

# A Brief Review on Swami Vivekananda and Hindu Nationalism

Asmina Khatun

Department of Political science, Researcher, The University of Burdwan, Purba Bardhaman ,713104

## Abstract

This paper undertakes a comparative analysis of Hindu nationalism and Swami Vivekananda's nationalist thought, examining the conceptual divergences between the two despite their frequent association in political discourse. The central inquiry revolves around the contested usage of the term 'Hindu' in the context of Indian nationalism — whether it denotes an inclusive civilizational identity or a narrowly defined religious-cultural exclusivism.

The paper begins by situating Indian nationalism within the broader theoretical framework of nationalism as articulated by scholars such as Hans Kohn and C. J. H. Hayes, before tracing the historical emergence of Hindu nationalism in colonial India. It then systematically examines the major strands of Hindu nationalist thought — from Vinayak Damodar Savarkar's concept of Hindutva, grounded in territorial, racial, and cultural unity, to M. S. Golwalkar's vision of a Hindu Rashtra that marginalizes religious minorities, to the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh's (RSS) organizational ideology, and finally to Deendayal Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism, which became the philosophical foundation of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP).

In contrast, the paper evaluates Swami Vivekananda's nationalist philosophy, which, while deeply rooted in Hindu spiritual traditions, was fundamentally universalist in character. For Vivekananda, 'Hindu' represented a vast, all-encompassing civilization that embraced Muslims, Christians, Jains, Buddhists, and all other communities without compulsion or exclusion. His nationalism was built upon the principles of Vedanta — the oneness of all existence — universal tolerance, social equality, and the upliftment of the marginalized masses. He envisioned nation-building not through religious consolidation but through manav dharma — the religion of humanity.

The comparative analysis reveals that while Hindu nationalists frequently invoke Vivekananda's name as ideological inspiration, their core doctrines — emphasizing ethnic-cultural exclusivity, minority subordination, and religious-political consolidation — stand in fundamental contradiction to his universalist and inclusive vision. The paper concludes that a genuine nationalism rooted in Vivekananda's thought must be India-building in character — broad, inclusive, and humanistic — rather than centered on narrow religious or cultural supremacy.

**Keywords:** Hindu Nationalism, Hindutva, Swami Vivekananda, RSS, BJP, Savarkar, Golwalkar, Integral Humanism, Indian Nationalism, Vedanta, Universalism, Secularism.

## Introduction:

Among innumerable subjects, only those that carry doubt and necessity become worthy of inquiry. Subjects that are already established or imaginary are not examined. Therefore, the question arises: what

doubt exists in the present subject of discussion? That India is a nationalist state is an entirely established fact, and like other nationalist states, India too is founded upon social, cultural, and political values. But when the word 'Hindu' — that is, the question of religion — arises in the context of Indian nationalism, disagreements emerge among various theorists. They have viewed the word 'Hindu' from different perspectives. Even within their own views, differences have been observed over time. Furthermore, differences are also visible between them and Swami Vivekananda, who is regarded as the father of Indian nationalism. Since doubt exists regarding what the word 'Hindu' truly means in the context of nationalism, and since there is also doubt about how it differs from Vivekananda's conception — and since these doubts create the necessity of resolution — the subject of my discussion is highly anticipated and relevant.

A review of the history of human society shows that it is a history of gradual evolution. Through this path of evolution, we have progressively arrived at the modern state. And the principal driving force of the modern state is nationalism. Nationalism is a psychological feeling through which a sense of mutual interaction and a kind of unity develops among a group of people. In other words, when a group of people, on the basis of social, cultural, and political values, bind themselves together in unity by establishing allegiance to a nation or nation-state, it is called nationalism. The goal of this nationalism is the right to self-determination, and to protect oneself from the political, social, and cultural pressures created by the modern world economy in determining national sovereignty.

In explaining nationalism, Hans Kohn states: "A state of mind, in which the supreme loyalty of the individual is felt to be due to the nation-state. It is a living and active corporate will. It is this will which we call nationalism, a state of mind inspiring the large majority of people and claiming to inspire all its members. It asserts that the nation-state is the ideal and the only legitimate form of political organization and that nationality is the source of all cultural creative energy and economic well-being."

