



January 2006

Censorship and Censure: Insiders, Outsiders, and the Attack on Bhandarkar Institute

Adheesh Sathaye

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/jhcs>



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sathaye, Adheesh (2006) "Censorship and Censure: Insiders, Outsiders, and the Attack on Bhandarkar Institute," *Journal of Hindu-Christian Studies*: Vol. 19, Article 5.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.7825/2164-6279.1360>

The *Journal of Hindu-Christian Studies* is a publication of the [Society for Hindu-Christian Studies](#). The digital version is made available by Digital Commons @ Butler University. For questions about the Journal or the Society, please contact cbauman@butler.edu. For more information about Digital Commons @ Butler University, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

Censorship and Censure: Insiders, Outsiders, and the Attack on Bhandarkar Institute

Adheesh Sathaye
University of British Columbia

ON January 5, 2004, the Bhandarkar Institute, a large Sanskrit manuscript library in Pune, was vandalized because of its involvement in James Laine's controversial study of the Maharashtrian king Shivaji. While most of the manuscripts escaped damage, less fortunate was the academic project of South Asian studies, which now faces some serious questions. If our intellectual pursuits should result in the destruction of the very materials we study, or injury to those who help us to study them, are they worth conducting at all?ⁱ Or might they be conducted in such a way as to avoid violent reaction? As groundwork for possible answers to these questions, this essay examines the intellectual history behind the violence as revealed through Marathi-language reviews of Laine's book published in the months prior to the attack. If we can understand how and why Laine's book came to be portrayed as censorable and the Bhandarkar Institute as censurable, then we may begin to see this event as more than just 'insider' hooligans protesting against an 'outsider' scholar.

Attack on the Bhandarkar Institute

Oxford University Press (OUP) published the Indian edition of James W. Laine's *Shivaji: Hindu King in Islamic India* in June 2003, but the moves towards censorship did not commence in earnest until November, when a

prominent group of Maharashtrian historians sent a letter to OUP calling for its withdrawal. Apologetically, OUP pulled it from Indian shelves on November 21, 2003, but this did little to quell the outrage arising from one paragraph in Laine's book deemed slanderous to Shivaji and his mother Jijabai:

The repressed awareness that Shivaji had an absentee father is also revealed by the fact that Maharashtrians tell jokes naughtily suggesting that his guardian Dadaji Konddev was his biological father. In a sense because Shivaji's father had little influence on his son, for many narrators it was important to supply him with father replacements, Dadaji and later Ramdas. But perhaps we read the story of his life as governed by motivations buried deep in his psyche by a mother rejected by her husband. One could then see that Shivaji's drive to heroism was spurred by his attempt to please his doting mother, and that she, aware of her Yadava heritage and thinking of her husband as a collaborator of low birth, instilled in her son the dream of a revived Hindu kingdom.ⁱⁱ

The furor over this passage resulted in two acts of physical violence. On December 22, 2003,

ADHEESH SATHAYE is an Assistant Professor of South Asian History, Language, and Culture in the Department of Asian Studies at the University of British Columbia. His research interests include the Sanskrit epics and narrative literature as well as Marathi devotional poetry and performance. An early version of this essay was presented at the 2004 American Academy of Religion meetings in San Antonio, Texas.

members of the Pune branch of the Shiv Sena assaulted the Sanskrit scholar Shrikant Bahulkar in his office at Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, “blackening” his face by pinning him down and smearing tar on his visage. Bahulkar was targeted because Laine had thanked him in the book’s acknowledgments. In support of his colleague, the noted Maharashtrian historian Gajanan Mehendale approached the Sena offices on December 25 demanding an apology to Bahulkar. His request denied, Mehendale destroyed four hundred manuscript pages of his own definitive history of Shivaji.ⁱⁱⁱ In light of Mehendale’s protest, Shiv Sena leader Raj Thakeray met with Bahulkar and offered a personal (and well-publicized) apology, assuring him that “such incidents would not be repeated, and that Sena activists would have to get a ‘clearance’ from the topnung leaders before embarking on such ‘aggressive campaigns’ in the future.”^{iv}

Then, in the morning of January 5, 2004, approximately 150 young men appeared at the gates of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (BORI) in Pune, overwhelmed the handful of BORI staff on duty, and proceeded to ransack the 87-year old archives for nearly an hour. The group toppled massive shelves and cabinets housing rare books and manuscripts, damaged museum pieces, defaced portraits, destroyed most of the wooden furniture, shattered anything made of glass, and threw BORI’s computers into a pond. When the police arrived, 72 individuals were arrested. The attackers belonged to a group known as the Sambhaji Brigade—the youth arm of a relatively new Maratha ‘cultural’ organization called the Maratha Seva Sangh.^v Their leader Purushottam Khedekar—an executive engineer in the Pune Department of Public Works—held a press conference that evening, praising the Brigade and explaining the need for the attack:

It has come to our knowledge that some passages in Laine’s book state that Shivaji’s renowned mentors, Samarth Ramdas Swami and Dadaji Kondeo, are his biological fathers. This kind of brutish penmanship raises questions

about Jijamata’s morals as well. How can we tolerate such blasphemy?^{vi}

The BORI Attack in the Media

The BORI attack received wide coverage in the major Marathi- and English-language newspapers in Maharashtra (e.g., *Sakal*, *Loksatta*, *Times of India*, *Indian Express*), and the story remained in Pune headlines for over two weeks.^{vii} The electoral fallout of the attack and the charges brought against Laine for “wantonly giving provocation with intent to cause riot” (Sections 153 and 153A of the Indian Penal Code) became the subject of a number of stimulating analyses in the English-language Indian media.^{viii} These journalists have painted a compelling picture of how and why intellectual life in India is being violently appropriated by political life. What remains unanswered, however, is a basic, unavoidable question: Why Laine?

James Laine was not the first Shivaji scholar—in English or in Marathi—to be controversial, or even the first to be censored. As Laine’s work itself suggests, the narrative of Shivaji’s life has always been subject to debate, even during the king’s lifetime. There are interminable arguments about the date of Shivaji’s birth, his associations with the *bhakti* saints Ramdas and Tukaram, or if he was a national hero or a ‘mountain rat.’ But few other publications have aroused the passions exhibited against Laine’s work—passions that in India are often associated with religious fervor. Indeed, Laine did anticipate controversy—seeing himself as “a disturber of the tranquility with which synthetic accounts of Shivaji’s life are accepted”—but surely he expected objections to his portrayal of Hindu and Muslim identity, and not for publishing a joke about Shivaji’s mother.^{ix}

Making this connection to religion, several English-language journalists erroneously ascribed the BORI attack to “Hindu extremists,” “angry Hindu activists,” “a Hindu mob,” or “Hindu fanatics.”^x Though it is true that the pro-Hindu Shiv Sena had conducted the earlier attack on Bahulkar, the Sambhaji Brigade professes a different, competing ideology.^{xi} The

4 Adheesh Sathaye

literature of its parent organization, the Maratha Seva Sangh, stresses devotion to Shivaji, to his mother Jijabai, and to modern non-Brahman leaders Jyotiba Phule, Bhimrao Ambedkar, and Shahu Maharaj, as part of a new religious/political movement known as Shivdharma. Founded in 2000, this largely lower-caste movement consciously regards itself as distinct from mainstream Hinduism and is particularly hostile towards Brahmanic hegemony.^{xiii} Shivdharma is, in short, a marriage of a passionate folk devotion to Shivaji with anti-Brahman politics.^{xiii} Given that BORI is thought of as a Brahmanic institution, it appears, then, that the Brigade did not carry out a 'Hindu fundamentalist' attack against non-Hindus, but one couched within ongoing caste politics that are increasingly encroaching upon Maharashtrian cultural life.^{xiv}

On the other hand, as several writers have noted, the discourse of 'defending' Shivaji from a foreign writer is strikingly similar to critiques being raised against the Western study of Hinduism by members of the Indian diaspora.^{xv} Considering it as the most extreme example of "the Hindu right's 'protofascist views,'" Amy Braverman has compared the BORI attack to the Indian-American interrogation of psychoanalytic studies of Hinduism.^{xvi} Braverman suggests a common underlying argument: a desire to censor the misrepresentation by 'outsider' Western scholars and replace it (or at least balance it) with 'insider' scholarship. William Dalrymple compares the BORI attack to the 'saffronization' of Indian history schoolbooks. Through such coercive acts, he believes that "a passionately contested battle is taking place over the interpretation of Indian history."^{xvii} Dalrymple represents the conflict as one between two mutually horrified parties—Hindu conservatives unable to tolerate blasphemous Western misrepresentation of their national/religious heroes like Shivaji, and Westernized Indian historians aghast at the erroneous and unprofessional content of the new schoolbooks. Like Braverman, Dalrymple posits an unquestioned opposition between 'outsider' scholarship and the hostile reactions of 'insiders,' who either have no conception of the

Western historical method (Dalrymple) or are protesting against perceived academic hegemony (Braverman).

