The idea of "globalization" has become a commonplace, but we lack good histories that can explain the transnational and global processes that have shaped the contemporary world. Columbia Studies in International and Global History will encourage serious scholarship on international and global history with an eye to explaining the origins of the contemporary era. Grounded in empirical research, the titles in the series will also transcend the usual area boundaries and will address questions of how history can help us understand contemporary problems, including poverty, inequality, power, political violence, and accountability beyond the nation-state.
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Steven Byun, *The Gold Standard at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: Rising Powers, Global Money, and the Age of Empire*

Heonik Kwon, *The Other Cold War*
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21. Ibid., chap. 4.

22. For several years, political scientists have been addressing these topics under the heading of "norm diffusion." See, for example, Amitava Acharya, "How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism," International Organization 58, no. 2 (2004): 239–75; and for the theorizing as applied to criminal accountability protocols, see Silkink, Justice Cascade.


25. Ibid., 19, and the literature on translation cited on p. 241, n. 76.

26. Ibid., 18; compare p. 48 for a similar formulation.

27. Ibid., 63.

28. Liberalism and culturalism, though generally emerging and working in historical succession, were, Sartori says, "both . . . conceptions of subjective autonomy that proceed from the historically specific structures of capitalist society [and] must both be understood in terms of an autonomy internal to the logic of capitalist social forms." Ibid., 51. Thus, Sartori's story is one about competition rather than the mere sequence of conceptual schemes.

29. It is perhaps interesting here that although the breakthrough of human rights around the world coincides with his periodization of "neoliberalism," David Harvey refuses to reduce the former to the latter. See David Harvey, A Brief History of Neoliberalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), esp. 177–80.

30. See, for example, Sartori, Bengal in Global Concept History, 20:

While I do insist on a radical epochal break from the forms of non-modern social relations that characterized premodern South Asia, I do so to emphasize the historical specificity of global social structures into which those older institutions have come, in an inevitably transformed manner, to be embedded, and not to negate the concrete continuities of particular social practices.
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"Casting the Badge of Inferiority Beneath Black Peoples' Feet"

Archiving and Reading the African Past, Present, and Future in World History

MAMADOU DIOP AND JINNY PRAIS

At the turn of the twentieth century, African and black writers were active participants in the international debates and controversies concerning modernity, its attributes, and its expressions. intellectuals such as W. E. B. DuBois, William Henry Ferris, and J. E. Casely Hayford were among the first generation of thinkers to seek a more inclusive understanding of universal narratives of the human past and experience. Deploying new universalizing narratives derived from Enlightenment and imperial discourses, they sought to establish connections among a diverse and widely dispersed black community and, at the same time, delineate a space for Africa in world history as a way to validate specific political claims and to proclaim a past and future role for all black peoples in human history. In their quest to relocate Africa in world history and reaffirm Africa's presence on the world stage, many black thinkers attributed to Africa the role of guide and savior and produced a form of intellectual history that effectively recomposed universal history.

At present, however, the quest to locate Africa in universal narratives has been less pronounced among scholars of African and African American studies. Until now, scholars writing in the post–World War II period have not been involved in the debate on global intellectual history in the same way as Asian/Indian historians like Ranajit Guha.
and Dipesh Chakrabarty and global intellectual scholars like Jack Goody have. The professionalization of African studies has ended the quest for a global presence and understanding of the African trajectory in world history. This tendency has been reinforced by the emergence of two narratives of nationalism—African nationalism and civil rights in the United States—that have led to the creation of African American and African studies and their simultaneous dissociation. This trend remains dominant particularly in history, which stresses archival research, the acquisition of African languages, field research, and rural communities in the search for an African authentic “library” despite the inclusion of Africa in broader fields such as Atlantic, Afri
cana, and African diaspora studies, and world history.

Today, the most fruitful areas for discussions of a global intellectual history that include Africans and people of African descent are Atlantic and black Atlantic studies. African intellectuals in the Atlantic world laid claim to sources of political authority and cultural advancement by exploiting Atlantic religious, cultural, and institutional resources and by taking their inspiration from law and human sciences. Their documents and ideas, largely influenced by the Bible, religious scriptures, and evangelical discourses, provided a historical framework and promoted new historical narratives to serve communities that were no longer local and exclusively African. Yet despite ample evidence of an African presence in the Atlantic, the dominant conceptualizations of the Atlantic world, including studies of the black Atlantic, have largely ignored and/or dismissed the role of Africa and Africans.

Historian John Thornton offers the most controversial and challenging approach to Africa in the Atlantic world by reintroducing Africa as a key entity and Africans as critical actors. The area of Thornton’s history is the West African coast and the islands off the coast—Cape Verde, São Tomé, and Príncipe—the Congo kingdom, and Angola. According to him, the communities that took part in the Atlantic world such as those of Africans or Eurasians, Luso-Africans, Afro-Victorians, and Originaires/Inhabitants are African Atlantic peoples, imagined and represented as “people of the sea” by the “people of the land.” Hence, the African Atlantic is conceived as part of the Atlantic community with its Atlantic traders, thinkers, and kingdoms.

This topography of the black Atlantic can be expanded to encompass the historical relationship between African and African American intellectuals and activists in the early twentieth century. Many of these intellectuals were connected to one another through political and intellectual alliances formed in the European and North American metropoles. Here they encountered numerous opportunities for intellectual exchange at the various congresses such as the Pan-African conferences (1900, 1919, 1945) and the First Universal Race Congress (1911) in western Europe. The presence of participants like DuBois and Casely Hayford at these congresses, in addition to the travels of individuals such as J. E. K. Aggrey and Edward Wilmot Blyden between West Africa and New York, nurtured and strengthened the international connection and dialogue among black intellectuals and launched black global intellectual history.

Black intellectuals traveled in the same black circuit that encompassed the Atlantic world. African Americans such as DuBois and Ferris were familiar with the work of African intellectuals living in Africa and in Europe, including Gold Coast (present-day Ghana) law
er, writer, and political activist Casely Hayford. For example, Casely Hayford and DuBois, along with other black intellectuals, including Edward W. Blyden, Alexander Crummell, and Martin Delany, were present at the first Pan-African Congress in London in 1900. Their direct communication and collaboration did not stop there, however. In 1903, Casely Hayford sent DuBois a congratulatory letter for the publication of The Souls of Black Folk. In 1909, DuBois asked Casely Hayford, among such other well-known people as Blyden, Franz Boas, and Giuseppe Sergi, to serve on the editorial board of the Encyclopedia Africana. Notably, William Henry Ferris included Casely Hayford as one of the “Distinguished Foreign Negroes” in his book The African Abroad.

Accordingly, by examining the writings of three global intellectual historians, W. E. B. DuBois, William Henry Ferris, and J. E. Casely Hayford, this chapter seeks to expand Thornton’s topography of the black Atlantic in ways that allow us to recover this late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century conversation among black intellectuals. It asks: How do we retrieve this library as part of framing the field
of global intellectual history? Of primary interest are these writers’ adaptations of and engagements with universal narratives of history and the political motivations and strategies that fueled them. These acts gave them a better understanding of the patterns of universal history and enabled them to posit plural modes for imagining the black presence in the narrative of past and also future human history. Their insistence on including Africa in world history was essential to their own political and social survival, as it enabled them to reclaim their identity as human in the aftermath of the Atlantic slave trade and imperialism in Africa. Black thinkers constituted an economy of knowledge that was constantly reshaped and contested internally. They used this knowledge to engage with Western intellectual constructions of human evolution, culture, and citizenship from which they were excluded. The inclusion of the black economy of knowledge in a discussion of global intellectual history will undoubtedly force scholars to rethink this field and, heeding the lessons of black scholars in the early twentieth century, to recognize the Western framing of universal history as only one trajectory of many.

Africa at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

For African and diasporic people throughout the Atlantic, Africa was vital to their antiracism and their anticolonial crusades. In the nineteenth century, Africa was a physical space that gave African Americans an opportunity to demarcate an alternative geography in which to build their lives, and it thus played a key role in their ideological and rhetorical combat against slavery in the United States. The dominant African American view of Africa during this period was strongly influenced by an evangelical Christian vision of the continent as a land of heathens needing conversion and as a space in which they themselves could find freedom from racial oppression. Consequently, African Americans’ debate on Africa revolved around the question of African American emigration back to, or the colonization of, Africa, with Frederick Douglass loudly declaring his opposition to emigration in favor of integration into American society, and Delany, Henry H. Garnet, and Crummell strongly advocating the relocation of African Americans to West Africa or Central America and the Caribbean.

In this early discussion of Africa, the continent was not a resource for validating African American claims to political inclusion in the United States. Rather, Africa was a physical territory in which African Americans could exercise religious, economic, and political agency. Africa had not yet become the foundation for black claims to inclusion in a universal narrative of human history. It was not until the late nineteenth century, with the rise of ethnology, that information about ancient African societies and cultures began to circulate through the dissemination of anthropological research in the public domain. This information sparked intense discussion and debate in popular magazines among white American and European academics. African Americans used this information to their own advantage to carve out a historical space and unveil their trajectory in world history. By explaining the world of cultures and races, black scholars reframed the intellectual history of the world as well as the instruments and sources of its production. Through this process, they established a library and a knowledge economy that registered the essential traits of cultural evolution and proposed a solution to the question of the human horizon for black people.

This process began with the work of African American writers Jesse Max Barber, Delany, Ferris, and DuBois. The writings of Ferris and DuBois, in particular, benefited substantially from the shift in thinking about Africa in the Western world that began at the end of the nineteenth century with the work of Leo Frobenius and Franz Boas. Their ideas, while still marginal until the early twentieth century, intersected with and informed the work of DuBois and Ferris and eventually gained traction and legitimacy in the popular press and academy during the years leading up to and immediately following World War I. The view that race and culture were mutually constitutive, despite Boas’s efforts to disentangle these two concepts, remained the dominant understanding of race during the prewar years. In science, popular literature, and art, the depiction of Africans as “savage” and “primitive” continued unabated, although the critique of Western civilization that developed after the war helped increase the credibility and distribution of more positive theories and images associated with
Africa. The war weakened the dominant proimperialist vision of the West as the only representation of civilization and thus created space for other expressions of civilization to be recognized and valued. At the same time, Africa, once labeled the “dark continent,” became a resource for artists, intellectuals, students, and statesmen in the West as they sought to repair what was perceived to be an ailing civilization overtaken by imperial greed, industrialization, and war.