(Nationalism: Its Meaning and History, Hans Kohn, D. Van Nostrand Company, 1955; The Idea of Nationalism, Hans Kohn, The Macmillan Company, 1946)

Again, according to C. J. H. Hayes: "Nationalism consists of a modern emotional fusion and exaggeration of two very old phenomena — nationality and patriotism."

(Nationalism as a Religion, Macmillan, 1960)

In this discussion of nationalism, a discussion of Indian nationalism is highly relevant — which was primarily expressed through various movements against India's colonial rule, centered around diverse economic, social, and political causes. From the very early period of India's nationalist awakening, the word 'Hindu' was frequently used to spread nationalist consciousness among all people. It was not used to identify any specific majoritarian religious community; rather, it emphasized building a sense of awareness among all Indians regarding the indigenous traditions and culture of India.

However, since the meaning of a word is always changing with its place, time, and surrounding circumstances, nationalism has at times become a refuge for the oppressed and a vehicle of anti-hegemonic politics, and at other times has flowed in the opposite direction. It is in this context that the emergence of Hindu nationalism — and the incorporation of the Hindu religion into Indian nationalism — becomes extremely necessary to discuss. This was inspired by a particular mode of thought of the nineteenth century and its historical interactions and conflicts. For example, looking at history, we can see that Hindu nationalism began to take shape through fierce opposition to the Christian missionaries' condemnation of India's caste system and through opposition to the separate electoral provisions favorable to Muslims. On the other hand, Gandhi's efforts to establish a friendly relationship through the

unity of Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh communities — and his guidance of the Khilafat Movement in the early 1920s for this purpose — was something the Hindutva ideologues could not accept at all. Furthermore, the communal Hindu-Muslim riots in the pre-independence period, Pakistan's efforts to form an Islamic state, and Nehru (inspired by Gandhi) rejecting this universalist vision in favor of building an Indian nation on the basis of a secular individual identity — all of these are the fruits of Hindu nationalism. Because in their view, unity between Hinduism and other religions is never possible. For they believe the constitution of the Hindu nation is different from all others. In other words, they place emphasis on an ethnic-cultural concept of nationhood, whose sole goal is the Hindu nation, the Hindi language, and Hindustan.

However, many theorists of Hindu nationalism have mentioned Swami Vivekananda as their source of inspiration. But in reality, it can be observed that the overall doctrine of these theorists — the theoretical characteristics of their stream of thought — differs considerably from Swami Vivekananda's nationalist ideology. Therefore, a comparative discussion of what the true form of Swami Vivekananda's nationalist thought is, in what sense he used the word 'Hindu,' and what the difference is between his thought and other Hindu nationalist streams of thought, is highly relevant — which I have attempted to present through the development of my research project.

### **Various Streams of Hindu Nationalism:**

#### ***Hindu Nationalism and the RSS***

When the concept of the 'Hindu nation' is initially brought up, the name of Vinayak Damodar Savarkar — the father of Indian Hindutva — comes up first. In his book *Hindutva: Who is a Hindu?*, he articulates his perspective. In defining 'Hindutva,' he places extreme emphasis on three elements: geographical unity, racial characteristics, and common culture. In his view, 'Hindu' does not refer to any religion. It is a cultural matter, encompassing certain customs and practices that originate primarily from the Vedic age. He believes that the Aryans are the true inhabitants of India, and that they created this culture. He repeatedly states that Hindus are a single nation, through whose veins the same blood has flowed since the Vedic age — encompassing the same thought, the same activities, achievements, history, literature, law, and customary festivals.

However, it must be asked: is the concept he articulates compatible with non-Hindus, i.e., Muslims and Christians? On this point, he says that since the Hindu nation means a common culture, Muslims and Christians have a separate religion and mode of thought. Moreover, since they do not regard India as their holy land (Punjabhumi), they do not fall within the scope of the Hindu nation. That is, Muslims and Christians are not organized within Hindutva. In his view, like other Hindus, Hindustan is indeed their birthplace (Pitribhumi) but not their holy land. Their holy land is Arabia and Palestine. And in that case, their love for that holy land is also divided — for their love and allegiance is greater toward the holy land than toward the birthplace. However, he also says that since all of them were once Hindus but converted to other religions at some point, Hindu blood runs through all of them, and since they live in India, his demand was that — not through force, but through persuasion — the importance of Hindutva should be established and they should be converted back to Hinduism. Non-Hindus, however, can live in this country by accepting the Hindu culture.

