Nr. 41

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar:
Public Enemy or national Hero?

Documentation of a debate on the self-understanding of the Indian Nation

Siegfried O. Wolf

Heidelberg Student Papers

South Asian Series

Über Heidelberg Student Papers

Die Serien der HSP bieten eine einzigartige Plattform für Studenten, um diese zum schreiben anzuregen, ihnen die Möglichkeit zu bieten ihre Erfahrungen mit den Bereichen Herausgeben und Publizieren zu erweitern und Bestätigung für das erarbeitete zu erhalten.

Über die Serie Südasien Studien

Heidelberg Student Papers (HSP) - Südasien ist eine Serie von Arbeiten im Bereich der Südasien Studien, die primär von Studenten der Universität Heidelberg und Akademischen Institutionen, welche in Kooperation mit dem Südasien Institut stehen, angefertigt wurden.

Es handelt sich hierbei um ein verifiziertes Journal, welches unter der Aufsicht der Abteilung der Politischen Wissenschaft am Südasien Institut, sowie der des redaktionellen Ausschusses der *Heidelberg Papers in South Asian and Comparative Politics* (HPSACP), unter der Aufsicht von Professor Subrata K. Mitra, PhD (Rochester) stehen.

Die HSP – Südasien Serie zielt darauf ab die besten Arbeiten von Studenten in den Bereichen Politik, Ökonomie, Geschichte, Sprachen, Kultur, Religion und Sozialen Angelegenheiten mit Bezug zur Region Südasien hervorzuheben. Die Einbringung aller disziplinären Perspektiven wird begrüßt. Die in den Serien dargestellten Meinungen sind ausschließlich die der Autoren und müssen nicht mit der Meinung der Universität oder der Redaktion übereinstimmen, es sei denn dieses ist ausdrücklich vermerkt.

About Heidelberg Student Papers

The HSP series offers a unique platform for students to promote their work. It will, at the same time, encourage them in their writing, give them recognition and the chance to gain experience in the process of editing and publishing. Authors from different levels, beginners as well as advanced students, will be selected by the Editorial Board, based on their academic performance.

About the Series "South Asian Studies"

Heidelberg Student Papers (HSP) is a working paper series in South Asian Studies by students primarily at the University of Heidelberg and academic institutions associated with the South Asia Institute (SAI).

It is a verified journal, under the responsibility of the department of Political Science at the South Asia Institute as well as the editorial board of the *Heidelberg Papers in South Asian and Comparative Politics* (HPSACP) under the patronage of Professor Subrata K. Mitra, PhD (Rochester).

The HSP - South Asian Series aims to highlight the very best work by students in the fields of politics, economics, history, language, culture, religious and social issues within the region. Submissions from all disciplinary perspectives are welcomed. The opinions expressed in the series are those of the authors of the articles concerned, and do not represent the views of the university or the editorial staff unless otherwise indicated.

Siegfried O. Wolf

author@heidelberg-papers.com

Der Autor promovierte an der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg in Politische Wissenschaft Südasiens.

The author received his Ph.D Political Science of South Asia at the Ruprecht-Karls-Universität of Heidelberg.

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar:
Public Enemy or national Hero?

Documentation of a debate on the self-understanding of the Indian Nation

Siegfried O. Wolf

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction

The partial destruction of a memorial plaque[1] has again enflamed a permanently swelling ideological foundational debate regarding the identity and self-understanding of the Indian nation. The focal point of this discussion is the most disputed and multi-faceted figure in Indian history, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar. His life and work, and above all his literary work, point to numerous paradoxes and controversial phenomena.

His political vision for a post-colonial India, manifested in the *Hindutva* social and state theory, was, from the beginning, diametrically opposed to the constitutional principles of the newly-founded *Indian Union*. Especially his definition of citizenship (*Who is a Hindu?*[2]), had a lasting impact on the Indian nation and brought him into a situation in which he was seen as the personified antipode to the fundamental consensus of Indian society as proclaimed under the leadership of Mohandas Karamchad (*Mahatma*) Gandhi by way of the independence movement. In the last two decades, this primary agreement regarding the basic values of Indian society, and the implied self-understanding of the nation, as well as the legitimacy of the social-structural and political organizations, has increasingly been brought up and called into question by various groups within the society that have taken recourse to Savarkar's *Hindutva*. This, in connection with his engagement for militant activism and nationalism for the liberation of India from the British colonial power has brought him to the center of public critical discourse over the past two decades.

In the ensuing article, we will *not* attempt an experiment at placing certain details, characteristics and activities of Savarkar into the foreground, or to play them down. The author distances himself from all attempts to revitalize or glorify the person of Savarkar and his ideology by way of an analysis that is led by emotion. The following pages are to be understood as the documentation of a debate that does *not* approach a specific theory or social or political science model for the problem area to be dealt with, but rather, attempts to bring the actors involved and their arguments into the discussion. At the heart, there is the intention of familiarizing oneself with the discussion, identifying the problem areas, and marking possible analytical areas, in order that through this knowledge, directional impulses might be given for a scholarly treatment of the topic at hand.

---

[1] This partial destruction in the summer of 2004 concerns the removal of a plaque that was part of a memorial to various people who were inmates at Cellular Jail on the Andaman and Nicobar Islands during the British colonial period. The plaque that was removed bore the name 'Vinayak Damodar Savarkar'.
[2] Understood as a catalogue of criteria that were to be fulfilled in order to gain citizenship.

The essential characteristics of all debates regarding Savarkar are, first of all, that they are not restricted to the academic world, but are carried out as a public discourse in relation to the political and societal spheres. Secondly, we are dealing here predominantly with a debate among the elite and thirdly, the determining actors of the controversy can be divided into two essential camps. On the one side are those who see Savarkar and the *Hindutva* that he proclaimed as the greatest danger to the foundation of the modern, secular state, democracy, and multiculturalism. With this background, Savarkar is used as the synonym for an "anti-modern" regression, and as the ideological founder of a phenomenon that has usually been referred to as "Hindu nationalism" or "Hindu fundamentalism". This side is opposed by a second camp consisting of people who tend to see Savarkar and his perceptions of state theory as a legitimate and ambitious form of democratic self-determination.

2 The Historical Context

Savarkar (1883-1966) was a child of his time. Born in Maharashtra, the second son of a family of Chitpavan-Brahmans,[3] Savarkar was already as a youth influenced by a nationalistic thought and felt himself to be obligated to an extreme and militant form thereof. He was deeply inspired by the idea of a violent liberation of India from the British colonial powers. Even during his school and university years, he founded the first unions, such as the "Union of Friends," the Mitra Mela,[4] whose members, at least according to their "oath,"[5] would not forsake the use of weapons of violence for the liberation of India. Savarkar drew the first public notice of him in 1906 with the burning of imported British items at his college in Pune. A preliminary high point of his extremist activities occurred with his more or less direct participation in the murder of a high-ranking British official who was with the India Office during his college years (1906-1910).[6] Convicted and banished to the Andaman Islands, Savarkar spent his later life there. His early release was followed by a period of internment ("house arrest") under the condition that, until 1937, he was not to cross the borders of the Indian district called Ratnagiri, and also that he not engage himself politically. After his ultimate release, Savarkar quickly had to realize that the essential turns in the direction of

---

[3] Regarding the Chitpavan Brahmans and their essential characteristics, add. see Chuyen, 2004, pp. 75f.
[4] This group was later renamed the *Abhimav Bharat Society*.
[5] "I,...convinced that without absolute political independence or *swarajya*, my country can never rise to that exalted position among the nations of the earth that is her due, and convinced also that *swarajya* can never be attained
except by waging a bloody, relentless war against the foreigner...." Savarkar, The Oath of the Abhimav Bharat, in Phadke, 1989, p. 226.
[6] For more information regarding Savarkar's time in London, see Srivastava, 1983.

