Putting Global Intellectual History in Its Place

Janaki Bakhle

In this essay I will 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 20th century revolutionary Indian nationalist who went to London to study law only to become seen as outside the law by the metropolitan police. Fairly early on, during his days in college, he 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 likeminded 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 Mazzini's biography into Marathi and by the end of the year started a secret, revolutionary society called the "Free India" society clearly 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 the influence he had on Savarkar was formidable.

In 1910, on the charge of waging war against the King as well as for seditious speeches made 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 the international press and figures such as Maxim Gorky. He was sentenced to two life terms in the notorious Andaman Cellular jail. 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 a 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 main voice of Indian nationalism, the Indian National Congress, for taking too soft a line on Muslims. As a result he stayed first under British, and then under Indian, surveillance, and although he was never formally charged, he was believed to have been implicated in the assassination of Gandhi on Jan 30, 1948.

If Gandhi is colloquially 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."[1] Savarkar's influence on modern India has rivaled that of Gandhi's as evidenced in the rise and growth of the Hindu nationalist party, the BJP, and the rather prominent role played in modern Indian political life of the ideology – Hindutva - taken from the title of his infamous text, and the core concept of what has become known as "Hindu fundamentalism," however misleading the term. For the very reasons that Savarkar sits awkwardly within 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 essay. 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.[2] Before addressing this question, I will first situate Savarkar in three strands of interlinked historical scholarship. These are: modern Indian history, early modern South Asian literary history, and Marathi literary and political history. In the discussion of each of these 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 Jose 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 came into being 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 anti-colonial rebuttal and grew into a nationalist counter attack. From the mid 18th to the mid 20th century, the large group made up of religious reformers, social reformers, political thinkers, philosophers who we might think of as public intellectuals, among others, 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 intellectuals were nationalists of one kind or another.[3] Official history in India has accordingly 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, or the work that emerged out of 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/set of preoccupations.[4]

Indian nationalist history typically adjudicated both who counted as an intellectual and what ideas could be considered properly part of the history of the Indian national triumph. Given the stunning success of M.K. Gandhi, the long hand of the nation has reached back into the entire period of colonial rule and adjudicated a set of Indian nationalists as worthy of study, and those on the incorrect side of the nation as worthy of condemnation. Barring a few notable exceptions, the almost obsessive (and variably critical, historical and analytic) scholarship that has been trained on Gandhi, Nehru, or Tagore, is conspicuously absent in the case of rightwing nationalists such as Vinayak Damodar Savarkar who has been written about either as the historical figure who provides us with the starting point from which we can draw a straight line to the contemporary Hindu right wing, or by partisan apologists and eulogizers.[5] By and large Savarkar is written about in ideological terms, either as someone to be denounced or to be admired, and the corpus of his writings in Marathi is rarely read, nor is the literature on him in

Marathi analyzed. Such neglect has produced a somewhat unbalanced historiographical account of nationalist politics and modern intellectual history; it has also meant that significant political figures and genealogies of political and intellectual thought are fundamentally misunderstood when they are not altogether ignored.

The national frame itself therefore requires considerable adjustment. But if one moves beyond the political frame of Indian nationalist history and locates Savarkar in the larger international political milieu of anarchism the problems do not go away. Even if one can take as axiomatic or a starting point for this essay that an idea or concept travels around the world, tracking the global itinerary of a putatively international idea --revolutionary nationalism, liberalism, secularism to take some examples—has its own difficulties.

"Anarchism" as an idea, for instance, traveled (or if a more determinist formulation might be preferred, was taken) around the globe from roughly speaking the middle of the 19th century through the early decades of the 20th. It was invoked by revolutionary nationalists in Italy, India, Ireland, the Philippines, and Russia, to give just a few examples. 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 at all it acquired any real purchase it did so outside India, by Indian exiles such as Lala Hardayal.[6] Within India itself, all other movements in the early to mid 20th century were rendered subservient to the growing influence and dominance of the mainstream nationalist body, the Indian National Congress. Moving further east, in the Philippines, as Benedict Anderson's recent work demonstrates, the canonical anarchist, Jose Rizal, was perplexed when his novels *El Filibusterismo* and *Noli me Tangere* were seen as incendiary, even as they are recognized 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 would be Russia.[7] Despite such major differences the term "anarchism" was used widely by colonial officials to describe and proscribe all forms of anti-colonial nationalism from Ireland to Egypt to India and the Philippines.[8] Colonial officials provided much of the language for understanding anti-colonial 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, which itself had a uniformity, even across different national styles and experiences, that was perforce recognizable from locations as various as Pune, Madras or Shanghai. Marx, or Macaulay were locally received through predominantly anti-imperial lenses; thus the importance of Lenin, for example, for anti-colonial thinkers and nationalists, and the centrality of Mazzini or Garibaldi for nationalists such as Savarkar.