Another Hindu nationalist, Golwalkar, in his work *We or Our Nationhood Defined*, presents certain concepts in explaining Hindu nationalism. In his view, a nation is a cultural entity, whereas the state is a political institution that is not separate from religion. In his view, religion is not an individual belief;

rather, it regulates all activities of society. Religion-culture is a particular national entity that creates national consciousness and inspires the Hindu nation. In his view, religion is incorporated into every sphere of the nation's life — that is, every activity of life, personal, social, and political, is a religious command. He wished that the minorities of India would live merely as outsiders under all the norms of the nation, and that they would be given no special privileges or rights. Furthermore, the non-Hindu people of Hindustan must adopt Hindu culture and language and maintain devotion to Hindu religion. They must not express any intolerance or hatred toward this land and its long heritage — rather, they must promote a positive attitude of love and devotion in its place. In his view, either they will remain foreigners, or if they wish to live in this country, they must live under the Hindu nation. But they cannot claim any special privileges or priority. He even referred to minorities as a threat to the integrity of the Hindu nation.

Golwalkar also presented a concept regarding the democratic secular nature of India, stating that for a Hindu, the state is always secular. He established an equivalence between secularism and his own perspective, saying that Hindu religious belief also tolerates a larger plane — that communal Hindutva strategy is, in fact, nothing but secular. He primarily emphasized uniting Hindus to form Hindustan, which he considered a pure form of secularism. He even stated that a state organized around Hindu religion or Hindu culture is inherently secular and democratic. And the Indian Muslim is an internal enemy who has arisen to destroy the integrity of the Hindu nation. He further believed that Muslims in India are a permanent burden, and their expressions of love and allegiance toward the Hindu nation are a threat.

In independent India, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) emerged as a politically important Hindu nationalist organization. It was founded in 1925 by Keshav Baliram Hedgewar. The RSS has always presented itself as a cultural organization rather than a political one. Its central ideal was to build unity among the Hindu nation, to boldly strengthen their self-respect and self-consciousness, and to propagate the concept of Hindutva — because in Hedgewar's view, the fundamental reason for the subjugation of Hindus by foreign powers was the failure and disunity of the Hindus. The RSS expanded further under Golwalkar's leadership. However, Golwalkar's views on Hindutva are now largely no longer followed by the present RSS. Instead, emphasis is now placed on inclusivity, setting aside anti-Muslim hostility. This we can observe in the views of the current RSS Sarsanghchalak Mohan Bhagwat, who states that a Hindu Rashtra does not mean one that excludes Muslims — for the RSS fundamentally speaks of unity in diversity. The Hindu nation they speak of emphasizes the inclusion of everyone. He even states that Muslims are our own people, and to exclude them cannot be called Hindutva. Therefore, in his view, we will certainly organize as Hindus, but not by excluding Muslims — rather, it will be done by including them.

### **Deendayal Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism and the BJP's Position**

Deendayal Upadhyaya, president of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, established a political philosophy of Ekatma Manav Darshan (Integral Humanism), which was adopted from 1965 onward as the central ideology for the Jana Sangh's new political philosophy and policies. Upadhyaya claimed that Integral Humanism follows Advaita (non-dualism), representing a principle of unity of which humanity is a part. According to his philosophy, the ideal person is one who lives by the four Purusharthas — Dharma, Artha, Kama, and Moksha (righteousness, wealth, desire, and liberation). The development of body, mind, intellect, and soul happens through this path. And just as body, mind, intellect, and soul exist in

the individual, they also exist in the family, society, nation, and universe. In essence, all of these are the multifaceted development of the same soul, where everyone is connected to everyone else.