Indian independence were being guided by other forces, and that it was no longer possible for him to convince and mobilize large numbers of people in favour of his own concepts and strategies.

If one wishes to concern oneself with the social- and state-theoretical considerations and the concepts used, then one must continually be aware of the "spirit and tone" of the time for such an analysis. The necessity for a historical contextualization of his actions is shown, for example, in that he agitated for a violent liberation of India from the British colonial power and was occupied his whole life with the completion of this societal-political project, which he expressed in his concept of *Hindutva*. Savarkar had the idea of a homogeneous society that was characterized by belief in one religion, one nation, one language, and one race. Thus, he notably criticized the tolerance that was inherent in Hinduism that, according to his own conception, lead to disunity and showed the Hindus' weakness towards their former and future enemies. The "moral pathos" with which Savarkar brought forth his views was incompatible with the conceptions of the independence movement under Gandhi's leadership and the Indian National Congress (INC) political party that arose later on under the Nehru-Gandhi dynasty regarding a future social and political order in India.

With his small work *Hindutva. Who is a Hindu?*, Savarkar reacted first of all to the tense relationship that had built up between his own *Hindu-Sangathan* movement[7] and the "Congress movement" under the growing influence of Gandhi. The incompatibility of the two positions was shown in a first meeting in 1906, and later in a second one in 1909 between Savarkar and Gandhi.[8] There was agreement that the system of rule of the *British Raj*, the colonial power, must gradually be dissolved. But there was disagreement regarding precisely how this dissolution should take place and what India's future social and political systems should look like. So, according to Savarkar's perception, the independence movement was stamped by the effect of two opposing forces that hampered each other.[9]

Even when the Hindu Nationalist movement, according to its own interpretation of historical developments, had made essential preparations regarding the "independence project," at this

---

[7] Movement for the Unity of Hindus.
[8] As a reaction to the confrontation with Savarkar and other people (of the extreme wing of the struggle for independence) in London, Gandhi was convinced of the necessity of producing his own work, *Hind Swaraj*. Compare Anthony Parel, 2000, p. 120, and Godbole, 2004, p. XVI.
[9] From the perspective of realist politics, we must add that with Gandhi's entrance onto India's political stage, the influence of the radical segment of the independence movement in general, and Savarkar's in particular, was reduced to a minimal level.

time, we already see unmistakably that the setting aside of the colonial system was ascribed to the forces around M.K. Gandhi and had these to thank for it. This feeling of Savarkar's failure is strengthened by two impressions.

(1) That these forces do not contribute to the formation of a "new Hindu order" in the sense of its own "reform-oriented" state-theoretical conceptions.

(2) That the Hindu Nationalist movement was interpreted as a backward and reactionary force that certainly concerned itself with building a new order, but concerned itself only with re-establishing the "old Brahman aristocracy." As to Savarkar, the struggle for independence failed as a method to realize a hinduistic model of order. This platform, the Hindu *Mahasabha* (HMS) was shown by its lack of acceptance by the Indian population to be an unsuccessful instrument in the transformation of its societal visions in the political arena.

When Dhananjay Keer, the most well-know biographer of Savarkar emphasizes in his foreword to the first edition of his life and work that "neither Savarkar nor his biography requires an introduction to the Indian public,"[10] then because of the discussion of his person that is so vehemently carried out, this statement can be agreed to only conditionally, and it must be encountered with skepticism; Keer's statement requires correction.

With the establishment of Gandhi and Nehru as leading persons on the political landscape, and at the latest, with the attainment of India's independence, the person Vinayak Damodar Savarkar has been far less the topic of discussion. The party that he dominated, the HMS, has become a shadow of its former self. Only in isolated instances was it able to gain a mandate in local elections. On all higher political levels, it was dominated by the INC. Even in Savarkar's "home district" of Bombay, it was unable to gain the seat.[11] This small political significance was flanked by the fact that the political programs for the transformation of Savarkar's societal-political goal into the establishment of a strong, independent nation of Hindus (the *Hindu-Rasthra*) was hardly ever the topic of public discourse in India. When Savarkar died in 1966, the event drew only conditional notice. Far away from the headlines of the Indian daily newspapers and the mainstream of Indian politics, or even the center of power in New Delhi,

---

[10] Compare Keer, 1988, volume IX.
[11] Desai, 2004.

Savarkar, seen as the leading theoretician and visionary of a *Hindu Rasthra*, spent the last years of his life unspectacularly and little noted.

It was only around 1990 that this ban was broken, and one had to recognize that over the first decades of the post-colonial India, Savarkar's ideas were more vivid than science and politics were capable of imagining. It would not be until 1999 that the BJP could realize the consolidation of its power over a complete legislative session, and that Savarkar's writing would experience an undespised boom, and he himself would have an incomparable "comeback."

3 Chronology of a Controversy

Extraordinary care was taken by the BJP to position him within the pantheon of "Indian freedom fighters," understood as the founding fathers of the nation. Societal groups which were generally subsumed under the concept *sangh parivar*, legitimized this "enthronement," in that Savarkar was a significant early fighter within the Indian independence camp, but his contribution to the liberation of the nation from British colonial rule was minimized by INC historians.[12] After the BJP gained increasing political influence, they initiated a policy of "rehabilitating Savarkar." Thus, Noorani says that after years of "turning away," the BJP finally publicly and explicitly admitted that Savarkar was revered as their "cult figure." The BJP now sought to suppress Gandhi's position as the outstanding symbol of Indian nationalism and to project Savarkar in his place as a "national hero."[13]

The attempt at making Savarkar socially accepted, or to put him on a higher societal level already began in the first years of the BJP government. The *Bharat Ratna Award* is the highest Indian civilian award. In 2000, Prime Minister A. B. Vajpayee proposed to President K. R. Narayan that Savarkar be nominated for this prestigious award.[14] Nevertheless, the president, looking at the political explosiveness of such a position, saw the pressure both from within and outside of parliament, and made his decision in the form of a strategic "abstention" to this call. Vajpayee then withdrew his request to nominate Savarkar for the *Bharat Ratna Award*. Through Narayan's policy of ignorance, the first attempt at a societal "rehabilitation," and also the building of a societal reputation were hindered.[15]

---

[12] Sanghvi, September 4, 2004.
[13] Noorani, 2003.
[14] The Statesman, September 10, 2002.
[15] Khare, February 27, 2003.