In writing an intellectual and social history of Hindu political fundamentalism, one 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.[9] 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.[10] Newer iterations of the argument attribute some agency to the 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 the influence of Mazzini could not be underestimated in the development of revolutionary nationalism.[11] Even in this newer formulation, however, the large premise remains the same: ideas originate in Europe and their globalization can be equated to their indigenization in a local milieu. In such an 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 if there is a global intellectual history we must therefore confront a hidden assumption about both the place of origin of all authentically global ideas and the direction in which they travel.

The aim of this essay is not to suggest a simple reversal of the flow of information and concepts, but rather 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 the Gita's 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 a difficult question to pose within the conventional frames of history.[12] 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. And yet, while Mazzini saw the potential possibilities of pan-Slavic, Italian, and Hungarian movements, united in the individual determination of each unit for its own nation, Savarkar was staunchly opposed to 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 undermined 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 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.[13] Savarkar thrived on making outrageous claims about Hinduism. Mazzini's interlocutors included some of the most prominent intellectual figures of his time such as Proudhon, Marx, John Stuart Mill, and John Morley (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.[14] Mazzini and Savarkar were theorists of a middle

class nationalism, but whereas Mazzini's anti-Marxism was overtly apparent, Savarkar was simply uninterested in Marxism, as 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 inter-regional marriage, wrote enthusiastically in favor of science and modernity, and approved of women's education. By such a 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. And yet, history decreed the opposite.

The point beyond sketching similarities and differences is not just to highlight the histories of both of 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 such intellectuals wanted to do and who they thought they were, rather than straightjacketing their messy historical trajectories into unidirectional determinist or insular culturalist frames. Savarkar (and Gandhi, Ambedkar, Nehru, 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 both to 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 certainly require reading him conjuncturally while also expanding the frame of internationalism. Beyond analyzing texts and authors in local and international circuits, however, one would also need to recognize that Savarkar and his actions circulated within the subterranean intellectual circles of other nationalisms. There were interrelations and connections between Egyptian nationalists and Indian extremists that were strong enough to render Savarkar's early historical tome on the 1857 Rebellion as the chief source of Indian history for the Egyptian nationalist paper *al-liwa.* 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 far more of a nationalist hero in Egypt than he did in the immediate milieu of moderate Indian nationalist politics.[15] Ibrahim Nassif al-Wardani, who was well acquainted with the Dhingra case, shot the Prime Minister Boutros Ghali, leading some British officials to focus on his connection to Indian extremism.[16] Wardani, Dhingra, and Savarkar were subsequently all viewed as religious fanatics (along with, and partly because of the putative influence of,

Mazzini), despite the fact that colonial authorities had to concede that they could not find evidence of religious hatred, let alone a defense of religion in their actions.[17] It is in these lateral rather than horizontal global circuits that one might locate with some precision the genealogical history of how and why a reference to Mazzini for colonial policeman immediately signaled the 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 in the shaping of any of the key figures of Indian intellectual history. Reading the full Marathi corpus of Savarkar, perhaps like reading the voluminous Italian writings of Mazzini, presents a very different picture of a man who we have so far characterized by terms such as "nationalist," "anarchist," or "fundamentalist." Indeed, Savarkar not only was less interested in history as a form of writing than my paper so far has presumed, he was in many respects 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 that was used as bluntly as possible. In much of his historical writing, whether his first work on 1857 as a nationalist rebellion or his last work *Saha Soneri Pane* or the 6 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? Perhaps we might need to look elsewhere for a more authentic understanding of his basic theory of history?

