



Political Thought of M. S. Golwalkar and Its Contribution to the Formation of Modern India

Mr. Darshan Gajjar, Assistant Professor of Politics and International Relations, ILSASS, The CVM University, Email: darshangajjar30@gmail.com

Abstract

The political thought of Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar (1906–1973), popularly known as Guruji, occupies a significant position in the intellectual history of modern India. As the second Sarsanghchalak of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), Golwalkar transformed the organisation into one of the most influential socio-cultural movements in independent India. His writings, particularly *We, or Our Nationhood Defined* (1939) and *Bunch of Thoughts* (1966), articulated a conception of India grounded in cultural nationalism, civilisational continuity, and the primacy of Hindu identity. Although Golwalkar never occupied public office, his ideological influence has extended far beyond the RSS, shaping political organisations, public discourse, and debates concerning nationalism, secularism, and national integration. This article examines Golwalkar's political philosophy by analysing his understanding of nationhood, the state, democracy, cultural identity, and social organisation. It further evaluates the contribution of his ideas to the formation of modern India while acknowledging the scholarly criticisms regarding pluralism, minority rights, and constitutional secularism. The article argues that Golwalkar's political thought remains indispensable for understanding the evolution of Hindu nationalism and contemporary Indian politics, irrespective of ideological agreement or disagreement. His intellectual legacy continues to influence debates on national identity, governance, and the relationship between culture and politics in twenty-first-century India.

Keywords: M. S. Golwalkar, Hindutva, Cultural Nationalism, RSS, Political Thought, Modern India, Hindu Nationalism



1.0 Introduction

Modern India's political development has been shaped by numerous ideological traditions, including liberalism, socialism, Gandhian philosophy, Ambedkarite constitutionalism, Marxism, and cultural nationalism. Among the principal architects of the cultural nationalist tradition stands Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar, whose intellectual contributions significantly influenced the ideological direction of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and, indirectly, many organisations within the Sangh Parivar (Andersen & Damle, 2018). While Jawaharlal Nehru envisioned India as a secular democratic republic founded upon constitutional liberalism, Golwalkar proposed an alternative conception rooted in India's ancient Hindu civilisation and cultural unity (Jaffrelot, 1996).

Golwalkar assumed leadership of the RSS in 1940 following the death of its founder, Keshav Baliram Hedgewar. During his thirty-three-year tenure, he transformed the RSS from a relatively small volunteer organisation into a nationwide movement emphasising discipline, national service, and cultural regeneration (Andersen & Damle, 2018). His writings and speeches became foundational texts for subsequent generations of RSS workers and influenced the ideological development of organisations such as the Bharatiya Jana Sangh and later the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) (Hansen, 1999).

Unlike many twentieth-century political thinkers, Golwalkar did not formulate a systematic theory of the state comparable to those of John Rawls, Karl Marx, or Mahatma Gandhi. Instead, his political philosophy emerged through speeches, organisational directives, and reflections on Indian civilisation, nationalism, and social organisation (Sharma, 2006). Consequently, his ideas must be understood within the broader framework of Hindu nationalist thought initiated by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar while recognising the distinctive emphasis Golwalkar placed upon culture rather than political sovereignty alone (Savarkar, 1923/2019).

The significance of Golwalkar's political thought extends beyond historical interest. Contemporary discussions regarding nationalism, secularism, minority rights, uniform civil laws, national integration, education, and cultural identity frequently invoke ideas associated with Golwalkar, either directly or indirectly (Bhatt, 2001). Supporters regard him as a visionary who sought to revive India's civilisational confidence after centuries of foreign domination, whereas critics argue that his conception of nationhood risks marginalising India's religious and cultural diversity (Noorani, 2000).

This article critically examines Golwalkar's political philosophy by analysing his conception of nationhood, statecraft, democracy, social organisation, and cultural nationalism. It also evaluates his contribution to the formation of modern India by assessing both the enduring influence and the controversies surrounding his ideas.

