "The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh: II: Who Represents the Hindus?"
4
5 *Economic and Political Weekly* 7, no. 12 (1972): 633–640.
6
7

8
9 Appadurai, Arjun. "Number in the Colonial Imagination." In *Orientalism and the Postcolonial*
10 *Predicament*, edited by Carol Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer, 314–39.
11
12 Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.
13
14

15
16
17
18 Bakhle, Janaki. "Country First? Vinayak Damodar Savarkar (1883-1966) and the Writing of
19
20 *Essentials of Hindutva*." *Public Culture* 22, no. 1 (2010): 149–186.
21
22

23
24
25 Bates, Crispin. "Race, Caste and Tribe in Central India: The Early Origins of Indian
26
27 Anthropometry." In *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, edited by Peter Robb, 219–259. New
28
29 Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.
30
31

32
33
34 Bayly, Susan. "Caste and 'Race' in Colonial Ethnography." In *The Concept of Race in South*
35
36 *Asia*, edited by Peter Robb, 165–218. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.
37
38

39
40 Bhatt, Chetan. *Hindu Nationalism: Origins, Ideologies and Modern Myths*. Oxford: Berg,
41
42 2001.
43
44

45
46 Blom Hansen, Thomas. *The Saffron Wave: Democracy and Nationalism in Modern India*.
47
48 Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
49
50

51
52 Butalia, Urvashi. *The Other Side of Silence*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1998.
53
54

55
56 Casolari, Marzia. "Hindutva's Foreign Tie-Up in the 1930s: Archival Evidence." *Economic*
57
58 *and Political Weekly* 35, no. 4 (2000): 218–228.
59
60

1
2
3 Celarent, Barbara. "Caste and Race in India by G. S. Ghurye." *American Journal of Sociology*
4
5 116, no. 5 (2011): 1713–1719.
6
7

8
9 Chandra, Shefali. "Whiteness on the Margins of Native Patriarchy: Race, Caste, Sexuality, and
10
11 the Agenda of Transnational Studies." *Feminist Studies* 37, no. 1 (2011): 127–153.
12
13

14
15 Chaturvedi, Vinayak. *Hindutva and Violence: V. D. Savarkar and the Politics of History*.
16
17 Albany: SUNY Press, 2022.
18
19

20
21 Cohn, Bernard. "The Census, Social Structure and Objectification in South Asia." In *An*
22
23 *Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays*, 224–54. Oxford: Oxford University
24
25 Press, 1990.
26
27

28
29 Cox, Oliver C. "Race and Caste: A Distinction." *American Journal of Sociology* 50, no. 5
30
31 (1945): 360–368.
32
33

34
35 Das, Veena. *Life and Words: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary*. Berkeley: University
36
37 of California Press, 2007.
38
39

40
41 Datta, Pradip Kumar. "'Dying Hindus': Production of Hindu Communal Common Sense in
42
43 Early 20th Century Bengal." *Economic and Political Weekly* 28, no. 25 (1993): 1305–1319.
44
45
46

47
48 Datta, Pradip Kumar. *Heterogeneities: Identity Formations in Modern India*. New Delhi:
49
50 Tulika Books, 2010.
51
52

53
54 Delfs, Tobias. *Hindu-Nationalismus und europäischer Faschismus: Vergleich, Transfer- und*
55
56 *Beziehungsgeschichte (Inklusive der ersten Auflage von M. S. Golwalkar's "We or Our*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Nationhood Defined*” aus dem Jahre 1939 und mit einem Geleitwort von Hermann Kulke).
4
5 Hamburg-Schenefeld: EB-Verlag, 2008.
6
7

8
9 Devji, Faisal. *Muslim Zion: Pakistan as a Political Idea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
10 Press, 2013.
11
12

13
14
15
16 Framke, Maria. “The Politics of Gender and Community: Non-Governmental Relief in Late
17 Colonial and Early Postcolonial India.” In *Gendering Global Humanitarianism in the*
18 *Twentieth Century: Practice, Politics and the Power of Representation*, edited by Esther
19 Möller, Johannes Paulmann, and Katharina Stornig, 143–166. Basingstoke: Palgrave
20 Macmillan, 2020.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28
29 Franklin, Sarah, and Helena Ragoné. Introduction to *Reproducing Reproduction: Kinship,*
30 *Power, and Technological Innovation*, edited by Sarah Franklin and Helena Ragoné, 1–14.
31 Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.
32
33
34
35