Savarkar's "renaissance" began on May 4, 2002 in Port Blair on the Andaman Islands. The impetus was the renaming of the Port Blair airport after Savarkar by BJP Interior Minister L. K. Advani. We are dealing here with what was, up to that time, the most significant attempt at not only pressing forward with Savarkar's rehabilitation, but also to lay claim to sole representation of Savarkar's political ideas.[16]

In order to underline the legitimacy of this action, the ceremonies were staged as an act, in order to "do justice" to the person of Savarkar that a distorted perception of history, a restricted ideological philosophy by certain political parties or members of certain families had denied him up to then. According to Advani, " no one in a place like Port Blair should object to naming an airport after Savarkar, who was imprisoned here for over ten years."[17]

The Indian Parliament, apart from its significance as the showplace of political discourse, is also the museum exhibition space for busts and figures of stone and metal that are supposed to guarantee the historical significance of the objects on display within the context of the development of India. If, according to Kay Benedict, the growing call for statues and portraits is any indication, then Indian democracy is much like a museum. This situation becomes forced because of the permanent dispute over the granting and reservation of the remaining free spaces and the tendency among certain parties and individuals to use the installation of certain statues and portraits in order to gain political capital for themselves.[18]

With this as the background, there is no doubt that when President A.P.J. Abdul Kalam revealed a portrait of Savarkar on February 26, 2003 in the *Central Hall* of the Indian Parliament, then this was Savarkar's "political comeback." This was met with euphoric excitement by BJP politicians and the Shiv Sena regional party in Maharashtra, both of which belonged to the then-ruling coalition known as the National Democratic Alliance (NDA). This scenario was countered by opposition delegates who left Parliament in protest, above all, the INC and the Communist Party of India (Marxist) (CPI-M). Only the idea that Savarkar and Gandhi should share the same estrade in the *Central Hall* of the Indian Parliament placed the "Gandhians" in a state of extraordinary indignation. Simply because Savarkar and Gandhi might have disagreed over Savarkar's possible contributions to the independence movement,

---

[16] Singh, May 5, 2002.
[17] The Times of India, May 8, 2002.
[18] Benedict, November 15, 2004, and August 28, 2004.

such an honor was seen as not being just, as well as belittle the role of such great personalities as Gandhi.[19] Besides this, the *Central Hall* of the *Vidhya Bhavan* is seen as the "heart and soul" of Indian Democracy. But a significant number of critics now see in Savarkar the personified image of just that which Indian democracy does not want to represent.[20]

Even in advance of this, Sonia Gandhi, the president of the INC, along with the leaders of other parties that stood close to her, had written letters to the president asking him to reconsider his decision to grant Savarkar such a high honor. In support of their petitions, they sought to connect Savarkar with Gandhi's murder and with supporting the "two nations theory." In addition, he was reproached for having written petitions to the British either for his release, or at least, for a betterment of his prison conditions.

Interestingly enough, it should be added at this point that at the same time as a parliamentary committee was debating the installation of a portrait of Savarkar and decided to put it in place, various leading opposition politicians, among them, CPI-M leader Somnath Chatterjee and leading Congress delegates, such as Pranab Mukherjee and Shivaraj Patil were also present. This fact, along with the boycott of the official unveiling of the portrait, sketches out a picture of inconsistency on the part of the INC.[21]

A further portrait of Savarkar was ordered and carried out by Chief Minister Narendra Modi in *Gujarat*. Even here, the politicians from the opposition Congress party kept their distance from the ceremonies.[22] In Gujarat, there are additional significant examples of attempts having been made over a long period of time to press on with Savarkar's rehabilitation. Thus, *Veer Savarkar Smruti Kendra*, together with the HMS, worked with Vadodara for twelve years to have a statue of Savarkar erected, which ultimately took place in September of 2004. In another place, the BJP, after twenty-seven years of "lobbying work," in the Rajkot Municipal Cooperation (RMC) succeeded in naming a High School after Savarkar, the *Vir Savarkar High School* in Devpara.[23] Hoping to make political capital out of the Savarkar-controversy, the Shiv Sena demanded for the erection of a portrait of Savarkar, in the Maharashtra Parliament Building.[24]

---

[19] Sreenvias, February 26, 2003.
[20] The Indian Express, February 27, 2003.
[21] The Statesman, August 21, 2001.
[22] The Telegraph, May, 28, 2003.
[23] The Times of India, September 3, 2004.
[24] The Telegraph, March 3, 2004.

Through numerous other measures, attempts were made to "bring Savarkar back to life." Aside from the expansion of the *Swatantra Jyoti* with the addition of a memorial plaque to Savarkar and the renaming of the airport, *Shaheed Park*, opposite the *Cellular Jail*, was renamed "Savarkar Park," as well as the installation of a further plaque in honor of Savarkar in his old prison cell.[25] In addition, in February 2003, a bibliographical pamphlet regarding Savarkar was published, a biography was commissioned, and an exhibition of Savarkar's pictures and writings was carried out and opened by President Abdul Kalam. All of this was followed by the extraordinary support for the film project "Veer Savarkar" by Sudhir Phadke, with financing by then-Prime Minister Vajpayee and campaigns by the NDA, which was lead by the BJP.

It could well be an irony of fate that one of the most active opponents of a person, his political ideas and philosophy, namely, Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gases Mani Shankar Aiyar, was given the task of dedicating a monument to this person's memory. This monument is the so-called "Flame of Freedom" (*Swatantra Jyoti*) that was commissioned by the NDA government in 2003. Aside from the "Flame of Freedom," the *Swatantra Jyoti* encompassed memorial plaques with inscriptions of Bahadur Shah, Madan Lal Dhingra, Bhagat Singh, and Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, and it was placed on the land where the Port Blair Cellular Jail had been, the same jail that was on the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. Savarkar spent more than ten years in this jail, and he is regarded by his followers as a synonym for all political prisoners of the armed struggle for Indian freedom who had to spend time in this British penal colony. For the BJP, the *Swatantra Jyoti* serves as a memorial that the struggle for freedom is not the monopoly of a single family.[26]

The previous holder of the office of Aiyar Minister Ram Naik, who descended from Maharashtra showed great interest in the *Swatantra Jyoti*-project but didn't have the opportunity to inaugurate it personally and to "hand it over to the nation"[27]. Before the monument could be completed, the Indian voters decided to place the responsibility of government in the hands of the opposition INC and the *United Progressive Alliance* (UPA) that they lead. Since the representatives of the UPA saw their government commission as checking and correcting the measures of the previous administration that, according to their

---

[25] Bhaumik and Koppokar, September 6, 2004.
[26] The Statesman, September 23, 2004.
[27] Punj, August 27, 2004.

interpretation of the basic principles of Indian democracy were not in their favor, the Rules of Conduct that they fashioned forbade the dedication of any memorial that implied named effects that they despised.

However, Minister Aiyar was not content with simply not dedicating any more memorials, but he also removed the plaque bearing the inscription to Savarkar, and he replaced it with one that bore an inscription to Gandhi. In addition, he wanted to rename the Port Blair Airport, which was then called *Swatarnya Veer Savarkar Airport*.

Impressed by the harsh criticism of the opposition and the resentment from within their own ranks regarding Aiyar's measures, the INC government took a step toward distancing themselves from the minister who had fallen victim to criticism. In a statement on August 19, 2004, Defense Minister and speaker (leader of the *Lok Sabha*) Pranab Mukherjee remained with the assurance that the government was in no way directly involved in the decision that was connected with the removal of Savarkar's memorial plaque. This was based on the fact that the decision that had been made to erect such a memorial plaque was made by the head of the *Indian Oil Corporation* (IOC) with backing from *Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gases* Mani Shankar Aiyar. In addition, the memorial was funded by the IOC.[28] Within this context, Mukherjee emphasized that the discussed decision of Aiyar's was made in his capacity with the IOC, and not in his capacity as a government minister. The opposition leader and former Interior Minister L. K. Advani countered that, according to his own experience, no decision of a *Union Territory* could be made without authorization from the central government. This conspiracy theory that Advani proclaimed, that the removal of the memorial plaque was not to honour Gandhi, but rather, to humiliate Savarkar, was strengthened by Party Speaker Sushma Swaraj.[29] Both of them called for the immediate restoration of the memorial plaque and an excuse of Aiyar. The latter categorically refused an excuse in parliament [30] and gave the burst out controversy an extraordinary intensity.

