



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

The Political Economy of Hindu Nationalism: From V.D. Savarkar to Narendra Modi

Iwanek, Krzysztof

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

1 December 2014

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/63776/>
MPRA Paper No. 63776, posted 24 Apr 2015 12:40 UTC

International Journal of
**Knowledge and Innovation
in Business (IJKIB)**

*'The Political Economy of Hindu Nationalism:
From V.D. Savarkar to Narendra Modi'*

Krzysztof Iwanek

December 2014
Volume 2, Number 1
Pages 1-38

ISSN: 2332-3388 (print)
2332-3396 (online)

The Political Economy of Hindu Nationalism: From V.D. Savarkar to Narendra Modi

Krzysztof Iwanek*

Abstract

In May 2014 India's stock markets climbed to a record high, anticipating the victory of the Bharatiya Janata Party and its charismatic leader, Narendra Modi. However, the first economic decisions of Modi's government did not incite a market revolution (though it has only been few months since its inception). This, however, is not surprising if one traces the Hindu nationalists' changing views on economy throughout the last decades. The main inspirations of BJP's ideology have been its mother-organization (RSS), and two earlier Hindu nationalist parties: Bharatiya Jana Sangh and Hindu Mahasabha (mostly through ideas of its leader, V.D. Savarkar). After briefly describing the views of all of these bodies, I will map out the main issues in the Hindu nationalist approach towards economy. Finally, I will try to show how the present government of Narendra Modi is trying to deal with these discrepancies.

Keywords: political economy in India, Hindu nationalism, Hindutva, swadeshi, Bharatiya Janata Party, Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh

Acknowledgements This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2014.

The author is grateful to J. Nehru Memorial Library for enabling him to pursue his research.

* Assistant Professor, Department of Hindi, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies (HUFs) Seoul, South Korea, [Email: krzysiwaneek@yahoo.com](mailto:krzysiwaneek@yahoo.com)

Introduction

This article seeks to outline the economic views of the Bharatiya Janata Party ('The Indian People Party', hence BJP) and its ideological predecessors. BJP is currently one of the two biggest parties in India, and the ruling one as of December 2014. The ideology and history of this party have been often described elsewhere and a longer introduction is hardly necessary here (some important monographs include Anderson and Damle, 1987, Basu et al., 1993, Graham, 1993, Hansen, 2001, Jaffrelot, 1997, and Kanungo, 1999). In a nutshell, Bharatiya Janata Party was formed in 1980 by a Hindu nationalist organization, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh ('The Union of National Volunteers', hence RSS) and is still closely linked to it. Both the party and the organization follow an ideology called Hindu nationalism or Hindutva or 'Hinduness', which is more precisely the chief idea of this ideology.

The ideology of Hindu nationalism always evolved in an opposition to the dominant ideology of its main rival, the Indian National Congress (hence Congress). While Congress ruled most of the time in independent India, the Hindu nationalists were an important part of two short-lived governments: one in 1977-79 and the other in 1989-1990, and the first long full term of their rule, together with allies, came in 1999-2004. In 1990s, while their party was growing in strength, it became obvious that the Hindu nationalists are internally divided into at least two schools of political economy. When one reads their earlier publications, it will be easy to observe that their actual view of economy was even less coherent. This subject is important nowadays, since the Hindu nationalists gained power again in May 2014 and are now facing the same ideological discrepancies.

While BJP is 34-years old, at least three sources of its inspiration should be considered. One is its mother-organization, the RSS (formed 1925), with which BJP shares in fact not only the views, but most of its members as well. BJP was also preceded by two important Hindu nationalist parties. These were, Akhil Bharatiya Hindu Mahasabha (‘The Great All-Indian Council of Hindus’, hence Hindu Mahasabha, formed 1914) and Bharatiya Jana Sangh (‘The Union of the Indian People’, hence BJS, formed 1951).

Therefore, this article is divided into 4 parts. The first one briefly discusses some views on economy within these main sources of inspiration for the BJP. The second deals with the evolving political statements on the economy of the BJP itself. Even these general overviews will reveal some above mentioned discrepancies within the Hindu nationalist movement. These two sections find their conclusions in the third one, which sums up the main reasons why such differences had arisen. The fourth and final section is an exemplification. It shows how the present BJP government is dealing with these discrepancies by both words and actions.

How did the RSS, Hindu Mahasabha and BJS perceive economy – an overview

Golwalkar’s views on economy

The first leader of the RSS, K.B. Hedgewar, did not publish much, contrary to the next one, M.S. Golwalkar, who inherited the mantle in 1940. Golwalkar was an outspoken critic of both communism and capitalism, although in his *Bunch of Thoughts* he seems to be unable to clearly distinguish capitalism and democracy. Both communism and capitalism, Golwalkar declares, reduce man’s existence to seeking material gains and both were in practice a means to exploit the majority by a clever minority (Golwalkar, n.d.). The Indian state should instead

follow the old Indian traditions who recognize the primacy of ethics and culture above purely economic needs. This idea will be a recurrent theme in Hindu nationalism, but both in Golwalkar's writings as well as in later sources the concept did not gain any concrete shape. Moreover, the above declarations are in contrast to other passages from the same text. The RSS leader also claimed that '[a]s a matter of fact the success of any government or any particular theory of government is to be measured in terms of its capacity to give every citizen two square meals, a place to rest in, sufficient clothing, treatment in case of illness, and education. That is the acid test' (Golwalkar, n.d.). While he castigates communism and capitalism for focusing on material needs only, he in fact claims that the bottom line of state's existence is fulfilling exactly these needs.

Although Golwalkar agreed that Mahatma Gandhi's ideas of trusteeship in productions were much more in tune with Indian tradition, he also considered them impractical. 'The labourers lose the incentive for work if they feel that they are not able to get suitable recompense.' – he claims, pointing out to the example of post-War West Germany, where, after '[a]ll controls were removed' the state achieved 'phenomenal economic growth' (Golwalkar, n.d.). In what way, then, did Golwalkar want to recreate Indian traditions in economy? Elsewhere he stated that in the old Indian vision of the government 'The State is not a trader or manufacturer but is entitled to regulate all vocations' (Golwalkar, n.d.). He also criticized centralization in contemporary India in the name of 'Welfare State' and stood for decentralization, which, interestingly, he considered a socialist idea (Golwalkar, n.d.). Despite the above mistake, the other passages quoted here would suggest that Golwalkar really favored capitalism, but he chose to hide it under the garb of some old Indian tradition of political

economy which was somehow more ethical than modern capitalism. Golwalkar’s views are more blurred by passages such as this: ‘There should be some limited right to property (coupled with a ceiling on personal income) i.e., scope for fulfilling his [individual’s] desires for enjoyment to a limited degree’ (Golwalkar, n.d.). How does such a declaration match his appraisal of removing state controls in the Federal Republic of Germany? However, the passages such as the above one appear to be in a minority in comparison to Golwalkar’s praises of free enterprise.