Insider/Outsider and Emic/Etic

In this manner, the attacks on Bahulkar and the Bhandarkar Institute touch upon a methodological issue that is central to religious studies: the "insider/outsider problem."^{xviii} In some ways the BORI attack might be read as the ultimate testimony to Wilfred Cantwell Smith's assertion that "no statement made by the scholar of religion is valid unless the religious believer could accept it as correct."^{xix} (With 'Maharashtra' substituted for 'religion' and 'Maharashtrian' for 'religious believer'). Conversely, one may argue that Laine, as an outsider embedded in the Enlightenment tradition of scholarship, was incapable of understanding (*verstehen*) the Maharashtrians' conceptualization of their own history because he did not share their essential belief in the exemplary status of Shivaji (following Schleiermacher and MacIntyre) or that he did not make a sufficiently 'imaginative leap' in order to produce an effective dialogue with Maharashtrian insiders (following Otto and Wach).^{xx} Alternatively, as I had argued elsewhere, the BORI attack and the Indian-American interrogation of Hindu studies might be both regarded as reversals of the insider/outsider dichotomy, as forcible assertions that Western scholars (and their Indian accomplices) are the 'insiders' who do not allow 'outsider' Hindus or Maharashtrians into their private, privileged, and ultimately corrupt conversations about Hinduism or Maharashtra.^{xxi}

In this essay, I would like to raise two points of objection to such wholesale applications of the insider/outsider dichotomy to the Laine controversy (including mine). First, implicit in the equations of 'scholar' to 'outsider' and 'native' to 'insider' is a disregard for the scholarly capacities of the insider. In other words, the only possibility of a 'native scholar' in this debate is one who is Western-trained. All other natives are informants. In the case of the BORI attack, this assumption leads

one to believe that there was no intellectual rigor behind the physical violence—only political rhetoric. On the contrary, we shall see that since at least early September 2003, writers close to the Shivdharma movement had been voicing their discontent with Laine's book through detailed—though not unbiased—reviews.

Second, the equation of 'insider' vs. 'outsider' to 'informant' vs. 'scholar' not only gives the false impression of a single, homogenous 'insider' identity, but also represents this identity as a natural property of an individual, like skin color or blood type. As easily as 'insider' and 'outsider' labels are affixed to ethnic identities, a cognitive system is also regarded as automatically being an 'Indian way of thinking' or a 'Maharashtrian worldview' or a 'non-Brahman discourse' (as I have had to do here to Shivdharma). However, keeping in mind Alasdair MacIntyre's observation that "criteria and concepts have a history; it is not just activities which have a history," it is manifestly important to investigate how 'insider' identities are constructed.^{xxii} In the case of the Sambhaji Brigade's attack, I suggest that new boundaries of Maharashtrian sociopolitical identity are being carved using Western scholarship itself as a scalpel. Since the boundaries between 'insiders' and 'outsiders' are negotiated precisely around the knowledge of Shivaji, I argue that an insider/outsider representation of intercultural or interreligious scholarship is inadequate to understand why Laine's *Shivaji* provoked violence. Instead of a dichotomization of 'insiders' and 'outsiders,' an emic/etic model, based on a dialectic between cognitive systems or worldviews, will better enable us to isolate intellectual conflicts from sociopolitical ones.

While 'emic' and 'etic' are often conflated with 'insider' and 'outsider' points of view—particularly in the anthropological work of Marvin Harris—one should note that the originally intended meanings of these terms were not bound to social identities but to cognitive systems.^{xxiii} 'Emics' and 'etics' are terms coined by the linguist Kenneth Pike in 1954.^{xxiv} In linguistics, 'phonetics' is the scientific description of articulated sounds, regardless of the language in which they are

uttered, while 'phonemics' is the specific set of sounds recognized within a particular language. For example, while the single American English phoneme /p/ is uttered as either the phonetic allophones /p/ or /ph/ (e.g., /p/ in 'nap' or /ph/ in 'paint'), /p/ and /ph/ are distinct phonemes in Hindi. Pike's neologisms 'emics' and 'etics' generalized these descriptions for cultural systems—etic analyses being universal, 'scientific' descriptions of culture, emic analyses describing structures of meaning belonging to a particular culture. While the etic analysis of a handshake would describe the physical actions involved—the clasp of right hands, the vigorous up-and-down motion—an emic analysis would understand a handshake to signify greeting, or bidding goodbye, or an agreement (for North Americans). These contextual differences of meaning do not derive from the empirical properties of the act, but belong to the cognitive system in which the act is interpreted. Scholarship, according to Pike, is not a dichotomy between these two modes of analysis, but a dialectic between them.^{xxv} The one modification I'd like to make to Pike's theory is to regard emic structures themselves as historical constructs (following Harris).^{xxvi} That is, someone—at some time and for some reason—has taught us what a handshake means. Furthermore, borrowing Julia Kristeva's terminology, every cultural act is not simply a product of emic structure but a *productivity*—an act of redistribution and permutation which has the power to transform its governing structure.^{xxvii} In other words, every hand we shake affects our understanding of what a handshake means. Using this methodology, let us see how emic incongruities between Laine's *Shivaji* and the Shivaji of Shivdharma led certain anti-establishment writers in Maharashtra to call for action against the book and those responsible for its writing.