4 Central Points of the Discussion

The contents of the discussion were the identification and the evaluation of Savarkar's role in Indian history. His contribution to India's independence movement was established as the variable for the falsification of the ensuing "hypotheses." By reason of the quite wide-ranging

---

[28] The Telegraph, August 19, 2004.
[29] Ramakrishnam, September 21, 2004.
[30] The Telegraph, August 19, 2004.

discussion that has been carried out, at this point, we should sketch out the essential arguments.

4.1 Gandhi's assassination

The discussion of which place Savarkar should have in Indian history does not occur, as a rule, without mentioning his alleged, but never proven, participation in Gandhi's murder. In view of the acquittal,[31] the attempt has always been made to offer ever more new indices that might prove Savarkar's participation in Gandhi's murder. Standing in this tradition, Jyotirmaya Sharma and the newspaper *The Hindu* that he represents have enriched the debate with five previously unpublished letters.[32] These documents, written by Gandhi's murderer Naturam Godse and addressed to Savarkar, are supposed to serve as proof of the close relationship between the two. There is no doubt that, to a certain degree, Naturam Godse admired Savarkar and counted him among the circle of followers. But Sharma's chain of evidence is not capable of proving to what extent Godse's inclination towards Savarkar could also be contradicted. On the contrary, there is the suspicion that we are dealing here with a very one-sided relationship, and that this relationship is stamped by dissonances rather than by agreements. This interpretation is also not changed by certain meetings that took place between the two prior to the murder. With this unclear background, Sanghvi emphasizes that one must accept the court's decision that Savarkar did not instigate in Gandhi's murder. The fact that the group of suspects were among Savarkar's followers, or at least, were inspired by his political ideas,[33] no doubt has an extremely burdensome effect on the "historical" evaluation.

His followers always emphasize Savarkar's acquittal, but they also admit to partial linkages between Gandhi's murderers and Savarkar, but at the same time, they try to mitigate that "even if Savarkar had had interest in Mahatma's death, it still happened too late!"[34] There would have been no motive for the murder. As a rule, Savarkar's opponents counter that the acquittal was purely for "technical" reasons,[35] and that this sufficiently justifies ignoring the court proceedings and continually attempting to bring forth evidence as to just how much Savarkar's followers were influenced by him, which ultimately lead to Gandhi's murder.

---

[31]. Savarkar was the sole defendant in the Savarkar murder case who was acquitted because no one could bring forth evidence without doubt.

[32].Sharma, September 20,2004 and September 21,2004.

[33] Sanghvi, September 4, 2004.

[34] Desai, October 19, 2004.

[35] From Sonia Gandhi's petition to Manmohan Singh, quote in The Times of India, February 26, 2003.

4.2 Petitions

Savarkar is continually reproached for having repeatedly asked for forgiveness from the British in the form of numerous petitions. This would distinguish him from other freedom fighters who risked their lives.[36] Savarkar's critics see in these petitions not only a turning away from the fight for freedom, but they interpret them as a fawning of his own loyalty to the British. Thus, Aiyar described Savarkar as a person who "was ready to serve the imperial authorities with all of his might."

Savarkar's followers, on the other hand, always attempt to see the petitions in light of his physical and spiritual sufferings. In noting the living conditions that the prisoners had to endure on the Andaman Islands, these petitions were all too understandable and consequential. Raghavan, in his "Search for the True Savarkar",[37] emphasized that the drafting of such petitions was a usual practice among the prisoners on the Andaman Islands during Savarkar's time there. This did not happen with the honest expectation of being released, but at least to be transferred to a prison on the mainland, where prisoners were treated less brutally and were guaranteed certain rights, such as being allowed to have visitors. Moreover, it is tried to present this as a strategic maneuver, because a "free and active" Savarkar is more valuable for the struggle for independence than an "imprisoned and passive one". With this background, Harindra Shrivasta emphasizes that Savarkar was the only true "political prisoner" who endured the tortures of the Andaman Islands, whereas freedom fighters such as Gandhi and Nehru could "pay the price for their resistance against the colonial regime" under far more comfortable conditions. He had always set himself against the British, for example, he refused to draft a petition saying that he had "renounced violent measures against the British, in return for being admitted to the bar as an attorney."[38]

4.3 The "Quit India"-Movement

When Gandhi called the *Quit India-Movement* to life in 1942 and called on the British to leave India in the middle of World War II, Savarkar's reaction not only cause misunderstanding, but also harsh criticism. Whereas many followed Gandhi's call to quit their jobs in all areas of public service, in order to demonstrate peacefully against the prominent position of the *British Raj*, Savarkar started a counter-campaign. With the slogan, "Hinduize

---

[36] Mukul, May 3, 2002.
[37] Raghavan, July 8, 2003.
[38] Harindra Srivastava in an interview with the author.

Politics, Militarize Hindus," he called on his fellow Indians to offer their services to the British, in order to get the opportunity to be accustomed to the idea of serving in an army. He was of the conviction that an independent India could exist only if, within the framework of its controversial maxims, "Might is Right" and "Survival of the Fittest," it could have sufficient military capabilities to stand up in the "international competition of nations." With this background, Savarkar's defenders explained that by reason of the various strategies and basic principles of the fight for freedom, it was impossible for Savarkar to support Gandhi's Quit India Campaign.

4.4 Two-Nations Theory

This reproach is based predominantly on Savarkar's state in Ahmedabad in 1937. "Today, India can not be taken to be a unified and homogeneous nation. Quite the opposite. There are in fact two nations, the Hindus and the Muslims." This argument was specifically forced by a comparison between Jinnah and Savarkar that Aiyar made on August 29, 2004 in Mysore (Tamil Nadu).[39] With reference to a press statement that Savarkar made on August 15, 1943 that "I [Savarkar, the author's remark] do not have any quarrel with Jinnah's Two-Nations theory. We, the Hindus are a nation of our own and it is a historical fact, that the Hindus and the Muslims are two different nations," Aiyar attempted to instrumentalize his argument for supporting the "Two-Nations theory."

In order to weaken the reproach that Savarkar had supported the "Two-Nations theory," his defenders argued that this theory was already implicit in the *Indian Council Act* of 1909, which guaranteed a separated electorate for the Muslims. This theory arose from the British gift of inventing and developing methods to divide the Indian population. This theory, which ultimately had its high point in the call for the implementation of the division of British India, was "unfortunately" supported by the Communist Party of India.[40] As with other attempts to nullify the reproaches in relation to the other reservations, we also find a similar strategy here in the appeal for Savarkar:

(1) The relativizing of his conduct by placing it within the historical context. This implies a possible sketching out of potential parallels between Gandhi and Savarkar, and,

---

[39] Aiyar claimed that Jinnah and Savarkar were equally guilty for the partitioning of colonial India. *The Statesman*, August 30, 2004.
[40] Rhagavan, March 20, 2003.

(2) The founding of a third party in connection with their complaint, in this case, the Indian Communists. Thus, it is argued that when Muslim theoreticians, such as Dr. G. Adhikari, justify the "Two-Nations theory" with the call for a Pakistan or a Muslim nation, that it reflects the aspirations of Muslim nationalities for self-determination, then it is highly curious that the Communists should be the spearhead of the "*Anti-Hindutva* campaign" and raise the complaint that the "Two-Nations theory" should resonate with Savarkar.[41] The fact that Savarkar spoke out against territorial separations based on religious criteria was proven by his restricted engagement within the framework of agitation against Curzon's division of the Bengal area in 1905 that a Muslim majority province had brought forth.