2.0 Historical Background and Intellectual Formation

Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar was born on 19 February 1906 in Ramtek near Nagpur in present-day Maharashtra. His early education reflected a strong academic inclination, eventually



leading him to Banaras Hindu University (BHU), where he studied zoology and later taught as a lecturer (Andersen & Damle, 2018). Although trained in the natural sciences, Golwalkar increasingly developed an interest in Indian philosophy, spirituality, and cultural history.

His association with Dr. Keshav Baliram Hedgewar proved decisive in shaping his ideological outlook. Hedgewar had established the RSS in 1925 with the objective of strengthening Hindu society through discipline, character-building, and social unity rather than immediate electoral politics (Jaffrelot, 1996). Golwalkar embraced this organisational vision and soon emerged as Hedgewar's most trusted associate.

The political environment of the 1920s and 1930s also influenced Golwalkar's intellectual development. India witnessed intense communal tensions, constitutional negotiations with the British, and growing debates concerning national identity. Simultaneously, global politics witnessed the rise of nationalism, anti-colonial movements, and ideological conflicts between liberal democracy, fascism, and communism (Hansen, 1999). These developments shaped Golwalkar's conviction that national unity required cultural cohesion rather than merely constitutional arrangements.

Following Hedgewar's death in 1940, Golwalkar became the second Sarsanghchalak of the RSS. Under his leadership, the organisation expanded significantly despite facing severe challenges, including the government ban imposed after Mahatma Gandhi's assassination in 1948. Although the ban was eventually lifted after constitutional assurances, the episode reinforced Golwalkar's emphasis on organisational discipline, social service, and ideological commitment (Andersen & Damle, 2018).

Golwalkar's principal works include *We, or Our Nationhood Defined* (1939), often regarded as his earliest ideological statement, and *Bunch of Thoughts* (1966), a compilation of speeches that became one of the most influential texts within the RSS tradition (Golwalkar, 1939; Golwalkar, 1966). Scholars generally agree that while the earlier work contains more rigid formulations of nationalism, the later speeches reveal greater emphasis upon social organisation, service, and cultural reconstruction (Sharma, 2006).

Intellectually, Golwalkar drew inspiration from Hindu philosophical traditions, the writings of Swami Vivekananda, Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Sri Aurobindo, and V. D. Savarkar, although his interpretation differed from each in important respects (Bhatt, 2001). Rather than advocating an explicitly political programme, he consistently argued that cultural transformation constituted the prerequisite for political strength.

3.0 Cultural Nationalism as the Foundation of the Nation

The cornerstone of Golwalkar's political philosophy is his concept of **cultural nationalism**, often described as *Sanskritik Rashtravad*. Unlike Western theories that define the nation through political institutions, territorial sovereignty, or social contracts, Golwalkar argued that nations are fundamentally cultural and civilisational communities (Golwalkar, 1966).



According to Golwalkar, India possessed national unity long before the emergence of the modern nation-state because its people shared common civilisational traditions, sacred geography, cultural symbols, and historical consciousness (Golwalkar, 1966). In his view, the Himalayas, the Ganga, the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, pilgrimage networks, and shared religious traditions collectively created a cultural nation that transcended linguistic and regional differences (Sharma, 2006).

This understanding differed significantly from constitutional nationalism advanced by Nehru and many leaders of the Indian National Congress. Whereas Nehru viewed citizenship as the basis of political community irrespective of religious identity, Golwalkar considered culture the primary determinant of nationhood (Nehru, 1946/2004; Jaffrelot, 1996). He believed that constitutional arrangements could only succeed when supported by a shared civilisational consciousness.

Golwalkar's conception of the nation also reflected his belief that India's civilisation was fundamentally Hindu, not in a narrowly theological sense, but as a comprehensive cultural tradition encompassing values, customs, philosophies, and historical memory (Golwalkar, 1966). Consequently, he frequently employed the term "Hindu" as a cultural rather than merely religious category.

Supporters argue that this conception fostered national integration by emphasising shared heritage over colonial divisions (Andersen & Damle, 2018). They contend that Golwalkar sought to overcome caste divisions, regional fragmentation, and linguistic rivalries by promoting a unified civilisational identity. His repeated insistence on social harmony and national service encouraged thousands of RSS volunteers to participate in relief work during natural disasters, refugee rehabilitation, and community welfare initiatives (Hansen, 1999).