Savarkar’s views on economy

The first large Hindu nationalist party, the Hindu Mahasabha, never became a governing party in India. Its time of greatest strength came in 1930s, a period in which India was still under British rule. It seems that its economic program gained a little bit more concrete form during the Second World War period. Since 1937 the party had been led by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, the most important ideologue of Hindu nationalism. In his 1939 presidential address, Savarkar shared some of his economic views with the public. ‘We shall first of all welcome the machine. This is a Machine age’ - he emphasized – ‘The handicrafts will of course have their due place and encouragement. But National production will be on the biggest possible machine scale’ (Savarkar, n.d.). This declaration was in clear opposition to the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi, who was against industrialization and machines as such and favored autonomous villages instead of universalizing tendencies of capital. For Savarkar, the charkha (carkhā), the hand-propelled spinning wheel which Gandhi and his party, the Congress, promoted as an Indian response to the British textile industry, was a ‘monomaniac’ solution (Savarkar, n.d.). When in

1940 British India had to join London's war efforts, Savarkar considered it to be a blessing in disguise. He observed that the British who so far did not introduce much heavy industry in India, were now forced to do so under war conditions. Savarkar called on the Hindus to join the factories and gain as much skills as it was possible (Savarkar, n.d.). Hence the industrialization of the Hindu nation became one of his chief declared goals. The Hindu Mahasabha leader also claimed that should his party rule India, 'Peasants and labourers must be enabled to have their share in the distribution of wealth to such an extent as to enable them not only with a bare margin of existence but the average scale of a comfortable life' but they would not only have to share the profits, but also the losses of their companies (Savarkar, n.d.). He did not elaborate, however, on how this system or re-distribution of wealth would work in case of peasants.

Savarkar's views on private property were not crystal clear as well. In the same paragraph of a 1940 speech, he stated both that '[p]rivate property must in general be held inviolate' and that some 'key industries and manufactures [...] may be altogether nationalized if the National Government can afford to do so and can conduct them more efficiently than private enterprise can do' and '[i]n some cases the Government may take over the land and introduce State cultivation if it can serve to train up the peasant class as a whole with the use of big machines and agriculture on a large and scientific scale' (Savarkar, n.d.). In the same address he also stressed, in a manner typical to him and other Hindu nationalists, that government led by his party would also 'safeguard the economical interests of the Hindus wherever and whenever they may be threatened by the economical aggression of the non-Hindus'. Finally, Savarkar envisaged a highly protectionist state. In 1940 he called to 'boycott foreign articles', set up new industries so that India-produced goods would win the competition

with the foreign ones and stated that ‘[e]very step must be taken by the State to protect National Industries against foreign competition’ (Savarkar, n.d.). In 1945 he reiterated that a campaign of boycotting foreign produce and purchasing only Indian articles strengthened the country’s economy (Savarkar, 1967).

The important term used by Savarkar here was *swadeshi* (*svadeśī*). The term is an adjective that literally means ‘of one’s own country’ and indicates an idea to purchase only India-produced goods. *Swadeshi* became a very important idea of the anti-British movement in India decades before independence, though its roots lie in late 19th century. In 1905, in response to a controversial partition of the province of Bengal by the colonial government, the Congress initiated a *swadeshi* movement that lasted for few years and remained a very important experience for the nascent nationalist movement for the decades to come. For Hindu nationalists the *swadeshi* inspiration probably also goes back to the 19th century. One of the organizations that had wielded a substantial influence on Hindu nationalism was the 1875-formed Hindu reformist body *Arya Samaj*. It was one of the organizations and communities that held up the idea of *swadeshi* already in 1880s (Jones, 2006). Right from its birth, *swadeshi* had both a nationalist and economic edge to it. It aroused nationalist pride but was also to the liking of Indian industrialists who were endangered by powerful foreign competition (Chibber, 2013).

Obviously, in conditions of colonial subjugation, *swadeshi* could only be realized through illegitimate movements (e.g. burning of British clothes) and private undertakings (establishing new, Indian-run enterprises). However, after India’s independence, *swadeshi* came to be understood as a protectionist approach of the government. It is argued by some that a strict government control of the economy introduced in post-independence India was not only a

result of socialist and communist influences, but also the popularity of the swadeshi idea (Nayar, 2001). As such, swadeshi is not an invention of the Hindu nationalists. It was and is supported by many parties and professional groups in India, and had been most famously used by the political rivals of Hindu nationalists. However, as in Savarkar's case, the Hindu nationalists also accepted swadeshi and have been using the term ever since. Contrary to the issue of machines, in respect to swadeshi, Gandhi and Savarkar agreed.

Bharatiya Jana Sangh's changing views on economy: 1950s to 1960s

When it came to industrialization, it was not only Savarkar that opposed Gandhian economic ideas. The same was true about some of Gandhi's influential friends in his own party, the Congress. This included Jawaharlal Nehru, who became the first prime minister of independent India in 1947 and continued to hold this office until his death in 1964. Nehru was a Fabian socialist and when Gandhi and Patel, other leaders of two different ideological trends in the Congress, died soon after the independence, Nehru was free to pursue his policies, including the economic ones. The turn of the Congress towards socialism was most evident in January 1955, when the party publicly promised to strive towards a 'socialist pattern of society' (Pandey, 1976). Some of the main facets of India's economy of 1950s and 1960s were (1) industrialization, (2) restricting foreign investment, (3) economic planning, (4) strengthening state-owned industries, (5) introducing land ceiling acts to curb the dominance of big landowners, and (6) distributing the land acquired by land ceiling acts amongst the rural poor. Hence Hindu nationalists found themselves in a difficult political position, as they also favored most of these solutions, but on the other hand had to somehow depict themselves as differing

from the governing party. As we shall see below, in next decades they kept changing some of their statements on economy, seemingly looking for a middle way between Gandhian, socialist and capitalist visions.

During the same time, the popularity of the Hindu Mahasabha was on the wane and the 1951-founded Bharatiya Jana Sangh became the main party of Hindu nationalism. The party's first manifesto, published for the 1951-52 elections, envisaged a strongly protectionist state and called to revive 'the spirit of swadeshi'. It promised to distribute some wealth acquired by the industrialists among the laborers (which might have been a continuation of Savarkar's idea) and regulate foreign trade (Mathur and Lal, 2006). When the landlords were dissatisfied with the Congress governments because of the land ceiling drive, they offered their support to some opposition parties. The BJS, however, still supported the idea of the abolishment of landlordism (called zamindari in northern India). In the 1951 manifesto its statements on this subject were not as radical as those of the Congress (Mathur and Lal, 2006). In the 1956 manifesto, however, BJS showed itself as an outspoken supporter of the abolishment of zamindari, yet in another manifesto published next year it added that the landlords would receive some compensation (Mathur and Lal, 2006). On the other hand, the above-mentioned second leader of the RSS, M.S. Golwalkar, seemingly stood against liquidation of zamindari, just as he criticized government's right to confiscate the land of farmers, 'operative farming, collective farming, nationalisation of banks and industries and such socialistic doctrines' (Golwalkar, n.d.). Eventually the main party that spoke against abolishment and garnered the support of landlords in the years to come in many regions of India was Swatantra Party, formed in 1959 (Brass, 2006, Chandra et al., 2002).

After two more decades the question of zamindari became a political non-issue, and therefore the opinion of Hindu nationalists on this matter was of lesser importance.