4.5 Concept of "Just Violence"

Generally, the attempt has been made to project Savarkar as a father figure among those people who disassociated from Gandhi's ideals of peace and non-violence. In opposition to Gandhi's *Ahimsa*-concept of absolute non-violence, Savarkar believed in relative or "just" violence in the sense of utilization of violence when all other methods have failed to achieve the desired goal. By reason of the tension between these two conceptions and the misunderstanding of the other way of doing things that is connected with this, Savarkar was thus not perceived as a freedom fighter, but rather, as an ordinary terrorist or extremist. This perception was called forth by the fact that Savarkar was involved not only in weapons smuggling, but also, to a certain degree, in the murder of a British official in London.[42] The criticism of Savarkar is tellingly expressed in the words of Sir Reginald H. Craddock in 1913, "Revolutions are not borne by pistols. Pistols are used only by murderers."[43]

5. Actors, Interests, and Regionalization of the Controversy

The controversy took place both on the federal and state levels. While it came to a quick end in New Delhi, the dispute had a noteworthy strength in Maharashtra. This phenomenon was strengthened by the addition of an ideological and personal dimension: the confrontation between the center and the periphery, respectively the central government in New Delhi and the state government in Maharashtra. There were those who saw in the discussion not only an attack by Minister Aiyar on Savarkar, but also a direct attack on a Maharashtra personality, and thus, on the state of Maharashtra itself. In the background of the ensuing elections to the Assembly, this argument had a special dynamic, and it contributed to Savarkar's "comeback,"

---

[41] Raghavan, March 20, 2003.
[42] For details, see Shrivastava, 1983.
[43] Sanghvi, September 9, 2004, and Mazumdar, 1975, quoted in Punj, July 11, 2002.

at least in the media. The complexity of the discourse underscores the fact that for all those who participated in the elections, there was so much at stake. Aside from the polarization, the participants in the discussion can be separated into three camps.

5.1. The Indian National Congress (INC)

For Sonia Gandhi, it was important for her to regain or keep the trust and favor of the voters that she possibly lost after her disputed decision *not* to assume the office of Prime Minister. Further, these were the first state parliamentary elections, since the assumption of power of the UPA, and it was of importance to demonstrate the government's unity, that was called in question.[44] Against this background, it is quite confusing for many political observers that the INC leadership would bring forth this controversy on the occasion of such an important election, and did not act more decisively against Aiyar's actions, but rather, pursued only a policy of distancing itself.[45] The fact that there was a political necessity here is shown in that the dispute was carried out not only between the two major parties, but also within the INC and the UPA. Thus, the "Mani Shankar effect" arouse concern especially within the INC in Maharashtra, as well as outside, among its affiliated parties, the *National Congress Party* (NCP), and the *Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam* (DMK).[46] This effect gained its drive in that the removal of Savarkar's memorial plaque was but a single act, but it was always being brought to mind by way of certain statements by Aiyar, including the comparison between Savarkar and Jinnah, which continually brought new actors and resentments into the picture.

Even in this scenario, the highest leadership of the INC underscores its distant position and emphasizes that Minister Aiyar's conduct does not represent the UPA's policy, but his statements underscored the fact that the INC belonged to those parties that stood in opposition to Savarkar's *Hindutva ideology*.[47] In order not to endanger the government's ability to function, Prime Minister Mannohan Singh also confirmed this official position of the INC. Thus, he called Savarkar a "patriot and freedom fighter," even if he did not agree with certain aspects and facets of his personality, above all, his *Hindutva* ideology. In addition, he reminded people that Savarkar was accused of having participated in Gandhi's murder, even if he was ultimately acquitted of the charges.[48] This statement was one of the clearest measures of conflict de-escalation, whereby the fear of turbulence within the UPA, and the

---

[44] Shankar, September 10, 2004.
[45] Shankar, September 8, 2004, and The Telegraph, September 9, 2004.
[46] Subhramanya, August 20, 2004.
[47] Subrahmanya, August 20, 2004, and Pervez, August 24, 2004.
[48] The Times of India, September 5, 2005.

thought that the BJP-Shiv Sena camp might be able to transform the "anger" over Aiyar's attack on Savarkar into political and capital and votes predominated.

5.2. The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)

5.2.1. The External Dimension: Confrontation with the INC

The fact that the controversy was not only to serve Savarkar's rehabilitation, but also pursued further political goals is shown by the verbal attacks on the UPA government in New Delhi by the opposition. So, the BJP continually took the trouble to emphasize that Aiyar's statements did not concern his own personal opinion, but rather, they reflected the INC's opinion.[49] The goal of this strategy is to sketch the INC out as an organization that is not only characterized by a disunited leadership, but also that it was difficult to clearly order the decisions that were made by the central government, and also political responsibility. The Savarkar debate laid open the fact that the Congress was "weak and vulnerable," and this is clearly expressed in three phenomena: (1) The devaluation of the Prime Minister's position, (2) the watering down of the "national ethos" by the government, and (3) the total disunity of the decision-making process.[50] Further, Advani emphasized the strength and unity of the NDA, which would have brought the nation forward in regard to stabilizing the economy, the development of infrastructure, and in terms of its security.[51] On the contrary, it appears as if the UPA, through a short-sighted *politics of negativism*, was more concerned with the deconstruction of "national heroes" than with true problems.[52]

Nevertheless, this indication of one-time unity cannot take away the extraordinary depth of votership that the BJP received. A victory in the Maharashtra elections would have been a significant turning point, and it would have given the NDA new swing power. So at first, many commentators went from the assumption that the Savarkar question that Aiyar continually kept bringing to life would cause difficulties for the BJP-Shiv Sena camp.[53] So, in view of the elections, the attacks on Savarkar not only produced heightened unity between the BJP and Shiv Sena, but also constructed a basis of communication within the triumvirate of the RSS, the BJP, and Shiv Sena.[54]Even if, on the part of the BJP, it was emphasized several times that Savarkar would not be a topic in the election campaign, the controversy supported

---

[49] The Statesman, September 20, 2004
[50] The Telegraph, October 8, 2004.
[51] The Telegraph, October 8, 2004.
[52] The Statesman, October 20, 2004, and September 21, 2004.
[53] The Telegraph, October 8, 2004.
[54] Shankar, September 8, 2004.

the relaxation of tensions between the organizations mentioned above. Thus, during the election campaign, the Savarkar question was primarily left up to Shiv Sena, and efforts were concentrated on such topics as bad economics in electricity management, the water crisis, or malnutrition.[55] According to the BJP leadership, Savarkar is a national problem, and not a regional one.[56] Thus, at the BJP's Rambhau Mhalgi Prabodhini training center in Thane near Mumbai, a debate "For and Against Savarkar" was held several weeks prior to the start of the elections. But in the real preparatory courses for the campaign, the people restricted themselves to such topics as rhetoric, organization, fundraising, and so on. Savarkar had vanished from the lesson plans.[57]

5.2.2 The Internal Dimension: Sushma Swaraj and the Savarkar *Satyagraha*.

The fact that the controversy dealt not only with an ideological, political-party confrontation between the INC and the BJP, but also with a power struggle within the BJP was shown on the Andaman Islands. On September 21, 2004, some one hundred fifty BJP members of parliament, under the leadership of Sushma Swaraj, participated in a demonstration, the *Savarkar* S*atyagraha*, for the restoration of the Savarkar memorial at the Port Blair Cellular Jail. The fact that Dr. Murli Monohar Joshi officially invited Sushma Swaraj to lead the BJP delegates' protest action in and around Port Blair could be interpreted as a generational change, or even as a transfer of power within the party.[58] Thus, the *Savarkar satyagraha* not only fulfilled the task of rehabilitating a dead idol, but also the enthronement of a new, "living" icon, to whom the party members gave their support by their presence.