Marathi-Language Reviews of Laine's *Shivaji*

Laine's *Shivaji* initially received good reviews in late August (*Sakal*) and early September (the Shiv Sena's daily *Samana*) in the Marathi-language press, lauding it as "a good reference text."^{xxviii} However, writers soon began to voice

6 Adheesh Sathaye

alternate opinions. The earliest negative review is Yashwant Kharade's three-page piece appearing in *Rangataranga* magazine, dated October 2003.^{xxix} Analyzing several passages in Laine's book, Kharade was the first Marathi-language reviewer to draw attention to the controversial passage believed to slander Shivaji's mother. However, he dismisses Laine's observations as "ridiculously [*hasyaspad-pane*]" written, and not as a defamation (*badnami*). Indeed, Kharade judges Laine to be "seasoned in talking in circles around his ignorance," whose book is negligible at best, a work that is "unnecessarily crowded with contradictory ideas, that's all!"^{xxx}

Laine has arguably produced an emic study that seeks to describe the possible narratives of Shivaji's life as they circulate through Maharashtrian culture, but it is clear that Kharade (and most other reviewers) read it as an etic history ordering the events of Shivaji's life in an absolute, chronological, and thematized 'master' narrative. The intolerability of such a master narrative is expressed in the *Rangataranga* editor Ram Paygude's introduction to Kharade's review:

This book, which the American professor James W. Laine has published through the graces of Oxford University Press, is truly a wake-up call sent out to historians. No one has made the effort to condemn the material [*majakur*] found within this book. We hereby publicly condemn it, the author, and those who have provided him with false and malicious information.^{xxxi}

The rhetorical difference between Kharade and Paygude is striking—while Kharade is content with explaining why he thinks Laine is a poor scholar, Paygude condemns the author and those who helped him. Paygude's argument relies on the assertion of Laine's linguistic 'outsider' status: "People come from great countries to our country to study it. And though they don't even know our language, our intellectuals tell them all sorts of things in an effort to tarnish history."^{xxxii} In doing so he displaces the culpability for

Laine's misrepresentation of history onto 'insider' intellectuals.

Paygude's wake-up call (*avhan*) seems to have been answered. In the weeks that followed, the voices of condemnation grew in intensity, and two letters calling for the complete withdrawal of Laine's *Shivaji* were sent to OUP, resulting in the book's censorship. The first, already mentioned above, was signed by a group of prominent Shivaji historians (including Ninad Bedekar, Gajanan Mehendale, Jayasinhrao Pawar, and Babasaheb Purandare) and Pune BJP politician Pradeep Rawat.^{xxxiii} The second, lesser-known letter was authored by a group headed by Dr. Praphullachand Tawade, the Executive Director of the "Center for Indian Historical Research and Education [*Bharatiya Itihas Samshodhan va Prabodhan Mandal*]." As a Marathi newsletter explained, this letter was written because "a wave of rage among lovers of Shivaji has been spreading on account of this defamation of King Shivaji."^{xxxiv} At a press conference, Tawade also suggested:

Indian intellectuals who have given guidance to the author in question should also explain themselves regarding this matter. They should declare the nature in which they communicated with this author. A certain foreign writer writes in a defamatory fashion regarding King Shivaji and acknowledges his gratitude to intellectuals here for giving him assistance; thereupon these intellectuals say nothing. Does this mean that they too are taking part in this defamation?^{xxxv}

Like Paygude, Tawade also blamed Laine's Indian associates, though the crime is no longer a "tarnishing" (*kalankit karane*) of history but "defamation" (*badnami*). Tawade's refocalization of blame from Laine onto his colleagues was then picked up in December by a writer named Jnanesh Maharao, through a series of articles in *Chitralekha*, a weekly magazine published in Mumbai.^{xxxvi} Maharao did three things that had not been previously done in print: he called for direct action against the

perpetrators of the defamation, he explicitly noted that these perpetrators were Brahmans, and he provided a list of their names.