36
37
38 Fuller, Chris J. “Colonial Anthropology and the Decline of the Raj: Caste, Religion and
39 Political Change in India in the Early Twentieth Century.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
40 26, no. 3 (2016): 463–486.
41
42
43
44

45
46 Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand. “A Shame” [from Gujarati], *Navajivan*, February 1, 1925. In
47 vol. 3 of *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, 167–7. New Delhi: Publications Division,
48 Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Govt. of India, 2000 [1960-94].
49
50
51
52

53
54
55 Gerstle, Gary. *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton:
56 Princeton University Press, 2017.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ghurye, G. S. *Caste and Race in India*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1932.
4
5

6
7 Golwalkar, M. S. *We, or: Our Nationhood Defined*, Nagpur: Bharat Publications, 1936; repr.
8
9 in Shamsul Islam. *Golwalkar's We or Our Nationhood Defined: A Critique*. New Delhi:
10
11 Pharos, 2006.
12
13

14
15
16 Goodrick-Clarke, Nicholas. *Hitler's Priestess: Savitri Devi, the Hindu-Aryan Myth, and Neo-*
17
18 *Nazism*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
19
20

21
22 Gupta, Charu. "Anxious Hindu Masculinities in Colonial North India: 'Shuddhi' and
23
24 'Sangathan' Movements." *CrossCurrents* 61, no 4 (200): 441–456.
25
26

27
28
29 Gupta, Charu. *Sexuality, Obscenity, Community: Women, Muslims and the Hindu Public in*
30
31 *Colonial India*. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2001.
32
33

34
35 Inden, Ronald. *Imagining India*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1990.
36
37

38
39 Jaffrelot, Christophe. "The Idea of the Hindu Race in the Writings of Hindu Nationalist
40
41 Ideologues in the 1920s and 1930s: A Concept Between Two Cultures." In *The Concept of*
42
43 *Race in South Asia*, edited by Peter Robb, 327–354. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.
44
45
46

47
48 Jeffery, Roger and Patricia Jeffery. "Saffron Demography, Common Wisdom, Aspirations and
49
50 Uneven Governmentalities." *Economic and Political Weekly* 40, no. 5 (2005): 447–453.
51
52

53
54 Jones, Kenneth. *Arya Dharm: Hindu Consciousness in 19th-Century Punjab*. Berkeley:
55
56 University of California Press, 1976.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kakar, Sudhir. *The Colors of Violence: Cultural Identities, Religion, and Conflict*. Chicago:
4 University of Chicago Press, 1996.
5
6

7
8 Kapila, Shruti. *Violent Fraternity: Indian Political Thought in the Global Age*. Princeton:
9 Princeton University Press, 2021.
10
11

12
13 Kapila, Shruti. "Self, Spencer and Swaraj: Nationalist Thought and Critiques of Liberalism,
14 1890-1920." *Modern Intellectual History* 4, no. 1 (2007): 109–27.
15
16
17

18
19 Keer, Dhananjay. *Savarkar and His Times*. Bombay: A. V. Keer, 1950.
20
21

22
23 Ketkar, Shridhar Venkatesh. *History of Caste in India*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications, 1979
24 [1909].
25
26

27
28
29 Klass, Morton. *Caste: The Emergence of the South Asian Social System*. Philadelphia: Institute
30 for the Study of Human Issues, 1980.
31
32

33
34
35 Kumar, Megha. *Communalism and Sexual Violence in India: The Politics of Gender, Ethnicity
36 and Conflict*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2016.
37
38
39

40
41
42 Mayne, John D. *A Treatise on Hindu Law and Usage*. Madras: Higginbotham; London: Stevens
43 and Haynes, 1878.
44
45

46
47
48 Mehta, S. S. "Laws of Eugenics and the Institution of Marriage amongst the Hindus." *Man in
49 India* 8, no. 2&3 (1928): 168–77.
50
51
52

53
54
55 Menon, Ritu, and Kamla Bhasin. *Borders and Boundaries: Women in India's Partition*. New
56 Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Moonje, B. S. "Baroda Hindu Sabha Conference, Presidential Address." In *Ideology of Hindu*
4 *Mahasabha and Other Political Parties*, 560-7. Vol. 3 of *The Making of India and Pakistan:*
5 *Select Documents*, edited by S. R. Bakshi. 6 vols. New Delhi: Deep & Deep, 1997.