The next, 1956 BJS manifesto's message was ambiguous. On one hand it wanted to protect the village industries (an idea that sounded Gandhian) and again promised to introduce profit-sharing for the benefit of the laborers. On the other hand it promised to open the doors of India to foreign investment, provided that it would in turn be open to Indian participation (Mathur and Lal, 2006). In the 1957 it also called for a reduction a number of taxes and to abolish the sales tax (Mathur and Lal, 2006). The government project of joint cooperative farming, which eventually proved abortive anyway, was also continuously criticized by Hindu nationalists. Their party also demanded decentralization of the federal government's economic power and leaving only the heavy industry under public control, thereby giving more space to private companies (Mathur and Lal, 2006, Jaffrelot, 1997). It seems that when the ruling Congress moved much closer to socialism in late 1950s, the BJS reacted with talking more about free enterprise. With this program, as Ch. Jaffrelot argues, BJS tried to reach out to the middle classes electorate, in the sense of middle-income peasants and merchants (Jaffrelot, 1997). The 1962 manifesto repeated the demands to decentralize the economic system and arrest the introduction of joint cooperative farming (Mathur and Lal, 2006). However, it was issues other than economy, such as cow protection and defending the country against inner and outer threats, that came to the forefront of BJS political strategy in 1960s (Jaffrelot, 1997).

The undefined idea of Artha. Upadhyaya's views on economy

The same decade witnessed the emergence of what was presented as a new party ideology. In a short series of lectures Deendayal Upadhyaya, an important RSS member and BJP leader, formulated an idea of ‘Integral Humanism’ that was adopted as the official party ideology in 1965 (and is still the official ideology of the BJP). Integral Humanism sought to present Hindu nationalism as a liberal and accommodative ideology. Upadhyaya not only refrained from uttering the term ‘religion’, and used ‘culture’, Sanskriti and Dharma instead, but also called them ‘Indian’ (Bharatiya) rather than ‘Hindu’. He also tried to assimilate elements of both Gandhian thought and socialism (Berti, 2007, Zavos, 2000). In terms of economy, Upadhyaya stated that India should follow neither capitalism nor communism, and should model the economic system on its own traditions. These traditions, he claimed, followed both the principles of material gains (Artha) and ethics (Dharma) and the former was always limited by the latter (Upadhyaya, 1992). In all of these points Upadhyaya in fact repeated the declarations of Golwalkar and other earlier Hindu nationalists. In practice, however, Integral Humanism was as vague and innovation-lacking as many other party ideologies. The two more concrete concepts Upadhyaya declared by were swadeshi and decentralization (Upadhyaya, 1992), both of which were used by his party before. He also criticized economic planning. However, Upadhyaya does not really inform us how really did he want to revive the traditional control of Dharma over Artha. Some of more specific economic proposals in Upadhyaya’s Integral Humanism were: guaranteeing employment and a minimum standard of living (Upadhyaya, 1992). Contrary to what he would claim, these were much more socialist ideas than reascent Indian traditions. In case of some other key issues, the party ideologue refrained from taking a definite stand and retained a middle position between socialism, capitalism and

Gandhian thought. He suggested creating 'Bharatiya Technology', that is machines that would fit Indian conditions (Upadhyaya, 1992). This, it seems, was a declaration that sought to find a balance between industrialization and traditional Indians means of production, but the Hindu nationalists had never put this ambiguous proposal into practice. In the same way, maneuvering between socialism and capitalism without suggesting any new solutions, Upadhyaya wrote that the issue of both private and public industries should be solved in a 'pragmatic and practical' way (Upadhyaya, 1992).

The evolution of Bharatiya Janata Party's view of economy

The end of BJS and the rise of BJP

In the late 1960s, Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, daughter of Nehru and leader of the Congress moved closer to the communists. It is still debated whether this decision was motivated more by her personal worldview or more by political expediency (as she broke the Congress party into two and needed allies). This, however, is irrelevant here. The crux of the matter is that the period of 1969-1977 was the period Indian government's strongest control over the economy. The BJS reaction, again, was to move in the opposite direction than the ruling Congress. The party's 1970s public documents criticize nationalization and government expenditure, as well as call on to decentralize industrial units and lower the taxes (Mathur and Lal, 2006).

In 1977 BJS became a part of a Janata Party, in which various anti-Congress parties merged. After this brisk move, the opposition parties took over central power from the Congress for the very first time in India's independent history and Hindu nationalists found

themselves in the ruling establishment. The Janata Party government, however, was a short-lived one and the Hindu nationalists did not hold economy-linked positions in it, although they had the biggest number of Members of Parliament in the Janata Party ranks. Ridden with factionalism and facing dire economic problems, the Janata Party government did not manage to achieve much. It decreased the land revenue and while that move was consistent with earlier Hindu nationalists demands to reduce taxes, probably the real reason for the reform lied elsewhere. Janata Party was supported by middle and large peasants and a number of its economic undertakings were to the benefit of this class. This included subsidies for the agricultural sector, but also the ‘Food for Work’ program for the rural poor (Chandra et al., 2002). Small industrialists, some of whom are traditional supporters of Hindu nationalism, were allowed to expand to new markets (Nayar, 2001). As a symbolical act of swadeshi, IBM and Coca Cola were asked to leave India (Nayar, 2001). On the other hand, Janata Party resisted the landowners’ plea and endeavor to regain land confiscated by the earlier Congress governments (Chandra et al., 2002).

Both the Janata Party and its government broke up in 1979. Rather than reinstate Bharatiya Jana Sangh, the RSS formed a new political entity, Bharatiya Janata Party, in 1980. The new party resolved to strive for ‘Gandhian Socialism’, state intervention and planning (Nayar, 2000). That might be surprising at first, given the relation of Hindu nationalists to both Gandhi and socialists, but should not surprise if we consider their true attitude to Gandhian thought and socialism. It might be remembered that just recently Hindu nationalism had tried to adapt parts of both these ideologies in the form of Upadhyaya’s Integral Humanism. As it

also turned out, the Hindu nationalists were again moving in the opposite direction than the Congress government.

Towards a 'more coherent' program of economic nationalism

Pressed by the IMF, the Congress government of 1980s introduced some market reforms, bringing down the limits in imports, expanded production and the scope of investment of private companies. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi suddenly talked of socialism in a different manner than she had in 1970s. While, as usual in her case, it remains uncertain whether this was more because of political expediency or more because of a change of heart, it is worth adding that, beside the IMF pressure, she was facing a growing influence of her sons, first Sanjay and then Rajiv, both of whom favored capitalism. After her death, Rajiv Gandhi enhanced her 'small deregulation' to a 'middle-range deregulation' in late 1980s. His reforms included a radical customs reduction, allowing monopoly companies to enter certain new markets, changing the government definition of a monopoly to a much more liberal one, allowing further production enhancement and a small tax reduction (Iwanek and Burakowski, 2013, Maiorano, 2014). Rajiv Gandhi's government also borrowed heavily from outside. As McCartney observes, 'Total external debt rose from [...] 11.0 per cent to 21.5 per cent of GNP' in the 1980-1989 period (McCartney, 2009). For this, as well as for letting in some foreign companies, he was attacked by the Hindu nationalists (although the need to borrow sprang partially from tax reduction, which the Hindu nationalists had also demanded). Nevertheless, the support to the idea of market economy was slowly growing among the Indian political class and some BJP members were certainly influenced by the same process (Anderson, Damle,

1987).

During the same time, however, the RSS remained closer to the idea of government interventionism. M.D. Deoras, who became the leader of the RSS in 1973 and remained in power for two decades, was considered to be much more down-to-earth than his seemingly spiritually inclined predecessor, Golwalkar. It was Deoras, however, who favored socialism while Golwalkar, as we remember, was more favorably inclined towards market economy. While Deoras admitted in 1979 that his organization did not have a definite economic policy (Rajagopal, 2001), his general views on economy were quite visible. He was a staunch supporter of swadeshi and opposed trade liberalization (Kanungo, 2002). Deoras even praised communism for inspiring people with ‘strong ideas’ (something which the strongly anti-communist Golwalkar would never say) and socialism for providing a ‘better deal for weaker sections’ (Kelkar, 2011). It was under the leadership of Deoras that the Swadeshi Jagaran Manch, the part of RSS to promote swadeshi, was formed in 1991 (see below for more details). This means that while BJP moved towards free market ideas until the beginning of the 1990s, the RSS leadership went from supporting decentralization during the 1940-1973 period to coming closer to socialism in later decades.