In his view, Dharma is neither a religion nor a specific domain. Rather, it can be said that Dharma is an innate law within society, always present within it. Dharma encompasses natural tendencies, rules, and freedoms, which are sanctioned for the comfort and unity of society. In his view, within the principle of unity, Dharma communicates mutual understanding among various spheres, teaches harmonization by ignoring coercion and arbitrariness. He claims that just as Dharma instills a sense of oneness and love within the family, so too the power of Dharma reflects society through deep love and harmony toward the motherland, its history, culture, heritage, values, and ideas. In his view, the matter of Dharma must be studied through feeling — which is manifested through the concept of Akhand Bharat (undivided India) or the Hindu Rashtra. In his view, India as a constitutional federal state is opposed to Dharma. For him, Dharma means undivided India — Akhand Bharat. However, an undivided state does not mean that all power will be concentrated at the center, nor that it will act at will. The provinces will also have rights over various governing powers. Even below the provinces, the janpads (local areas) will have appropriate powers. Even the panchayats will be given power. In this way, decentralization alone is possible. On the other hand, all these institutions and their powers will be engaged in the welfare of the undivided state.

In essence, Upadhyaya's Dharma was extremely important in the context of nationalism. He claimed that his Dharma is based on Hindu principles. He placed his concept of unity not on the state, but on the inherent cultural characteristics and the social reconstruction aligned with the spirit of the nation. In his view, the state acts as a guardian of the nation's soul according to the principles of Dharma. He says that Dharma is not determined by many opinions — Dharma is eternal. Furthermore, in identifying democracy, it is not sufficient to say it is a government of the people. Essentially, in a people's republic, a democratic government will have a religious foundation. In other words, in his view, true democracy exists where Dharma is present alongside freedom — because in his view, in politics, religion/Dharma inspires the individual, society, state, and ruler. A Dharma-state does not mean a theocratic state. A theocratic state holds all rights and privileges of one religion, with direct or indirect restrictions on all other religions. A Dharma-state emphasizes the importance of religion for individual peace, happiness, and progress. Then the state will be responsible for maintaining an environment in which every individual follows religion according to their choice and lives in peace. A Dharma-state will also ensure religious freedom.

In 1951, the Bharatiya Jana Sangh entered Indian politics, emphasizing conservatism, Hindu communalism, and Integral Humanism. Their ideological foundation and progress was shaped by the emotional affiliation with the RSS. They primarily used cultural symbols to promote Hinduism and to mobilize people for the national movement.

However, Hindu nationalist thought became most popular in 1980 with the emergence of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) from the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, under the leadership of Atal Bihari Vajpayee and L. K. Advani. It primarily emphasized cultural nationalism, positive secularism, and national integration. The BJP, through its declaration in harmony with Deendayal Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism, has emphasized social cohesion. According to the BJP's conception, the social philosophy of the Bharatiya Janata Party is the foundation of its social activities — which is generally embedded in Integral Humanism. This Integral Humanism primarily governs all the contradictions among society and its various elements. The BJP even claims that in all social and economic spheres, they will help the

backward sections of society. They also respect religious diversity and the teachings of all other religions — though at present, very little tolerance toward non-Hindu minorities, especially Muslims, can be observed.

For the Bharatiya Janata Party, Integral Humanism is a foundational philosophy that protects the party's conception of political, social, economic, and religious development. The BJP considers this ideology as a doctrine in harmony with the traditions of ancient India. They even believe that this Integral Humanism is a part of Indian human philosophy, which builds a social order, resolves all conflicts in modern society, and abandons all forms of exploitation in that society. Moreover, this holistic perspective establishes a relationship between society as a whole and the individual, acknowledging the freedom of both the nation and the individual.

In this regard, according to their view, they have adopted certain primary truths for the protection of integrity. The first among these is that from Kashmir to Kanyakumari they include within a single nation. Second, they believe India is an ancient nation — and therefore they are not engaged in forming any new nation. According to the Vedic declaration, their nationalism is ancient: "The earth is my mother and I am her son."

India or the Indian nation is generally based on cultural unity, which has established our political, economic, and social unity. In this regard, according to Suhas Palshikar, the search for religious-cultural assimilation and the dominance of Hindu culture are the primary characteristics of the politics of Hindutva. Therefore, whenever India has failed in all these efforts, the country has fragmented into various states. But our cultural unity has persisted. Furthermore, according to many Hindu nationalists, the partition of India on the basis of religion and the creation of Muslim-majority Pakistan represents the failure of Nehru's ideology in the context of Indian nationalism. They believe that if Muslim nationalism was the reason for the creation of Pakistan, then Hindu nationalism should hold dominance within the Indian state.