Scholars such as Frobenius, Boas, Bronislaw Malinowski, and Maurice Delafosse, who worked in the new sciences of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, imagined African societies and cultures as endowed with reason and sophisticated aesthetic sensibilities. Their research provided evidence of African civilization—political and social organizations, states and legal institutions, and systems of justice—and insisted that African civilizations had existed long before African contact with Europeans. The combination of academic and artistic productions in which Africa was rethought (not always in a positive light) helped create a more positive attitude toward Africa in Europe and North America. For black intellectuals, it offered an archive of evidence about African societies, cultures, and histories from which they could assemble a usable past and put forward a new vision of Africa to the world.

Black thinkers used this evidence and the new perspectives on Africa to critique and revise many of the Enlightenment principles and narratives, particularly the works of G. W. F. Hegel, that were used to support the European “civilizing mission” in Africa. Hegel’s philosophical interventions had profound implications for black peoples’ inclusion in modernity and history, as well as for their access to freedom and citizenship. In the works of Hegel and that of other Enlightenment thinkers, Africa and Africans came to occupy the unenviable position of the radical “other,” which in evolutionary terms represented the early stages of the history of humankind. This articulation of the unilinear version of the evolution of “Man,” which was further developed and integrated into Hegel’s theory of universal history, or “World History,” obscured Europe’s geographical and cultural specificity by merging it with the concept of civilization itself and identifying the European as Man. As the epitome of civilization and the alleged harbinger of a predictable future solidly grounded on science and technology, Europe took a leading role in making sense of the history of the world, a project largely motivated by imperial expansion. This entailed the simultaneous integration and exclusion of non-Western cultures and communities from the flow of history. As the West incorporated the non-Western world, it rendered it incapable of contributing to the movement of history’s grand teleological narrative. Despite evidence to the contrary, most Europeans conceived of Africans as having left no signs, architecture, or monuments in the landscape and no script and written records. Accordingly, they constructed Africa’s past as an absence, a continent and people without history or progress. Within the purview of Hegel’s “providentialistic philosophical plan”—the necessary course of history—and after considering that African societies possessed neither the modern state political culture and institutions nor the indispensable knowledge and technologies to transform nature, he wrote, “What we properly understand by Africa, is the Unhistorical, Underdeveloped Spirit, still involved in the conditions of mere nature, and which had to be presented here only as on the threshold of the world’s History.” In this narrative, which played a critical role in Europe’s “civilizing mission” in Africa, Africa is established as devoid of historical agency, neither a subject nor an object of history before its encounter with Europe.

Black intellectuals deployed a strategic historical vision that undermined the unitary, normative authority of the Hegelian theory, which based history on political accomplishments. They adopted the “prominent strands of the Counter-Enlightenment . . . and the ensuing romantic movement” that alleged “different periods demonstrate different tastes and preferences in ethics and aesthetics” and that no single group was in “a position to rank them or objectively choose between them.” Black thinkers advocated a cyclical approach that posited a continuous cycle of the rise and fall of human civilizations. Suggesting that “time moved in cycles,” many black writers argued that all civilizations, including the once powerful African civilizations, were subject to periods of advancement and decline and that Africa would rise again. They drew on the research of Count Volney, Abbé Grégoire, and Thomas Bbowdich, which suggested that ancient Egypt was a black civilization originating from the lower Nile valley region
and Ethiopia—the Egypt of the black men.” They also constructed their own archive, which documented the antiquity and pioneering role of Africa and Africans in the political, cultural, economic, and religious patterns of a cyclical understanding of universal history. For some scholars, highlighting the civilizing mission of black Egyptians in early antiquity served as a powerful device to bring about a new geography and history of the continent and of human civilization. This evidence helped them recompose a global historical narrative and posit a black presence in human history, both in the past, at the beginnings of civilization (ancient Egypt and Ethiopia), and in the future.

This task, as these black intellectuals defined it, was not to construct a history entirely outside the Western world, but to establish their histories and cultural manifestations within the Western universal framework. In their search for a universal history redesigned by the black contributions, these thinkers considered the history of African, African American, and Afro-Caribbean communities always to be parcels of larger Atlantic and world histories. They worked within the intellectual and political culture of the West. Their production of black history and identity was primarily located in an Atlantic and diasporic context inasmuch as one could argue that “black is a country” in the Western world. By inscribing their historical and philosophical interventions on race rather than space, ethnicity, or nation, they circumscribed a physical space that dramatically revised Hegel’s geography of the black continent and compiled worldly intellectual and cultural resources to support their claims.

The Restoration of Africa in World History

Ferris, DuBois, and Casely Hayford each were deeply engaged in restoring Africa to world history. Collectively, they made common cause to “bolster both Negro American and emergent African nationalist esteem” and to constitute a group that historian George Shepperson describes as the “Negro history movement.” They developed their ideas in relation to one another as members of a black global intellectual community. Common to each was the quest for political rights—for black Americans, political rights in the United States, and, for Africans, political rights in the European empires—and the contestation of the exclusionary theories and practices of citizenship based on racial identity in the United States and in colonial Africa. Each appealed to African history, particularly the African contribution to world history and the progress of humanity as the primary mode for securing these rights. Through their countering of the universal narrative of history and insistence on the location of Africa within it, they provided evidence of their humanity and their contribution to its history and its future development. This, in turn, invigorated their claim to be recognized as men deserving of political and social rights.

William Henry Ferris did not present a coherent academic history of Africa or the “African abroad.” Instead, his two-volume monograph, *The African Abroad, or, His Evolution in Western Civilization, Tracing His Development Under Caucasian Milieu*, published in 1913, is an attempt to chronicle the history and accomplishments of black people in the Americas by archiving the global conversation about Africa and race. Ferris, a graduate of Yale (1891) and Harvard (1900), was a marginal member of the “Talented Tenth.” He moved even further away from the black middle class in 1919 when he became the associate editor of Marcus Garvey’s *Negro World.* His intellectual and political work has largely been overlooked by scholars of African American history, however, with the exception of Kevin Gaines’s *Uplifting the Race*, which contains a chapter on Ferris. Wilson Moses also refers to Ferris in several of his books. Both Gaines and Moses describe Ferris’s book as a ramble and series of “philosophical meanderings,” and *The African Abroad* was not well received at the time of its publication. Its main problem, according to many reviewers, was its alleged excessive praise of Anglo-Saxons. Other problems, such as the confusing nature of the book, did not enhance its reception. Several chapters also include lengthy excerpts from book chapters, pamphlets, speeches, and newspaper articles, accompanied by long monographs.

*The African Abroad* might best be described as an archive of materials that document an international discussion of Africa and Africans’ role in the history of humanity. Using the limited resources on Africa available in English, Ferris proposed several chapters on the history of the continent using the latest anthropological research. Critical to
this project was the contemporary debate on Africa and its history in the North American press. Especially important were two articles that appeared in the May 1906 issue of *Century Magazine*. Both articles—also reprinted in the June 1906 issue of *The Colored American Magazine*—framed the larger debate about Africa that was taking shape in the United States and Europe in the early part of the century. The first article, by Charles Francis Adams, used ethnographic data from his experience living in Omdurman, Sudan, to argue that Africans were inherently and inevitably savage peoples, an argument he supported with evidence of what he perceived to be the primitive and savage nature of the Sudanese living in Omdurman. He concluded that the project of reconstruction in the United States was doomed, that the Negro in America could be neither assimilated nor expelled. The editor of the *Century Magazine* disagreed with Adams's conclusion and argued that his view of the Sudanese was flawed. In referring to Boas's recent article, "What the Negro Has Done in Africa," published in *The Ethical Record* in March 1904, the editor maintained that Africans were highly advanced peoples, basing much of his discussion on Boas's research on the social and political organizations of "African tribes and extended kingdoms," the primary illustration being the Lunda Empire in central Africa.

Further defending the view that Africans were civilized, Ferris reprinted Pixley Ka Isaka Seme's speech, "Regeneration of Africa," which won him the Curtis medal oration first prize at Columbia University in 1906. He argued that Seme's accomplishment as a Zulu man from South Africa proved that Africans were not inhibited by their race but could achieve success at the highest level in Western society. Next Ferris reprinted an article, "The Zulus as Fighters," that appeared in the *Cable Dispatch* on May 31, 1906. In his own commentary, Ferris noted recent praise offered to King Menelik of Abyssinia in the *Independent* and the tremendous progress of the black republic of Liberia. He included an article from the *New York Independent* (October 6, 1906) on African Americans and Africans in Liberia, who were described as contented and industrious people, "in spite of all that has been said of the inherent laziness of the Negro." In another chapter, "Africa at the Dawn of History—The Negro in Pre-Historic Times," after discussing Africans' full capability of participating in scientific and technological progress, Ferris continued to build his case in favor of Africans' contribution to human history. He based his argument on the work of Boas, W. C. Taylor, C. S. Henry, Sergi, W. Z. Ripley, Grégoire, and Volney. Ferris opened the chapter with a discussion of Sergi's and Ripley's findings that the "civilizing" race had originated in Africa and Asia and that Africans and Asians were the "founders of the world's civilization, that they gave the world the foundations of art, science, astronomy, mathematics, and religion." As he did in other chapters, Ferris included lengthy selections from these scholars' work as well as reviews and analyses of their findings in popular magazines and newspapers. The first of these is a review by A. J. Jones on Ripley's *The Races of Europe: A Sociological Study* (1899), in which he argued that the true origin of the European races was in Africa and Asia. Jones adapted this evidence to illustrate the fundamentally flawed nature of the imperial project and the mission to civilize. To further support his argument in favor of Africa's contribution to human history, Ferris reprinted sections from Volney's research on ancient Thebes and Taylor's work on ancient Ethiopia. Volney's work suggested that the Africans of ancient Thebes made a lasting and significant contribution to humanity in the realms of religion, philosophy, and astronomy, while Taylor's work attested to the advanced civilization of ancient Ethiopia. Ferris also included selections from the writings of the French Roman Catholic priest and advocate of racial equality, Abbé Grégoire, on the African's affinity for art and trade and love of freedom. Additional support in the form of a pamphlet by Boas, *The Anthropological Position of the Negro*, also was reproduced. In this pamphlet, Boas's main purpose was to contest the research findings of R. B. Bean (published in *Century Magazine*), suggesting that black people's brains were, on average, smaller than those of white people. Bean used these findings to conclude that black people were racially inferior to white people. Boas argued with the logic of Bean's conclusion and provided his own findings on the complexity of African social, economic, and political organizations, stating, "There is no scientific proof, that will stand honest criticism, which would prove the inferiority of the Negro race." Ferris used this evidence to conclude,
Thus we see that many ancient and modern authorities testify that the blacks in Africa have made some contributions to civilization. Then, again, in the month of June 1908, the papers were telling how seven tons of architectural and sculptural matters from Africa were shipped to the curator of the University of Pennsylvania, thus proving that the blacks in Egypt, centuries ago, did have a civilization. So the race of black men has done something in the past.