Jnanesh Maharao's *Chitrlekha* Articles

In an essay entitled "Foreign Book, Domestic Minds [*Videshi Pustak, Svadeshi Mastak*]" dated December 22, 2003, but in circulation at least one week prior, Maharao describes the controversial passage as reflecting a long-running Brahman conspiracy to denigrate Shivaji's rule in favor of the Peshwas. Maharao first gives a full citation of the controversial paragraph and then declares that Laine's statements are "entirely based on fiction."^{xxxvii} Providing historical evidence to refute them, Maharao then argues that Laine's ideas "must have come about through the writhing of those sorts of age-old insects [*sanatani kide*] who have idiotic ideas of status in their minds, and then they must have been somehow filled into James Laine's head."^{xxxviii} Using intricate metaphor and wordplay, Maharao suggests that the "Maharashtrians" who told Laine the jokes were in fact Brahmans: "true Cobra serpents [*attal kobra nag*], who, in order to cover up the sins of the Peshwas, spew their venom of defamation on the spotless Maratha rule of King Shivaji—as if possessed by Afjhal Khan."^{xxxix} Maharao's conclusion to this piece strengthens Paygude and Taware's finger-pointing:

Neither the institute which provided James Laine with historical information regarding King Shivaji, nor any of the intellectuals who directed him have publicly condemned this book. Because the principal criminal lives in a foreign country, we cannot beat him with our shoes. And therefore those who have given him assistance are shamelessly having a good time.^{xl}

Significantly, this article names these individuals and institutions for the first time in the Marathi-language print media.^{xli} In his follow-up article, Maharao laments that despite all sorts of talk, no one has yet "stood up and actually confronted those of perverse minds who

have nurtured James's vileness."^{xlii} He adds that though the book has been censored, the historians' letter to OUP has "neglected the domestic minds which injected the perverse filth into James's book."^{xliii} Finally, noting the previous involvement of BORI in Shivaji-centered controversy and citing an emailed suggestion from a reader in the Netherlands—"The first thing we should do is to ask the explanation [*sic*] of this Bhandarkar research institute-Pune. Who I think is responsible for it"—Maharao concludes his second article by demanding a public clarification from BORI. Further, adds Maharao:

Since one is unlikely to receive a confession of their guilt through such a statement, the government itself should investigate Pune's 'Bhandarkar Historical Research Institute' and the 'American Institute of Indian Studies,' as well as the other related parties, and the appropriate measures should be taken.^{xliv}

Did Maharao's articles directly lead to the actions of the Sambhaji Brigade? We can gain a sense of his influence by noting that two celebratory Sambhaji Brigade publications reprinted Maharao's two *Chitrlekha* articles in February 2004.^{xlv} Moreover, BORI scholar M. A. Mehendale explained that in the days before the January 5 attack:

Some officials from the Maratha Mahasangh met with the Institute Librarian, Mr. Satish Sangale. At that time, they showed him an issue of the *Chitrlekha* weekly. The Librarian made a Xerox copy of the relevant article within it, and only then did the Institute become aware of the reprehensible nature of the material Prof. Laine had written.^{xlvi}

Though Maharao unequivocally—and, I believe, genuinely—denounced the attack on BORI in the pages of *Chitrlekha*, it is clear that his writings provided an intellectual and ethical foundation to the Sambhaji Brigade's

8 Adheesh Sathaye

violence.^{xlvii} He articulates a particularly volatile anti-Brahman discourse that first posits the existence of a Brahmanic cultural hegemony and then demonstrates how it perpetuates itself through a conspiratorial and deeply rooted intellectual control of the history of Shivaji. One goal of the Shivdharma movement is to rescue Shivaji—and therefore all non-Brahmanas—from Brahman hegemony. Shivdharma's Shivaji is an untarnished and socially progressive hero, but his character is eclipsed only by that of Jijabai, who is treated as a sort of 'Holy Mother.' In other words, Laine's emic analysis of Shivaji mother jokes is irreconcilable with Maharao's emics, which demand a Shivaji and a Jijabai who are consonant with Shivdharma. It is the politicized juxtaposition of this emic conflict with social ones—between Brahmans and non-Brahmans—that makes violence into an acceptable, legitimate response to Laine's writings.

We may now return to our original question. Why Laine? Because his emic narratology revealed a Shivaji that etic histories could not. Unfortunately, unlike Kharade's review, Maharao's writings politicized this emic conflict along insider/outsider terms, calling for a (legal) censure of the 'insider' parties that are to blame. Since the 'outsider' Laine is merely a *tabula rasa*, unable to come up with such ideas on his own, the defamatory nature of his book must therefore originate from his 'insider' Brahman informants. To censure these informants, therefore, is to resist Brahmanic hegemony.