Savarkar fashioned himself most of all as a poet. His first publications were poems, the very genre to which he turned repeatedly in moments of crisis, and which also characterized the core literary motif of his most incendiary essay "Essentials of Hindutva."[18] 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, the need for an Indic civilizational malaise to be enlivened with a hearty dose of modern medicine. And yet his poetry is also profoundly rooted in his sense of regional literary tradition, the importance of Sanskrit meter, and too the recognition that the genre of the *mahakavya* took as their subject matter not merely mythological themes but also political biographies. [19] Savarkar seems to see himself as following in a tradition in which (as Lawrence McCrea has argued in his essay on Bilhana's *Vikramankadevacharita*) the real king 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 having fashioned himself not just as yet 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 the modern nation state.[20]

Savarkar's poetry varies in its quality. Some of it is good, some pompous, some lyrical, and all of it is difficult, and convoluted. This is not unusual, as his poetic voice matures and finds its stride. His desire to write *kavya* is manifest, but the subject of the panegyric or whose virtues he extolled is not the king of earlier times but the nascent nation, allegorized as mother, sister, or widow. Narayan Rao has written about poetry as a medium that is not authentic unless it is recited, spoken, and fundamentally aural.[21] But Savarkar wrote his poems to be read, to be published in magazines, by a new readership that was cognizant nonetheless of old metres. [22] He knew enough to use context-specific compounds and sounds, he knew enough to turn on style for effect, he knew enough to recognize that *rasa* (emotive content) and metre could not compete with each other, and that the emotive aspect of his poetry was more important than the simple use of rhyming. [23] He used both regional Marathi metres as well as Sanskrit classical metres such as *Shardulavikridit* and *Mandakranta*, and the verses, with some exceptions, scan correctly. As Philip Engblom has noted, the kinship between Marathi and Sanskrit was strong enough that such adaptations of Marathi poetry to Sanskrit norms was not to overly stretch it.[24] Marathi also has enough of a Sanskritic texture, with its combination of *purusha* and *mridu* sounds, to have made it possible for 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 dischordant "mya" when referring to the 1st personal singular in his poems instead of "amhi" or "aasacha" instead of asaycha" as an index to a more rustic Marathi and as a way of inverting 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 Bhagur, and educated first in Nasik, and then in the city of Pune. His own personal trajectory took him from one of the y smallest towns in Western India to progressively larger and more cosmopolitan milieus, from Pune to the heart of empire in London. Despite his international travel, local roots and histories remained for him powerful, both in terms of his literary upbringing but also 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 17th 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 as it was, perforce, linked to it. The memory of the Maratha chieftain, Shivaji Bhonsle (1690-1708), and his recurrent battles with the last great Mughal emperor Aurangzeb, makes up a significant portion of the region's self-identification, as Prachi Deshpande has shown.[25] The militant poet-sage, Ramdas, who was both Shivaji's political and spiritual advisor, in effect becomes the patron saint of a modern Marathi community that memorialized him in several literary and poetic works. If we are to begin to try and peek into 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 *arya*s were well known in literary circles.

Let us take one of his longer, more interesting poems on the subject of child widowhood introduced to us through the plague. The plague in the early twentieth century in Western India had devastating effects on the rural countryside and towns, and indexed 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 will excoriate 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 *arya* meter. I offer here a brute translation focusing solely on the themes he used. Savarkar changes voices constantly, from his own as the poet, to that of the plague, to a householder, the ghost of the dead wife, to 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, the son disconsolate and terrified that his father will leave as well. In such a section the tone could well be autobiographical; 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 play is that between children, the love play is not sexual in the everyday sense of the word, but familiar as if these were young girls and boys younger than Savarkar when he wrote the poem.

He switches voices again, to the ghost of the young wife who died, and then back to Savarkar. Do we read this use of the female voice, written by a male poet, as an index that he would have known or read Hala's *Sattasai*? 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, the second requires a little juggling, but in the first line itself he lets his reader know that he knows the rules of Sanskritic meter[26] The plague speaks, 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 "la" alliteration: *bhulala*, *khulala*, *vadala*.[27]

The plague travels, sees all of India, caresses (with a terrible hand) Bombay, then goes to Pune, Nasik, makes sacred pilgrimages, bathes in the Godavari, and goes to Puri.[28] 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.[29] The fallacy of believing in Sanskrit chants and prayers is emphasized by Savarkar again and again.