Other chapters include detailed discussions of the research findings on Egypt, Ethiopia, and African empires. In the chapter “Africa, the Dark Continent,” Ferris sets out to dispel the dominant understanding of Africa as primitive and savage. His main source of ammunition was Boas’s scholarship providing evidence of African accomplishments in agriculture, the art of smelting iron—“when the ancestors of the Aryans were using stone implements, and were introducing bronze weapons”—and legal procedure and state formation.

Throughout, Ferris sought to prove that Africans were part of human history and that Africans, like all human beings, sought two things in their lives: bread and freedom. Upholding the Hegelian idea of freedom as the highest human striving, he pointed to the Haitian revolution as evidence of black people’s natural quest for freedom. Black people in the Americas had a prophetic role to play in the development of humanity. The “African abroad,” whom he identified as a “Negro-Saxon,” had, through a process of assimilation, effectively absorbed the lessons of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Ferris described them as the group from which world historical figures—conceptualized in ways similar to Hegel’s understanding of a “World-historical individual”—capable of transforming human history would emerge. The historical experience of the Negro-Saxon had brought people of African descent to the Americas and into contact with what he described as the highest and most advanced civilization of the Anglo-Saxon people. Because of their location in the West, he contended, Negro-Saxons were well positioned and equipped to advance human civilization to a higher level of sophistication.

Dominating Ferris’s engagement with a global narrative of history was the Hegelian evolutionary worldview, which he revised so that it included African peoples and cultures. Ferris believed that Africans in the West, Negro-Saxons, would play a critical role in history. In making this argument, he wrote that the Anglo-Saxon race represented the most advanced of civilizations. He did not, however, attribute Anglo-Saxon achievements to a natural or inherent superiority to other cultures, as many of Ferris’s critics have assumed, but to the Anglo-Saxon historical experience. The Anglo-Saxon people, he argued, had benefited from other, including African, civilizations. Times were changing, and the moment was ripe for a new race of people to exploit the cultural advancements of the Anglo-Saxon race and thus propel humanity to a higher level. This action, he believed, could be undertaken only by Western-influenced and -educated Africans and people of African descent living in the Americas and Europe, that is, Negro-Saxons, who, he proclaimed, were destined to move beyond the Anglo-Saxon race to produce a more advanced civilization. His valorization of the Anglo-Saxon race had little to do with a love of the white man, as his critics have complained, but, rather, with a love of humanity. Ferris had carved out a space for Africans and people of African descent to use in the development of human history, here and now. Not only were Africans present at the very beginning of human civilization, the “Africans abroad,” in the Americas and in Europe, but they also were to play a prophetic role in stimulating the growth and development of humanity once more. In this way, Ferris framed his narrative within the Hegelian understanding of the linear progress of history, though he moved beyond history as limited to political affairs to emphasize history as the product of encounters, interactions, and transactions among human communities.

Similarly, J. E. Casely Hayford, a Gold Coast lawyer and the founder of the National Congress of British of West Africa (1919), believed that Western-educated Africans had a prophetic role to play in the future of humanity, although Casely Hayford’s engagement with a global narrative of history was influenced more by Counter-Enlightenment thought, particularly the cyclical view of history. As he professed in Ethiopia Unbound, Africa, the source of humankind and the site of the world’s greatest civilizations, would lead humanity once again. Casely Hayford sought to counter the Hegelian exclusion of Africa from world history in two steps. First, he emphasized the importance of African civilizations; second, he adopted the Gibbonesque theory of the rise
and fall of civilizations. The first approach is captured in his speeches and writings on Gold Coast native institutions and history. The second is taken up in Casely Hayford’s 1911 novel, *Ethiopia Unbound*, in which he argued that an Africa once home to great civilizations would inevitably “rise again.” He explained that all modern societies, including the British, borrowed from other societies in their development and that these acts of borrowing enabled societies to advance. Africa would regain its former stature by borrowing and building on lessons learned from Western and non-Western societies. Furthermore, he suggested, African societies possessed unique spiritual knowledge that, when combined with Western civilization, could greatly advance humanity. Africa, as the oldest and youngest (in terms of industrialization) continent, was ideally situated to lead the world into the future.

Africans, Hayford stated, had learned the formula for true progress: respectful study and comparison of all human society’s “methods” and the wisdom to blend and carry these lessons into something better. Through the valorization of shared knowledge and blended cultural forms, he authorized an African modernity that could not be reduced to a Western form.

The ideas expressed in *Ethiopia Unbound* were not new. Black intellectuals from around the world were discussing the global race problem and generating a range of explanations and solutions. Among the first was Edward Blyden, a native of St. Thomas who emigrated to Liberia with the assistance of the American Colonization Society. Blyden was a pioneering figure in the Negro history movement. His *African Life and Customs* (1908) brought a sociological perspective and holistic approach to the study of African societies. It argued for a deep appreciation and recognition of the inherent logic and necessity of African customs and traditions, in both the past and the present. His work, therefore, represents a slightly different view from that of African Americans associated with the Negro history movement. He was less concerned with documenting Africans’ contribution to human civilization. Rather, he sought to define the “African personality” and establish Africa’s right to be judged like any other race for creating the social, economic, religious, legal, political, and familial patterns that best suited their environment. His argument was an expression of cultural relativism associated with Boas and popularized by the students. Boas trained at Columbia University in the 1920s and 1930s. Blyden had a tremendous impact on Casely Hayford’s ideas, which is reflected in *Ethiopia Unbound* and also in his earlier study of African institutions. While his intellectual influence on DuBois and Ferris is less evident, Blyden was in regular communication with African Americans, and he was considered a leading authority in the study of Africa and prominent African nationalist.

This was a time when a number of black intellectuals were looking to one another to discover how to assert a distinctive cultural identity that would win them recognition as participants in the advancement of human civilization and world progress. Different groups fitted themselves into the Western-dominated international community in various ways, although most during this period entered the conversation by forming their own clubs, founding magazines, and attending international and imperial conferences as men of learning dressed in three-piece suits. In these ways, they professed their right to lead their own “civilizing” missions of their countries or race of origin and sometimes in competition with one another. It was the development of a transatlantic network of ideas that propelled many black thinkers to engage with the universal narrative of history.

In 1911, the same year *Ethiopia Unbound* was published, DuBois attended the First Race Congress, which met at the University of London and where he discussed the possibility of “a future world which would be peaceful, without race prejudice,” and a new internationalism that might someday include all of humankind. DuBois’s political and intellectual work on the continent began with the publication of his monograph *The Negro* in 1915, which he described as a short general statement on the history of the Negro peoples. *The Negro*, inspired by a lecture by Boas that he attended at Atlanta University in 1903, drew on the latest research in the social sciences to provide a brief history of the continent. Along with Ferris and Carter Woodson, DuBois seized the image of Africa developed in the work of Boas and Frobenius to demonstrate a black contribution to civilization and to legitimate their own claim for citizenship in the context of the United States. The research they produced was a “more complex ethnographic engagement with black culture” and introduced a wealth of information about Africa and African societies.
These works gave African and African American thinkers the building blocks from which they could write political and intellectual history and make their claims to citizenship. DuBois produced two revisions of *The Negro—Black Folk, Then and Now; An Essay in the History and Sociology of the Negro Race* in 1939, and *The World and Africa: An Inquiry into the Part Which Africa Has Played in World History* in 1946. Africa's exclusion from history, DuBois argued in 1946, was not for lack of evidence but was an intentional omission performed largely in the service of European imperial expansion and accumulation of wealth. It was an imperial project designed to justify the enslavement, colonization, and exploitation of the continent and its peoples. The ethnographic data on Africa, particularly the work produced during the interwar years, enabled him to revise *The Negro* and to present in *The World and Africa* less a comprehensive history of "the Negroid peoples" and more "a statement of their role in human history from pre-historic to modern times." Because it actively sought to return Africa to world history and human destiny, *The World and Africa* was a political intervention that used the new studies of the interwar period to contest a philosophy of history born from a desire to authorize European imperialism and its "mission to civilization."

