

Recall This Book
Episode 120: Roundup
Episode 3 of Violent Majorities: Indian and Israeli Ethno-nationalism,
(Ajantha, Lori, John)
December, 2023

John Plotz:

Hello and welcome to Recall This Book, where we invite scholars and writers from different disciplines to make sense of contemporary issues, problems, and events. This is the roundup episode for Violent Majorities: Indian and Israeli Ethnonationalism, which you know by now was hosted by two fabulous anthropologists. Hello, fabulous anthropologists, Ajantha Subramanian and Lori Allen. So that makes this, I guess, a kind of three-host night.

In episode one, Ajantha and Lori spoke with Balmurli Natrajan about such fascinating topics as the slippery slope to a multiculturalism of caste in India, while in episode two, just two weeks ago, Natasha Roth-Rowland joined them to discuss territorial maximalism in the Israeli right, and whether the most extreme ethnonationalists should be seen as radical non-state actors, or as indissolubly wedded to established political ruling parties. So if you haven't listened to those yet, I think you should just hit pause right now and listen to them. So, you have one second. Go.

Okay, you're back. Great. Today, Ajantha and Lori and I are going to discuss our findings, with me playing the role of ingenué or dumb rube, which as listeners will know, comes extremely naturally to me, giving them a chance to emphasize and also unpack further what they think are the key ideas from those conversations, and ideally I think to build a bridge between them.

So before we dive in, let me just guest-ify our two hosts. Ajantha is professor at CUNY Graduate Center, and she's a historical anthropologist specializing in the political economy of caste. Her work includes *Shorelines: Space and Rights in South India*, Stanford, 2009, and *The Caste of Merit: Engineering Education in India*, Harvard University Press, 2019, which analyzes meritocracy as a terrain of caste struggles in India, and its implications for democratic transformation, and additionally was the subject of Recall This Book 22, back in February 2020, before the dark. Highly, highly recommended. Just before the dark.

And Lori Allen is an independent scholar and professorial research associate at SOAS University of London. Her work includes a 2013 book from

Stanford, *The Rise and Fall of Human Rights: Cynicism and Politics in Occupied Palestine*, and *A History of False Hope: Investigative Commissions in Palestine*, also Stanford 2020. They're both brilliant beyond words. I can't wait to get started. And I was just hoping, Ajantha, maybe you could start us off with something that you wanted to single out as particularly illuminating from the talk that you and Lori had with Murli.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Sure. There was a lot in that conversation with Murli. I think one thing that was super helpful was his characterization of the Hindu nationalist project as having a kind of twofold structure. So he talked about how, in the effort to manufacture hegemony, that this project treats Muslims and Dalits, so Dalits are the former untouchables of India, that the project treats them differentially. So it constructs the Muslim as the racialized external other, and the Dalit as the ethnicized internal other.

And what was particularly striking was he said that the racialization of the Muslim, which actually quite explicitly draws upon fascist discourses about the Jew in the early 20th century, and I think we'll get to that later, but he said that the racialization of the Muslim is actually easier to accomplish, and that often it's done through the use of both state and vigilante violence, but that the making of the Hindu us... So, the making of the Muslim "them" is easier to accomplish. But the making of the Hindu "us" through the incorporation of Dalits and other populations is actually much harder. And the way he put it was Hindutva has a harder time constructing the people, the people that is the key to growing it from an elite project into a mass movement. And this is because so many of the constituent parts of the Hindu us, so not just Dalits, but a whole bunch of others, are recalcitrant subjects.

And so for him, this project consists of this constant back and forth between claiming these recalcitrant groups as part of a national majority, the Hindu us, and deeming them anti-national or part of the ever-expanding them, when they refuse to comply with Hindu nationalist ideology. And this instability of the boundary between the us and the them, the easiest way to stabilize that boundary is violence. So I think these were some of the things which for me were most provocative about the conversation with him, and I think it also connects well to the conversation about Israel. Because I think in the Israel case, you also have this tension around who is the us and who is the them. And the them can be this ever-expanding category, that at one moment might be just the Muslim and the Palestinian, but at another moment could

also include the liberal, the secularist, the queer, the whatever, whatever, whatever.

John Plotz:

Can I actually follow up a little bit on just that first move, Ajantha, about... Because I think you're saying something more than just that straightforward thing that people often say about nationalist focused governments, which is that they work well on a friend-foe distinction, that Carl Schmitt-ian move of making... That it's easier to demonize than it is to consolidate.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Yes.