From 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.[30] 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. All the sacred cows of orthodox Hinduism are excoriated by him: the Vedas, the lawgivers, the priests. His pen is fierce in its denunciation of society, and in particular of merry widowers who remarry young girls even as they are in their dotage. In that sense it is an anti-hegemonic text that marshals an ideological critique of a nation that has not yet come into being by recourse to a classical idiom[31] For women the plague piles particular insult upon injury. Not only does it create child widows who lead miserable lives, but it kills mothers, sisters and wives thereby coming close to eradicating the female race. What does he advocate? And who does he ask? The leader of orthodox Hindus namely the Shankaracharya to lend his support to widow remarriage, to the founding of schools for widows which can be run by older widows so that a new society can benefit from generations of educated young women.

Why would this one poem be important other than the fact 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 importantly, his poetry was the most intellectually demanding of all his writings, and must accordingly be taken extremely seriously. Why did he choose to write in such 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 must perforce engage and acknowledge the connections between the kind of writing Savarkar presents and the precolonial global world described by Sheldon Pollock as the world of the Persian and Sanskrit cosmopolis.[32] 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 Maharashtri and Sharaseni), Pali, and Apabhramsha; the New Indo-Aryan languages of the second millennium, including Bangla, 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."[33] Savarkar's knowledge and use of Sanskrit, Maharashtri, Apabhramsha, 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," Sheldon Pollock laments the loss by the late 19th 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 pre-colonial India, Pollock argues that by 1800 the capacity of "Sanskrit thought to make history had vanished." (394). Furthermore, as he put it, "The great experiments in moral and aesthetic

imagination…ha[d] entirely disappeared, and instead, creativity was confined within the narrow limits of hymnic verse." (398) The ability to innovate in one of the world's oldest and greatest literary languages was lost. Pollock's argument which balances in the one hand the appreciation and acknowledgement of exceptional literary work that is authored across the centuries and regions, and the death of such creativity in the other leads to an interesting historical situation: genius has to 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 therein ends Sanskrit creativity.

A little over a hundred years earlier, Vishnushastri Chiplunkar (1850-1882), writer and publisher of "Nibandhamala" (1874) had asked Pollock's question for Marathi. With the most unabashed and staunchly nationalist ideological vantage point, very different than that Pollock would deploy a century later, Chiplunkar agitated in an early essay over the possibility that Marathi was in imminent danger of falling quickly into disuse as an organic and live language. Chiplunkar'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.[34] 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, Moropant was in the contemporary period of 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. Chiplunkar, in passing, remarked on 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 had done so without destroying it, and had paradoxically strengthened it. (pp 4-5) This was not the case with English. Chiplunkar's explanation for this is quasi-spatial. Persian and Marathi interacted but didn't appropriate each other's spaces, even though it was clear that Persian entered Marathi. However, this was not the case with English 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 which were now just spinning wildly out of control. The infatuation with English was made even worse for Chiplunkar, because at its best Marathi was now considered unable even as a translational language, but insofar as it would be used for those purpose it was going to serve the servile purpose of rendering English more widespread. For that reason, Marathi needed not to be relegated to a past in which English was the future but remembered as a language that could do it all, including Sanskrit.

By Chiplunkar's logic, then, Marathi was always "global" even as it had regional connections and traditions that were at least as vital and important. Over a hundred years later Sheldon Pollock from an anti-nationalist point of view made the very same argument about Sanskrit and Persian cosmopolitanism strengthening rather than obliterating vernacular languages.[35]

Savarkar's agreement with and exemplification of Chiplunkar's argument with a significant departure in 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 cosmpolis and the deep regional poetic tradition, come together with a clear anti-colonial and nationalist agenda. Elsewhere I have argued that it was precisely his slipperiness that made it possible for his infamous text, "Essentials of Hindutva" to be read across a political spectrum, then and now. The larger project to which his poetry, his prose, and his 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." (394) If that is the case, then Savarkar was very clear in letting us know what he knew, how he was going to use language, and indeed how he was going to use his life.