For Ferris and DuBois, the motive for their engagement with world history was political. Through the reproduction of archival material in his book, Ferris documented a moment in global intellectual history in which men like Boas and Frobenius talked about the origins of humanity and the meaning of race and the relations among race, culture, and civilization. Ferris's concept of the Negro-Saxon—based on his understanding of the Anglo-Saxon accomplishments as the highest ideal the world had ever seen, an ideal from which Africans Abroad had benefited—was critical to his political agenda, despite the poor reception the concept received in the black press. Ferris's primary aim was, first, to demonstrate that Africans had contributed to the beginning of human civilization and, second, to suggest that the African Abroad would continue to contribute to the progress and future of humanity. His concept of the Negro-Saxon enabled him to include Western-influenced black thinkers writing outside the United States (e.g., Casely Hayford) in his narrative about the past and future of humanity. Different from many black American intellectuals at this time, most notably DuBois, Ferris moved his discussion of the Negro-Saxon beyond the provincial narrative of the black American rescue of Africa and Africans from the dustbin of history. For DuBois, the turn to African history was largely motivated by his concern with the possibilities of citizenship in the United States. Less interested in documenting the work and ideas of African intellectuals (as was Ferris's emphasis in his archive of intellectual history), DuBois actively sought a path for black American involvement in the future of Africa. In 1919, he traveled to Versailles, where he argued as a representative of the NAACP for the internationalization of the former German colonies. Like many African Americans at this time, DuBois hoped to see black Americans playing a key role in the development of Africa.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, we looked at global intellectual history, in particular how black intellectuals have and will figure in this area of study based on an analysis of Africa's first black historians. In our investigation of this early history, we examined the ways that early black thinkers from Africa and North America grappled with their political exclusions from empires and nations by turning to world history and locating Africa in it as a means to counter and repair the universal narrative of history that had excluded them. If the field is to incorporate black intellectual global history, it must include Africa and its diaspora and recognize the epistemological tradition that has already structured the parameters of this discussion.

The lessons we can draw from black intellectuals' interventions and operations address key issues of global intellectual history. First, the territory in which these intellectuals worked and formulated their ideas was global precisely because of their physical dispersal throughout the Atlantic. The global nature of their situations allowed them to reexamine the designs, methods, languages, and theories of global intellectual history through their own international networks, which had one function: reconstituting the dismembered world of the black people (Africa and its diasporas) through a continuous conversation about African history and culture. Second, through the methods they
deployed—in this case, their adaptations of universalizing narratives to include Africa and people of African descent—black intellectuals built an archive and proposed multiple ways of reading and explicating the location and contribution of African people in the past, present, and future in the history of humanity. These two moves were crucial to raising new questions and establishing new parameters regarding the resources, methods, and objects of global history to address the intellectual and ethical issues of their exclusion from universal narratives of history and modernity. They used intellectual European categories and epistemological and ethical values to reclaim their agency as a single community of Africans and people of African descent. This enabled them to rectify the misinterpretation of their history and to uncover more decisively the European misinterpretation of its history. Their example will allow historians of global intellectual history to examine the ways that a group of historical actors, while operating in the physical and discursive intellectual territories of the global, revised and contested evolutionary theories of history and found a place for themselves in the history of humanity.
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In this chapter I use India’s most controversial anti-colonial nationalist—Vinayak Damodar Savarkar (1883–1966)—to consider the contours of a new global intellectual history. Savarkar is the classic example of the early-twentieth-century revolutionary Indian nationalist who went to London to study law only to become seen by the metropolitan police as outside the law. Fairly early on, during his days in college, Savarkar came to be associated with the wing of Indian nationalism that colonial officials termed the “extremists.” His companions during the five years he spent in London were a motley group of like-minded revolutionary Indian students, all of whom idolized Irish nationalists (in particular the Fenians), Russian bomb makers, and Italian thinkers. Within six months of his arrival, he translated Giuseppe Mazzini’s biography into Marathi, and by the end of the year he had started a secret, revolutionary society called the “Free India,” which clearly was modeled after Mazzini’s “Young Italy.” Mazzini (1805–1872) was one of his heroes, and given the centrality of the devotion to patria and the shared sense of duty that permeates Savarkar’s early writings in Marathi, it is indisputable that Mazzini had a formidable influence on Savarkar.

In 1910, on the charge of waging war against the king and making seditious speeches in India four years earlier, Savarkar was arrested and brought back to India for trial. The notoriety surrounding his trial made him a “terrorist” of world fame, capturing the interest of both the international press and figures such as Maxim Gorky. Savarkar was sentenced to two life terms in the notorious Andaman Cellular jail. After he was brought back to India in 1922, he wrote an extended essay in English entitled “Essentials of Hindutva,” which soon became the de facto manifesto for right-wing extremist and militant Hindu nationalism. He was placed under house arrest until 1937, after which he became the president of the Hindu political party, the Hindu Mahasabha. By this time, his rhetoric had taken a particularly strident and virulent tone, denouncing the Indian National Congress, the main voice of Indian nationalism, for taking too soft a line on Muslims. As a result, Savarkar stayed first under British, and then Indian, surveillance, and although he was never formally charged, he was believed to have been implicated in the assassination of Gandhi on January 30, 1948.

If Gandhi is considered the father of the nation-family, Savarkar would be its ostracized, reviled, and hated black sheep, referred to on occasion as “the principal philosopher of terrorism.” Savarkar’s influence on modern India has rivaled Gandhi’s, as evidenced in the rise and growth of the Bharatiya Janata Party, the Hindu nationalist party, and the rather prominent role in modern Indian political life of the ideology known as Hindutva, whose name was taken from the title of Savarkar’s infamous text and the core concept of which has come to be known as “Hindu fundamentalism,” however misleading the term. For the very reasons that Savarkar sits awkwardly in a history of Indian nationalist history—a stark and unpleasant contrast to Gandhi, to say the least—his life provides an opportunity to rethink the regional, national, imperial, and international circuits that require our attention if we are to find new ways to write global intellectual history.

“Is there a global intellectual history?” is the central question for this chapter. The question presumes that key concepts or ideas travel around the world and that tracking and analyzing their itinerary is the dominant mode of writing a global intellectual history. Before addressing this question, I first will situate Savarkar in three strands of interlinked historical scholarship: modern Indian history, early modern South Asian literary history, and Marathi literary and political history. When discussing them, I will use one or more representative works in order to lay out the field before turning to Savarkar and his
political and literary career. I will conclude by suggesting that Benedict Anderson's recent work on the poet/anarchist José Rizal offers us one way of thinking about a new global intellectual history that is neither deterministic nor closed off from a range of hermeneutic approaches that are required to capture the full complexity of the global frame.

The modern discipline of history writing in India began as a response to almost two centuries of British colonial occupation (1757–1947) and its epistemic and representational domination. In a sense, modern Indian (intellectual) history began as an anticolonial rebuttal and grew into a nationalist counterattack. From the mid-eighteenth to the mid-twentieth century, the large group made up of religious reformers, social reformers, political thinkers, and philosophers whom we might think of as public intellectuals wrote in new registers as the presence of the East India Company slowly spread its tentacles over much of India, setting the stage for the powerful and pervasive British Raj. Broadly speaking, all the intellectuals were nationalists of one kind or another. Accordingly, official history in India has always been nationalist history, but even most other historiographical traditions, both that created by critics of nationalism like the members of the Subaltern Studies Collective and the work that emerged from the American modernization framework of the global history of ideas like Stanley Wolpert, Stephen Hay, and Ainslee Embree, have also been decisively determined by a nationalist frame and set of preoccupations.

Indian nationalist history typically includes both those scholars who counted as intellectuals and those ideas that could properly be considered part of the history of the Indian national triumph. After the stunning success of Mohandas K. Gandhi, the long hand of the nation appears to have reached back into the entire period of colonial rule and classified some Indian nationalists as worthy of study and others, on the incorrect side of the nation, as worthy of condemnation. Barring a few notable exceptions, the most obsessive (and variably critical, historical, and analytic) scholarship that has been trained on Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, or Rabindranath Tagore is conspicuously absent in the case of right-wing nationalists such as Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, who has been studied and analyzed as the historical figure either who gives us the starting point from which we can draw a straight line to the contemporary Hindu right wing or who has been praised by partisan apologists and eulogizers. For the most part, Savarkar is written about in primarily ideological terms, as someone to be either denounced or admired. But his writings in Marathi are rarely read, and the literature on him written in Marathi is seldom analyzed except by Marathi lay writers. Such scholarly neglect has produced a somewhat unbalanced historiographical account of nationalist politics and modern intellectual history. It also has meant that when they are not altogether ignored, significant political figures and genealogies of political and intellectual thought are fundamentally misunderstood.

The national frame itself therefore requires considerable adjustment. But if we move beyond the political frame of Indian nationalist history and locate Savarkar in the larger international political milieu of anarchism, the problems do not go away. Even if we took as axiomatic or a starting point for this chapter that an idea or concept travels around the world, tracking the global itinerary of a putatively international idea—for example, revolutionary nationalism, liberalism, and secularism—would have its own difficulties.

“Anarchism” as an idea, for instance, traveled (or, if a more determinist formulation is preferred, was taken) around the globe from roughly speaking, the middle of the nineteenth century through the early decades of the twentieth. It was invoked by revolutionary nationalists in Italy, India, Ireland, the Philippines, and Russia, among others. But anarchism’s historical development in India as a political movement did not add up to very much, never ascending to the level of a movement. If it acquired any real purchase at all, it did so outside India, by Indian exiles such as Lala Hardayal. Within India itself, all other movements in the early to mid-twentieth century were rendered subservient to the growing influence and dominance of the mainstream nationalist body, the Indian National Congress. Moving farther east, to the Philippines, as Benedict Anderson’s recent work demonstrates, the canonical anarchist José Rizal was perplexed when his novels El Filibusterismo and Noli me tangere were seen as incendiary,
even though they are regarded today as anarchist masterpieces. Perhaps the only location in which the integration of the idea and history came together into something we might call a movement was Russia. Despite such major differences, the term “anarchism” was used widely by colonial officials to describe and proscribe all forms of anticolo- nial nationalism, from Ireland to Egypt to India and the Philippines. Colonial officials provided much of the language for understanding anticolonial nationalists at the same time that many of the ideas that traveled in the modern period did so because they were responses to imperial rule. This language itself had a uniformity, even across different national styles and experiences, that was recognizable from locations as various as Pune, Madras, or Shanghai. Marx, or Macaulay, was locally received through predominantly anti-imperial lenses. Thus the importance of Lenin, for example, to anticolonial thinkers and nationalists, and the centrality of Mazzini or Garibaldi to nationalists like Savarkar.