However, critics argue that Golwalkar's model leaves insufficient room for India's religious pluralism. Jaffrelot (1996) contends that defining the nation primarily through Hindu civilisation risks excluding communities whose historical narratives differ from the dominant cultural framework. Similarly, Noorani (2000) argues that cultural nationalism may conflict with constitutional secularism by privileging one civilisational identity over others.

Nevertheless, irrespective of normative evaluation, cultural nationalism remains the central organising principle of Golwalkar's political thought and has profoundly influenced contemporary debates concerning Indian identity, education, history writing, and public policy.

4.0 Golwalkar's Concept of Hindu Rashtra

The concept of **Hindu Rashtra** constitutes the most debated dimension of Golwalkar's political philosophy. Although the phrase has often been interpreted as advocating a theocratic state, Golwalkar consistently distinguished between a **religious state** and a **cultural nation**. He argued that *Hindu Rashtra* did not imply governance by religious clergy or the establishment of Hindu religious law as state law. Rather, it referred to a nation whose collective ethos emerged from India's civilisational heritage (Golwalkar, 1966).



Golwalkar maintained that the word *Hindu* represented an inclusive cultural identity developed over thousands of years. According to him, India's philosophical traditions, festivals, sacred geography, epics, and historical experiences created a common cultural foundation that bound diverse communities together (Golwalkar, 1966). Therefore, he regarded Hindu Rashtra as synonymous with India's civilisational continuity rather than a constitutional alteration of the Republic.

His conception differed significantly from Western nationalism, which often emerged from political revolutions, linguistic unification, or territorial consolidation (Smith, 1991). Golwalkar believed that India's national identity predated colonialism and was rooted in shared cultural memories rather than political institutions. Consequently, political sovereignty merely restored an already existing cultural nation rather than creating a new one (Jaffrelot, 1996).

An important element of this theory was Golwalkar's distinction between **national identity** and **individual religious practice**. He repeatedly argued that people belonging to different faiths could participate in the national community provided they accepted India's cultural heritage as their own (Golwalkar, 1966). Supporters interpret this position as an appeal for cultural integration instead of religious conversion (Andersen & Damle, 2018).

Nevertheless, critics remain unconvinced by this interpretation. They argue that the expectation that minorities identify primarily with Hindu civilisation places unequal cultural obligations upon non-Hindu communities (Noorani, 2000). Thomas Blom Hansen (1999) similarly observes that Golwalkar's formulation blurs the distinction between cultural belonging and religious identity, creating ambiguity regarding the place of minorities within the national framework.

Scholars also distinguish between Golwalkar's earlier work, *We, or Our Nationhood Defined* (1939), and his later speeches collected in *Bunch of Thoughts* (1966). The former contains passages that appear considerably more rigid regarding minorities and national identity, whereas the latter places greater emphasis on social harmony, discipline, and national reconstruction (Sharma, 2006). Consequently, many contemporary scholars caution against interpreting Golwalkar's thought exclusively through his earliest publications.

5.0 Views on the State and Political Power

Unlike many political philosophers, Golwalkar did not regard the **state** as the highest political institution. Instead, he adopted an organic conception of society in which the nation existed independently of governmental structures. For Golwalkar, governments change, constitutions evolve, and political institutions may be reformed, but the nation, as a cultural organism, endures across centuries (Golwalkar, 1966).

This understanding reflects a broader tradition within Indian political thought that distinguishes between **Rajya (the state)** and **Rashtra (the nation)**. Whereas the state performs administrative and coercive functions, the nation represents the collective cultural consciousness of the people (Bhatt, 2001). Golwalkar therefore assigned greater importance to social organisations than to electoral institutions.



He argued that excessive dependence on governmental power weakens society by reducing citizens to passive recipients of state action (Golwalkar, 1966). Instead, he advocated voluntary organisation, civic responsibility, and disciplined social participation. The RSS shakha became the practical embodiment of this philosophy, functioning as a space where individuals developed physical fitness, moral discipline, leadership qualities, and commitment to public service (Andersen & Damle, 2018).