6
7
8
9
10
11 Mukerjee, Radhakamal. *Regional Sociology*. New York: Century, 1926.

12
13
14
15
16 Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. New Delhi:
17 Oxford University Press, 1988 [1983].

18
19
20
21 Nivedita, Sister. "The Present Condition of Woman." In *Papers on Inter-Racial Problems:*
22 *Communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, Held at the University of London, July*
23 *26-29, 1911*, edited by Gustav Spiller, 89–98. London: P.S. King & Son; Boston: The World's
24 Peace Foundation, 1911.

25
26
27
28 Pande, Ishita. "Loving Like a Man: The Colourful Prophet, Conjugal Masculinity and the
29 Politics of Hindu Sexology in Late Colonial India." *Gender & History* 29 (2017): 675–692.

30
31
32
33 Pandey, Gyanendra. *A History of Prejudice: Race, Caste, and Difference in India and the*
34 *United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

35
36
37
38 Peerbhoy, Ayaz S., to Guy Aldred, 4 December 1948. "Savarkar: Past and Present: A Socialist
39 Estimate." *The Word* 10, no. 5 (1949): 61.

40
41
42
43 Pendas, Devan O., Mark Roseman, and Richard F. Wetzell, eds. *Beyond the Racial State:*
44 *Rethinking Nazi Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

45
46
47
48 "Report from Bombay: Extract from the Fortnightly Report from Bombay for the Second Half
49 of May 1947, 3 June 1947: Home Pol (I), File No. 18/5/47, NAI." In *1947*, edited by Sucheta

1
2
3 Mahajan, 2090-7. Vol 10, part 2 of *Towards Freedom: Documents on the Movement for*
4 *Independence in India*, edited by Sabyasachi Bhattacharya. New Delhi: Oxford University
5 Press, 2015.
6
7

8
9
10 Roy, S. N. "How to Make a Child Beautiful." *Man in India* 7, no. 2&3 (1927): 196–9.
11
12

13
14 Ruskola, Teemu. "Raping like a State." *UCLA Law Review* 57, no. 5 (2010): 1477–1536.
15
16

17 Russell, Robert V. *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*. London:
18 Macmillan, 1916.
19
20

21
22
23 Sabastian, Luna. "Women, Violence, Sovereignty: 'Rakshasa' Marriage by Capture in Modern
24 Indian Political Thought." *Modern Intellectual History* 19, no. 3 (2022): 757–782.
25
26

27
28
29 Sabastian, Luna. "Indian Political Thought and Germany's Fascism, ca. 1918-1950." Doctoral
30 thesis, University of Cambridge, 2020.
31
32

33
34
35 Salesa, Damon Ieremia. *Racial Crossings: Race, Inter-marriage, and the Victorian British*
36 *Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
37
38

39
40
41
42 Sampath, Vikram. *Savarkar: A Contested Legacy, 1924-1966*. New Delhi: Penguin, 2021.
43
44

45
46 Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. *The Beginning of Hindu Culture as World-Power (A.D. 300-600)*.
47 Shanghai: The Commercial Press, 1916.
48
49

50
51
52 Sarkar, Benoy Kumar. "The Sociology of the Poor and the Pariah." *Man in India* 20, no. 3
53 (1940): 144–177.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Sarkar, Tanika. "Semiotics of Terror: Muslim Children and Women in Hindu Rashtra."
4

5 *Economic and Political Weekly* 37, no. 28 (2002): 2872–2876.
6
7

8
9 Sarkar, Tanika, and Urvashi Butalia, eds. *Women and the Hindu Right: A Collection of*
10
11 *Essays*. New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1995.
12
13

14
15
16 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar [An Indian Nationalist, pseud.]. *The Indian War of Independence*
17
18 *of 1857*. S.l.: s.n., 1909.
19
20

21
22 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar [A Maratha, pseud.]. *Essentials of Hindutva*. Nagpur: V. V.
23
24 Kelkar, 1923.
25
26

27
28 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. *Hindu-Pad-Padashahi, or: A Review of the Hindu Empire of*
29
30 *Maharashtra*. Madras: B. G. Paul, 1925.
31
32

33
34 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. "The 'Suffering' Muslims of Kohat." *The Mahratta*, March 1,
35
36 1925.
37
38

39
40 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. *An Echo from Andamans: Letters Written by Veer Savarkar*
41
42 *During His Captivity to His Brother Dr. Savarkar*. Poona: Venus Book Stall, 1947.
43
44