However, the Bharatiya Janata Party claims that they alone are truly secular. In this regard, they identify secularism as Sarva Dharma Sambhava — equal respect for all religions. In their view, a secular state should maintain a neutral position regarding the religious beliefs of the people, and provide protection and equal respect to all religious practitioners. According to them, Congress has, for many years, destroyed secularism by formulating certain policies to appease narrow communal and sectional interests. They claim that Hinduism transcends religious governance because it is based on Indian culture — and 'Hindutva' is merely its synonym. Moreover, the identity of Indian nationality is rooted within Hindu culture. A nation is primarily built upon a common cultural ideology. Therefore, according to the BJP's conception, Indian nationality should consolidate Hindu heritage along with traditional practices and beliefs, which will extend the country's ancient history. And according to their claim, religious minorities can benefit from the traditional tolerance inherent within this Hindu-dominant framework. In their view, religious minorities will be free to practice religious activities in their personal sphere, but must publicly show respect for Hindu customs.

Furthermore, according to the BJP's claims, they are committed to a single nation, a single people, and a single culture. The party's national vision is not united merely by India's geographical identity, but refers to India's eternal cultural heritage. Therefore, in the case of India, the truth is that we are all Indians regardless of whatever differences exist in religion and language. Hence our goal is to create primary allegiance toward the country, and therefore no discrimination will be made against any Indian community or religion. They also claim that India is the homeland of Muslims and Christians — they

did not come from outside. Their ancestors were Hindus and Hindu blood continues to flow through their veins. Religion may have changed, but that does not mean their nationality and culture has changed. Culture is connected to the soil of India and to national allegiance. And those who abandon this allegiance become enemies.

At present, Narendra Modi claims that the party does not favor the injustices of the majority. Rather, this governance prides itself on the question of equal treatment between minorities and the majority. Since the time of Advani, the BJP has always claimed that they want to ensure genuine secularism. Genuine secularism gives appropriate and equal importance to all religious communities. In this regard, Modi states on the matter of secularism that whether it is Eid or Diwali, both communities will receive equal opportunities and benefits in matters of free governance.

### **An Evaluation of Swami Vivekananda's Nationalist Thought:**

Swami Vivekananda was, in heart and soul, a true nationalist, who sought to establish his nationalist ideals upon a religious foundation. However, there is no reason to confuse spirituality or religion here with rituals and matters of social opinion. By religion, he actually meant the eternal principles of moral and spiritual development — because he was fundamentally a believer in universal tolerance, not in social and religious imposition. And by this religion, he primarily meant Hinduism, which he claimed to be the mother of religions. In his view, Hinduism is that religion which constantly teaches tolerance of other religions and universal acceptance. In his view, 'Hindu' represents a vast and expansive culture that encompasses Muslims, Christians, Jains, Buddhists, and all other communities.

In this regard, he believed that unity within multiplicity is the way of nature. Other religions prescribe certain fixed opinions and try to forcibly make all of society conform to them. In his view, all religious doctrines are ultimately directed toward the same purpose, and the same truth exists within all religions. Therefore, one should not try to bring everyone under the same ideology. For this reason, he revived the eternal truths of the Vedas and Upanishads in order to strengthen the development of the nation and the individuality of belief. In this context, Swami Vivekananda placed enormous emphasis on the philosophy of Vedanta, stating that Vedanta alone teaches how to accept the diversity of religious perspectives — that is, Vedanta speaks of the oneness of the world. In his view, religion is not a sentence, agreement, or theory, nor is it a group-based matter. Religion cannot even reside in a sect or society. It is the relationship between God and the soul — that is, seeing God within the individual. That is why he says: "He who serves the living being serves God." Swami Vivekananda also says that the true message of Hinduism is not to divide people on the basis of religious community but to unite the whole of humanity, and to abandon all compulsion in matters of belief in any religion. In this regard, he declared in an inspired voice at the Chicago Parliament of Religions: "I am proud to represent a religion which has taught the world both tolerance and universal acceptance. We believe not only in universal toleration, but we accept all religions as true." In essence, he attempted to achieve a harmonization of all the religious elements of a universal religion — a synthesis of all noble virtues: friendship, fraternity, tolerance, and all other good qualities. And this harmonization of all religions lies within Vedanta.