The curiosity 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 for 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 both a native Marathi speaker and a Sanskritist equally. In hearkening to a previous generation of Marathi poets, Savarkar attempts to ignore 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: it does not reify either canon overtly even as it pays both of them respect. It breaks as many rules as possible while letting the rule-keepers know that the poet knows the rules. Savarkar worships Ramdas, imitates Moropant in a secular register, pays attention to Chiplunkar whose politics he sympathises with 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. What Savarkar does in response is aggressively lay claim to Sanskrit and all the languages adduced by Sheldon Pollock in the earlier quote of the Indo-Aryan millennium as belonging to him and to do with what he pleases. It is undoubtedly an arrogant, auto-didactic, hubristic, proto-nationalist move; but he does it as a poet with full knowledge of the tradition he is a part of 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 ignores altogether the regional density of literary history and nationalists who don't 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. 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 each other, I will refer to Benedict Anderson's recent work on the Filipino poet, Jose Rizal, in his important book *Under Three Flags*. This is an international and global history in many threes, 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 Jose Rizal, although the last member of this group interests him more than any other. 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. Between symbolism, literary figures, and Spanish and American Imperialism, the frame is set but Anderson does not attribute to the frame a single explanatory role. Empire (not colonial occupation) globalized the world of the late 19th 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."[36] His subject – Jose Rizal – lived in a globalized world interconnected through the community of letters, with anarchism as the travelling concept. Even as international anarchism, by Anderson's definition, was "the main vehicle of global opposition to industrial capitalism, autocracy, latifundism, and imperialism"[37] he is careful to suggest more questions than answers, eventually suggesting modestly that ideas, despite their global spread, are both 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 he 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 re-emerge 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 intimately depicts Isabelo des 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."[38] Germany is privileged over Spain, but the language in which this hierarchy is established is Spanish!

In the same year *El folk-lore Filipino* was published, Jose 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* (my italics)*."*[39] At the close of the book one is left with a series of unanswered but productive questions.

The connections between anti-colonial (Spanish) nationalism in the Philippines and Cuba are explored primarily through his intense focus on Jose 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, 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, Swift among others), but also the absence of political writing (Hegel, Fichte, Marx, Tocqueville, Comte, Saint Simon, Fourier, Bentham, Mill, Bakunin, or Kropotkin), despite having spent ten years in metropolitan centers such as Madrid, Paris, London and Berlin.[40] The importance of international radical movements is of course central to the development of home grown 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 or easy or straightforward influence, and Anderson repeatedly abjures the simple or single answer.

As I try to understand Savarkar's relationship to similar circuitries of global and local ideas and influences, I take my cue from Anderson's determined refusal to privilege similarity over difference, answers over questions, and generality over particularity. Savarkar's "anarchism" can certainly be affiliated to the international "political project of spectacular assassinations…committed by despairing and hopeful anarchists,"[41] and compared to Rizal's despair and pathos expressed in a letter in 1892 at the age of 31 with instructions that it be opened posthumously. As Rizal wrote:

"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."[42]

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 longstanding Marathi literary tradition. Neither can Savarkar's anarchism be explained in relationship to or reconciled with the figure of the beleaguered Brahmin as the exemplar of heteronomy within an overwhelmingly conservative Hinduism, a persona in the wake of his self-fashioning Savarkar's Marathi and Hindi biographers recreate for him again and again. Without recourse to folklore but with a vague and inchoate autodidacticism apropos of Sanskrit treatises, Savarkar, in his *Essentials of Hindutva*, wrote against Gandhi by putting in place the idea of

territorial India as an antique land populated with a mytho-historical people. Neither Rizal nor Savarkar used the term "anarchist" as a means of self-identification. Colonial policemen used the term, and now historians do. But 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 pre-colonial 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 both for nationalist resistance and for 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 worked to cement 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 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 historians must all 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 essay, 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 has first to 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 don't recognize it.

---

[1] See "Maharashtra Dharma and the Nationalism Movement in Maharashtra," p 26, by Rajendra Vora in *Writers, Editors, and Reformers: Social and Political Transformations of Maharashtra, 1830-1930,* ed, N.K. Wagle, Manohar New Delhi, 1999

[2] For an analysis of how a key concept, namely, culture, travels within the determinist frame of global capitalism, see Andrew Sartori's rigorous *Bengal in global concept History: culturalism in the age of capitalism,* Chicago, 2008. Of its genre Sartori's work is easily the best example. My purpose in this essay, however, is to suggest some limitations with such a determinist frame.

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

[4] See Stanley Wolpert's two works of intellectual history: *Tilak and Gokhale: revolution and reform in the Making of Modern India* (Berkeley: 1962) and *Morley and India:1906-1910* (Berkeley: 1967); Ainslee T Embree's *Charles Grant and British Rule in India* (New York, Columbia: 1962); Stephen N. Hay's *Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and his critics in Japan, China, and India* (Cambridge, Harvard, 1970) as a few examples. There was and remains the 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. See as just one example John Gallager, Gordon Johnson, and Anil Seal, eds., *Locality, Province and Nation: Essays on Indian Politics 1870-1940*, Cambridge, 1973

[5] One notable example is John Pincince's dissertation, *On the Verge of Hindutva: V.D. Savarkar, revolutionary, convict, ideologue c1905-1924.* University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2007.