Conclusions

When I presented this paper at the AAR conference, an interesting question was posed from the audience: Would the attack have occurred if James Laine had described the joke about Shivaji's birth as a *Brahman* joke rather than a Maharashtra one? In all likelihood, it does seem to be a joke that a Brahman—and not a Maratha—would tell, and Maharao's arguments of a Brahman conspiracy might have lost some of their weight if Laine had contextualized his fieldwork in any folkloristic detail. However, such speculation is irrelevant to

what did transpire, and it certainly has not been the aim of this paper to discuss what Laine did right or wrong. Instead, I hope this investigation into the intellectual history behind the BORI attack has been able to highlight some methodological limitations of positing a binary opposition between 'insider' informants and 'outsider' scholars. The ontological impossibility of 'native scholars' like Maharao, Tawade, or Kharade forces us to perceive the Sambhaji Brigade's attack as arising from a nebulous mob mentality. Furthermore, the *a priori* assumption of natural 'insider' and 'outsider' identities fails to see how scholarship itself (be it Western or 'indigenous') is imbricated in the construction of these very ethnic boundaries. If we may learn anything from the BORI attack, it is that thinking of intercultural research as consisting of 'outsiders' trying to understand the history, religion, or culture of 'insiders' fails to capture the political dynamics of scholarship in today's India. In making sense of the censoring of Laine and the censure of the Bhandarkar Institute, I hope to have shown the value of regarding Laine's Marathi-language reviews as productivities—as intellectual attempts to redefine and control the knowledge of Shivaji.

ⁱ Vaishnavi K. Sekhar, "Historians rue attack on freedom of expression," *Times of India*, March 24, 2004; James W. Laine, "In India, 'the Unthinkable' is Printed at One's Peril," *Los Angeles Times*, January 12, 2004; John D. Smith, "Why I Urge India's Politicians To Denounce Cultural Vandalism," *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, January 23, 2004, 18.

ⁱⁱ James Laine, *Shivaji: Hindu King in Islamic India* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 93.

ⁱⁱⁱ One volume of this work, more than a thousand pages in length, has already been published: Gajanan Bhaskar Mehendale, *Shri Raja Shivachhatrapati* (Pune: G. B. Mehendale, 1996).

^{iv} Times News Network, "Raj Thakeray Apologises to Bahulkar," *Times of India*, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/388216.cms>.

^v More information about the Maratha Seva Sangh and the Sambhaji Brigade may be gleaned from their handbook: Balkrishna Parab, ed., *Maratha Seva*

Sangh: Jijau Brigade va Sambhaji Brigade Samskarmarga [Maratha Seva Sangh: The Activity Guide for the Jijau Brigade and the Sambhaji Brigade], Maratha Samskarmala 1 (Thane: Nirmalkumar Deshmukh, [ca. 2002?]). See also the weekly magazines *Marathamarg* (edited by Prabhakar Pawade) and *Saptahik Shivadharm* (edited by Purushottam Khedekar). Note that the Maratha Seva Sangh is a distinct, cultural organization from the Maratha Mahasangh political group.

^{vi} Times News Network, "‘Love for Shivaji’ Trotted Out As Reason for Attack," *Times of India*, January 6, 2004, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/407218.cms>.

^{vii} An excellent online archive of media coverage and responses to the BORI attack is "James Laine's *Shivaji: Hindu King in Islamic India* and the Attack on the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute," *the complete review*, 5, no. 1 (February 2004), <http://www.complete-review.com/quarterly/vol5/issue1/laine0.htm>.

^{viii} E.g.: Dilip Chitre, "BORI Shame: Intolerance Tolerated," *The Indian Express*, January 16, 2004, http://www.indianexpress.com/full_story.php?content_id=39275; Ananya Vajpeyi, "The Limits of Tolerance," *Outlook (India)*, January 30, 2004, <http://outlookindia.com/full.asp?fodname=20040130&fname=anya&sid=1>; Smruti Koppikar, "To Chase a Mountain Rat," *Outlook (India)*, April 12, 2004, <http://outlookindia.com/full.asp?sid=1&fodname=20040412&fname=Shivaji+%28F%29>

^{ix} Laine, *Shivaji*, 8.

^x Mary Jane Smetanka, "Book Incites a Riot a World Away: A Macalester Professor's Study of a Hindu King Led to a Rampage by Extremists," *Star Tribune* (Minneapolis, MN), January 9, 2004, 1A; Martha Ann Overland, "Hindu Protesters Attack Prestigious Research Institute in India," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 23, 2004, <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v50/i20/20a04101.htm>; Pallava Bagla, "Book Triggers Attack on Research Institute," *Science*, January 16, 2004, 296; Sara Rajan, "A Study in Conflict," *Time (Asia)*, March 29, 2004, <http://www.time.com/time/asia/magazine/article/0,13673,501040405-605550,00.html>.