BJP formed a part of a brief, chaotic and internally divided 1989-1990 government. In the 1991 campaign the party turned to the idea a much broader economic deregulation (Nayar, 2000). As it happened, at that time Rajiv Gandhi’s Congress claimed the same goal (Nayar, 2001). Although BJP won most seats in the 1991 election, nobody wanted to become its coalition partner and Congress-led minority government was established. As the country was facing a dire economic crisis, Congress opted for a large-scale economic liberalization under the

economist-turned-politician minister Manmohan Singh. Rupee was devaluated, government licenses in most industries were discontinued, import limitations were mostly done away with, foreign direct investment was allowed in many areas, taxes and customs were radically cut, government monopolies were substantially reduced (Nayar, 2001, Thirwell, 2004, Frankel, 2010). In doing all of this, Congress went against the ideas it has been declaring for decades. On the other hand, these reforms were in tune with Rajiv Gandhi's and Manmohan Singh's personal views. Rajiv Gandhi, however, died during the 1991 campaign and therefore did not live to see these reforms happen and Manmohan Singh was given a free hand seemingly only because the rest of the Cabinet knew no other option, not because it agreed with him. While throwing India's door open to imports and foreign investment was against BJP's constant idea of swadeshi, many other liberalizing reforms of the Congress happened to agree with the Hindu nationalist call for deregulation. Once again, the BJP found itself in a situation in which it was saying what the Congress was doing.

In these circumstances, as K.R. Nayar claims, 'BJP began to develop a more coherent economic program of its own, going beyond mere criticism of the government. The first outcome of this effort was an elaborate 54-page Economic Policy Statement in 1992.' (Nayar, 2000). While the party repeated its stance on swadeshi, it hinted that this term does not have to mean outright protectionism and that foreign direct investment would be allowed, but not in the areas where Indian companies functioned well. In the same 1992 document BJP also rejected both 'crony capitalism' as well economic planning and licensing (Nayar, 2000). The attitude towards the latter two was less important in practice, as at that time the Congress government was already doing away with both. Ideologically, however, it was important as the

BJP was grasping a better defined form of economic nationalism. As it stated in the same document, it favored ‘internal liberalization’, not an ‘external’ one, as the latter equaled globalization (Nayar, 2000). In another words, the party offered economic liberty to Indian companies, but not to foreign ones. However, the expulsion of the American company Enron from the state of Maharashtra, in the period when it was ruled by the BJP-Shiv Sena alliance, seems to be more of an exceptional case of a BJP’s openly hostile attitude towards a foreign firm in 1990s (McGuire and Copland, 2007). Party’s 1998 manifesto claimed that Congress government’s recent liberalizing reforms did not go far enough and were introduced in a wrong way.

What the party would not admit at this point was that its new program went against its 1980-declared goal of ‘Gandhian Socialism’, since large Indian companies would not be limited by socialist controls and big industry would grow at the expense of Gandhi-favored small traditional industries and villages. However, until today article 4 of the party’s constitution does promise to have a ‘Gandhian approach to socio-economic issues leading to the establishment of an egalitarian society free from exploitation’ (BJP constitution, 2014). One could also argue that the 1992 Economic Policy Statement in fact brought BJP back to Golwalkar’s appraisal of free enterprise. In the new circumstances, when socialist ideas were losing ground in India, this program made sense. With these declarations in their hands, the BJP could hope to gain support of Indian industrialists, whose power grew immensely in wake of the 1991-1993 reforms.

The first full tenure of the NDA government and its economic policies

The Hindu nationalists' time came at the end of the millennium. After a few years of shuffles on the Indian political scene, a coalition government with BJP as the lead party was formed in 1998. While it did not survive long, soon after the BJP-formed National Democratic Alliance (hence NDA) was able to finally rule for a full tenure (1999-2004). The budget of 1998 was termed a 'swadeshi budget' due to its protectionist attitude, but in practise the same year BJP started to open the economy to foreign investment (Nayar, 2000). The 1999-2002 were a time of broad market reforms under prime minister A.B. Vajpayee. A large scale disinvestment was undertaken, though majority stakes were not sold, state monopolies, customs and income tax were reduced, and the limits in the number of some imported goods were completely done away with. In these circumstances, however, the BJP found an enemy in the RSS, which was taken aback by such a betrayal of the idea of swadeshi. The BJP also revealed itself to be internally divided on the question of market reforms. While some Hindu nationalists sat in the government, others, belonging to the RSS, protested against some of its measures. Even more important was the backdoor influence of the RSS which brought the reforms to a halt in 2002. The other events that weakened the position of the government were: a Tehelka website-inspired corruption scandal of 2001, a few lost state elections of the BJP in 2001-2002 and the 2003 Supreme Court ruling against disinvestment, all of which weakened the position of Vajpayee's government (Iwanek and Burakowski, 2013). In 2004 the NDA lost power to Congress and its new-found allies and regained it only after a decade.

These shifts of Hindu nationalists' declarations regarding economy reveal few colliding trends which within the Hindu nationalists movement, trends that its leaders try to accommodate. The next section of this article will try to list and explain these discrepancies.

The reasons for differing views on economy within the Hindu nationalist movement

The BJP-RSS disagreement

Firstly, there is a difference in how economy is perceived by the main Hindu nationalist party (BJP) and the main organization (RSS). The RSS created BJP and the two seem inseparable twins, as most of BJP's members are also RSS members. However, BJP from time to time acted against the will of the mother-organization, especially when in power. Views on economy might be the biggest difference between them. RSS is preoccupied more with the Hindu nation than the Indian state. Welfare of this nation is not as important as its unity, mental power and physical strength. Moreover, since the RSS always puts things Hindu and Indian first, it is a firm believer in swadeshi. The RSS-ran schools do not only preach swadeshi in the sense of choosing Indian produce but also teach, among others, that one should perform Indian games, which, among other advantages, are cheaper (sic!) than Western sports (Tripāthī et al., 2008). In 1991, when the communist world was falling apart and India was on the verge of its first broad market reforms, RSS created the Swadeshi Jagaran Manch ('A Forum to Awaken [the Idea of] Swadeshi', hence SJM). It calls for the people to purchase only India-produced goods (Chitkara, 2004). One of the organization's opinions is that 'Liberalisation, globalisation, privatisation became attractive instruments for bringing economic slavery.' (Bajpai, 2008). The organization used to come out in protest against companies such as Colgate and Coca Cola. Let us observe again that a year after the creation of SJM, the BJP issued an Economic Policy Statement that was partially against the ideas of swadeshi (as it allowed a degree of foreign investment). This

means that the early 1990s were a time when a larger rift between the approach to economy of the BJP and that of the RSS was created.