Like Bankim, Vivekananda's soul was illuminated with the enlightened vision of Mother India as a deity. For him, India did not mean merely a geographical entity or a paradise for the pleasure of the elite. Therefore, he worked to awaken the masses — for their physical and moral development, and to create a sense of pride in the ancient glory and greatness of India among them. This is why he is celebrated as one of the chief architects of modern Indian nationalism. Moreover, his love for the country was

boundless. He was the living embodiment of sensitive patriotism. A nation is composed of individuals in harmony. Therefore, Vivekananda emphasized that noble qualities such as manliness, human dignity, and respect ought to be manifested by every individual. In his view, to speak of national solidarity and fraternity without a deep sense of selfless service is nothing but meaningless words — because he believed it was essential to identify personal interest with the interest of the country and the nation.

And it is in this context that he spoke of manav dharma (the religion of humanity) for the purpose of nation-building. That is, his religion was a religion of making human beings. And his fundamental principle was to build a dynamic religion and a united India. Because in his view, if the Indian people cannot be elevated from their degraded condition, the formation of a new India is practically impossible. He primarily condemned the exploitation of India's laboring people by the elite. In this regard, he felt that building patriotism among the country's large working population was the first step. He believed that no special privilege should exist for any one person. Therefore, he sought to build equal opportunities for all people. In this regard, he rejected class dominance in a country of priesthood exploited by foreign imperialists, and emphasized the establishment of equality for all people. In his view, class interests and class limitations create an obstacle to social reconstruction. Therefore, in this context, he sought the betterment of the people through a process of social transformation.

And Swami Vivekananda was the first person in the world to consider the governance of the working class and to prophesy about the culture of the proletariat. He also placed emphasis on mutual cooperation for the improvement of social welfare. At the same time, he strongly opposed the caste system — because in his view, the caste system prevalent in society creates an obstacle in the path of the nation's progress. Therefore, it is observed that he strived to bring about a radical transformation of society through the abolition of the caste system in agreement with educated individuals. Because Swamiji sought freedom for human beings in every sphere of life.

He even believed that various religious ideals are matters of personal realization — and therefore the state should never intervene there. By deeply realizing the truth, putting an end to communal bitterness, and engaging in the reconstruction of India's ancient culture, everyone will dedicate themselves to this work. He was opposed to exploitation in all spheres of society within India. Moreover, he realized that so-called religiosity and patriotism had taken the form of exploitation. Therefore, opposing the class character of falsehood, he sought the spread of education and the development of the people on the basis of equality for the betterment of the masses. This was a practical aspect of bringing together people of various communities through his concept of equal class membership. In this context, he declares in his *Bartaman Bharat (Modern India)*:

"O brave one, take courage, and proudly say — I am an Indian, every Indian is my brother. Say — the ignorant Indian, the poor Indian, the Brahmin Indian, the Chandal Indian — all are my brothers. Wearing only a loincloth, call out proudly — every Indian is my brother, every Indian is my life, the gods and goddesses of India are my God, the society of India is my cradle, the garden of my youth, the Varanasi of my old age. Say, brother — the soil of India is my heaven, the welfare of India is my welfare."

### **A Comparative Discussion of Hindu Nationalism and Swami Vivekananda's Nationalist Thought:**

In colonial India, Swami Vivekananda was the one who first succeeded in awakening self-confidence among his countrymen. His nationalist ideals, national consciousness, and patriotism inspired the next generation. Therefore, paying tribute to Swamiji — one of the chief architects of the new India —

Rabindranath Tagore said: "If you want to know India, read Vivekananda." And according to Aurobindo: "Vivekananda is the maker and the chief leader of our national life."