Golwalkar's scepticism regarding the omnipotent state also reflected his criticism of both socialism and communism. He believed that centralised state control suppresses individual initiative and weakens organic social institutions such as the family, local communities, and voluntary associations (Golwalkar, 1966). Although he accepted the necessity of government for maintaining order, he rejected excessive bureaucratic expansion.

His views therefore differ from Nehru's preference for a developmental state directing economic planning and industrialisation (Nehru, 1946/2004). Whereas Nehru emphasised state-led modernisation, Golwalkar prioritised societal regeneration through cultural awakening and community organisation (Jaffrelot, 1996).

This emphasis on civil society has influenced numerous organisations affiliated with the Sangh Parivar that operate in education, tribal welfare, disaster relief, rural development, and social service. Supporters argue that these initiatives demonstrate Golwalkar's belief that nation-building occurs through organised society rather than governmental intervention alone (Andersen & Damle, 2018).

6.0 Democracy, Leadership, and Social Organisation

Golwalkar's relationship with democracy has generated extensive scholarly debate. Critics have often cited passages from his early writings to argue that he displayed scepticism towards parliamentary democracy (Noorani, 2000). However, subsequent scholarship presents a more nuanced interpretation.

Golwalkar criticised what he perceived as the shortcomings of Western parliamentary systems, particularly excessive partisanship, electoral opportunism, and ideological fragmentation (Golwalkar, 1966). He feared that competitive politics encouraged sectional interests at the expense of national unity.

Nevertheless, he did not advocate the abolition of democratic institutions in post-independence India. Instead, he argued that democracy would function effectively only when supported by disciplined citizens possessing strong moral character (Andersen & Damle, 2018). Elections alone, in his view, could not guarantee national progress unless society shared common ethical values.

His emphasis on character-building reflected the organisational philosophy of the RSS. Golwalkar believed that responsible leadership emerges through long-term social training rather than electoral competition alone (Golwalkar, 1966). Consequently, the RSS concentrated on developing disciplined volunteers instead of contesting elections directly.



Golwalkar also criticised the politics of caste mobilisation. He regarded caste divisions as historical distortions that weakened Hindu society and undermined national unity (Golwalkar, 1966). While he acknowledged the historical existence of social hierarchies, he repeatedly urged RSS workers to transcend caste distinctions through shared participation in organisational activities (Andersen & Damle, 2018).

Scholars disagree regarding the practical implications of this position. Some argue that the RSS under Golwalkar promoted greater social interaction across caste boundaries than many contemporary organisations (Andersen & Damle, 2018). Others contend that his emphasis on cultural unity insufficiently addressed structural inequalities embedded within Indian society (Jaffrelot, 1996).

Similarly, Golwalkar opposed class conflict as an organising principle of politics. Rejecting Marxist theories of historical development, he viewed society as an organic whole whose different components should cooperate rather than engage in perpetual conflict (Bhatt, 2001). Social harmony, rather than class struggle, constituted the basis of national development.

7.0 Cultural Regeneration and National Character

One of Golwalkar's most enduring contributions lies in his insistence that **nation-building begins with character-building**. He repeatedly argued that military strength, economic prosperity, and political stability ultimately depend upon the moral qualities of citizens (Golwalkar, 1966).

This emphasis reflects a long-standing tradition within Indian philosophical thought, particularly the teachings of Swami Vivekananda and Sri Aurobindo, both of whom stressed the relationship between spiritual development and national regeneration (Aurobindo, 1997; Vivekananda, 1897/2006). Golwalkar adapted these ideas within the organisational framework of the RSS.

The daily shakha became the principal mechanism for cultivating discipline, patriotism, self-sacrifice, teamwork, and civic responsibility. Activities such as physical exercises, discussions, community service, and leadership training aimed to produce citizens capable of serving society without expectation of personal gain (Andersen & Damle, 2018).