Swaraj's action would have been successful only if Prime Minister Manmohan Singh had quickly issued a permit for making a replica of Savarkar's inscription. Singh's statements that he was interested in ending the debate on Savarkar as soon as possible rose hope among the demonstrators.[59] If the central government in New Delhi had not granted permission, if the authorities had stopped the procession, and had temporarily put the participants "into custody," then they would have had no choice but to transfer the memorial plaque over to the local authorities, and the action would have to be accepted as a failure. With the actions on the

---

[55] Kashyap, October 8, 2004.
[56] Vyas, September 17, 2004.
[57] Within the framework of his field research, the author spent several days at this training center, where the BJP candidates from maharashtra were preparing for the impending election campaign at the same time. Many BJP delegates said in discussions with the author that Savarkar would not be the topic that would stamp the election campaign. Although they had the will to take position, they chose to concentrate on regional topics.
[58] The Statesman, September 22, 2004.
[59] Basu, September 22, 2004.

Andaman Islands, Sushma Swaraj's position was not only to be strengthened, but the internal party evidence was also brought forth that the majority of the BJP's delegates stood behind Sushma Swaraj, and not behind Uma Bharti. For this reason, the general protest against Aiyar's destruction of Savarkar's memorial plaque can be interpreted as a curtain that was used to hide the lack of peace within the party. The fact that Sushma Swaraj sought out a position within the top party leadership is out of the question. We will have to wait to see which effect the success that failed to appear will have on the internal struggles of the various party wings. It is interesting to note the fact that, except for Sushma Swaraj, no other figure from the BJP's top leadership participated in the protests on the Andaman Islands. Neither Advani, nor Vajpayee were present, nor did the "stars" of the BJP, such as Pramod Mahajan or Murli Manobar Joshi have an active role in the *Savarkar* S*atyagraha*.[60]

5.2.3 The Hindu *Mahasabha* and Savarkar's Family.

Aside from the other two camps, the *BJP-Shiv Sena* coalition and the *Indian National Congress* and its affiliates, there is a third group that we should identify. At this point, we should mention the members of Savarkar's family and the HMS, which still exists. Its primary position in the debate is the attempt to "uncouple" the person Savarkar from the BJP and its associated organizations, the *Sangh Parivar*. Those who remain active in the party, such as Vikram Savarkar and Himani Savarkar, doubt the BJP's sole claim to representation and the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh in the Savarkar affair. Both the INC and the BJP would "shamelessly" attempt to make Savarkar a topic of the election campaign, and they reject its legitimacy to speak regarding Savarkar. The fact that for them, it concerned not only Savarkar's rehabilitation, but also strategic election campaign calculations, is shown by the fact that both sides gave their own opinions to the author, namely to formulate their political aims on the basis of Savarkar's basic principles and to straighten their campaigns for the coming elections in Maharashtra according to these principals. Both sides get their support from the so-called "SWAT team" that Vikram Savarkar established in order to support an election campaign that was based on "Savarkar's principles." This group, known as the *Hindu Ekata Andolan*, was founded and brought back to life especially for the Maharashtra election campaign, and it consists of a number of different political, semi-political, and cultural organizations, as Vikram Savarkar told the author. In addition, the organization *Hindu Aghadi* plays a supporting role.[61] According to Vikram Savarkar, this happened especially out of

---

[60] The Telegraph, September 18, 2004.
[61] The Times of India, September 7, 2004.

"necessity," since the BJP did not act as Savarkar would have. The doubtful fact as to the monopolization of "Savarkar's legacy" by groups such as the RSS[62] are quite justified, is taken up by only a few commentators. One example of this would be Subhash Gatade.[63] Gatade bases this on the fact that no one has ever admitted to a smooth relationship between the RSS, as the mother organization of the *Sangh family*, and Savarkar. In order to give evidence for his theory, he brings forth various pieces of evidence and events. Even a cursory look at the relationship between the Hindu Mahasabha and the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh allows noteworthy differences to be visible. As early as Savarkar's presidency of the HMS (1937-1942), there was the first confrontation between him and Hedgewar, the head of the RSS, regarding common social and political aims. Especially Hedgewar's decision not to support Savarkar's activities sparked an especially tense relationship. To be sure, they were both in agreement that a future, post-colonial India would have to be built on a cultural-hinduistic foundation, neither side could come to an understanding regarding a common strategy for implementing such a conception. Hedgewar was indeed highly impressed with Savarkar's vision of a *Hindu-Rashtra*, but he could see no way to get there in the abstract-theoretical concepts. As opposed to Savarkar, Hedgewar was of the conviction that a Hindu state could not be implemented by way of engagement in the political-party sphere. Participation in politics, so he feared, could endanger the integrity and the unity of the RSS. Moreover, this institutional distance was underlined by deep skepticism against Savarkar's effort to reform certain elements of the hinduistic social structure. Also power political thoughts might have played a limited role to the effect that Hedgewar was afraid that parts of "his" organization might fall too much under Savarkar's influence. The marginal nature of the RSS' contribution to the Indian struggle for freedom and the fact that this was removed from India's "struggle for independence," both the armed and the non-violent ones, formed a further hinderance to the process of a possible coming together of the RSS and Savarkar. Despite the common wish of the establishment for a *Hindu-Rashtra*, Savarkar did not favor joining the RSS. The non-participation in the Indian struggle for freedom is further explained by the contemporary concerns of the RSS for setting up historical exponents, such as Savarkar, Bhagat Singh, and Subhas Chandra Bose, since few to no such personalities have come from within their own ranks.

---

[62] The RSS has the following reason for one of its resolutions, "Denigration Heroes of Independence - Reprehensible," which seeks to defend Savarkar and says that his ideology is the primary source of inspiration for the RSS.

[63] Gatade, September 21, 2004.

The ultimate emotional breech between Savarkar and the RSS came with its decision to form a political party along its own path, and not to have recourse to the HMS, but rather, to support a new political party, the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, under the leadership of former HMS leader Shyama Prasad Mukkerjee.[64] The relationship between the two was now determined not only by a "non-cooperation," but also by an open rivalry within the parliamentary sphere.

6. Results

In summary, we can establish that in the most recent controversy, we are dealing with a political discourse whose stamping argument is exclusively meant to evaluate Savarkar's contribution to the Indian struggle for independence. The fact that we are dealing here with a distorted perception of the actual problem is made clear in that neither his philosophical foundation, nor the concept of the social-structural transformation of Indian society that builds on it, on which the criticism of Savarkar as a person and his life's work touch, are made any clearer. Possible failed interpretations and conscious modifications by individuals and groups that place themselves in Savarkar's "spiritual tradition" are categorically not perceived as such, nor are they ordered under Savarkar's original thought. Herein, the contractors of the debate are in no way inferior to one another.

This is especially explosive when one considers the wide range of the discussion. The fact that we are dealing here with far more than the simple determination of Savarkar's role in Indian history is shown in the attempts by all sides in recent Indian history at instrumentalizing personalities of national significance for one's own ideological direction and separating them from others. The peculiar thing about Savarkar's case is that it not only experiences a noteworthy high point, but that it also takes on extremely grotesque forms. Without a much deeper critical reflection, including both "complaints" and "affirmations," Savarkar will be projected *a priori* as a counter-model to the current conception of the state. From this, we can establish that the most recent debate that has been carried out regarding Savarkar did not deliver any conclusive arguments insofar as one might grant Savarkar an adequate place in Indian history. Nevertheless, it offered the observer several indications as to of possible starting points for a scholarly, well-grounded treatment of this person.