Differences between the needs of various BJP electorates

Secondly, the Hindu nationalists are supported mainly by Hindu lower-middle classes and small to middle industrialists (Basu et al., 1993, Kanungo, 2002, Graham, 1993). We have seen that in the earlier period both Hindu Mahasabha and BJS promised solutions that were rather not to the liking of landlords and big businessmen. However, in the last two decades BJP became increasingly popular among middle classes and large industrialists. According to Hansen, 73% of college graduates and 53% of the business class voted for the party in the middle of 1990s (Hansen, 2001). Narendra Modi, has been winning support of large business houses in his state of Gujarat, of which he was the Chief Minister for the last 12 years, before becoming the prime minister of India this year. In fact already in 1995, before even Modi gained the highest position in Gujarat, BJP obtained 70% of middle and upper caste votes in the state, according to McCartney (McCartney, 2009). The fact that some important Indian companies such as Reliance have warm feelings for Modi, is well-known. Now Modi will be striving to achieve the same popularity amongst industrialists on the national level. The difficulty will lie in the fact that it is easier to compete for Indian investment while ruling one Indian state and one of the most developed ones, for that matter (as in the case of Tata Motors factory which, being unable to open in West Bengal, was invited by Modi to come to Gujarat). While representing the whole of the country, the any prime minister can't simply strive to bring in all Indian investment to one state (unless his government would promote the states ruled by his party

above those ruled by opposition parties). However, Hindu nationalists also expand downwards, trying to take hold of lower castes and classes, of labor and peasants. The victory of the BJP in 2014 is partially attributed to its growing leverage with these classes (Chibber and Verma, 2014).

It is obviously hard to fulfill the expectations of all these communities and classes at the same time. The industrialists and middle class expect the BJP to, among others, lower the taxes. Some of the lower groups often depend on the state in terms of subsidies and various other perks which means it becomes difficult to fulfill their needs after reducing the level of taxation. The middle classes and large industrialists are also seemingly not as adverse to foreign direct investment as other classes (for the point that not all industrialists support the idea of FDI, see McCartney, 2009). However, the small shopkeepers, BJP's traditional electorate, perceive foreign direct investment in the retail sector as a main threat to their existence. The discrepancy was best visible when India's stock markets climbed to a record high in May 2014, in anticipation of BJP's biggest political victory till this date, but while the big firms were awaiting Narendra Modi's storm of market reforms, the Prime Minister in his maiden speech to party members said that his government will be the 'the government of the poor'. Also, while lower middle classes might form the backbone of both the RSS and the BJP, the big industrial houses probably support only the BJP, as they would have hardly any benefit from supporting the RSS. This factor, therefore, reinforces also the previous discrepancy: the struggles between the party and the organization in the field of economy.

The BJP-Congress rivalry

Thirdly, the Hindu nationalists, being in opposition in the Centre for most of their time, had to somehow both attack the Congress governments and not to compromise on their own core ideals. As long as BJS and BJP declared an economic policy which was partially socialist-inspired (even though they would not admit it), it found it difficult to underline its differences from the openly socialist Congress. When it became more outspoken in its critique of socialist system of controls, it again lost the race with the Congress, which in 1991-1993 introduced stronger market reforms than the Hindu nationalists ever tried to introduce when in power or even envisaged when in opposition. It was only in 1999-2002 that the BJP evened the score. As it turns out, most main parties in India share some basic views on economy and these tend to be in favor of government control over free market play (Rudolph and Rudolph, 1987). As argued by some, the only national party in India that had really stood for free enterprise was the long-defunct Swatantra Party (Rudolph and Rudolph, 1987). Throughout the last two decades, both the BJP and the Congress, took pains to maneuver between low to middle-range interventionism and low to middle-range market reforms. At the same time both were in the need of politically attacking each other. The example here is BJP's recent opposition to foreign direct investment in the retail sector. Introducing it was a dream of many foreign companies eyeing the Indian market, and the horror of India's small shopkeepers. During the 2009-2014 UPA rule, the government first decided to allow FDI in retail, but withdrew the decision in face of large protests of the shopkeepers and the opposition parties, including the BJP. The government eventually changed its mind one more time and opened India to FDI in retail, though with serious limitations. During the time of opposition to this move, Narendra Modi also strongly voiced his dissent and rhetorically asked: 'What kind of country sells flour overseas and

then buys a chapati [unleavened bread]?’ Nowadays, however, his government does not promise to withdraw the decisions on FDI introduced by his criticized predecessors.

Hindu nationalism and labor movements

Fourthly, while the Hindu nationalists formally reject communism and socialism as foreign, anti-religious and seemingly anti-national, they in fact partially strive to achieve goals similar to the aims of those ideologies. One of the main aims of the Hindu nationalists is the consolidation (sangathan) of the Hindu nation. To achieve this, they claim to strive for equality (samrastā) of all classes, castes and communities. On one hand, the concept of class struggle would run against these goals, but on the other, the broader idea of eventual equality is included in both ideologies of the left and Hindu nationalism. The 1949 constitution of the RSS did not offer any broad view of economy. One of the scant economy-related remarks is mentioning the need of establishing a ‘disciplined’ and ‘organized’ industrial life (Kelkar, 2011). The document also condemns revolutions, as it claims to stand for an orderly evolution of society through legitimate means only (Kelkar, 2011). These remarks were a clear take on communism, whom the RSS perceived as one of its main threats, especially in the post-independence period. While the RSS stressed the need to defend workers’ rights many times, it also considered strikes a last resort that should be resorted to as seldom as possible. The clashes between Hindu nationalists and socialist and communist organization began already in the pre-1939 period (Limaye, 2011).

The RSS grew weary of the success of communist trade unions but on the other hand emulated their success. After India’s independence it formed own trade union to counter

communist influences). It was called the Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh ('The Union of Indian Laborers', hence BMS). This trade union was formed in 1955 as a part of the RSS. BMS grew immensely in 1970s to become one of India's leading trade unions in 1990s (Bajpai, 2008, Mathur, 2008). The founder of BMS was Dattopant Thengadi, the same person who went on to establish SJM much later. BMS mobilizes labor and rejects capitalism, but also tries its best not to look similar to communist-influenced unions. The organization rejects the idea of class struggle, uses a saffron flag (like other Hindu nationalist organizations) instead of a red one and celebrates the Workers' Day not on 1st of May, but on Vishwakarma Day (Vishwakarma was a god of artisans)(Basu et al., 1993, Bajpai, 2008). However, most of this is arguably symbolic, not real ideological differences. BMS was another organization that from time to time protests against its own government of the BJP, opposing exactly the same decisions that were criticized by the communist trade unions.

Is there a religion vs. economy debate within the Hindu nationalist movement?

I would also add another point here, but rather as an issue worth considering than a factor similar in strength to the above ones. Hindu nationalism is an ideology that claims the existence of a Hindu nation, and therefore is labelled by some as 'religious nationalism' (Cf. Kanungo, 2002, for a brief overview of terms used to describe this ideology). BJP and RSS prefer the term 'cultural nationalism'. Does the religious part of Hindutva's origins influence the ideology's stance on economy? The most famous case is the cow protection movements. The movement to halt the killings of cows, animals sacred to Hindus, emerged strong in the late 19th century among organizations that might be considered Hindu nationalists' ideological predecessors (Hansen, 2001). Although the biggest ideologue of Hindutva, V.D. Savarkar, was

seemingly not adverse to cow killing, the Hindu nationalists took to similar cow protection movements more than once in the course of the 20th century. Cow protection was a recurrent idea in the manifestos of Hindu nationalist parties. Narendra Modi played a similar tune in at least one of his speeches. It also should be added that while cow slaughter (and subsequent consuming, selling in India or export or beef) may be economically important to some groups, it is not so important for the Indian economy as such. For Hindu nationalists it is therefore a clearly religious issue and they do not have to find a balance between religion and economy here. Can we, however, find more such examples?