Golwalkar regarded education as another crucial instrument of national reconstruction. He criticised colonial educational systems for disconnecting Indians from their civilisational heritage and advocated curricula that emphasised indigenous history, philosophy, literature, and ethical values (Golwalkar, 1966). In his opinion, education should cultivate both intellectual competence and national consciousness.

This educational philosophy continues to influence debates regarding curriculum reform, historical interpretation, and cultural education in contemporary India (Jaffrelot, 2021). Supporters argue that greater emphasis upon Indian knowledge traditions strengthens national confidence, whereas critics caution against ideological reinterpretation of history.



Golwalkar also attached considerable importance to social service (*seva*). Under his leadership, RSS volunteers increasingly participated in relief work during floods, famines, refugee rehabilitation after Partition, and other humanitarian crises (Andersen & Damle, 2018). These activities reinforced his conviction that patriotism must manifest through concrete service rather than abstract rhetoric.

By linking moral education, voluntary organisation, and public service, Golwalkar developed a distinctive model of citizenship centred upon duties rather than rights alone. This emphasis on civic responsibility continues to shape the organisational culture of numerous institutions associated with the broader Sangh movement.

8.0 Golwalkar's Contribution to the Formation of Modern India

Although M. S. Golwalkar never held constitutional office, his contribution to modern India is best understood through the long-term institutional, ideological, and socio-political influence of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). His impact did not arise from legislative authority but from organisational leadership and ideological consolidation. During his tenure as the second Sarsanghchalak (1940–1973), the RSS evolved from a relatively small regional organisation into a nationwide socio-cultural movement with branches across India (Andersen & Damle, 2018). This institutional expansion laid the foundation for a network of organisations that would later influence politics, education, labour movements, tribal welfare, student activism, and social service.

One of Golwalkar's most significant contributions was the **institutionalisation of disciplined cadre-based organisation**. Rather than seeking immediate political power, he focused on creating dedicated volunteers committed to long-term nation-building through social work, leadership training, and community engagement (Golwalkar, 1966). This organisational philosophy distinguished the RSS from conventional political parties and contributed to its longevity. Scholars have argued that Golwalkar's emphasis on organisational discipline enabled the RSS to survive political crises, including the ban imposed following Mahatma Gandhi's assassination in 1948 (Andersen & Damle, 2018).

Golwalkar also played an indirect role in the emergence of political alternatives within India's democratic framework. While the RSS itself remained officially non-political, its ideological influence contributed to the formation of the **Bharatiya Jana Sangh (1951)** under Syama Prasad Mookerjee and, subsequently, the **Bharatiya Janata Party (1980)** (Jaffrelot, 1996). Many leaders associated with these organisations received their ideological training within the RSS. Consequently, Golwalkar's ideas concerning cultural nationalism, national integration, and civic discipline gradually entered mainstream political discourse.

Another notable contribution lies in his emphasis on **national integration**. The trauma of Partition profoundly shaped Golwalkar's understanding of Indian politics. He regarded cultural fragmentation and communal division as threats to national unity and therefore advocated the strengthening of a common national identity rooted in civilisational continuity (Golwalkar, 1966). Supporters argue that this emphasis fostered patriotism and encouraged citizens to



transcend linguistic, regional, and caste divisions (Andersen & Damle, 2018). In their view, Golwalkar sought to cultivate emotional unity rather than merely administrative cohesion.

Golwalkar's influence also extended to **civil society**. Under his leadership, the RSS increasingly engaged in educational initiatives, disaster relief, rural development, and community service. These activities reflected his belief that nation-building depended not only upon governmental institutions but also upon active citizen participation (Golwalkar, 1966). Contemporary scholars have noted that the Sangh Parivar's extensive organisational network demonstrates the practical application of this philosophy (Hansen, 1999).

Furthermore, Golwalkar contributed to the revival of discussions surrounding **Indian civilisational identity**. During the decades immediately following independence, political discourse often centred on constitutional development, industrialisation, and economic planning. Golwalkar introduced an alternative intellectual framework that emphasised cultural continuity, indigenous traditions, and historical consciousness (Bhatt, 2001). Whether accepted or rejected, this framework fundamentally reshaped debates concerning education, history, language, and national identity.