(1) The identification and segregation of Savarkar's Hindutva concept, with possible modifications by the RSS and the BJP.

---

[64] Compare Anderson/Damle, 1986, pages 124f.

(2) The critical examination of the relationship between Savarkar and Hedgewar, as well as between the HMS and the RSS.

(3) Related to the two points mentioned above, the questioning of the legitimacy of the claim to representation of the *Sangh Parivar* organizational group, as it relates to Savarkar.

In summary, we can agree with the words of Prime Minister Manmohan Singh that, "History offers us the luxury of interpreting events in different ways."[65] Nevertheless, the intensity of the political discussion shows us that the controversy "should not be banned as unnecessary," as Singh had called for. Against this background, this documentation will attempt to deal with this last-mentioned item and stimulate a scholarly discourse, either despite or because of this apparent necessity.

---

[65] The Times of India, 2004. "Savarkar's remark was Mani's personal view." September 5, 2005.

Bibliography:

Andersen, Walter K./**Damle**, Shridhar D. (1986), *The Brotherhood in Saffron*.

Basu, Uday (2004), „PM gets 30 min. to undo Mani slip", in: *The Statesman*, 22.09.2004.

Bhaumik, Saba N./Smruti **Koppikar** (2004), „Veer Savarkar. The Inside Story", in: *Outlook*, 06.09.2004.

Benedict, Kay (2004a), „House is home to leaders in metal", in: *The Telegraph*, 15.11.2004.

Benedict, Kay (2004b), „Shivaji statue puts parties on same dais", in: *The Telegraph*, 28.08.2004.

Chuyen, Gilles (2004), *Who is a Brahmin. The politics of identity in India*, New Delhi: Manohar.

Desai, A.V. (2004), „Reliving Old Emnities – The almost-barrister ex-terrorist", in: T*he Telegraph*, 19.10.2004.

Gatade, Subhash (2004), „Savarkar and Sangh: a muddled equation", in: *The Hindu*, 21.09.2004.

Mazumdar, R.C. (1975), *P. 221 Penal Settlement in Andamans*, Publication Department, Government of India.

Mukul, Akshaya (2002), „Savarkar had begged the British for mercy", in: *The Times of India*, 3.05.2002.

Noorani, A.G. (2003), *Savarkar and Hindutva: The Godse Connection*, New Delhi: Leftword.

Kashyap, Siddharta (2004), „Central BJP leaders differ on Savarkar issue", in: *The Times of India*, 08.10.2004.

Keer, Dhananjay (1988), *Veer Savarkar, second edition*, Popular Prakashan Private Limited.

Keer, Dhananjay (1950), *Savarkar And His Times, first edition*, Bombay (Mumbai): A.V. Keer.

Khare, Harish (2003), „Another day, another President", in: *The Hindu*, 27.02.2003.

Parel, A. Anthony (ed.) (2000), *Gandhi, Freedom, and Self-Rule*, New York/Oxford.

Pervez, Shahid (2004), „Cong strategy to blunt BJP attack", in: *The Statesman*, 24.08.2004.

Phake, Sudhir/**Purandare**, B.M./Bindumadhav **Joshi** (eds.) (1989), *Savarkar*, Festschrift, Mumbai (Bombay): Savarkar Darshan Pratishtnah (Trust).

Punj, Balbir K. (2004), „Savarkar springs back and how", in: *The Pioneer*, 27.08.2004.

Punj, Balbik K. (2002), „Understanding Hindutva", in: *The Pioneer*, 11.07.2002.

Raghavan, G.N.S. (2003), „In search of the real Savarkar", in: *The Indian Express*, 08.07.2003.

Raghavan, G.N.S. (2003), „Savarkar and Gandhi, some parallels", in: *The Indian Express*, 20.03.2003.

Ramakrishnan, T. (2004), „Irrelevant questions, says Sushma", in: *The Hindu*, 21.09.2004.

Sanghvi, Vir (2004), „The Prodigal Son", in: *The Hindusthan Times*, 04.09.2004.

Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar (1999), *Hindutva. Who is a Hindu?*, seventh edition, Mumbai (Bombay): Swatantryaveer Savarkar Rashtriya Smarak.

Sharma, Jyotirmaya (2003), *Hindutva. Exploring the Idea of Hindu Nationalism*, New Delhi: Viking/Penguin Books.

Sharma, Jyotirmaya (2004a), „Only Dr. Hedgewar is your equal", in: The Hindu, 21.09.2004

Sharma, Jyotirmaya (2004b), „Please don't get angry with your shishya", in: The Hindu, 20.09.2004.

Shankar, Kalyani (2004a), „Open field in Maharashtra", in: The Pioneer, 10.09.2004.

Shankar, Kalyani (2004b), „Countdown in Maharashtra", in: The Pioneer, 08.09.2004.

Shrivastava, Harindra (1983), Five Stormy Years. Savarkar in London. June 1906 – June 1911, New Delhi: Allied Publishers Private Limited.

Shrivastava, Harindra (1993). *The Epic Sweep of V.D. Savarkar*. Savarkar Punruthtan Sansthan: New Delhi.

Singh, Sanjay (2002), „Savarkar invoked to defend Hindutva", in: *The Statesman*, 5.05.2002

Sreenivas, Janyala (2003), „Savarkar bust: Gandhians see red", in: *The Indian Express*, 26.02.2003.

Subrahmanya, K. (2004), „DMK piles Savarkar heat", in: *The Telegraph*, 20.08.2004.

The Indian Express (2003), „Politics of portraiture", 27.02.2003.

The Statesman (2004a), „Govt. should cooperate with BJP on Savarkar plaque: Advani", 20.10.2004

The Statesman (2004b), „Joshi sees a new govt at Centre soon", 23.09.2004

The Statesman (2004c), „Power shift in Port Blair", 22.09.2004

The Statesman (2004d), „BJP promises a historic stir in Port Blair", 21.09.2004

The Statesman (2004e), „Govt. should cooperate with BJP on Savarkar plaque: Advani", 20.09.2004

The Statesman (2004f), „Savarkar no different from Jinnah: Aiyar", 30.08.2004

The Statesman (2004g), „Mani Skankar ire: Congress „soldiers are harming the party", 21.08.2001

The Statesman (2002), „Veer Savarkar is new BJP password", 10.05.2002

The Telegraph (2004a), „Savarkar satyagraha on track", 18.09.2004

The Telegraph (2004b), „Savarkar warm-up for polls", 19.08.2004

The Telegraph (2004c), „Now, Sena cries for Savarkar in House", 03.03.2004

The Telegraph (2004d), „Advani accuses, Cong counters", 08.10.2004

The Telegraph (2004e), „Savarkar inside, Cong outside", 28.05.2003

The Times of India (2004a), „Savarkar kin to contest against BJP", 07.09.2004

The Times of India (2004b), „Savarkar remark was Mani's personal view", 05.09.2004

The Times of India (2004c), „Savarkar cries for attention, even in BJP bastion", 03.09.2004

The Times of India (2002), „Uproar in LS over CPI. MP's remarks on Savarkar", 08.05.2002

Vyas, Neena (2004), „Savarkar, 'tiranga yatra' not poll issues: BJP", in: *The Hindu*, 17.09.2004