Since the RSS is dominated by Brahmans, the priestly class in the traditional Hindu social order, we could as well expect the promoting of vegetarianism, to which this class should adhere. But this is not the case. This example brings us to another question: if the RSS would promote such traditions, then which group's traditions would it actually be? Even if it would choose Brahman values, then, in case of cuisine, the question would be – which Brahmans? The choice of cow protection was much safer, as the Hindu nationalists could safely ascertain that majority of Hindus does not consume beef. While the RSS and BJP do drum up certain religious issues, they usually make sure that they would be met with a huge support and would not, if possible, clash with their other ideas. The example here is their approach to the caste system. This system, along with class struggle, is surely an impediment to unify the Hindu nation. But the system also remains a central part of the Hindu religion. In such a case the RSS finds itself in a contradictive position: in order to successfully build a Hindu nation, it would have to fight Hindu social and religious rules. I would assume this is why the Hindu nationalists are outspoken in their criticism of inequalities in the Hindu society but never really launched a

large-scale movement to change the system, comparable to the cow protection movement (putting aside the question how does one fight a social system to which every member of such a movement would belong). Eventually, it is the nation which is paramount for the RSS and BJP, not religion. Many, if not most of the issues taken up by the Hindu nationalists have a religious aspect to them (even it is referred to as 'cultural' or otherwise), but religion is treated as means here, not the final goal. The relation of religion to economy in Hindu nationalist ideology should also be perceived from this angle.

If Brahman influence is to be found in Hindu nationalist views on economy, this could be in what was referred to as 'Brahmanical distaste for business and businessmen' (Guha, 2007). How much this 'distaste' is nowadays common among Brahmans, remains a different issue that would need a completely different research. But it was visible throughout this article that the Hindu nationalists stressed the fact that material gains are not everything and should not dominate above the entire spiritual side of human life. This view was expressed, among others, by Golwalkar, Upadhyaya and Savarkar (all of which happened to be born in Brahman families). The last of these, curiously, uses a quote from Jesus Christ in this context ('man does not live by bread alone', Savarkar, n.d.). This constant talk of spirituality-above-materialism might be at least partially aimed at addressing the 'Brahmanical distaste'. However, we have also seen that it did not really lead to promising any concrete economic solutions. Nowadays it seems that 'the Baniya [merchant] taste' for economy matters more in terms of practical political actions than the 'Brahmanical distaste'.

It might be added here in passing that one of the BJP's slogans regarding imports is – or was - 'computer chips – yes, potato chips – no' (McGuire and Copland, 2007). This motto once

signaled the Hindu nationalists’ openness to bringing in crucial technology, but not allowing the imports of those articles that would not fit in the Hindu culture and customs. It might seem as an aspect of a broader and even more ample credo of the RSS: ‘Be modern, not Western’. These are, however, once again declarations, not actions. While both the Rajiv Gandhi government of 1984-1989 and the NDA government of 1999-2004 showed a special preference to some technologies, they would not really limit the selling materials that could be considered a threat to Indian traditions. The events examples such as the expulsion of Coca Cola in 1970s remain isolated cases and, at any rate, Coca Cola was actually asked to leave India at the same time as IBM, which in that case would mean ‘computer chips – no, potato chips and Cola – no’. The SJM’s opposition to Coca Cola, once the firm came back to India, occurred later, and was apparently not given a priority by the RSS. The same goes to the attacks on KFC which the central BJP leadership did not even support (McGuire and Copland, 2007). Another case is a mention of a Hindu nationalist project to produce cow urine-based soft drink. While the idea was mocked by many, from the Hindutva perspective it would seemingly make perfect sense. Cow urine is used in certain Hindu rituals and is said to possess purifying powers. A soft drink made out of it would be obviously promoted as a traditional alternative to Coca Cola and the like. Such a drink could theoretically become the perfect combination of swadeshi and protection of India’s traditions, the symbol of ‘Be modern, not Western’. The idea, however, was not only not put into practice but was seemingly supported by only a fraction of the Hindu nationalists and was never put forward by a popular movement. The above ideas and contradictions betray Hindu nationalists’ imprisonment in modernity.

Is there a tradition vs. modernity debate regarding economy in the Hindu nationalist movement?

As a form of nationalism, the ideology of RSS is not really conservative in its core, but reformist (even if it acquires some aspects of conservatism). Their rallying cry of going back to traditions does not amount to any practical program. When Upadhyaya promised to revive Indian traditional political economy, he was really putting forward socialist ideas. Golwalkar praised Gandhian idea of trusteeship in production as traditional, only to discard it in favor of free market. Fighting against Coca Cola, the Hindu nationalists could have simply promoted traditional drinks as say, lassi, a popular sweet or salty drink made from curds, ice cubes and other additions, similar to a milk shake. Instead, some Hindu nationalists suggested producing a cow urine-based soft drink, therefore betraying their need to create new solutions rather than stick to the old ones.

Are there any alternative and traditional models of economy that the Hindu nationalists could have turned to? M. Gadgil and R. Guha proved that in at least part of India's traditional communities, the caste system reinforced the balance of environment through the distribution of occupations, kinds of food that could be consumed by particular groups and the time when certain animals could be killed to prevent rampant exploitation of nature (Gadgil and Guha, 2013). Theoretically, that is a tradition that the Hindu nationalists could call to return to. Of course, it may be argued that restoring such balance is not feasible anymore and would be very difficult to impose from above, but the same can be said about Gandhian economy: it might be idealistic and impossible, but still there are people who believe in it. The bottom line is that the Hindu nationalists do not even try to reconstruct such a model. Arguably, the explanation does

not lie in the fact that it would additionally strengthen the caste system, but in the fact that the proponents of Hindutva do not really want to recreate any traditional model of economy.

Having said all of this, let me turn to the present BJP-led government’s declarations and deeds performed so far.

The economic policy of the present BJP-led government

The NDA government formed in 2014 is the first one in which the BJP has a majority on its own and is therefore in a comfortable position to introduce its reforms. The victory was arguably achieved thanks to a huge anti-incumbency factor, Modi’s charisma and personality cult, and a promise of development in times of an economic slowdown. During the last election campaign focused on promising economic growth more than before and talked less about religious and cultural issues around which it had mobilized its electorate in the past. Narendra Modi, so far serving as the chief minister of the state of Gujarat, pointed out to the progress of his state, promising to repeat the same success story all over India. Fulfilling these promises will be obviously a challenge for many reasons. One of them is that Modi, known for his openness to attract foreign and Indian companies and facilitating their expansion, will now have to face those BJP and RSS members that stick to the idea of economic nationalism.

As we can see, one tight-rope that the current prime minister has to walk is between his need to attract foreign direct investment and the defense of swadeshi. The change in approach towards FDI was first visible in BJP’s 1992 document. In the 1999-2002 period, when faced with criticism for abandoning the idea of protecting Indian companies, some leading members of the BJP said that the concept of swadeshi actually implied ‘going out to the world and winning’

(McGuire, Copland, 2007). In September 2014, in his typical rhetorical style and pun fashion, prime minister Modi claimed that for Indians FDI actually means 'First Develop India' (My definition of FDI for people of India is 'First Develop India', 2014). He spoke these words on 25th September, while commencing his flagship 'Make in India' campaign, in which the government promises to reduce its controls and especially bureaucracy (including on the state level), act as 'help-desk' to firms, develop infrastructure, focus on the manufacturing sector, and invite powerful global companies to India. There is talk of 'deregulation' and 'public private partnership' here, but not directly of selling stakes in public companies. The stress is also on manufacturing and then exporting, rather than imports. Modi also elaborated that the coming of foreign companies to India is needed to raise working opportunities and purchasing power of Indians. What is more, the whole campaign is also meant to strengthen Indian companies, so that they would not leave the country and become more competitive globally (PM launches Make in India global initiative, 2014). In a manner typical of politicians, Narendra Modi wants to use the Make in India campaign to convince us that everybody will be happy: both foreign and Indian companies, both labor and industrialists. Two solutions most vehemently criticized by the swadeshi faction – raising FDI and allowing more imports – are not mentioned here.

