

OUTSIDER AS ENEMY: POLITICS OF REWRITING HISTORY IN INDIA

K.N.PANIKKAR

Rewriting of History is a continuous process into which historian brings to bear new methodological or ideological insights or employs a new analytical frame drawn upon hitherto unknown facts. The historians' craft, the French historian, Marc Bloch, whose work on feudal society is considered a classic, has reminded us, is rooted in a method specific to history as a discipline, most of which has evolved through philosophical engagements and empirical investigations during the last several centuries. No methodology which historian invokes in pursuit of the knowledge of the past is really valid unless it respects the method of the discipline. Even when methodologies fundamentally differ, they share certain common grounds, which constitute the field of historian's craft. Notwithstanding the present scepticism about the possible engagement with History, a strict adherence to the method of the discipline is observed in all generally accepted forms of reconstruction of the past. A departure from such norms of the discipline tends to erase the distinction between myth and history, which the forces of the Hindu rightwing, actively supported by the present government, is seeking to achieve.

The distinction is important, despite the undeniable connection between history and myth. Although elements which constitute myth are not verifiable like historical facts, myths do represent reality even if symbolically and metaphorically. Myths are essentially illusory representations of phenomena and as such do not help discover the historicity of events and by the very nature of representation they tend to mask the reality. Yet, there are no myths in which reality is not embedded in some form, be they origin, explanatory or legitimatory myths¹. This integral connection between myth and history facilitates the transmutation of the latter into the former and through that change the existing historical consciousness in society. The rewriting of history the Sangh Parivar has undertaken with the connivance and collaboration of the government is essentially an attempt at communal mythification, which lends ideological support and legitimacy to the politics of cultural nationalism.

History As Communal Ideology

The communal interpretation of history has a fairly long tradition, at least going back to the colonial times. The history of the subjected that the colonial administrators and ideologues wrote, either as a part of their intellectual curiosity or as a political mission, essentially took a religious view of the past. Although James Mill's periodisation of Indian history into Hindu and Muslim periods is generally pointed out as an example of this colonial view, almost every aspect of the social, cultural and political life was incorporated into this religious schema. This view has had an abiding influence on Indian historiography, with a large number of Indian historians of vastly different ideological persuasions rather uncritically internalising this interpretation. Thus the history of India is seen through a series of stereotypes rooted in religious identity. No aspect of society or polity has escaped this religious view, be it social tensions, political battles or cultural differences. Such an interpretation of history has been a part of the textbooks, both of school and college, for a long time, moulding the historical consciousness of society and in turn the social perspectives and behaviour of several generations. This divisive notion of history was one of the several ideological weapons that colonialism invoked to construct its legitimacy.

In the Hindu communal worldview and politics the religious interpretation of history has an entirely different import, even if it shares much of the colonial assumptions. Unlike the colonial history which mainly emphasises social divisions, despite invoking the tyranny of the Yavanas and the Muslims its focus is more on social antagonism and political hostility, which differentiates the Hindu communal from the colonial communal. The antagonism and hostility encoded in the interpretative structure of the former, which identifies the 'outsider' as enemy, turn history into an ideology of communalism. The politics of Ramjanmabhoomi temple is a good example of the mediation of such history in the making of popular historical consciousness. The organising principle of this politics was not only the privileging of faith over reason, but also the identification of an enemy who acted against the religious interests of the Hindus.