John Plotz:

But you're actually saying something more about the slipperiness of the need for, especially I guess, Dalits to both be inside and outside of the body. Is that right? I mean that they are... I'm trying to connect this to that phrase of his that you know I love, which is the slippery slope of the multiculturalism of caste, the way in which you can account for caste as a form of cultural diversity, which allows you to do this double work.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Right, that's what he means by ethnicization, that ethnicization is the idea of horizontal difference, that it's a kind of obscuring of the violence of hierarchy. So, caste is a particularly important sticking point for the Hindu nationalist project, because it's very difficult to talk about caste as anything other than violent hierarchy. And so to ethnicize the Dalit is to somehow obscure that reality of caste, and to make the coexistence of different castes into a form of happy multiculturalism. Hindutva has become more of a mass politics, especially in the last 30 years. So groups that you think would've been far more resistant, and would've seen through these overtures, have actually become conscripted into this project. So, obviously there's something that it's offering them. And he had different takes on what that might be, so he talked about disenfranchised youth, men in particular, who derive a sense of satisfaction and pride from being foot soldiers in this project.

John Plotz:

Didn't we hear about Hilltop Youth in Israel? I wonder if there's a connection there.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Yes. There's a connection.

Lori Allen:

I think it's really important to understand the kind of ego satisfaction that's given to especially men and young men through these violent thug groups that go out and assert themselves, and are seen to give them prestige as well as standing within their communities. In terms of the Hilltop Youth, which are the Israeli young men thugs, I don't know if... I mean, I think there is some research that shows that a lot of these people are folks from lower rungs of society that feel like they're being given or are taking a place in society that is important, important to the nation, to such an extent that the Israeli army has in fact started to try to incorporate them as... I mean, they wouldn't call it this, but as shock troops essentially in the West Bank. But I think I was just hoping that we would move to this kind of materialist analysis, and not just rely on the ideological categories.

I think that, in Israel, one of the dynamics that Natasha helped us understand was the way that what was far right or more radically right gets co-opted into the state, and what is the center and what is the right is constantly shifting ever right-wards. And there isn't, I don't think, a parallel hierarchization of Judaism or Zionism. Obviously, I mean, the Ashkenazi have traditionally had more economic power and political power, but the whole point is that in both of these projects, both of these ethnonationalist projects, the goal is political hegemony. And the place of the state in that goal has changed over time for different groups, whether or not they are committed to the state or are anarchist and outside the state, like Natasha described the Hilltop Youth as, but the point is that they want to redeem the land, however, they're defining that in a politically hegemonic way.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Yeah. I mean, she actually said that the Hilltop Youth could almost be thought of as anarchists at one point, that they were anti-state, and they've since become the state. Or even the natalist policies that were so central to the far right, this idea of demographic warfare. I mean, that was the other thing that she said was widely shared. So, I think when you scratch the surface, you

see that the ideological spectrum is not so much a spectrum as a set of shared principles.

Lori Allen:

But I think what the distinction is, is these different far-right groups have a different orientation towards the state at different moments. And so the Hilltop Youth are a group who were, she said, had been hostile to the state, and she described them as even a kind of anarchist, as Ajantha recalled. But what I'm pointing to is the fact that even they are also getting incorporated into the state. Similarly with the religious right has slowly, slowly become increasingly powerful within the Israeli army and the military services, they have, because of their greater discipline apparently, risen in the ranks, and so there are more religious right officers within the army. So in all these different ways, we're seeing elements of the state be taken over by the far or extreme right.

Ajantha Subramanian:

I think that the history that she tracked was one where there's a kind of increasing blurring of the boundary between the far right movement and the state, and between state violence and extra-parliamentary violence. But she also said that, at different moments, it was convenient to externalize certain forms of violence as non-state. And this is another shift, she said in 1994 when Baruch Goldstein goes and shoots up the mosque in Hebron, the alibi at the time that was preferred was that "well, he was an American settler"; that this was a kind of imported extremism. But that alibi is no longer necessary, and in fact, there's been a total embrace of vigilantism as necessary and legitimate. So, now you've got Itamar Ben-Gvir handing out guns to settlers to go and take over the West Bank.

Lori Allen:

And the acceptance of this vigilante violence and the pushing of the red lines of what is acceptable violence is also a reflection of our global moment as well, where we've seen a shift of extreme right parties become more central to governments across Europe as well, and we might even say the United States has had moments of this.