[6] See Maia Ramnath's *Decolonizing Anarchism: An antiauthoritarian History of India's Liberation Struggle*, forthcoming 2011, AK Press, California.

[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 Secy of State John Morley, 19th November 1909, Mss Eur D 573/22, folio 93.

[9] See Stefan Recchia and Nadia Urbinati's introduction to *A Cosmopolitanism of Nations: Giuseppe Mazzini's writings on Democracy, Nation Building, and International Relations* (Princeton; 2008) See also"Deshabhakta: The leaders of the Italian Independence Movement in the Eyes of Marathi Nationalists," pp 49-55 in particular for an analysis of the rearticulation of Mazzini's politics in a specificially Marathi idiom by E. Fasana, in *Writers, Editors, and Reformers: Social and Political Transformations of Maharashtra, 1830-1930,* ed, N.K. Wagle, Manohar New Delhi, 1999

[10] See Gita Srivastava's book *Mazzini and his Impact on the Indian Nationalist Movement*, Allahabad, 1982

[11] Ibid.

[12] On the subject of 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 – it could equally be marshaled in support of one's politics whether as a liberal, radical, militant, or pacifist nationalist. Yet, as Chris Bayly has 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. C.A. Bayly "India, The Bhagavad Gita and the World" pp 275-295, in MIH, Vol 7 #2, August 2010.

[13] I am taking this summary from a conversation with Stefan Recchia, and the introduction to Stefan Recchia and Nadia Urbinati ed., *A Cosmopolitanism of Nations: Giuseppe Mazzini's writings on Democracy, Nation Building, and International Relations* (Princeton; 2008)

[14] See the letter from Secretary to State John Morley to the Viceroy of India, the Earl of Minto, May 27, 1909, Mss Eur D/573/4, folio 116. 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 rule." Indeed in the correspondence between these two officials there is a good bit of confusion about how precisely to label the group. They are variously called murderers, extremists, anarchists, seditionists, and fanatics. See Morley to Minto, July 2nd, 1909, Mss Eur D/573/4, folio 134. British Library, OIOC.

[15] See Noor-Aiman Iftikhar Khan,"The Enemy of my Enemy: Indian Influences on EgyptianNationalism, 1907-1930" pp 74-78, unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago, 2006

[16] Ibid, 81

[17] Ibid, 86

[18] See my "Country First? Vinayak Damodar Savarkar (1883-1966) and the Writing of "Essentials of Hindutva" in Public Culture, Winter 2010 22(1): 149-186

[19] I refer here to the argument made by Lawrence McCrea in "Poetry Beyond good and Evil: Bilhana and the Tradition of Patron-centered Court Epic" in Journal of Indian Philosophy (2010) 38:503-518. Philip Engblom has noted as well that such writing is a continuation of the pandit tradition in Western India. See "Vishnu Moreshwar Mahajani and Nineteenth-Century Antecedents to Keshavsut", pg 143, in *Writers, Editors, and*

Reformers: Social and Political Transformations of Maharashtra, 1830-1930, ed, N.K. Wagle, Manohar New Delhi, 1999. Engblom details some of the early poetic experiments in the modern period by poets such as Mahadev Moreshwar Kunte among others.

[20] I follow in the line of argument made by E. Fasana, "Italian Movement and Marathi Nationalists", pg 45, in *Writers, Editors, and Reformers: Social and Political Transformations of Maharashtra, 1830-1930,* ed, N.K. Wagle, Manohar New Delhi, 1999

[21] Personal comment to author at the Cornell Workshop on the Folk and the Classical, May 2011.

[22]See Philip Engblom"Keshavsut and Early Modernist Strategies for Indigenizing the Sonnet in Marathi", Journal of South Asian Literature, Vol 23, #1, 1988, 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. Engblom is sensitive to the different strands of Marathi poetry, to poets who either resisted English influence by sticking resolutely to older Shastric and Sanskritic 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 Keshavsut, i.e. Krishnaji Keshav 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 Bapuji Thombre (1890-1918), known as Balkavi, was the best exponent of the romantic modern poetry while, Bha. Ra. Tambe or Bhaskar Ramachandra Tambe (1874-1941) wrote poetry for an emergent middle class.