His ideas have also influenced contemporary discussions regarding **decolonisation of knowledge**, indigenous educational traditions, and the recovery of India's intellectual heritage. Although these debates have evolved considerably since Golwalkar's lifetime, many scholars identify his writings as an important source of contemporary cultural nationalist thought (Jaffrelot, 2021).

9.0 Criticisms of Golwalkar's Political Thought

Despite his influence, Golwalkar remains one of the most controversial political thinkers in modern Indian history. His conception of nationalism has generated extensive criticism from historians, constitutional scholars, and political theorists.

The most persistent criticism concerns his understanding of **minority rights**. Scholars such as Christophe Jaffrelot (1996), A. G. Noorani (2000), and Jyotirmaya Sharma (2006) argue that Golwalkar's emphasis on cultural homogeneity risks marginalising India's religious diversity. They contend that defining national identity primarily through Hindu civilisation creates unequal expectations for religious minorities, particularly Muslims and Christians.

Critics also point to passages in *We, or Our Nationhood Defined* (1939), where Golwalkar appeared to advocate a strong assimilationist conception of citizenship. These passages have frequently been cited as evidence of exclusionary nationalism (Sharma, 2006). However, supporters counter that Golwalkar's later writings in *Bunch of Thoughts* (1966) present a more nuanced understanding focused on cultural integration rather than political exclusion. This distinction has become an important subject of contemporary scholarship.

A second criticism concerns his relationship with **constitutional secularism**. India's Constitution establishes a secular democratic framework guaranteeing equal citizenship irrespective of religion (Austin, 1999). Critics argue that Golwalkar's emphasis on Hindu



civilisation challenges the neutrality expected of the constitutional state (Noorani, 2000). They maintain that national identity in a diverse democracy should be grounded primarily in constitutional citizenship rather than cultural majoritarianism.

Conversely, supporters argue that Golwalkar criticised not secular governance itself but what he regarded as **pseudo-secularism**, namely unequal treatment of different communities for political purposes (Andersen & Damle, 2018). From this perspective, cultural nationalism seeks equal civic participation while recognising India's historical civilisational foundations.

Golwalkar's views on **caste** have likewise attracted mixed evaluations. He consistently called for Hindu unity beyond caste distinctions and encouraged common participation within RSS activities (Golwalkar, 1966). Nevertheless, scholars influenced by Ambedkarite thought argue that cultural unity alone cannot eliminate deeply embedded social inequalities without structural reform (Omvedt, 2004). Consequently, they regard Golwalkar's approach as insufficiently attentive to institutional discrimination.

His critique of **Western liberal democracy** has also generated debate. While Golwalkar questioned excessive party competition and ideological fragmentation, critics contend that parliamentary democracy and constitutional pluralism remain essential safeguards against authoritarian tendencies (Khilnani, 1997). Others interpret his writings as advocating moral renewal rather than institutional replacement.

Finally, historians have debated Golwalkar's interpretation of **Indian history**. Supporters regard his emphasis on civilisational continuity as an important corrective to colonial historiography, whereas critics argue that his historical narratives sometimes simplify India's complex cultural interactions (Guha, 2007; Chandra, 1984).

These debates illustrate that Golwalkar's political philosophy remains intellectually significant precisely because it continues to provoke fundamental questions regarding nationalism, identity, citizenship, and democracy.

10.0 Contemporary Relevance

More than five decades after his death, Golwalkar's political thought continues to influence Indian public life. The growing electoral prominence of the Bharatiya Janata Party, the expansion of the RSS, and renewed debates concerning nationalism have revived scholarly interest in his writings (Jaffrelot, 2021).

His emphasis on **cultural self-confidence** resonates with contemporary efforts to recover indigenous knowledge systems, promote Indian languages, and reassess colonial interpretations of history. Discussions concerning educational reform, curriculum revision, and civilisational studies frequently engage ideas associated with Golwalkar, even when they do not explicitly cite him.