In writing an intellectual and social history of Hindu political fundamentalism, we can begin with the premise that there was an international circuitry of exchange demonstrated by recognizable similarities between Italian nationalism of the Mazzinian variety and the development of the ideas of extremist nationalists in India. But in order to move forward, we would need to tackle the standard understanding of Indian extremism as one that was merely fed by Mazzini. Newer iterations of the argument attribute some agency to individual readers and translators, and in place of the first, the argument would now read like this: Savarkar read Mazzini and translated his ideas into a Marathi (native, local) idiom, but Mazzini’s influence could not be underestimated in the development of revolutionary nationalism. Even in this newer formulation, however, the large premise remains the same: ideas originate in Europe, and their globalization can be equated with their indigenization in a local milieu. In such a historical understanding of Savarkar, local history merely adds color to a universal premise but does not alter it in any way, nor does it explain how the ideas arrived in India. In asking whether there is a global intellectual history, we must therefore confront a hidden assumption about both the origin of all authentically global ideas and the direction in which they travel.

The aim of this chapter is not to suggest a simple reversal of the flow of information and concepts but to pose the question of the expansion of frames in order to move past a straightforward unidirectionality of influence and travel of ideas. That Mazzini read the Bhagavad Gita (in translation) does not mean that its ethics directly influenced his On the Duties of Man and Manifesto for Young Italy. It does mean, however, that such a question (might this reading have played a critical historical role?) continues to be difficult to pose within the conventional frames of history. Mazzini was undoubtedly central to Savarkar’s own development as a thinker, but we should not begin our analysis by simply presuming the nature and character of intellectual influence. More interesting, perhaps, is to compare Mazzini and Savarkar, noting the ways in which they were similar (if far from identical) intellectual figures. Both Mazzini and Savarkar saw themselves as literary figures and succeeded more in the realm of writing than in politics. Neither was a systematic thinker. Both were cosmopolitan nationalists, stipulating that the nation should be based more on a common political project than on ethnicity, religion, culture, or language. But whereas Mazzini saw the potential possibilities of the pan-Slavic, Italian, and Hungarian movements, united in the individual determination of each unit for its own nation, Savarkar opposed the pan-Islamic Indian Khilafat movement because it was predicated on opposition to the territorial integrity of India and began instead with a religious understanding of territory that seemed to him to undermine Indian political unity.

Mazzini’s national citizens were an association of people who would be governed by their will, which in turn was tempered by moral law. The moral law in question was not named as such but was clearly religious in character. Savarkar had no moral theory at all. Mazzini himself was a deeply devout and religious man; Savarkar’s relationship to orthodox Hinduism was fraught at best. Unlike Immanuel Kant, with whom his notion of the will as being tempered by an individually determined morality is sometimes compared, Mazzini was neither agnostic nor willing to hide his religious devotion. Savarkar thrived on making outrageous claims about Hinduism. Mazzini’s interlocutors included some of the most prominent intellectual figures of his time such as Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Karl Marx, John Stuart Mill, and John Morley (the liberal secretary of state for India). Yet the same
John Morley was among the many liberal colonial officials to wonder whether Savarkar and his London group were simply fanatics. Mazzini and Savarkar were theorists of a middle-class nationalism, but whereas Mazzini's anti-Marxism was overtly apparent, Savarkar was simply not interested in Marxism, nor was, for the record, Gandhi. Mazzini wrote in the language of progressivism, in favor of women's education, and was incensed that he was seen as reactionary or conservative. Savarkar was irate and frustrated all his life that he had been misunderstood as a reactive conservative. An early champion of the abolition of caste, he despised the empty rituals of orthodox Brahmin Hinduism, spoke approvingly of miscegenation and interregional marriage, wrote enthusiastically in favor of science and modernity, and approved of women's education. According to such logic, the real conservative Hindu nationalist should be Gandhi, who spoke in the language of faith and religion, approved of the caste system in principle, and had no time for science and progress. Yet history decreed the opposite.

My point beyond sketching similarities and differences is not just to highlight the histories of both these important individuals but also to show that anarchism, or any other great world idea, took very different forms in different parts of the world. It is also to pose as a problem the question of how we understand what it is that such intellectuals wanted to do and who they thought they were, rather than straitjacketing their messy historical trajectories into unidirectional determinist or insular culturalist frames. Savarkar (and Gandhi, B. R. Ambedkar, Nehru, Jyotirao Phule) drew inspiration from a canon of influences that extended beyond the standard texts of English or European intellectual history. They developed their own theories and teleologies, which were expressly part of universal history that simultaneously incorporated a local agenda with the desire to participate in a larger conversation. They were hardly derivative thinkers, to use Partha Chatterjee's frame, but they had no problems using sources and ideas from outside their own traditions to both legitimate and expand their own ideas. They operated neither under the anxiety of influence nor in a world in which they felt the need to be wholly original, indigenous, or consistent. They were simultaneously global and Indian, with no sense of either contradiction or determination.

To locate Savarkar in the world of global intellectual history would therefore require reading him conjuncturally while also expanding the frame of internationalism. Beyond analyzing texts and authors in local and international circuits, however, we would also need to recognize that Savarkar and his actions circulated in the subterranean intellectual circles of other nationalisms. The interrelations and connections between Egyptian nationalists and Indian extremists were strong enough to make Savarkar's early historical book on the 1857 rebellion the chief source of Indian history for the Egyptian nationalist paper Al-Iiwa. Following the assassination of Sir Curzon-Wyllie by one of Savarkar's associates, Madanlal Dhingra, what traveled was the image of an Indian nationalist martyr in Egypt. Indeed, Dhingra became a far more nationalist hero in Egypt than he did in moderate Indian nationalist politics. Ibrahim Nassif al-Wardani, who was well acquainted with the Dhingra case, later shot the prime minister, Boutros Ghali, leading some British officials to focus on his connection to Indian extremism. Wardani, Dhingra, and Savarkar all were subsequently viewed as religious fanatics (along with Mazzini and partly because of his putative influence), even though the colonial authorities had to concede that they could not find evidence of religious hatred, let alone a defense of religion in their actions. It is in these lateral rather than horizontal global circuits that we might locate with some precision the genealogical history of how and why a reference to Mazzini would immediately signal to a colonial policeman a global threat and presence of "fanaticism" and, curiously enough, "anarchism."

In confronting the relationship between a figure like Savarkar and the questions surrounding a new global intellectual history, we must further ask how to keep a sense of balance between the recognition that colonial occupation and international intellectual influences were central to the development of Indian political thought and the need to remain attentive to the importance of locality and proximate as well as indigenous intellectual forces to the shaping of any of the key figures of Indian intellectual history. Reading Savarkar's full Marathi corpus, perhaps like reading Mazzini's voluminous Italian writings, presents a very different picture of a man whom we have so far characterized as "nationalist," "anarchist," or "fundamentalist." Indeed, Savarkar was less interested in history as a form of writing than I have so far
presumed, and in many respects, he was far more a literary than a political figure. Even in his prose, history was simply equated with ideology, in that history was an ideological instrument used as bluntly as possible. In much of Savarkar's historical writing, whether his first work on the 1857 rebellion as a nationalist rebellion or his last work, Saha soneri pane, or the six "glorious epochs" in Indian history as he perceived them, the standard elements of historical writing—basic commitments to accuracy, facts, and historical causation and sequence—seem unimportant at best and often absent altogether. They are replaced with passion and polemic. There is simply no reason for us, given what we do know about Savarkar's education in both India and England, to believe that he did not know his dates or that he was simply stretching a historical fact or working with another chronology. How, then, do we explain his fundamental disinterest in history? Might we perhaps need to look elsewhere for a more authentic understanding of his basic theory of history?

Most of all, Savarkar fashioned himself as a poet. His first publications were poems, the genre to which he turned repeatedly in moments of crisis and that also was the core literary motif of his most incendiary essay, "Essentials of Hinduvta." His poetry was as ideological as his prose, addressing the political problems of his time, such as child widowhood, the plague, the emasculation of the Hindus, and the need for an Indic civilizational malaise to be enlivened with a hearty dose of modern medicine. Yet his poetry is also rooted in his sense of regional literary tradition, the importance of Sanskrit meter, and the recognition that the genre of the mahakavya took as their subject matter both mythological themes and political biographies. Savarkar seems to see himself as following in a tradition in which—as Lawrence McCrea argued in his essay on Bilhana's Vikramankadeva Charita—the real kingdom makers were poets, not historians, and poetry "does not simply publicize or preserve the memory of heroism of royal virtue—rather it creates them." Savarkar may be more accurately understood as not having fashioned himself as just another poet but as a mixture of Mazzini and Bilhana—as the exemplary, all-powerful bard who could marshal a classical idiom with a local tradition to bring into being a modern nation-state.

Savarkar's poetry varies in its quality. Some of it is good, some pompous, and some lyrical, and all of it is difficult and convoluted. This is not unusual, for his poetic voice matures and finds its stride. His desire to write kavya is clear, but the subject of the panegyric whose virtues he extolled is not the king of earlier times but the nascent nation, allegorized as a mother, sister, or widow. Narayan Rao has argued that poetry as a medium is not authentic unless it is recited, spoken, and fundamentally aural. But Savarkar wrote his poems to be read and be published in magazines by a new readership that recognized old meters. He knew enough to use context-specific compounds and sounds, to turn on style for effect, and to recognize that rasa (emotive content) and meter could not compete with each other and that the emotive aspect of his poetry was more important than the simple use of rhyming. He used both regional Marathi and Sanskrit classical meters such as Shadbhakti and Mandakranta, and the verses, with some exceptions, scan correctly. As Philip Engblom noted, the kinship between Marathi and Sanskrit was strong enough that such adaptations of Marathi poetry to Sanskrit norms were not far-fetched. Marathi also has enough Sanskritic texture, with its combination of purusha and mridu sounds, to have enabled Savarkar to write in a peculiar hybrid style that sought to preserve the sense of a single literary tradition for Sanskrit and Marathi. At the same time, Savarkar occasionally used the disdained myva when referring to the first-person singular in his poems instead of anuhi, or aasaahca instead of aasaycha, perhaps as a means of letting the reader know his facility with an older and more rustic Marathi, or the poetry of Samarth Ramdas. He might also have been trying to invent the usual relationship between classical and vernacular forms.