Winkelmann, Johannes (1992), *Max Weber. Soziologie, Universalgeschichte Analysen. Politik*, Stuttgart: Kröner Verlag

Appendix:

A 1: Spheres in focus

Following spheres were in the focus of the analysis, to identify the perception and significance of Savarkar and Hindutva during the debate:

Table 1:

Sphere I. Academia	Sphere II. Media	Sphere III. Political Parties	Sphere IV. Sangh Parivar
Literature research	**Literature research**	**Literature research**	**Literature research**
Secondary literature	Press clippings	Secondary literature	Primary literature
	Press Trust of India	'Grey literature'	'Grey literature'
Interviews	**Interviews**	**Interviews**	**Interviews**
JNU / DU*	The Hindu	BJP*	RSS* (incl. Organizer**)
CSDS / NMML*	Indian Express	Shiv Sena*	VHP*
IIS / CSSS*	Asian Age	AKHMS*	VKA*
HU*	Press Club of India	INC*	RMP*+

* JNU   - Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi; DU- Delhi University, New Delhi;
  CSDS - Center for the Study of Developing Societies;
  NMML - Nehru Memorial and Museum Library, New Delhi;
  IIS   - Institute of Islamic Studies, Mumbai.
  CSSS - Center for Study of Society and Secularism
  BJP   - Bharatiya Janata Party
  AKHMS - Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha
  INC   - Indian International Congress
  RSS   - Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh
  VHP   - Vishva Hindu Parishad
  VKA   - Vanavasi Kalyam Ashram
  RMP   - Rhambau Mhalgi Probodhini Trainings-Complex

** Organizer, a weekly, based in New Delhi, mouthpiece of the RSS

+ Rambhau Mhalgi Prabodhini (RMP) is a traning and research academy, working for the capacity building of voluntary activists and elected representatives of the people (mainly BJP); conducted a conference on Savarkar in Summer 2004 (around 80 participants).

A 2: List of interviewees

Sphere I: Academia

Bhargava, Rajeev

Rajeev Bhargava, Professor of Political Theory and Indian political thought, Department of Political Science at the University of Delhi, Head.

Bhambhri, Chandra Prakash

Professor of Political science at the Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi; author of various books on Politics in India (Hindutva, a challenge to multi-cultural democracy, Shipra Publications, New Delhi)

Kamai, Gangmei

Professor and Social Worker from Manipur

Katju, Dr. Manjari

Lecturer at the Department of Political Science, University of Hyderabad; author of *Vishva Hindu Parishad and Indian politics* (2003, Orient Longman: Hyderabad)

Sarangi, Prof. Dr. Prakash

Department of Political Science, Head, University of Hyderabad University Hyderabad

Vanaik, Achin

Professor of International Relations and Global Politics, The Department of Political Science, Delhi University; published various books on communalism in India (*Communalism Contested. Religion, Modernity and Secularization*, Vistaar Publications/Sage, New Delhi, 1997)

Further scholars and writers

Engineer, Ashgar Ali

Institute of Islamic Studies, Director (ISS); Center for Study of Society and Secularism (CSSS), Head; (awarded Communal Harmony Award in 1997 and the Right Livelihood Award in 2004); Mumbai, Santacruz

Godbole, Vasudev Shankar

Writer, published Rationalism of Veer Savarkar, (2004, Itihas Patrika Prakashan)

Jodlekar, J.D.

Scholar, writer

Srivastava, Dr. Harindra

Scholar, writer, former Senior lecturer & Reader, department of English, University of Delhi; published seven books (Five Stormy Years. Savarkar in London, 1983), Allied Publishers Private Limited: New Delhi) and over hundred articles on Savarkar.

Sphere II: Media

Agarwal, Prof. V. K.

Maa Prabhu Media, Hony. Joint Editor, New Delhi.

Ahmad, Faraz

Spl. Correspondent (Deccan Chronicle, The Asia Age),

New Delhi.

Gadgil, Milind	Mumbai Tarun Bharat, Editor, Mumbai
Jain, Praveen	The Indian Express, Photo Editor, New Delhi
Sonamane, Kishor	Employment and NRI Times – weekly newspaper, Sr. Exeq. Mumbai(Bombay)
Qureshi, S. Shamin	Sab Ka Akhbar (Urdu Daily), Chief Editor, New Delhi.

Sphere III: Political Parties

Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha (AKHMS)

Savarkar, Himani	National President, Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha (AKHMS); President of the Abhinav Bharat Daughter of Gopal Godse (brother of Nathuram Godse, assassinator of M.K. 'Mahatma' Gandhi).
Savarkar, Vikram	Former President of the Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha (AKHMS); nephew of V.D. Savarkar, Mumbai.
Tyagi, Dinesh	AKHMS, Former National President, Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha (AKHMS).
Tyagi, Manesh	AKHMS, Former National Vice President, Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha (AKHMS).
Various representatives	Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha (AKHMS), Central Offices, Mumbai and New Delhi

Indian National Congress (INC)

Herdenia, L. S.	Former Vice Chairman, National Integration Committee, Government of Madhya Pradesh; Member, Board of Trustees of the Qaumi Ekta Trust Indian National Congress (INC), Mumbai.

Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)

Kripal, Sinha, Dr. Ram	Former member of parliament (BJP); former Minister in the Central government and former Minister in Bihar; BJP Secretary; Editor BJP Today.
Various representatives	BJP Central Office, Head Members of Parliament (Maharashtra) at the RMP

Shiv Sena

Various representatives   Shiv Sena, Central Office, Mumbai

Sphere IV: Sangh Parivar

Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP)

Dalmia, V. H.   Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP), International President

Agrawal, Sita Ram   Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP), Central Secretary

Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS)

Parande, Shyam   RSS, Secretary, New Delhi

Rawat, Arunt   RSS, media/public relations, Mumbai

Sharda, Ratan   RSS, media/public relations, Mumbai

Subramaniam, Ramesh   RSS, media/public relations; coordinator, Shree Multimedia Vision, Ltd.

Swaroop, Devendra   RSS, (chief) ideologue

Rhambau Mhalgi Probodhini Trainings-Complex (RMP), Bhayander (W)

Sahasrabuddhe, Vinay   RMP, Director General, Thane*****

Deshmukh, Rajesh   RMP, Admistrative Officer, Bhayander (W),Thane

Various activists and politicians RMP - Complex

A 3: List of libraries, research institutes and organization visited

Table 2:

Abhinav Bharat*	Registered Public Charitable Trust, Mumbai
Akhil Bharatiya Vanavasi Kalyam Ashram	VKA, organization affiliated with the RSS[+]
Asiatic Society	Public Library, Mumbai
David Sasoon Library	Public Library, Mumbai
South Asia Institute (SAI)	Heidelberg University, Heidelberg
German Library	Frankfurt/Main
JNU-Main library	Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi
DU-Main Library	Delhi University, New Delhi
CSH-Library	Centre De Sciences Humaines, New Delhi
NMML	Nehru Memorial and Museum Library, New Delhi;
Delnet	Online Database of libraries, New Delhi
Press Trust of India (PTI)	Online Database of the News agency PTI
Swatantryaveer Savarkar Rashtriya Smarak (SSRS)**	Savarkar National Memorial and Library, Mumbai.

* Founded by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar
[+] The author attended the 50 Years Celebrations (Golden Jubilee Celebrations).
* National Museum dedicated to the Armed Revolutionaries of the Indian Freedom Struggle. Thanks to Datta Barve (Secretary, SSRS) and Suhas Bahulkar, for his kind support of my research.