What we see here might be actually modest deregulation wrapped up in a swadeshi cloth. The Make in India campaign website and publications select 25 promising sectors of various industries. In each case, both foreign investors in this sector as well as future investing opportunities are mentioned. There is also a 'FDI policy' section and in each case it spells out the FDI allowed so far, not promised by the government for the coming years (cf. Make in India 2014). If it would stop here, the proponents of swadeshi would certainly be happy, while the

multinational companies would ask how, then, would Make in India actually enhance their investment options. In practice, however, the government is planning to raise the level of FDI in at least some sectors. The expressions in the 2014 BJP election manifesto was careful in that matter: ‘Barring the multi-brand retail sector, FDI will be allowed in sectors wherever needed for job and asset creation, infrastructure and acquisition of niche technology and specialized expertise. BJP is committed to protecting the interest of small and medium retailers, SMEs and those employed by them.’ (BJP Election Manifesto 2014. Ek Bharat, Shreshtha Bharat, 2014).

As of September 2014 there was talk of selling 5% of government stakes in Oil and Natural Gas Corporation, 11.36% in National Hydroelectric Power and 10% in Coal India (Disinvestment takes off, 2014) and selling of some projects of these companies to foreign firms (Das, 2014).

The government also raised investment limit in insurance and cleared projects to raise the FDI cap in defense to 49% and in railway infrastructure to 100% (FDI cap raised to 100% for Railways, 49% for defense projects, 2014). In this case the FDI in railway infrastructure and defense is already mentioned as ‘allowed’ in the Make in India campaign. Insurance is not a sector mentioned in the campaign at all. A further move to allow up to 100% FDI in defense is also considered, which the Make in India campaign publication also does not mention. The liberalization of petrol prices, started already in fact by the previous government, has been finished by Modi’s government on October, once elections of members for the legislative assemblies of two states, Maharashtra and Haryana, had come to an end. Nowadays there is talk of ending the LPG subsidy for richer citizens and that particular move should be accepted by both the proponents of the free market as well as believers in swadeshi (Govt may do away with LPG subsidy for rich: Jaitley, 2014). On the other hand, the new government of India also

refused to sign a major WTO deal and was praised by the swadeshi faction for doing that (Sheasley, 2014). Later, in November, the US and the WTO, which first seemed to be adamant in not changing the draft of the deal, seemingly agreed on India's condition that it would only sign the deal if it could permanently continue its food security policy within the new WTO standards (As PM Narendra Modi heads to G20, India and US announce WTO deal, 2014).

Until now, the RSS is giving a clean chit to Narendra Modi, but it is obvious that already some of his above mentioned decisions and promises are not to its liking. SJM wants the new government to limit imports and withdraw the decision of allowing more FDI in the defense sector. (Krishnan, 2014). BMS wants liberalization of railways to be stopped. In July the RSS was said to halt the government's GM crops trials, but this issue was also on BJP's election campaign agenda (Chandrasekhar, 2014, Singh, 2014). It is also worth looking at some issues of the *Organiser*, the English-language mouthpiece of the RSS. Most of the articles are full of praise for the new prime minister, but there are some noteworthy exceptions. An August issue article criticized the government primarily for selecting the manufacturing sector, rather than services, as its focus for the Make in India campaign. Of the three points raised there one is economic in nature (the services sector is growing faster than manufacturing) and the other environmental (the growth of manufacturing will destroy the environment, as it is happening in China). There is, however, also a typically swadeshi point: 'Prime Minister Modi, moreover, has also welcomed foreign investors to set up manufacturing units in India. Question is why can the job not be accomplished by Indian businessmen?' (Jhunjunwala, 2014). The same month one of the *Organiser* authors reacted to government disinvestment plans warning that 'selling the huge profit making and dividend paying PSEs [Public Sector Enterprises] would result in killing a

sheep for one meal only- the other option is feeding it well and getting wool for many years.’

The same piece warned the BJP that one of its previous, 1999-2002 period privatizations did not work out (Saurav, S., 2014). In a more recent interview, the chief of the RSS Akhil Bharatiya Gousewa (The All-India Cow Service) praised the government for dedicating an amount of money to cow protection but demanded a ban on beef exports (Ban Cow Beef Export Forthwith – Shankarlal, 2014).

So far, the economic strategy of Modi’s cabinet has been to (1) partially privatize, but not to sell the majority stakes of government companies, (2) carefully select the sectors or projects being opened to FDI, and (3) focus on manufacturing rather than services or agriculture. Especially the last strategy had been tried out by Modi in Gujarat. He will possibly also show some degree of preference for Indian big companies over foreign ones. Obviously, it has only been few months since inception and the government can surely take more radical steps. However, taking into consideration all aspects mentioned here, I would risk predicting that Narendra Modi’s economic policy will not be as much pro-market as many big companies expect (though it will still be more pro-market than most of India’s previous governments). If his government tries a more throughout liberalization he will come into direct conflict with the RSS (to which he belongs) and the swadeshi faction of his party. It remains to be seen whether he and his companions will be able to spread the new interpretation of the swadeshi concept among the RSS and BJP rank and file.

References

- “BJP constitution”, available at: <http://ap.bjp.org/about-us/bjp-history/61-bjp-constitution> (accessed 22 October 2014).
- “BJP Election Manifesto 2014. Ek Bharat, Shreshtha Bharat.” [‘One India, Excellent India’], available at: <http://bjpelectionmanifesto.com/pdf/manifesto2014.pdf> (accessed 8 September 2014).
- “CM Strongly Opposes FDI in Retail”, available at: <http://www.narendramodi.in/cm-strongly-opposes-fdi-in-retail/> (accessed 4 October 2014).
- Make in India campaign website, available at: <http://www.makeinindia.com/sectors/> (accessed 4 October 2014).
- “My definition of FDI for people of India is ‘First Develop India’ ”, available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nVp-UiXPwOc> (accessed 4 October 2014).
- “PM launches Make in India global initiative”, available at: <http://www.narendramodi.in/pm-launches-make-in-india-global-initiative/> (accessed 4 October 2014).
- Indian Express* (2014), “As PM Narendra Modi heads to G20, India and US announce WTO deal”, 13 November, available at: <http://indianexpress.com/article/business/economy/india-us-resolve-impasse-over-food-security-clears-way-for-wto-deal/> (accessed 22 November 2014).
- Organiser* (2014), “Ban Cow Beef Export Forthwith – Shankarlal”, 23 September, available at: <http://organiser.org//Encyc/2014/8/23/Interview%EF%BB%BF---Ban-Cow-Beef-----Export-Forthwith---Shankarlal.aspx> (accessed 10 October 2014).
- The Hindu* (2014), 16 September, “Disinvestment takes off”, available at: <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/editorial/disinvestment-takes-off/article6413419.ece> (accessed 9 October 2014).
- The Hindu* (2014), 22 November, “Govt may do away with LPG subsidy for rich: Jaitley”, available at: <http://www.thehindu.com/business/Economy/govt-may-do-away-with-lpg-subsidy-for-rich-jaitley/article6622104.ece> (accessed 25 November 2014).