The poetry therefore can be said to minimally reference Savarkar's personal trajectory. He was born in rustic Maharashtra in a small town called Bhogur and was educated first in Nasik and then in the city of Pune. His own personal trajectory took him from one of the smallest towns in western India to progressively larger and more cosmopolitan milieux, from Pune to the heart of empire in London. Despite his international travel, local roots and histories remained powerful for him, in his literary upbringing and in the development of a historical consciousness. Both the colonial author Grant Duff in his History of the Marathas (1826) and V. K. Rajwade, the eminent historian of Maharashtra, wrote about the region's claim to its own national
history from about the seventeenth century until the final defeat of the Marathas in 1818 by the British East India Company. As a result, Maharashtra's history cannot be easily assimilated into the broader Indian nationalist frame, even though it was linked to it. The memory of the Maratha chieftain, Shivaji Bhonsle (1690–1708), and his recurrent battles with Aurangzeb, the last great Mughal emperor, makes up a significant portion of the region's self-identification, as Prachi Deshpande showed. The militant poet-sage, Samartha Ramdas, who was Shivaji's political and spiritual adviser, in effect became the patron saint of a modern Marathi community that memorialized him in several literary and poetic works. If we are to guess at the contents of Savarkar's library, we would certainly need to acknowledge, in addition to Mazzini and the modern Marathi poets, the influence of premodern poets such as Ramdas and Moropant, whose arios were well known in literary circles.

As an example, let us look at one of Savarkar's longer, more interesting poems, on the subject of child widowhood introduced to us through the plague. In the early twentieth century in western India, the plague had devastating effects on the rural countryside and towns, revealing the immense cultural divide between English colonial attempts to curb and contain it and the manner in which those attempts were seen by everyday Maharashtrians. Savarkar uses a natural disaster made worse by colonial policy to lead us to the traditional and older scandal of child widowhood, in which he excoriates widowers for being able to live on and prosper at least as much as he goes after a fossilized shastric law.

The poem itself has 102 verses, in the ayya meter. I offer here a rough translation focusing solely on the themes he used. Savarkar changes voices constantly, from his own as the poet to that of the plague, a householder, the ghost of the dead wife, a young wife, and the young widow to whom the entire poem is dedicated. He moves to an intimate space, that of a home and household in which the wife has died, the husband is bereft, and the son is disconsolate and terrified that his father will leave as well. Here the tone could well be autobiographical, as Savarkar lost his mother to the plague and eventually his father, too. His mother was a young woman when she died, and Savarkar moves to an examination of the love between husband and wife, but the couple is childlike. The description of love play is that between children, not sexual in the usual sense of the word, but familiar as if these were girls and boys younger than Savarkar was when he wrote the poem.

He switches voices again, to the ghost of the young wife who died and then back to Savarkar. Should we read this use of the female voice, written by a male poet, as evidence that he would have known or read Satavahanahala Sattasar? He begins with the palace—prasada—that is built for the plague with the mortar of oppression and the humiliation of the earth. The first line scans perfectly, and the second requires a little juggling. But in the first line, he lets his reader know that he knows the rules of Sanskritic meter. The plague muses to itself (it is a masculine voice) about the beauties of the land—aryavarta— unlike any others. Its eyes are filled with this land's beguiling beauty, indexed by the Sanskritic “la” alliteration: bhulala, khulala, vadala.

The plague travels, sees all of India, caresses (with a terrible hand) Bombay (Mumbai), then goes to Pune, Nasik, makes sacred pilgrimages, bashes in the Godavari, and goes to Puri. Savarkar's own voice asks rhetorically, What else can I say? In one fell swoop he (the plague) circumnavigated the country, without tiring. The plague destroyed cities, and none of the mantras and chants that could be chanted had any effect. Again and again, Savarkar emphasizes the fallacy of believing in Sanskrit chants and prayers.

Beginning in verse 29, Savarkar is relentless in making sure no heartstring, no emotional avenue, no intellectual avenue is left unexplored to let us know the horrors of child widowhood. The critical voice of this poem is that of an early feminist engaged in raising social consciousness about the miserable plight of the child widow. In subsequent verses, Savarkar leaves no road untrod, exorciates all the sacred cows of orthodox Hinduism: the Vedas, the lawgivers, the priests. His pen fiercely denounces society, particularly merry widowers who remarry young girls even when they are in their dotage. In that sense, the poem is an antihegemonic text that by recourse to a classical idiom marshals an ideological critique of a nation that has not yet come into being. For women, the plague piles insult on injury. Not only does it create child widows who lead miserable lives, but it also kills mothers, sisters, and wives thereby coming close to eradicating the entire female race. What does he advocate? And to whom does he turn?
Savarkar appeals to the leader of orthodox Hindus, the Shankaracharya, to support widow remarriage, to found schools for widows that can be run by older widows so that a new society can benefit from generations of educated young women.

Why is this one poem important, other than that it won an award and marked him at an early age as an upcoming poet in western India? Partly because the long hand of presentism has disallowed real historical inquiry about key figures like him, and partly because the history of nationalism has disallowed a more regionally specific understanding of how figures like him feature in the region. But more important, his poetry was the most intellectually demanding of all his writings and accordingly must be taken extremely seriously. Why did Savarkar choose to write in a Sanskritic idiom that was deliberately convoluted yet more attentive to tradition than his historical prose? The tentative answer to this question cannot be found in the literature on the modern period. It therefore must engage and acknowledge the connections between the kind of writing that Savarkar presents and the precolonial global world that Sheldon Pollock describes as the world of the Persian and Sanskrit cosmopolis. That world, Pollock writes,

may be said to know three international culture languages: Sanskrit, the major Indo-Aryan language of premodernity, with a literary history of two and a half millennia; Persian, whose own history began anew at the start of the second millennium; and from the eighteenth century on, English. Added to these are a small number of Middle Indo-Aryan script languages of the first millennium: the Prakrits (above all Maharashtrai and Saraswati), Pali, and Apabhramsha; the New Indo-Aryan languages of the second millennium, including Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Sindhi, Sinhala, and Urdu; and four major Dravidian languages of South India first attested at different points in the first millennium: Tamil, Kannada, Telugu, and Malayalam.

Savarkar’s knowledge and use of Sanskrit, Maharashtrai, Apabhramsha, and modern Marathi locates him as part of a literary culture that has been international in a non-European direction for two millennia through the overlapping Sanskrit and Persian cosmopolis.

In a widely cited essay, “The Death of Sanskrit,” Pollock laments the loss, by the late nineteenth century, of Sanskrit as the language and medium in which original thought and conception could be articulated. Identifying four text moments across a large swath of time and region in precolonial India, Pollock argues that by 1800, the capacity of “Sanskrit thought to make history had vanished.” Furthermore, as he puts it, “The great experiments in moral and aesthetic imagination... entirely disappeared, and instead, creativity was confined within the narrow limits of hymnic verse.” The ability to innovate in one of the world’s oldest and greatest literary languages was lost. Pollock’s argument, which balances, on the one hand, the appreciation and acknowledgment of exceptional literary work written across the centuries and regions and, on the other hand, the death of such creativity, leads to an interesting historical situation: genius must recur across time and region in order to play its own pallbearer. The final scene ends in two acts: one with penultimate finality in the colonial period, and the last with ultimate and disastrous consequences for Sanskrit in the nationalist and postcolonial period. For Pollock, this ends Sanskrit creativity.

A little more than a hundred years earlier, Vishnushastri Chipulkar (1850–1882), the writer and publisher of ‘Nibandhamala’ (1874), asked Pollock’s question about Marathi. With the most unabashed and staunchly nationalist ideological vantage point, very different from what Pollock would use a century later, Chipulkar agitated in an early essay over the possibility that Marathi was in imminent danger of falling into disuse as an organic and live language. Chipulkar’s clear intent was writing to raise consciousness in a colonial time, in which the quickness and facility of English threatened to take over the slower and more sedimented seriousness, depth, and beauty of Marathi. The language of political sovereignty that had taken the Maratha empire to Attock and Delhi, and the language of poets like Tukaram, Ramdas, Mukteshwar, Waman Pandit, and Moropant, was, in his time, in real danger of being replaced by those who thought it too beggarly to be used as anything other than a translation language and who believed it incapable of being used for innovative thought. Chipulkar mentioned the robustness of Marathi in a political context as well, distinguishing between the language of rule and the
language of colonial occupation. Muslim rule, as he called it, required the learning of both Arabic and Persian, which had entered Marathi but without destroying it and paradoxically had strengthened it. This was not the case with English. Chiplunkur's explanation for this is quasi-spatial. Persian and Marathi interacted but did not appropriate each other's spaces, even though it was clear that Persian had become part of Marathi. This was not the case with English, however, which maintained no separations and had become a virtual craze. In turning their heads to follow the spread of English, the Marathi intelligentsia had lost their heads altogether. This infatuation with English was made even worse for Chiplunkur, because at its best Marathi was now considered useless even as a translational language, but insofar as it would be used for that purpose, it would serve the servile purpose of spreading English even more widely. For that reason, Marathi did not need to be relegated to a past in which English was the future, but to be remembered as a language that could do it all, including Sanskrit.

According to Chiplunkur's logic, then, Marathi was always "global," even though it had regional connections and traditions that were just as important. More than a hundred years later, Sheldon Pollock made the same argument, from an antinationalist point of view, about Sanskrit and Persian cosmopolitanism strengthening rather than obliterating vernacular languages. Savarkar's agreement with and exemplification of Chiplunkur's argument, albeit maintaining that Sanskrit was privileged over other languages, was nowhere more evident than in his poetic corpus, which indexes a particular moment in Indian history in which the worlds of the folk and classical, the premodern Sanskrit cosmopolis, and the deep regional poetic tradition come together with a clearly anticolonial and nationalist agenda. Elsewhere I have argued that it was precisely Savarkar's slipperiness that made it possible for his infamous text, "Essentials of Hinduva," to be read across a political spectrum, then and now. The larger project to which his poetry, prose, and polemics were devoted was the purification of Marathi, the Hinduization of geography, and the nationalizing of Indian history. Pollock writes that "kavya . . . is itself often an argument about how language is to be used, indeed, about how life is to be used." If that is the case, then Savarkar clearly let us know what he knew, how he was going to use language, and, indeed, how he was going to use his life.