45
46
47 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. *Hindu Rashtra Darshan (A Collection of the Presidential*
48
49 *Speeches Delivered from the Hindu Mahasabha Platform)*. Bombay: L. G. Khare, 1949.
50
51

52
53 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. *The Story of My Transportation for Life: A Biography of Black*
54
55 *Days of Andamans*. Translated by V. N. Naik. Bombay: Sadbhakti Publications, 1950 [1927 in
56
57 Marathi].
58
59
60

1
2
3 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. "Hearty Congratulations to Pandit Anand Priya for Converting
4 Muslims to Hinduism." May 25, 1947. In Savarkar, *Historic Statements*, edited by S. S.
5 Savarkar and G. M. Joshi, 196–7. Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1967.
6
7

8
9
10
11 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. *Six Glorious Epochs of Indian History*. Translated by S. T.
12 Godbole. Bombay: Bal Savarkar, 1971 [1963 in Marathi].
13
14

15
16
17
18 Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. *Savarkar Samagra (The Complete Savarkar)*. 10 vols. Delhi:
19 Prabhat Prakashan, 2000.
20
21

22
23
24
25 Sen, Satadru. *Benoy Kumar Sarkar: Restoring the Nation to the World*. New Delhi: Routledge,
26 2014.
27
28

29
30
31 Sharma, Jyotirmaya. "Digesting the 'Other': Hindu Nationalism and the Muslims in India." In
32 *Political Hinduism*, edited by Vinay Lal, 150–72. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
33
34

35
36
37 Skidmore, Thomas E. *Black into White: Race and Nationality in Brazilian Thought*. Oxford:
38 Oxford University Press, 1974.
39
40

41
42
43 Slate, Nico. *Colored Cosmopolitanism: The Shared Struggle for Freedom in the United States
44 and India*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.
45
46

47
48
49
50 Spencer, Herbert. *The Principles of Sociology*. 2nd ed. London: Williams and Norgate, 1877
51 [1874].
52
53

54
55
56
57 Srivastava, Harindra. *Five Stormy Years: Savarkar in London (June 1906 – June 1911): A
58 Centenary Salute to Swatantrayaveer Vinayak Damodar Savarkar*. New Delhi: Allied, 1983.
59
60

1
2
3 Thapar, Romila. "The Theory of Aryan Race and India: History and Politics." *Social Scientist*
4
5 24, no. 1/3 (1996): 3–29.
6
7

8
9 Visana, Vikram. "Savarkar before Hindutva: Sovereignty, Republicanism, and Populism in
10
11 India, c.1900–1920." *Modern Intellectual History* 18, no. 4 (2020): 1106–1129.
12
13

14
15 Visana, Vikram. "Glory and Humiliation in the Making of V. D. Savarkar's Hindu
16
17 Nationalism." *The Historical Journal* 66, no. 1 (2023): 165–85.
18
19

20
21
22 Wilkerson, Isabel. *Caste: The Origins of Our Discontents*. New York: Random House, 2020.
23
24