[23] I am grateful to Somdev Vasudeva for reading this poem with me and helping me with many of its Sanskrit features. I owe this insight to him

[24] Engblom, pg 145, "Vishnu Moreshwar Mahajani and Nineteenth-Century Antecedents to Keshavsut", in *Writers, Editors, and Reformers: Social and Political Transformations of Maharashtra, 1830-1930,* ed, N.K. Wagle, Manohar New Delhi, 1999

[25] See Prachi Deshpande, *Creative Pasts: Historical Memory and Identity in Western India, 1700-1960,* Columbia University Press, 2006. In particular, see chapter 2, "Representing Maratha Power" pp 40-70.

[26]The poem was submitted by Savarkar for a competition held by the Bombay Hindu Union Club. He wrote it in 1909, and the full Marathi text can be found in *Samagra Savarkar Vangmaya,* Vol 8, pp 42-48. Savarkar Smarak Publications, Bombay: 2000

Paaya paravashata jya, dushkalachya shilahi zho rachila
Avanati-krutant-keli-prasada plague kalas tya khachila (1)

[27] Nandanavanasam mohak srishticha saarbhut ha desh
Ho drishti dhanya pahuni, dharuni asa plague hridayi uddesh (2)
Aryavarti aala, mumbaila thevile mag padala
Zhala ant sukhacha ye ut anantvakatra-vipadala (3)
Jee aikili tyahuni shatapat adhikachi suruchita dhanya
Pahuni bhulala khulala; vadala; mohak na bhu ashi anya (4)

[28] Kela nishchaya aisa, kuravaluni Mumbai bhayan kari
Ho dhig na nij jine te, yastav baghnya pune prayan kari (6)
Godasnanastav kari shrimattrayambak puris gamanala
Ala panchvateela tethuniya ramraya namanala (7)

[29] Bahu kay vado? Kele aikya abdat deshparyatna
Pavanahuni javan, nachi damla ha ki vichitra vidhighatna (8)
Plague kashacha ala? Krutkarmachachi bhog avatarala
Karmayatta phalachya upabhogaveen kon bhav tarla? (9)
Keli bhayan nagare, nagarasam dat sarva vana vasate
Damale namale gamale hatsattvachi mantra tantra sunvasa te (10)

[30] Jata nath streecha tee gai-huni gay manave
Sutka ablanchi tya karnya ghesi na ka yama nave? (31)
Bandhu na, bandhav na, na matapitar jya abhagite (32)
Tya majhi dukhachi prabhuji! Pochti na ka nabha geete?
Mee alpavayi bala, majha saubhagyanidhi aha jalala
Vaidhavyacha durdhar bhayankar giri ha prachand kosalala (33)
Kay karu? Zau kuthe? Ho majhe aptsoyre sare
Tara anath bala, chal baghta svastha baisuni ka re? (34)

Dete ka koni ' ablechya hya madeey hakela?
Bola ho, bola ho, dheeracha shabda ek tari bola (35)

[31] I am indebted to Satya Mohanty for this insight, as also the other participants at the Cornell workship, including Narayan Rao, Leela Prasad, Lawrence McCrea.

[32] See Sheldon Pollock, "The Sanskrit Cosmpolis, AD 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. Houben. Leiden: Brill. Here Sheldon Pollock's work which 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] See Sheldon Pollock, *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia,* pg 23 Berkeley,California: 2003

[34] See V.S. Chiplunkar, *Nibandhamala*, Vol 1, "Marathi bhashechi sampratchi sthiti" pp 1-11,Varda Books, Pune , 1993. For an historical analysis of Chiplunkar's work, see Prachi Deshpande, *Creative Pasts*, pp 100-105

[35] Pollock, *Literary Cultures in History,* Introduction, pg 25. Berkeley: 2003

[36] Many of the ideas in the sections 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, Samiha Rahman, Tamar Newman, Tim Curley, Louis Miller, Gus von Hagen, Ben Honrighausen, for their stimulating discussion, and would like to acknowledge their role in my formulations. See Benedict Anderson, *Under three Flags: Anarchism and the anti-colonial Imagination,* New York: Verso 2005), pg 4

[37] Ibid, 54

[38] Ibid, 13, 23

[39] Ibid, 5

[40] Ibid, 105

[41] Ibid, 41

[42] Ibid, 134, Anderson's translation