The curious aspect of Savarkar's poetry is that while it is recognizably Marathi, it is also so Sanskritized as to be incomprehensible to an average Marathi reader, even to those familiar with poetry. It is neither Marathi nor Sanskrit but both, neither classical nor folk but deliberately mixed, a form of writing that seems to have been intended to interpolate equally both a native Marathi speaker and a Sanskritist. In harking back to a previous generation of Marathi poets, Savarkar ignores the modern divide between the linguistic communities of Sanskrit and Marathi, insisting instead on bringing them together in a national and self-critical moment. It is a poetry that both Sanskritists and Marathi scholars deride, for it does not reify either canon overtly, even though it pays its respects to both of them. It breaks as many rules as possible while letting the rule keepers know that the poet knows the rules. Savarkar's worshippers Ramdas, imitates Moropant in a secular register, and pays attention to Chiplunkur, with whose politics he sympathizes while thumbing his nose at Orientalists, Indologists, and conventional Sanskritists who then and now read his hybrid Sanskrit as inaccurate Sanskrit and bad politics to boot. In response, Savarkar aggressively lays claim to Sanskrit and all the languages adduced by Sheldon Pollock in the earlier quotation of the Indo-Aryan millennium as belonging to him and to do with what he pleases. It is undoubtedly an arrogant, autodidactic, hubristic, protonationalist move, but Savarkar makes it as a poet with full knowledge of the tradition of which he is a part and whose rules he can bend to his craft.

How, then, does one write an intellectual history of a figure like Savarkar? It is clear that while conventional categories are useful in a piecemeal understanding, all four frames are inadequate. The Marathi regional frame is inadequate to understanding him because he was far more than just a Marathi poet. The national frame is inadequate because it completely ignores the regional density of literary history and nationalists who do not match the Gandhian standard. The modern nationalist frame is inadequate because it takes no account of the continuity between an older Sanskrit cosmopolis and Savarkar's experimentation. Finally, the early modern frame is inadequate because it discounts Savarkar's later hybrid Sanskritic experiments as inelegant and incorrect.
Before seeking to find a way to bring all these frames into some kind of alignment with one another, I will turn to Benedict Anderson's recent book *Under Three Flags* on the Filipino poet José Rizal. This is an international and global history in many threads, about nationalism under three banners depicted on the cover: the anarchist flag, Cuban flag, and Filipino flag. There are three Filipino patriots to whom Anderson pays close attention: Isabelo de los Reyes, Mariano Ponce, and José Rizal, although the last member of this group interests him more than the others. The tripartite worlds of Bismarck, Global Anarchism as a phenomenon, and the declining Spanish Empire make up the larger historical backdrop for the development of these ideas and their circulation. Anderson sets his frame around symbolism, literary figures, and Spanish and American imperialism, but he does not give the frame a single explanatory role. Empire (not colonial occupation) globalized the world of the late nineteenth century in unprecedented ways. The Philippines attract Anderson because "in the 1890s, though on the outer periphery of the world-system it briefly played a world role which has since eluded it." His subject, José Rizal, lived in a globalized world interconnected through the community of letters, with anarchism as the traveling concept. According to Anderson's definition, even though international anarchism was "the main vehicle of global opposition to industrial capitalism, autocracy, latifundism, and imperialism," he is careful to offer more questions than answers, eventually suggesting that despite their global spread, ideas are distinctly of their own time and owned by no particular place or group.

In a work that is both personal and experimental, Anderson does not depart from some of his earlier concerns but writes more to open interpretive ground than to ground a single global argument. And he does so with stunning erudition. His comfort level with literature in French, Spanish, Dutch, and English (in addition to what he calls the last pure language, Latin) allows a familiar, but more subtle, attack on globalism and American imperialism. *Under Three Flags* incorporates a vast network across Europe, in and out of which his selected nationalists/anarchists moved. Familiar tropes reemerge in this work, such as the quintessentially modern birth of the novel form in Asia and the production of a national community through recourse to folklore and oral transmissions. "Enlightenment" comes to the Philippines through the "unbackward" language of "backward" Spain, a formulation that depicts Isabelo de los Reyes, living in colonial Manila, as he published a Spanish-language text called *El folk-lore filipino*. Isabelo is shown fashioning himself as one who brought "into the mental darkness of the colonial regime...the light of modern Europe." Germany is privileged over Spain, but the language in which this hierarchy is established is Spanish!

In the same year that *El folk-lore filipino* was published, José Rizal also published his anarchist and incendiary first novel, entitled *Noli me tangere*. Anderson emphasizes the cosmopolitanism of Filipinos, leading him to pose the central question about how we might understand the international circulation of ideas. Filipinos wrote to Austrians in German, to Japanese in English, to each other in French, or Spanish, or Tagalog...Some of them knew a bit of Russian, Greek, Italian, Japanese, and Chinese. A wire might be sent around the world in minutes, but real communication required the true, hard, internationalism of the polyglot.

At the close of the book, the reader is left with a series of unanswered but productive questions.

The connections between anticolonial (Spanish) nationalism in the Philippines and Cuba are explored primarily through his intense focus on José Rizal: what he did and did not read, where he might have read it, how his writings might have been interpreted, where his works were circulated, and where they were misunderstood. Anderson follows Rizal around the world, reads his books, opens his suitcases, and is struck by the presence of certain authors in his library (Chateaubriand, Voltaire, Zola, Cervantes, Balzac, and Swift, among others) but also by the absence of political writing (Hegel, Fichte, Marx, Tocqueville, Comte, Saint Simon, Fourier, Bentham, Mill, Bakunin, and Kropotkin), despite having spent ten years in metropolitan centers such as Madrid, Paris, London, and Berlin. The importance of international radical movements is, of course, central to the development of homogenous nationalism, but Anderson takes local literary production on its own terms even as the literature reveals an instrumental relationship and deployment of the "science" of anthropology or the development of
folklore. What seems most compelling about Anderson’s new work is that his early version of the determinate spread of nationalism is now more complicated. The interesting circuitry of exchange of ideas is not about overdetermination, let alone easy or straightforward influence, and Anderson repeatedly absurdes the simple or single answer.

As I tried to understand Savarkar’s relationship to similar circuitries of global and local ideas and influences, I took my cue from Anderson’s refusal to privilege similarity over difference, answers over questions, and generality over particularity. Savarkar’s “anarchism” can certainly be affiliated with the international “political project of spectacular assassinations . . . committed by despairing and hopeful anarchists” and compared with Rizal’s despair and pathos expressed in a letter in 1892 at the age of thirty-one with instructions that it be opened posthumously:

I also want to show those who deny patriotism that we know how to die for our duty and for our convictions. What does death matter if one dies for what one loves, for one’s country and those beings whom one reveres? . . . I have always loved my poor country and I am sure I shall love her to the last moment . . . my future, my life, my joys, I have sacrificed all for love of her.

Some common tropes seem inescapable: the fetishization of martyrdom, the overwhelming sense of duty to a feminized country, the sublimation of all erotic desire into this abstraction. But there are local affiliations, too, as I have pointed out, not least Savarkar’s debt to and location within a long-standing Marathi literary tradition. Savarkar’s anarchism cannot be easily explained in relationship to, or be reconciled with, the persona of the beleaguered Brahmin as the exemplar of heteronomy in an overwhelmingly conservative Hindu milieu—which is how Savarkar fashioned himself in his autobiographical works, and the image that his Marathi and Hindi biographers recreated repeatedly. Without recourse to folklore but with a vague and inchoate autodidacticism apropos of Sanskrit treatises, Savarkar, in “Essentials of Hindutva,” wrote against Gandhi by putting in place the idea of territorial India as an antique land populated with a mythohistorical people. Neither Rizal nor Savarkar used the term “anarchist” as a means of self-identification. But colonial policemen used the term, and

now historians do. The term calls attention both to global forces and meanings and to deep and fundamental contradictions, even when the question of influence seems undeniable.

I have noted the precolonial and early colonial (pre- and early modern) global configurations chiefly to point out that there was always a global circuitry of ideas but also that the centrality of Enlightenment categories to Indian intellectual history cannot be separated from colonialism. Colonialism was as much a contingent historical force as it was a provocation for both nationalist resistance and claims of civilizational autonomy or superiority in opposition to the idea of European origins of all ideas. It was colonial rule and the epistemological assumptions of colonial/imperial/global history that cemented the force of the categories that have long since been under dispute (tradition/modernity, European enlightenment/colonial enlightenment, origin/reception) by world historians. None of these categories can by themselves do all the work they need to do for a global intellectual history. “The study of history,” Partha Chatterjee wrote in an earlier structuralist frame of mind, “must concern itself with the ceaseless process by which structures are transformed into events and events into structures. Historical discourse is constituted on that constantly shifting, tension-ridden, inherently polemical terrain of knowledge.” This is not an easy task, and Chatterjee prescribes for us the bitter herb that all historians must chew. Historians need to accept as a theory of history “the uneven development of contradictions, a varying order of antagonism,” and here’s the rub: “a large zone of theoretical indeterminacy.” At the very least, this would require acknowledging the fundamental character of colonial domination at the same time putting in play the particularistic histories that can be seen for all the figures adduced in this chapter, including not just Savarkar and Mazzini but Rizal and others, too. As Anderson’s Under Three Flags shows us, there is a first salutary lesson to be learned. If we are to proceed at all with a global intellectual history, the hermeneutic frame first must be expanded and then resolutely, and permanently, left open. It is one thing to acknowledge, as
Sudipta Kaviraj did, that the ghost of Europe hovers over us all; it is quite another to argue that the specter of Europe should (or ever did) set the terms of the arguments, or worse, that it has already done so and we just do not recognize it.