The ideological vision through which Vivekananda presented his nationalist ideas differs considerably from much of present-day Hindu nationalism. Because although Hindu nationalists take pride in the way he spread the interpretation of the word 'Hindu' in the context of nationalism across the world, for the sake of political ideology they have given it a different form. As a result, the word 'Hindu' has been transformed into a partisan term for them. Whereas Vivekananda, in his interpretation of the word 'Hindu,' says that Hinduism is that religion which constantly teaches tolerance of other religions and universality — it is a culture that encompasses Muslims, Christians, Jains, Buddhists, and all other communities. In his stream of thought, there is never any mention of forcibly imposing his culture upon others. Rather, he shaped Hinduism into a religion that is acceptable to all. On the other hand, present-day Hindu nationalists often take the narrow meaning of the word 'Hindu,' understanding by it people of a particular religion, and speak of forcibly imposing their culture upon others.

In this context, the first thing that must be said is that we see Hindu nationalists certainly emphasizing again and again the building of Hindu culture, but in this they are stressing the conversion of non-Hindus into Hinduism — which can be said to be the complete opposite of Swami Vivekananda's conception. Because although he spoke of Hindu culture, he never spoke of forcibly imposing Hinduism or that culture upon others. Because he believed in universal tolerance, not in social and religious imposition.

On the other hand, if we look further, we can see that Hindu nationalists, in building national consciousness, have always emphasized the formation of unity among the Hindu nation, and the matter of integrating non-Hindus can also be said to be neglected in that context. But if we consider Swami Vivekananda's national consciousness, we see that he never spoke of nation-building consisting only of Hindus alone — and for him, 'Hindu' was a vast and expansive culture that spoke of including Muslims, Christians, Jains, Buddhists, and all other communities.

Furthermore, we mostly see that Hindu nationalists, in speaking of building national consciousness among the Hindu nation on the basis of religion and culture, have at times ignored the claims of the minority for privileges or priority, and in many cases have even labeled them as a threat to the Hindu nation. This can be said to be entirely opposed to Swami Vivekananda's nationalist conception. Because firstly, Swami Vivekananda never explained Hinduism on the basis of any particular religion and culture. He always emphasized nation-building on the basis of the harmonization of all religions. Because in his view, all religious doctrines are ultimately directed toward the same purpose, and the same truth exists within all religions. Therefore, one should not try to bring everyone under the same ideology — rather, he emphasized the universal acceptance of Hinduism, that religion which believes in what is true in every religion and accepts it with respect. And moreover, he always spoke of manav dharma for the purpose of nation-building, and was not in favor of granting special privileges to individuals. He always sought to build equal opportunities for all people.

### **Conclusion:**

No matter how much Hindu nationalists invoke Swami Vivekananda in explaining their nationalist conception, or how much they present Vivekananda's ideology alongside other nationalists' ideologies in the context of the formation of the Jana Sangh Party in India — in reality, no harmony with his conception can be observed. Rather, it can be said that present-day nationalism is primarily more preoccupied with the protection of religious existence. In this regard, it can therefore be said that if the

nationalist ideology of protecting religious existence does not take root in people's minds at the present time, the social picture of India itself could change — and Indians could truly feel in reality what it means to be absorbed in the dream of an undivided India. Therefore, if there is a true nationalist conception, it should be a nationalism based on the building of India — not centered on any small region or issue — which is primarily what we observe in the stream of thought of Swami Vivekananda.

## Reference:

1. Sharma, Jyotirmaya, *Hindutva: Exploring the Idea of Hindu Nationalism*, Penguin Books, India, 2003.
2. Bhatt, Chetan, *Hindu Nationalism: Origins, Ideologies and Modern Myths*, Oxford International Publishers Ltd, 2001.
3. Jaffrelot, Christophe, *Hindu Nationalism, Permanent Black*, Oxford Apartment, Delhi, 110092.
4. Datta, Bhupendranath, *Swami Vivekananda: Patriot-Prophet*, Rudransh Prakashan, 2016.
5. Vivekananda, Swami, *Bani O Rachana (Vol. 1)*, Udbodhan Karyalay, Calcutta-3.
6. Vivekananda, Swami, *Bani O Rachana (Vol. 2)*, Udbodhan Karyalay, Calcutta-3.
7. Vivekananda, Swami, *Bani O Rachana (Vol. 3)*, Udbodhan Karyalay, Calcutta-3.
8. Vivekananda, Swami, *Bartaman Bharat*, Udbodhan Karyalay, Calcutta