Similarly, his belief in **organised civil society** remains relevant in an era when voluntary organisations increasingly supplement governmental welfare initiatives. Disaster relief, rural



development, environmental conservation, and community service continue to demonstrate the importance of civic participation in democratic societies.

At the same time, debates surrounding **religious pluralism, constitutional morality, and minority rights** ensure that Golwalkar's ideas remain contested. Liberal scholars emphasise the constitutional commitment to equality and diversity, whereas proponents of cultural nationalism argue that constitutional values themselves must be understood within India's civilisational context. These competing interpretations continue to shape academic and political discourse in contemporary India.

Consequently, Golwalkar occupies a unique position within modern Indian political thought. He is neither merely an organisational leader nor simply an ideological symbol; rather, he represents a distinct intellectual tradition that continues to influence discussions concerning the nature of the Indian nation.

11.0 Conclusion

Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar remains one of the most influential, and controversial, political thinkers of twentieth-century India. His philosophy of cultural nationalism challenged dominant liberal conceptions of nationhood by arguing that the Indian nation derived its unity primarily from shared civilisation rather than constitutional arrangements alone. Through his leadership of the RSS, he transformed a modest volunteer organisation into a nationwide movement dedicated to character-building, social service, and cultural regeneration.

Golwalkar's contribution to the formation of modern India lies less in formal political office than in shaping institutions, ideas, and public discourse. His emphasis on discipline, civic responsibility, voluntary organisation, and national integration continues to influence numerous social and political organisations. The organisational model he developed has had enduring consequences for India's civil society and democratic politics.

At the same time, his political philosophy has attracted sustained criticism regarding minority rights, secularism, pluralism, and constitutional equality. These criticisms remain central to scholarly evaluations of his legacy and highlight the tensions between cultural nationalism and liberal constitutionalism. The continuing relevance of Golwalkar's thought stems precisely from these unresolved debates.

Ultimately, understanding modern India requires engagement with multiple ideological traditions rather than exclusive reliance upon any single perspective. Golwalkar's political thought constitutes an indispensable component of this broader intellectual landscape. Whether viewed as a visionary advocate of cultural nationalism or as a contested ideological figure, his writings continue to shape discussions on nationhood, identity, democracy, and the future of the Indian Republic.



References

- Andersen, W. K., & Damle, S. D. (2018). *The RSS: A view to the inside*. Penguin Random House India.
- Aurobindo. (1997). *The renaissance in India*. Sri Aurobindo Ashram. (Original work published 1918)
- Austin, G. (1999). *Working a democratic constitution: The Indian experience*. Oxford University Press.
- Bhatt, C. (2001). *Hindu nationalism: Origins, ideologies and modern myths*. Berg.
- Chandra, B. (1984). *Communalism in modern India*. Vikas Publishing House.
- Golwalkar, M. S. (1939). *We, or our nationhood defined*. Bharat Publications.
- Golwalkar, M. S. (1966). *Bunch of thoughts*. Sahitya Sindhu Prakashana.
- Guha, R. (2007). *India after Gandhi*. Picador.
- Hansen, T. B. (1999). *The saffron wave: Democracy and Hindu nationalism in modern India*. Princeton University Press.
- Jaffrelot, C. (1996). *The Hindu nationalist movement and Indian politics*. Columbia University Press.
- Jaffrelot, C. (2021). *Modi's India: Hindu nationalism and the rise of ethnic democracy*. Princeton University Press.
- Khilnani, S. (1997). *The idea of India*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Nehru, J. (2004). *The discovery of India*. Penguin Books. (Original work published 1946)
- Noorani, A. G. (2000). *The RSS and the BJP: A division of labour*. LeftWord Books.
- Omvedt, G. (2004). *Ambedkar: Towards an enlightened India*. Penguin Books.
- Savarkar, V. D. (2019). *Hindutva: Who is a Hindu?* BluOne Ink. (Original work published 1923)
- Sharma, J. (2006). *Hindutva: Exploring the idea of Hindu nationalism*. Penguin Books.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity*. Penguin Books.
- Vivekananda, S. (2006). *Lectures from Colombo to Almora*. Advaita Ashrama. (Original work published 1897)