Notes

I am grateful to Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori for giving me the opportunity to present an earlier version of this chapter at their workshop on global intellectual history. Much of this chapter was worked out in conversation with the workshop participants. For a characteristically brutal reading of both my prose and ideas, I am indebted to Nicholas Dirks. I would also like to thank Partha Chatterjee, Mamadou Diouf, Satya Mohanty, Rosalind O’Hanlon, Sheldon Pollock, Narayan Rao, Rahul Srivate, Somdev Vasudeva, and Akbar Zaidi for helping me think through some of the problems in writing about a figure as difficult as Vinayak Damodar Savarkar. All the errors remain mine alone. For ease of publication, I have not placed editorial or accent marks for the Marathi passages quoted and have offered as well only a rough transliteration in English of the Marathi poem to which I refer. The full text of the poem is readily available in the published version of Savarkar’s collected works.


2. For an analysis of how a key concept, namely, culture, travels in the determinist frame of global capitalism, see Andrew Sartori, Bengal in Global Concept History: Culturalism in the Age of Capital (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008). In this genre, Sartori’s work is easily the best example. My purpose in this chapter, however, is to suggest some limitations with such a determinist frame.

3. The list here is long, and I cite the names of only a few scholars whose work falls into the large category of Indian intellectual history: Stephen Hay, Ainslee Embree, Edward Shils, Ranajit Guha, Thomas Metcalfe, Eric Stokes, Sudipta Kaviraj, Partha Chatterjee, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Amales Tripathi, Stanley Wolpert, Veena Naregal, Francesca Ozlini, Prachi Deshpande, G. P. Deshpande, M. S. Pandian, V. Geetha, and Gopal Guru.

4. For a few examples, see Stanley Wolpert’s two works of intellectual history: Tilt and Gokhale: Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961); and Morley and India: 1906–1910 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967); as well as Ainslee T. Embree, Charles Grant and British Rule in India (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962); and Stephen N. Hay, Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China, and India (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970). There was and remains a long tradition of writing about India that emerged out of an imperial history framework, as, for example, in some of the revisionist work on nationalism in the early Cambridge school. As one example, see John Gallagher, Gordon Johnson, and Anil Seal, eds., Locality, Province and Nation: Essays on Indian Politics, 1870–1940 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).


7. I am grateful to Thomas Hansen for his discussion with me about global anarchism.

8. See the letter from the Viceroy of India, Earl of Minto to Secretary of State John Morley, November 15, 1909, Miss Eur D 573/22, folio 99, London, British Library, Oriental and India Office Collection.


11. Ibid.

12. C. A. Bayly, “India, The Bhagavad Gita and the World,” Modern Intellectual History 7, no. 2 (2010): 275–95. On the Bhagavad Gita, see the recent forum in Modern Intellectual History in which the contributors analyze its use and circulation in both Indian and international circles. In colonial India in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the Gita was picked up as the exemplary text of Hinduism in India in large part because of its versatility. That is, it could equally be marshaled in support of one’s politics whether as a liberal, radical, militant, or pacific nationalist. Yet as Chris Bayly argued, outside India the Gita emerged as a global text in large part because the ground had been cleared for it by the failure of Christian evangelicalism and a loss of faith in apostolic infallibility in the West.
13. I am taking this summary from a conversation with Stefano Recchia and from the introduction to Recchia and Urbinati, eds., Cosmopolitanism of Nations.

14. See the letter from Secretary to State John Morley to the Viceroy of India, the Earl of Minto, May 27, 1909, Miss Eur D/573/4, folio 116, London, British Library, Oriental and India Office Collection. Morley was alert to the idea that colonial rule was untenable and that resistance to it would take violent form:

I have a painful feeling of the want of all sense of proportion in my political friends who never recognize the immense advance we have now made in the progressive direction. . . . You are no Ultra-Alarmist, nor more am I, but it is really senseless for these politicians to argue as if India were Yorkshire, or even as if it were Ireland. Such a want of imagination, and still worse such flat ignorance of the facts of the case—bombs and plots—and the greatest and deepest fact of all, that we are governing a population who don't love us, and who will less and less patiently acquiesce in our role. (Morley to Minto, July 2, 1909, Miss Eur D/573/4, folio 134, London, British Library, Oriental and India Office Collection)

Indeed, in the correspondence between these two officials there is a good bit of confusion about how to label the group, as they are variously called murderers, extremists, anarchists, seditionists, and fanatics.


16. Ibid., 81.

17. Ibid., 86.


19. I refer here to the argument made by Lawrence McCrea, “Poetry Beyond Good and Evil: Bilhana and the Tradition of Patron-Centered Court Epic,” Journal of Indian Philosophy 38, no. 5 (2010): 503–18. Philip Engblom noted as well that such writing is a continuation of the pantid tradition in western India. See Philip Engblom, “Vishnu Moreshwar Mahajani and Nineteenth-Century Antecedents to Kesavasat,” in Writers, Editors, and Reformers: Social and Political Transformations of Maharashtra, 1830–1930, ed. N. K. Wagle (New Delhi: Manohar, 1999), 143. Engblom details some of the early poetic experiments in the modern period by poets such as Mahadev Moreshwar Kunte, among others.


21. A personal comment to me at the Cornell Workshop on the Folk and the Classical, May 2011.

22. For an analysis of the encounter between the larger world of English literature and poetry and Marathi literature and poetry that resulted in the development of modern Marathi poetry, see Philip Engblom, “Keshavasat and Early Modernist Strategies for Indigenizing the Sonnet in Marathi,” Journal of South Asian Literature 23, no. 1 (1988): 42–66. Engblom is sensitive to the different strands of Marathi poetry, to poets who either resisted English influence by sticking resolutely to older Shastric and Sanskrit norms or assimilated and emulated it by trying in effect to write English poetry in Marathi, by working with a more natural idiom rather than the convoluted and difficult medium of Sanskrit. Between 1870 and 1920, a few exceptional poets who marked modern Marathi poetry were Kesavasat (Krishnaji Kesav Damle, 1866–1905), whose famous poem “Tutari” is claimed to have trumpeted the birth of modern Marathi poetry chiefly in its use of the sonnet form. Tryambak Bapji Thombre (1890–1918), known as Balkavi, was the best exponent of the romantic modern poetry while, Bha. Ra. Tambe, or Bhashkar Ramachandra Tambe (1874–1941), wrote poetry for the emerging middle class.

23. I am grateful to Sonodee Vasudev for reading this poem with me and helping me with many of its Sanskrit features. I owe this insight to him.


26. The poem was submitted by Savarkar for a competition held by the Bombay Hindi Union Club. He wrote it in 1909, and the full Marathi text can be found in Sundara Savarkar Vangmay, 8 vols. (Bombay: Savarkar Smarak Publications, 2000), 8:42.

Paaya paravashtata jya, dushkhalaya shahili zho rachila
Avanati-kruntat-kell-prasadha plague kalas tya khacila (1)

27. Nandanavanskam mohak sristhichaa saabhit ha desh
Ho drishibh dhaaaya pahuhi, dhanvir asa plague hridiya uddesh (2)
Aryavatd aala, mumballa thevile mag padala
Zhala at sukhabha ye ut anavatavatra-vipadala (3)
Jee aikil tisarbha shatapat adhikaci suruchita dhanya
Pahuu bhulala khulala vadala; mohak na bhu ahi anya (4)

Kela nischayaa aisa, kurvaluni Mumbai bhayaa kari
Ho dhig na nii jine te, yastav baghnya pune prayan kari (5)
Godamastav kari shirnatavrambhek puris gomanala
Ala panchvateela tehihnya ramcaya ramanaa (7)
29. Bahu kay vado? Kele aikya abdhatshperyatna
Pavanahuni javan, nachi damla ha ki vichitra vithighatatna (8)
Plague kashcha ala? Krutikarmachachi bhog avataraal
Karmayatta phalchhya upabhogaveen kon bhav tarla? (9)
Koli bhayan nagure, nagarsam det surva vana vasate
Damale namale gamale hatastvatchi mantra tantrata sunvase te (10)

30. Jata nath streechaa tee gai-huni gay manave
Saktu abhanchi tya karnya gheshi na ka yama navre? (31)
Bandhu na, bandhav na, na matapitar jya abbagite (32)
Tya majhi dukhhachi prabhuji Pochti na ka nabha geete?
Mee alpavayi bala, majha saubhagyanidhi aha jalala
Vaidhuvachacha dundhar bhayankar girli ha prachand kosalala (33)
Kay kari? Zau kuthe? Ho majhe apsorye sare
Tara anath bala, chal baghta avstrha baisuni ka te? (34)
Detu ka kon? ablechya hya madeey hasela?
Bola ho, bala ho, dheracha shabda ek tari bola (35)

31. I am indebted for this insight to Satya Mohanty and the other participants
at the Cornell workshop, including Narayan Rao, Leela Prasad, and Lawrence
McCrea.

32. Sheldon Pollock, “The Sanskrit Cosmopolis, 300–1300: Transculturation,
Vernacularization, and the Question of Ideology,” in Ideology and Status
of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language, ed. J. E.
M. Houwen (Leiden: Brill, 1996). Here Sheldon Pollock, who insists on an
earlier literary cosmopolitanism, challenges the modernist emphasis solely
on a world that is global because of capitalism. The literary cosmopolis
of Sanskrit is a case in point.

33. Sheldon Pollock, introduction to Literary Cultures in History: Reconstruct-
ions from South Asia, ed. Sheldon Pollock (Berkeley: University of Califor-
nia Press, 2003), 23.

34. Sheldon Pollock, “The Death of Sanskrit,” Comparative Studies in Society

35. Ibid., 398.

36. V. S. Chipulkar, “Marathi Bhashchei Sampratichi Sthitil,” 4–5, in Niband-
hamala, 2 vols. (Pune: Varda Books, 1993), 112. For a historical analysis
of Chipulkar’s work, see Deshpande, Creative Parts, 100–105.


on Benedict Anderson come from a vibrant discussion about his work in
my class on revolutionary nationalism around the world in spring 2009. I am
grateful to my students Monica Saini, Sylvia Abdullah, Mujeeb Mashal,