John Plotz:

Actually, that's a great point to connect to another topic that came up, I thought, in both, and that we were also thinking about informally: the

connection between a diasporic minoritarian presence in other countries, and basically extremist majoritarian logic of the in-country ethnonationalism. So, Lori, I totally take your point about the rising ethnonationalism within the places that that diaspora is located, and I think we should very much include the United States for that. But nonetheless, those are groups that are operating as minorities within that complex ethnonationalist context in the West, also looking back towards India or Israel. So, thoughts about that, about the way that these conversations helped us think about that tension or that duality?

Ajantha Subramanian:

I think one of Natasha's main points is that we have to think about the far right as always already transnational, that Jabotinsky... Where was he again? Where did he...

Lori Allen:

Poland. He was from...

Ajantha Subramanian:

Poland. That's right. *[[Actually Odessa; see show notes for clarification]]*

John Plotz:

Didn't he die in America though, Jabotinsky?

Lori Allen:

I think so, yeah. But it was even in this moment... I mean, there's a great book by this guy Heller called *Jabotinsky's Children*, which traces the development of Betar, the youth wing of the revisionist movement, and the transnationalization of that from early on as part of their political project, as a way of gaining power by bringing American Jews into the picture.

John Plotz:

Yeah. And that recent novel, by the way, *The Netanyahu's* (we spoke to the author on Recall This Book) that is fascinating about Jabotinsky's Children, about the spiritual heirs and their diasporic impact.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Yeah. So I think in the Israel case, her argument is that we have to think of this as transnational all the way through.

John Plotz:

I see. Yeah.

Ajantha Subramanian:

In the Indian case, I think it's a slightly different trajectory. So, the Hindutva project is also transnational from the outset, insofar as it derives a lot of its inspiration from European fascism. So in that sense, ideologically it's part of that same formation. It starts... I mean, Murli had a interesting way of pushing it back to the late 19th century, but I think a lot of people see... I mean, if you think about the RSS as the first institutionalization of the Hindutva project, the RSS starts in 1925, and they're using a lot of the same language. I mean, one of their founding fathers even travels to Italy to meet Mussolini. So, there's a kind of fascist diaspora, in an ideological sense, that all of these groups are a part of. But in terms of actually having a presence in the US, for instance, that's much later.

Lori Allen:

I have a question about the timing of this. Is it more a case of the Indian diaspora becoming important to the Hindutva project once the Indian diaspora in the US becomes a strong ethnic minority in that context, strong economically, educationally, politically?

Ajantha Subramanian:

I think initially there's an effort to exploit the cultural anxieties of the diaspora. And this is happening not just in the US but in other parts of... So in Trinidad and Mauritius, there are these...

John Plotz:

And the UK itself as well?

Ajantha Subramanian:

And the UK. And the UK. So you've got Hindu nationalist outfits starting organizational work in all of these places. And what they're mainly doing is doing summer camps for kids and trying to address the anxieties around cultural loss that are being expressed by people in the diaspora. And I don't know at what point that begins to translate into much more active financial support for the Hindutva project in India. I mean, it's very clear in the early '90s that that's already happening. So there's a movement in... This is where

the BJP, which is the political wing of the RSS, really gained parliamentary strength, was through this mobilization around destroying a 16th century mosque in the northeastern...

John Plotz:
Ayodhya.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Yes, in the northeastern city of Ayodhya. And so there's this whole story about how this mosque is actually the birthplace of the God-king Ram, and needs to be reclaimed, and the only way to avenge this hurt to Hindu sentiment is to destroy the mosque and build a temple. And for that, there's a ton of funding that comes from places, like from both the United States and the UK. But I'm not sure how early those financial links are forged.

John Plotz:

Can we tell an interesting story about the analogous forms of diasporic nationalist support to the case of the Jewish diaspora and Israel? Which I recognize is different, because it's in a way triangulated, because most of that Jewish diaspora comes from Europe originally, not from Israel itself, but... Yeah.

Lori Allen:

The idea of diaspora assumes an originary homeland, and so that is actually part of Zionist ideology, to claim that Jews around the world are part of a diaspora, whereas in fact that is a side product of this nationalist project. So, that's a first thought. So, the Jews of Europe are not a diaspora. They were folks that the Zionist project could call in, or leaders of the Zionist project. And of course, it's the American Jewish people who have been among the most influential and supportive parts of world Jewry for Israel and the Zionist project. And what's interesting there is that originally American Jews were not so het up about Zionism. They were maybe supportive from afar, but not in a way that made them want to move there. And I actually did an interview with an NYU historian, Zach Lockman, in the journal MERIP, where he gives this history.