25
26 Wolf, Siegfried. "Die Konstruktion einer kollektiven Identität: Vinayak Damodar Savarkar und
27
28 sein Hindutva-Konzept." Doctoral thesis, Ruprecht-Karls Universität, Heidelberg: 2009.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 **Notes**
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
-
- 4 i Prem Datta Sharma to Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, July 26, 1940, reel no. 6, file no. c-7-38, p. 317, Veer Savarkar
5
6 Papers, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi.
- 7
8 ii By order of the President Savarkar to Sharma, August 5, 1940, reel no. 6, file no. 3-c-15-46, p. 136, Veer
9
10 Savarkar Papers.
- 11
12 iii Keer, *Savarkar and His Times*; Srivastava, *Five Stormy Years*.
- 13
14 iv A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*.
- 15
16 v Aldred, “‘Hindu’ Defined,” 118.
- 17
18 vi Blom Hansen, *Saffron Wave*, 60-65, 77-80; Kapila, *Violent Fraternity*, 96-104.
- 19
20 vii “Hindutva” is traditionally regarded as a compound of “Hindu” + *tva*, or “ness.” A different etymology has
21
22 been proposed by Chaturvedi, *Hindutva and Violence*, 141, which combines “Hindu” with *tattva*, or “essence.”
- 23
24 viii A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 95, 92.
- 25
26 ix See, for example, Bakhle, “Country First?,” 177, 179-80; Bhatt, *Hindu Nationalism*, 98-9; Wolf,
27
28 “Konstruktion einer kollektiven Identität,” 133, 345.
- 29
30 x For example, Bakhle, “Country First?,” 169-71, 177.
- 31
32 xi Peerbhoy to Aldred, 61.
- 33
34 xii An Indian Nationalist, *Indian War of Independence*.
- 35
36 xiii An Indian Nationalist, *Indian War of Independence*, 233-4; Savarkar, “The Following Statement Is Issued by
37
38 Br. Savarkar, the President of the Hindu Mahasabha in Reply to the Article Published by the Maha Raja Sir
39
40 Kishan Prasad of Hyderabad Regarding the Nizam Civil Resistance Movement,” May 4, 1939, reel no. 23, serial
41
42 no. 2, p. 549, Veer Savarkar Papers; Savarkar, *Hindu Rashtra Darshan*, 40-1.
- 43
44 xiv Visana, “Savarkar before Hindutva,” 1126.
- 45
46 xv Savarkar, *Hindu-Pad-Padashahi*.
- 47
48 xvi Chaturvedi, *Hindutva and Violence*, 389.
- 49
50 xvii Kapila, *Violent Fraternity*, 98-108.
- 51
52 xviii An Indian Nationalist, *Indian War of Independence*, 62-3.
- 53
54 xix Appadurai, “Number in the Colonial Imagination,” 314-39; Cohn, “Census,” 224-54.
- 55
56 xx Fuller, “Colonial Anthropology,” 466-7.
- 57
58 xxi Devji, *Muslim Zion*, 49-51, 83-7.
- 59
60 xxii Datta, “‘Dying Hindus,’” 1303-19.
- xxiii Sharma, “Digesting the ‘Other,’” explores another aspect of Hindutva in relation to imbibition: the fantasy of
tearing apart and eating up the Muslim.
- xxiv Vinayak Chaturvedi, *Hindutva and Violence*, 186-96; Sabastian, “Indian Political Thought and Germany’s
Fascism,” 86-139.

- xxv Cf. Casolari, "Hindutva's Foreign Tie-Up," 218-28; Bhatt, *Hindu Nationalism*, 105-8. "Race" was neither monolithic nor self-evident in Nazi Germany either: see Pendas, Roseman, and Wetzell, *Beyond the Racial State*.
- xxvi Gandhi, "A Shame," 30:166.
- xxvii Pandey, *History of Prejudice*; Slate, *Colored Cosmopolitanism*; Chandra, "Whiteness on the Margins;" Wilkerson, *Caste*.
- xxviii Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 180-1. Cf. Sarkar, "Semiotics of Terror," 7; Kakar, *Colors of Violence*; Kumar, *Communalism and Sexual Violence*, 13.
- xxix A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 73-4; Chaturvedi, *Hindutva and Violence*, 186-96.
- xxx Delfs, *Hindu-Nationalismus*, 105.
- xxxi Jaffrelot, "Idea of the Hindu Race," 335n32.
- xxxii Savarkar, *Story of My Transportation*, 461.
- xxxiii Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 175-6; Franklin and Ragoné, introduction to *Reproducing Reproduction*, 1-2.
- xxxiv "Annual Report of the Hindu Mahasabha [for 1939]," reel no. 7, serial no. D-22-22, p. 10, Veer Savarkar Papers.
- xxxv Thapar, "Theory of Aryan Race," 5; Bates, "Race, Caste and Tribe," 241; Bayly, "Caste and 'Race,'" 165-218.
- xxxvi A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 74.
- xxxvii A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 78.
- xxxviii A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 79. The identification of Hindus (rather than Muslims) with Jews may be surprising to some readers but was taken for granted by Savarkar and many of his ilk, including today. I expect the perceived affinity to lie in their religions based on descent rather than conversion, civilisational longevity, and national survival amid and despite persecution and the loss of political power.
- xxxix Cox, "Race and Caste," 368.
- xl Cox, "Race and Caste," 366.
- xli Mukerjee, *Regional Sociology*, 240-9; Russell, *Tribes and Castes*, 2:263-4; Ghurye, *Caste and Race*, 76-80, 96-7; see also Celarent, "Caste and Race," 1716-17; Klass, *Caste*, 37-9.
- xlii Ketkar, *History of Caste*, 15-17.
- xliii Bates, "Race, Caste and Tribe," 24.
- xliv For example: Roy, "How to Make a Child Beautiful;" Mehta, "Laws of Eugenics."
- xlvi Sarkar, *Beginning of Hindu Power*, 21-3; Sen, *Benoy Kumar Sarkar*, 50-5, 86.
- xlvi Sarkar, "Sociology of the Poor," 166.
- xlvi A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 63-4.