^{xi} Spencer Leonard has noted the political aspects of these differences in his "Regressive Anti-Hindutva? The James Laine Affair within and besides Election 2004," (paper presented at the 2005 Association of Asian Studies meetings, March 31, 2005).

^{xii} Shivdharma as a religious and political movement is still in need of thorough analysis. The central social and ethical issues involved in Shivdharma are discussed in the writings of A. H. Salunkhe, Jaimini Kadu, and Shrimant Kokate, as well as in the February 2003 annual of the *Shivasphurti* magazine (edited by Shailaja Molak). (This magazine is now called 'Shivasparsha'.)

^{xiii} For studies of Maharashtrian anti-Brahman politics, see: Rosalind O'Hanlon, *Caste, Conflict, and Ideology: Mahatma Jotirao Phule and Low Caste Protest in Nineteenth-Century Western India* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Gail Omvedt, *Cultural Revolt in a Colonial Society: The Non Brahman Movement in Western India, 1873 to 1930* (Bombay: Scientific Socialist Education Trust, 1976).

^{xiv} Both Leonard and Vajpeyi have raised similar points, though from different disciplinary viewpoints. ^{xv} See, for example: Shankar Vedantam, "Wrath Over a Hindu God: U.S. Scholars' Writings Draw Threats from Faithful," *Washington Post*, April 10, 2004, A01.

^{xvi} Amy M. Braverman, "The Interpretation of Gods: Do Leading Religious Scholars Err in their Analysis of Hindu Texts?" *University of Chicago Magazine*, December 2004, 36.

^{xvii} William Dalrymple, "India: The War Over History," *The New York Review*, April 7, 2005, 62.

^{xviii} Russell T. McCutcheon, ed., *The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Religion: A Reader* (London and New York: Cassell, 1999); Elisabeth Arweck and Martin D. Stringer, eds., *Theorizing Faith: The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Ritual* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 2002). The insider/outsider debate in Hindu studies has been discussed in a special issue of the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*: Caldwell, Sarah, and Brian K. Smith, eds. "Who Speaks for Hinduism?" *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 68 (2000): 705-837. Similarly, S. N. Balagangadhara has deconstructed 'religion' as a Western category of thought: S. N. Balagangadhara, *The Heathen in His Blindness...: Asia, the West, and the Dynamic of Religion*, Studies in the History of Religions 64 (Leiden, New York: Brill, 1994); see also a symposium volume on Balagangadhara's work in *Cultural Dynamics* 8 (1996): 115-210.

^{xix} Russell T. McCutcheon, "Introduction," to *The Insider/Outsider Problem*, 18. Note also Mircea Eliade's assertion that religious data "exist on their own plane of reference" (Mircea Eliade, "A New Humanism," in *The Insider/Outsider Problem*, 98).

10 Adheesh Sathaye

^{xx} Alasdair MacIntyre, "Is Understanding Religion Compatible with Believing?" in *Faith and Philosophers*, ed. John Hick (London: Macmillan, 1964) (reprinted in McCutcheon, *The Insider/Outsider Problem*, 37-49); Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its relation to the Rational*, trans. John W. Harvey, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1950); Joachim Wach, "The Meaning and Task of the History of Religions (*Religionswissenschaft*)," in *The History of Religions: Essays on the Problem of Self-Understanding*, ed. Joseph Kitagawa (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967) (reprinted in McCutcheon, *The Insider/Outsider Problem*, 82-94).

^{xxi} Adheesh Sathaye, "Attacking the Text: New Approaches to Sanskrit Literature in the Wake of the Bhandarkar Incident" (paper presented at the 2004 International Conference of Vedanta, Miami University (Ohio), April 10, 2004).

^{xxii} MacIntyre, "Is Understanding Religion Compatible with Believing?" 41. Michel Foucault has demonstrated how the genealogies of seemingly natural categories involve the political control of knowledge; see Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, eds., *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

^{xxiii} For a good introduction to the emic/etic debate—as well as its conflation with the insider/outsider problem, see Thomas N Headland, Kenneth L. Pike, Marvin Harris, eds., *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*, *Frontiers of Anthropology 7* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990).

^{xxiv} Kenneth L. Pike, *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*, 2nd ed. (The Hague: Mouton, 1967).

^{xxv} See Kenneth L. Pike, "On the Emics and Etics of Pike and Harris," in *Emics and Etics*, 28-47; on the notion of emic and etic as a dialectic, see also Dell H. Hymes, "Emics, Etics, and Openness: An Ecumenical Approach," in *Emics and Etics*, 120-121.