But what's interesting to think about is the history of this in which it's really the 1960s where American Judaism becomes more tightly inclined towards Zionism and more tied to Israel and the Israeli project. And that's

partly a result of what happened in the 1967 war where Israel came out as victorious. And so it was kind of a prideful international nationalism that brought them to affection for Israel. But it's also been a concerted effort among lots of people to create a link between Jewish American identity and Israeli American identity. And you can see that in cultural ways that are also religious. So, there's an Israeli flag in people's temples from that period on. Kids get drawn into these campaigns to raise money to plant trees in what are essentially settlements in Israel. So there are all these ways, similar maybe to what the Hindutva folks do for kids, in raising a consciousness.

Ajantha Subramanian:

The 1960s, as you said, Lori, is really key because of the 1967 war. But she [Natasha] also said that there's this earlier moment in the '50s when, as part of Americanization, you've got a conservative turn away from Communism, which was the other internationalism that was really important.

John Plotz:

The Bund, Yeah.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Yeah. So there's a kind of whatever, an internal fracturing of the American Jewish population, with Americanization being expressed as a disavowal of Jewish communists. So, she talked about that as the sort of...

Lori Allen:

That's more in her dissertation than in the conversation, I think.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Yes, yes. But that's like the precursor to then what happens in the late 1960s. So there's Americanization in the 1950s, and then there's a turn towards Israel in the 1960s, and there's an interesting way that these two things converge. So there's a political conservatism and support for Israel that comes together.

John Plotz:

I totally agree with the word interesting, but I just also have to say, as somebody who's currently resident at Brandeis University (where the question of suturing Zionism to Jewish identity and saying that every form of

anti-Zionism is a form of antisemitism, is so alive and well) that although it is interesting, it's also profoundly depressing to me to think about that as a legacy of this constituting of American Jewish identity through the lens of Israel. Because I was born and raised into the myth (it was a myth as well) of the notion of the Jewish value in America of cosmopolitan or universalism, that embraced minority identity, precisely because minority rights could be protected through some kind of universalism, of which the university seemed like an instantiation at least. And now, to be at a university that prides itself on particularizing by way of Israel, it just hits home to me at this particular moment. Although I completely agree with you that it is interesting, it's also kind of awful. So, I just wanted to say that.

Lori Allen:

It is awful, but it also, I think, is important for us to recognize the immense amount of work and institutional energy that has gone into getting us to this point, wherein there's an equation between Israel and Judaism, an equation between anti-Israeli critique and antisemitism. This has been institutionalized in Europe and in the US, especially these days through the IHRA redefinition of antisemitism, and specifically the illustrative examples that state quite baldly that critique of Israel is antisemitic. But that didn't come out of nowhere. This has been a very successful campaign supported by the Israeli state itself. So, I think in this moment where we're probably all looking for ways of understanding how any of this can come unraveled, recognizing those institutions and the funding sources of those institutions, those funding sources being groups that benefit from tax breaks in the United States, there are places where there are spaces to lever out the sutured-together.

Ajantha Subramanian:

One more thing about Zionism. I mean, it's so important to combat these equations between Judaism and Zionism, but also because Zionism is becoming a model for other long-distance nationalist projects like Hindutva. So you actually have groups in the United States taking their cues from Zionist strategies.

Lori Allen:

And not just their cues, but their training.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Their training. Yeah. So you have a group like the Hindu American Foundation, which is aligned with the Hindu right in India, sharing platforms with the ADL and other groups. And the most obvious expression of that is this term Hinduphobia, which is being weaponized in the same way as antisemitism is weaponized, to shut down criticism of the Modi government. But in the US it has a second goal, which is to shut down conversations about caste. Because again, there's this real fear of caste as a fragmenting force which undermines Hindu unity. So in the same way that caste is disavowed by the Hindu right in India, you have echoes of that now in the US.

John Plotz:

Yeah. Can I just say how beautifully and organically you guys have brought us to that bridge question that I was hoping we would get to towards the end of the conversation? But Lori, can you mention more about the training? That's news to me.

Lori Allen:

Yeah. I don't know that much, but I know that people like Azad Essa, and there are some other people who are doing research on the actual political lobbying groups that are receiving training from Zionist support institutions in the US. So, Hindutva lobbyists are getting this kind of training. I can't name the organization.