- 1
2
3
4 xlviii Sampath, *Savarkar*, 41-68. This point was already made seventy years earlier by Keer, *Savarkar and His*
5 *Times*, 132, 156-8, 160-72.
6
7 xlix "Session of All India Hindu Mahasabha" [translated from the Arabic], *Oudh Akhbar* (Lucknow), January 6,
8 1923, in "Newspaper Extracts Relating to the Hindu Mahasabha," 1924, file no. 198, p. 9, Home (Political),
9 National Archives of India, New Delhi.
10
11
12
13 ^l Savarkar to Raja Ram Sabir [?], January 21, 1943, reel no. 11, serial no. 15, p. 208, Veer Savarkar Papers.
14
15 ^{li} Raja Ram Sabir to Savarkar, January 15, 1943, reel no. 26, serial no. 14, p. 271-2, Veer Savarkar Papers.
16
17 ^{lii} Savarkar to Raja Ram Sabir [?], 208.
18
19 ^{liii} [Savarkar's] Presidential Office, Hindu Mahasabha, Press note, April 15, 1942, reel no. 6, file no. c-55-86, p.
20 48, Veer Savarkar Papers.
21
22 ^{liv} Visana, "Glory and Humiliation," 165-85.
23
24 ^{lv} A. B. Mahajan to Savarkar, December 25, 1940, reel no. 14, serial no. 10, p. 316, Veer Savarkar Papers.
25
26 ^{lvi} S. M. Pavande to R. M. Deshmukh, n.d. [October 1940], copy, reel no. 7, file no. c-10-41, p. 160, Veer Savarkar
27 Papers.
28
29 ^{lvii} A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 117-18
30
31 ^{lviii} A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 116.
32
33
34 ^{lix} Savarkar to Savitri Devi, June 3, 1941, reel no. 10, file no. c-38-69, p. 5, Veer Savarkar Papers.
35
36 ^{lx} Savitri Devi to Savarkar, December 1, 1944, reel no. 31, file no. B 16/143, p. 34, Veer Savarkar Papers.
37
38 ^{lxi} Goodrick-Clarke, *Hitler's Priestess*, 27, 69-71, 120.
39
40 ^{lxii} Savitri Devi to Savarkar, 33.
41
42 ^{lxiii} Savarkar, *Echo from Andamans*, 13.
43
44 ^{lxiv} Inden, *Imagining India*, 88.
45
46 ^{lxv} Savarkar, "Message," August 26, [193]9, reel no. 12, serial no. 4, p. 38, Veer Savarkar Papers; A Maratha,
47 *Essentials of Hindutva*, 31n.
48
49 ^{lxvi} Chaturvedi, *Hindutva and Violence*, 11, 22-3.
50
51 ^{lxvii} Jones, *Arya Dharm*, 129-35.
52
53 ^{lxviii} Savarkar, "'Suffering' Muslims," 110.
54
55 ^{lxix} Savarkar to Rao, July 5, 1941.
56
57 ^{lxx} Gupta, "Anxious Hindu Masculinities," 446-7.
58
59 ^{lxxi} Andersen, "Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh," 635.
60