^{xxvi} See Marvin Harris, *The Nature of Cultural Things*, (New York: Random House, 1964) as well as his more recent *Theories of Culture in Postmodern Times* (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 1999).

^{xxvii} Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984), 36.

^{xxviii} Santosh Shenai, "Shivaji in the People's Consciousness [*lokamanasatil Shivaji*]," *Sakal*, August 31, 2003, 4; Anant Deshpande, review of *Shivaji: Hindu King in Islamic India, Samana*,

September 7, 2003 (as cited by Jnanesh Maharao, "Foreign Book, Domestic Minds [*videshi pustak, svadeshi mastak*]," *Chitralekha*, December 22, 2003).

^{xxix} Yashwant Kharade, review of *Shivaji: Hindu King in Islamic India, Rangataranga*, October 2003: 171-175. This magazine lists Maratha Seva Sangh chief Purushottam Khedekar as a member of its Editorial Advisory Committee.

^{xxx} Kharade, review of *Shivaji*, 175.

^{xxxi} Ram Paygude, *Rangataranga*, October 2003, 171.

^{xxxii} *Ibid.*, 171.

^{xxxiii} According to *Frontline*, this letter stated: "Though we do believe in freedom of expression, we cannot subscribe to the practice of maligning the life and character of any person, especially of one who commands the love, respect, and admiration of crores of people and is a source of inspiration to them, by casting baseless aspersions" (Anupama Katakam, "Politics of Vandalism," *Frontline*, January 30, 2004, <http://www.flonnet.com/fl2102/stories/20040130003802800.htm>).

^{xxxiv} "A Wave of Rage from Writings Defamatory to Great King Shivaji [*chhatrapati Shivaji maharajanvishayi badnamikarak lekhane santapacil*]," *Ravivar Maharashtra Dinank*, November 30-December 7, 2003, 1.

^{xxxv} *Ibid.*, 2.

^{xxxvi} Maharao appears aware of Tawade's activities, as he mentions Tawade, his Indian History and Education Society, and the co-signers of his letter to Oxford University Press in his *Chitralekha* article of December 29, 2003.

^{xxxvii} Maharao, "Foreign Book, Domestic Minds [*Videshi Pustak, Svadeshi Mastak*]," *Chitralekha*, December 22, 2003, http://www.chitralekha.com/chitra_mar/22_12_03/maajkall.asp.

^{xxxviii} *Ibid.*

^{xxxix} *Ibid.* By 'Cobra serpents,' Maharao is making a pun using an item of Marathi-English folk speech denoting the subcaste of Konkanaatha Brahmans: "Ko-Bra." Afjal Khan was a noted adversary of Shivaji.

^{xl} *Ibid.*

^{xli} *Ibid.* Note that the names he exposes are all Brahman names. What of non-Brahmans that Laine acknowledges, such as Asghar Ali Engineer? "The mention of Asghar Ali Engineer among them," asserts Maharao, "must be a precaution taken so that [his book] should not get the stamp of being a 'spectacle put on for tightening the grip of Hindu-Muslim conflict'" (*Ibid.*).

^{xlii} Jnanesh Maharao, "King Shivaji: Beliefs-Misconceptions [*Shivachhatrapati: samaj-apasamaj*]," *Chitralekha*, December 29, 2003, http://www.chitralekha.com/chitra_mar/29_12_03/maajkall.asp.

^{xliii} Ibid.

^{xliv} Ibid.

^{xlv} Maharao's "Foreign Book, Domestic Minds" appears in *Sambhaji Brigade: Vastav va Bhumika* [Sambhaji Brigade: Foundations and Founding Principles] (Pune: Jijai Prakashan, February 11, 2004), 9-13; *Saptahik Shivadharm* [Shivadharm Weekly], February 1, 2004, 20-27. Maharao's piece also appears in *Shivajanma: Kucalaki Brigade ani Sambhaji Brigade* [The Birth of Shivaji: The Conspiracy Brigade and the Sambhaji Brigade], edited by Govind Pansare (Kolhapur: Shramik Prakashan, ca. April 2004), 17-20; this is an independent volume of essays regarding the Brigade's attack. I wish to thank Lee Schlesinger for these and other bibliographical references to Maharao.

^{xlvi} M. A. Mehendale, "Bhandarkar Pracya Samstha ani American Pra. James Laine [The Bhandarkar Oriental Society and the American Prof. James Laine]," *Satyagrahi Vicaradhara*, March 2004, 35.

^{xlvii} Jnanesh Maharao, "The Unforgivable Attack on Bhandarkar [*Bhandarkar-varil akshamy halla*]," *Chitralekha*, January 19, 2004, http://www.chitralekha.com/citra_mar/19_01_04/maajkall.asp.