John Plotz:

One thought that surfaced for me about the bridge as the conversations went on was how strong a bridge Islamophobia or Islam as the enemy might be. I mean, because I could see it working perfectly, or I could see them not being structural parallels. So, what do you guys think? Is it important that Islam is a common enemy?

Lori Allen:

Very much so, I think so. In many ways, Netanyahu individually and Israel writ large has come to stand for a lot of Islamophobic countries as a strong man to emulate and learn from. Their mobilization of terrorism and the need for nationalist security that somehow justifies their quashing of any resistance and the oppression of Palestinians, who are not, by the way, all Muslim, but for the sake of an ethnonationalist project, who's counting the 20% Christians? And so I think that Israel stands for this, and you see this kind

of bromance between Modi and Netanyahu at different moments. What do you think, Ajantha?

Ajantha Subramanian:

Oh, absolutely. Yeah. In fact, there's all these exposés now about Modi's troll army playing a hugely consequential role in generating disinformation about October 7th. So, some of the most lurid social media tweets about beheaded babies and raped women have all come out of India. So, this is what Hindutvites in India do all the time, and they've just repurposed their domestic disinformation campaign for this new kind of phenomenon.

John Plotz:

There was also a final topic, Lori, that I know you had a lot of thoughts about that I hoped we got to, which is the nominalism question, or whether it matters what we call a spade, I suppose. So yeah, do you want to...

Lori Allen:

Yeah. Well, I was actually interested in what both of you thought about this. And the question is when and how we apply the term fascism to any of these movements or overall projects. And Natasha, and I think Murli, maybe not in the conversation but in other places, has talked about the necessity of being careful of how we apply fascism to what's going on, because if everything is fascism, then what is it really? And we need to preserve this term for really extreme cases. But I have gained a lot of insight from reading some Black American authors who talk about the fact that fascism... Slavery is fascism. Even Robert Paxton, the great theorist of fascism, has referenced the Ku Klux Klan as perhaps the earliest fascist organization, or recognizing colonialism as a fascist structure. It's a style of politics.

And so this idea of preserving fascism for really extreme cases, we have to think about, extreme from whose perspective? And so a point that I made when we talked with Natasha is that it seems like Israel as a fascist state has only come into common discourse once the Israeli state started turning against Jewish people, and that's with the judicial overhaul. So, the Jewish majority was starting to feel the sharp end of fascism, whereas of course, Palestinians have been living under a military dictatorship since the beginning. So I actually wondered what both of you thought about how we use this term and what use is it.

Ajantha Subramanian:

I mean, the other thing that she said, well, that both of them said, was that if you just trace the genealogy of these movements, there's a shared history. So I think in both respects, both attending to that shared history and not being blindsided by the fact that these were populations that were subject to forms of colonial and fascist power themselves, not letting that blind us to this family resemblance, not just family resemblance, but actual historical connections. So, I think that's one thing. But the other is what you just said, Lori, being self-aware about when we are willing to use the term, and what that says about normalized violence. So, whether you're talking about Black people in post-Reconstruction South, or Kashmiris, from their vantage point, the US and India have been fascists for a very long time. From the vantage point of Kashmiris, India is a settler colonial state. So, I do think that that's a really, really important reminder, not just that these terms are important to specify, but that we need to be conscious of why they're not used for particular instances.

Lori Allen:

And part of why they're not used is because, after World War II, the term [fascism] carried a certain ideological/moral weight. It now means something bad. I mean, we might see that shifting again, as people proudly claim to be fascist, and the whole notion of a liberal international order...

John Plotz:

Illiberal democracy, I was going to say, is the phrase that I think does a lot of cover work for that, because you can somehow... It's respectable to be an illiberal democrat, which as far as I can tell does mean a fascist, right? Because it means majoritarian control of the country on the basis of some assumed demographic ideal, or real Hungary or whatever.

Lori Allen:

And that's why I object to this term ethnic democracy or ethnodemocracy, that puts the emphasis on democracy without mentioning that it's democracy for some.

John Plotz:

You guys are the experts here, but in terms of your point about the genealogy, I thought that wonderful detail that Natasha brought up about how... I can't even remember what Zionist organization it was, but they used to wear brown shirts, and then the memo went out in the 1920s, you guys got

to switch to blue shirts. And so, somehow putting on blue shirts, that totally insulates you from the genealogical connection to the hilltopshirts.