- Business Standard* (2014), 7 August, “FDI cap raised to 100% for Railways, 49% for defence projects”, available at: http://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/modi-cabinet-may-liberalise-fdi-regime-for-defence-railway-projects-114080600341_1.html (accessed 4 October 2014).
- Anderson, W., Damle, S. (1987), *The Brotherhood in Saffron: The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh and Hindu Revivalism*, Westview Press, Boulder.
- Bajpai, S.Ch. (2008), *R.S.S. at a Glance*, Suruchi Prakashan, New Delhi.
- Basu, T., Datta, P., Sarkar, S., Sarkar, T., Sen, S. (1993), *Khaki Shorts Saffron Flags, A Critique of the Hindu Right*, Orient Longman, New Delhi.
- Berti, D. (2007), “Hindu Nationalists and local history: From ideology to local lore”, available at: <file:///C:/Users/hp/Downloads/2462-2457-1-PB.pdf> (accessed 29 September 2007).
- Brass, P.R. (2006), *The Politics of India since Independence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Chandra, B., Mukherjee, M., Mukherjee, A. (2002), *India after Independence 1947-2000*, Penguin Books, New Delhi.
- Chandrasekhar, S., “India puts GM trials on hold”, available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/blog/2014/jul/31/india-gm-crop-trials-bjp-rss>, (accessed 4 October 2014).
- Chibber P., Verma, R., “It is Modi, not BJP that won this election,” available at: <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/it-is-modi-not-bjp-that-won-this-election/article6070375.ece> (accessed 22 October 2014).
- Chibber, V. (2013), *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*, Verso, London.
- Chitkara, M.D. (2004), *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh: National Upsurge*, APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi.

- Das, K.N., "Some Coal India mines may be run by foreign firms – minister", available at:
<http://in.reuters.com/article/2014/07/31/coal-india-mining-idINKBN0G01MF20140731>
(accessed 12 September 2014).
- Frankel, F. (2010), *India's Political Economy, 1947-2004. Gradual Revolution*, Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Gadgil, M., Guha, R. (2013), *This Fissured Land. An Ecological History of India*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Golwalkar, M.S., (n.d.), *Bunch of Thoughts*, available at:
http://www.archivesofrss.org/Encyc/2014/1/20/23_07_20_06_thoughts.pdf (accessed 2 October 2014).
- Graham, B. (1993), *Hindu Nationalism and Indian Politics. The Origins and Development of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Guha, R. (2007), *India after Gandhi. The History of World's Largest Democracy*, MacMillan, London.
- Hansen, T.B. (2001), *The Saffron Wave. Democracy and Hindu Nationalism in Modern India*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Iwanek, K., Burakowski, A. (2013), *Indie. Od kolonii do mocarstwa. 1857-2013* ['India. From Colony to a Power'], PWN, Warszawa.
- Jaffrelot, Ch. (1997), *The Hindu Nationalist Movement and Indian Politics, 1925 to the 1990s: Strategies of Identity Building, Implementation and Mobilisation*, Penguin Books India (Viking), New Delhi.
- Jones, K. (2006), *Arya Dharm: Hindu Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century Punjab*, Manohar Publishers, New Delhi.
- Jhunjunwala, B., "Hitch Indian Bandwagon to Services Sector", available at:
<http://organiser.org//Encyc/2014/8/23/Economy--Hitch-Indian-Bandwagon-to-Services-Sector%EF%BB%BF.aspx> (accessed 9 October 2014).

Kanungo, P. (2002), *RSS's Tryst with Politics. From Hedgewar to Sudarshan*, Manohar Publishers, New Delhi.

Kelkar, S. (2011), *Lost Years of the RSS*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.

Krishnan, U., "Modi's Biggest Foes to Open India Seen With His Own Camp", available at:

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-08-20/modi-s-biggest-foes-to-open-india-seen-with-his-own-camp.html> (accessed 12 September 2014).

Limaye, M. (2011), "What is the RSS?", available at <http://www.sacw.net/article2051.html> (accessed 29 September 2014).

Maiorano, D. (2014), "Continuity amid Change in India's Political Economy from 1980 to 2004", *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 44-54.

Mathur, J.P., Lal, M. (2006), *History of Jana Sangh*, volume 6, *Party Documents (1952-1980)*, Bharatiya Janata Party, New Delhi.

Mathur, S. (2008), *The Everyday Life of Hindu Nationalism*, Three Essays Collective, New Delhi.

McCartney, M. (2009), *Political Economy, Growth and Liberalisation in India, 1991-2008*, Routledge, London.

McGuire, J., Copland, I. (eds.)(2007), *Hindu Nationalism and Governance*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Nayar, B.R. (2000), "The Limits of Economic Nationalism in India: Economic Reforms under the BJP-Led Government, 1998-1999", *Asian Survey*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 792-815.

Nayar, B.R. (2001), *Globalization and Nationalism: The Changing Balance in India's Economic Policy 1950-2000*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.

Pandey, B.N. (1976), *Nehru: A Biography*, Stein and Day, New York.

Rajagopal, A. (2001), *Politics after Television. Hindu Nationalism and the Reshaping of the Public in India*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rudolph, L. I., Rudolph, S.H. (1987), *In Pursuit of Lakshmi. The Political Economy of the Indian State*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.

Saurav, S., "Economy: Disinvest Judiciously", available at:

<http://organiser.org//Encyc/2014/8/12/Economy--Disinvest-Judiciously%EF%BB%BF.aspx>,

(accessed 10 October 2014).

Savarkar, V.S. (n.d.), "Hindu Rashtra Darshan" ['A Vision of a Hindu Nation/State'], available at:

<http://www.savarkar.org/content/pdfs/en/hindu-rashtra-darshan-en-v002.pdf>, (accessed 27

September 2014).

Savarkar, S.S. (ed.)(1967), *Historic statements by Savarkar*, G.P. Parchure, Bombay.

Singh, S., "Not the first Intervention", available at: <http://organiser.org//Encyc/2014/8/16/Opinion-->

[-Not-the-first-Intervention%EF%BB%BF.aspx](http://organiser.org//Encyc/2014/8/16/Opinion--Not-the-first-Intervention%EF%BB%BF.aspx) (accessed 4 October 2014).

Sheasley, Ch., "Why did India block the first global trade reform in 19 years", available at:

<http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-South-Central/2014/0801/Why-did-India-block-the->

[first-global-trade-reform-in-19-years](http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-South-Central/2014/0801/Why-did-India-block-the-first-global-trade-reform-in-19-years) (accessed 12 September 2014).

Thirwell, M.P. (2004), "India. The Next Economic Giant", available at:

http://www.lowyinstitute.org/files/pubfiles/India_webFINALsml.pdf (accessed 29 September

2014).

Tripāthī, Ś. Ś., Das T., Candr P. (2008), *Ācārya-śisyā samvād*, bhāg 2, ['The teacher-pupil dialogue, part two'], sarasvatī śīśu mandir prakāśan, mathurā.

Upadhyaya, D. (1992), *Integral Humanism*, Jagriti Prakashan, Noida.

Zavos, J. (2000), *The Emergence of Hindu Nationalism in India*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.