- 1
2
3
4 lxxii By order of the President [Savarkar] to Vishwanathji Agrawal, August 10, 1944, reel no 29, p. 16, Veer
5 Savarkar Papers.
6
7
8 lxxiii Nivedita, "Present Condition of Woman," 90-3.
9
10 lxxiv Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 154-5, 178-9.
11
12 lxxv For the enmity of intimacy, see Kapila, *Violent Fraternity*, 89-129.
13
14 lxxvi A Maratha, *Essentials of Hindutva*, 37-8.
15
16 lxxvii Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 155-6.
17
18 lxxviii Savarkar, *Hindu Rashtra Darshan*, 54.
19
20 lxxix "Being Interviewed in Connection With the Controversy of 'TWO NATION THEORY Regarding Moslems'"
21 Dr. B. S. Moonje Has Issued the Following Press Interview," August 28, 1943, reel no. 28, p. 123, Veer Savarkar
22 Papers.
23
24 lxxx Savarkar, *Hindu Rashtra Darshan*, 58-61.
25
26 lxxxi Savarkar, *Hindu Rashtra Darshan*, 50-1.
27
28 lxxxii "Being Interviewed in Connection," 123.
29
30 lxxxiii Savarkar, *Hindu Rashtra Darshan*, 64-5, 69-70.
31
32 lxxxiv Golwalkar, *We*, 35, 47-8.
33
34 lxxxv For the gendering, even queering, of sovereignty, see Ruskola, "Raping like a State," 1479, 1481-2; Nandy,
35 *Intimate Enemy*, 4.
36
37 lxxxvi "For Private Circulation Only: Hindu Women's Right to Divorce Bill," reel no. 23, serial no. 1, p. 154,
38 Veer Savarkar Papers.
39
40 lxxxvii Savarkar, "Draft: Barrister Savarkar President of the All India Hindu Mahasabha Has Released the
41 Following Statement to the Press on the Muslim Dissolution of Marriage Bill," reel no. 23, serial no. 1, p. 75-7,
42 Veer Savarkar Papers.
43
44 lxxxviii See, *inter alia*, Gupta, *Sexuality, Obscenity, Community*; Datta, *Heterogeneities*, 155-213.
45
46 lxxxix Framke, "Politics of Gender," 143-59.
47
48 xc "Annual Report of the Hindu Mahasabha [for 1939]," reel no. 7, serial no. D-22-22, p. 12-13, Veer Savarkar
49 Papers; "The Following Statement, Regarding the Recent Hindu-Muslim Riots in Behar [*sic*], Has Been Issued
50 By Barrister Savarkar, the President of the Hindu Maha Sabha, to Be Released to the Press, Dadar, Bombay,"
51 May 10, 1941, reel no. 10, serial no. c-37-68, quote at p. 180, Veer Savarkar Papers.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 xci For the reframing of "Partition violence" as civil war, see Kapila, *Violent Fraternity*, 320-2.

-
- 1
2
3
4
5 xcii Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 152 and elsewhere.
6
7 xciii "Report from Bombay," 2093.
8
9
10 xciv Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 255.
11
12 xcvi Visana, "Glory and Humiliation;" Sharma, "Digesting the 'Other.'"
13
14 xcvi Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 178-9.
15
16 xcvi Sabastian, "Women, Violence, Sovereignty."
17
18 xcvi Mayne, *A Treatise on Hindu Law*, 69, 66, quoted in Sabastian, "Women, Violence, Sovereignty," 757.
19
20 xcix Kapila, "Self, Spencer and Swaraj," 115; Chaturvedi, *Hindutva and Violence*, 127-8.
21
22 c Ambedkar, *Riddles in Hinduism*, 4:227-8.
23
24 ci Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, 1:640-59.
25
26 cii Menon and Bhasin, *Borders and Boundaries*.
27
28 ciii Butalia, *Other Side of Silence*.
29
30 civ Das, *Life and Words*, 19-37.
31
32 cv Savarkar, Statement issued regarding the Burmese Muslim Riots in Rangoon, September 11, 1938, reel no 23,
33 serial no. 1, p. 226, Veer Savarkar Papers.
34
35 cvi Savarkar, *Story of My Transportation*, 235-6.
36
37 cvii Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 176-7.
38
39 cviii Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 175-6.
40
41 cix Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 245.
42
43 cx Moonje, "Baroda Hindu Sabha Conference, Presidential Address," 564.
44
45 cxii Savarkar to Lala Ganpat Rai, March 16, 1945, reel no. 32, file no. B 13/140, p. 142, Veer Savarkar Papers.
46
47 cxii Jeffery and Jeffery, "Saffron Demography," 449; Pande, "Loving Like a Man," 683-4.
48
49 cxiii Savarkar to Ganpat Rai, 142.
50
51 cxiv Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs*, 183.
52
53 cxv Savarkar, "Hearty Congratulations," 196-7.
54
55 cxvi Savarkar, *Savarkar Samagra*, 2:646, my translation.
56
57 cxvii Gerstle, *American Crucible*.
58
59 cxviii For parallels in other parts of the globe, cf. Skidmore, *Black into White*; Salesa, *Racial Crossings*.
60
61 cxix Kapila, *Violent Fraternity*, 129; Alter, "Celibacy, Sexuality."

^{cxx} Sarkar and Butalia, *Women and the Hindu Right*.

For Review Only