I would love to end by semi-springing on you guys something that we always do, Actually, Ajantha, you remember it from the last time: "recallable books," meaning, people who enjoyed this conversation, is there a book you would like to mention and say they ought to go off and take a look at that book? And Lori, I know you already have one in mind.

Lori Allen:

I've got multiple, so it's hard to choose. But one that I haven't mentioned in our conversation so far is a book called Revolutionary Yiddishland: A History of Jewish Radicalism. And it's quite a remarkable book, translated from French into English not too long ago. It's a compilation of ethnographic interviews of Jewish people who have refused Zionism. Specifically it's focused largely, I think, around World War II. But I think it's important for these narratives and histories that refuse the nationalist monopolization of history-telling, in this case, refusing the Zionist telling where all Jews belong to Israel, is really important to keep alive. And that's why I think Natasha's work itself is really important, because the history of the extreme right and Zionism has not been forefronted for obvious reasons in especially American Jewish understanding of Israel.

John Plotz:

That's awesome. And Ajantha, I'm just stalling a bit, so I'll go first to give you time to think of one.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Yeah, yeah.

John Plotz:

But first of all, I want to say, just apropos of the nominalism, I forgot to mention this before, Lori, but I really appreciate the point that you made in passing and very politely about using the word diaspora or diasporic to think about the description of Jews in Europe, as if they were somehow dispersed rather than of that place, and how that might be an ethnonationalist move that European antisemites would make in the 19th century, but that it was in Israel's interest to make it in a later time. And I think, growing up in a Jewish

family in the 1970s, I probably just incorporated that as simply the language of description. So I really love that corrective.

And I guess I would connect that to the book I will choose, it's really easy because I already mentioned it. We did a Recall This Book conversation with Joshua Cohen, whose novel *The Netanyahus*, which is about one of these children of Jabotinsky, literally Bibi Netanyahu's father Benzion Netanyahu. And it's this hilarious comedic romp of the worst job interview on earth. But he comes to America, to assimilationist 1950s America, and meets this 1950s Philip Roth type character who just wants to be a secular Jew, a Jewish historian of 18th century America, and then this Zionist Jabotinskyite is foisted on this secular Jewish family. So it's a description of this weekend from hell, told from the perspective of both the Zionist outsider and the would-be assimilationist American Jew.

Ajantha Subramanian:

One of my go-to books to get at just the lived reality of religion, and the remarkable heterogeneity of South Asia, is Susan Bayly's *Saints, Goddesses and Kings*, and the subtitle is *Muslims and Christians in South Indian Society*. And it's a historical ethnography. It's a historical ethnography, and it's just a remarkable account of just religious plurality, social dynamism. And even though she doesn't talk about Hindu nationalism, it throws into relief the violence of the project, this effort to impose this monolithic history on a... I mean, it's a subcontinent. It's called a subcontinent for a reason. So, I think that book is one that I really cherish.

John Plotz:

Lori was waving around a different book. I don't know if you want to see... You want to rise to that.

Ajantha Subramanian:

I mean, this is one that we actually referenced in our conversation with Murli, which is the work of Christophe Jaffrelot, who's I think the most important scholar of the Hindu right. And his most recent book is this amazing, rich account of Modi and what the Modi phenomenon has done both to the Hindu right and to India more broadly. And it's called *Modi's India*. What's the subtitle, Lori?

Lori Allen:

Hindu Nationalism and the Rise of Ethnic Democracy.

John Plotz:

That is awesome. Okay. I think with that, I just want to thank you guys so much, and say that this wide-ranging conversation, and also the two conversations before that you hosted and brought to Recall This Book, which were just wonderful, has been a real pleasure. So, the same thanks I would also extend to those of you listening at home, and if you enjoyed this conversation, definitely check out the Recall This Book archive at our website. But for all of us here at the podcast, and also on behalf of Elizabeth Ferry as well, Ajantha, Lori, thanks a ton. It's been great. All right.

Ajantha Subramanian:

Thank you, John.

Lori Allen:

Thank you so much for letting us be involved.

John Plotz:

Recall This Book is the creation of John Plotz and Elizabeth Ferry. Sound editing is by Khimaya Bagla, and music comes from a song by Eric Chasalow and Barbara Cassidy. We gratefully acknowledge support from Brandeis University and its Mandel Center for the Humanities. We always want to hear from you with your comments, criticisms, or suggestions for future episodes. Finally, if you enjoyed today's show, please forward it to five people, or write a review and rate us wherever you get your podcasts. Thanks for listening.