Among the variety of factors that define the relationship between communalism and revivalism in India history plays a central role. The revivalist ideas were inherent in the social and religious reform movements of the nineteenth century, circumscribed as they were within the boundaries of caste and religious communities. Yet, revivalism as an influential tendency emerged only during the second half of the nineteenth century. Bankim Chandra Chatterji, Dayananda Saraswathi and Swami Vivekananda are generally considered the early protagonists of this tendency. Inward looking in their intellectual orientation and engaged in revitalising Hinduism and Hindu community, they tried to privilege many ideas and institutions from the ancient past. However, their perspective was communitarian rather than communal. Antagonism against other religions and communities was not a part of their perspective. Even when they were critical of other religions as in the case of Dayanand, their attempt was to explore religious truth through a comparative understanding of different religions. Dayanand after all was as trenchant a critique of the practices of Sanatani Hinduism as of other religions. So were Bankim and Vivekananda. These early articulations of revivalist tendencies were not rooted in relation to the 'other' in terms of a community within society². It was more in the nature of internal revitalisation and consolidation in the context of colonial domination. Communalism, on the other hand, though subsumed several elements of revivalism, is firmly anchored on a hatred of the 'outsider' who, it is held, is mainly responsible for the distortions and eventual loss of the indigenous civilisational achievements. Notwithstanding this distinction revivalism transformed itself into communalism which, among other things, was made possible by the mediation of communal history, which cast the 'outsider' in the role of the enemy. The inward looking communitarian perspective, which mainly characterised revivalism, merged with a suspicion and hostility of the other. This process is facilitated by a religious interpretation of history which by locating the 'outsider' as the cause of the decline in the fortunes of the community forms the ideology of communalism.

The concept of the 'outsider', variously described as the Mleccha, Yavana and Turuska, has been part of the social consciousness for a long time. They were communities from

both within and outside India and their defining elements were primarily social and cultural. The language, food habits, dress and a variety of other practices underlined the otherness. The Aryans considered the indigenous population as Mleccha and at a later stage those who came from outside like the Huns and the Muslims were incorporated into this category. Although the otherness was often a source of conflict, both inter and intra-community, the relationship with the other was not characterised by continuous hostility and conflict³. That the relationship with the outsider in the past was based on irreconcilable political interests is a construction of communalism influenced more by political interests rather than by social reality.

Outsider As Enemy

The demographic composition of India which reflects the coming together of a variety of groups -racial, linguistic and ethnic- during the course of the last two millennia raises the question who the 'outsider' is in Indian society. According to the Anthropological Survey of India there are 4635 identifiable communities, diverse in biological traits, dress, language, forms of worship, occupation, food habits and kinship patterns. Most of these communities have a mixed ancestry and it is now almost impossible to identify their roots. They could be traced to Proto- Austroloid, Palio- Mediterranean, Caucasian, Negroid and Mongoloid. The racial component is also quite varied, drawing from almost every stock in the world. This plurality is also reflected in the number of languages in use. Apart from thousands of dialects there are as many as 325 languages and 25 scripts derived from various linguistic families-- Indo- Aryan, Tibeto-Burman, Dravidian, Austro-Asiatic, Andamese, Semitic, Indo-Iranian, Sino- Tibetan, Indo- European etc. The Indian society as a consequence is a social and cultural amalgam with many of its constitutive element loosing their specific identity, at any rate none existing in its initial pure form⁴.

The Hindu communal view of history strives to negate this historical process by making a distinction between the original inhabitants of the land and those who settled later. According to this view all those who migrated to India and their descendants are

foreigners and therefore not part of the nation. Thus the Muslims, Christians and Parsis, who are not indigenous to India and hence outsiders should either 'indianise' themselves or live like 'second class citizens without any rights or privileges⁵.' This naturally raises the question who the original inhabitants were. Were the Aryans to whom the upper caste Hindus trace their lineage indigenous to India? The opinion of scholars of ancient history, based on archaeological and linguistic evidence, has been that Aryans had migrated to India, in all probability in small groups, over a period of time⁶. If this view is correct the assumption that the non-Hindu is the only 'outsider' becomes untenable and the historical rationale for the Hindu nation based on Vedic lineage also becomes suspect. The present attempt to invent the indigenous origins of Aryans, which is supported more by speculation rather than tangible evidence, is rooted in an anxiety to overcome this paradox.⁷

The distinction between the indigenous and the 'outsider' is also sought on the basis of the pure and the impure; the claim to purity traced to the idyllic past uncontaminated by the intrusion of the 'outsider', which is an essential ideology of religious fundamentalism. One among the various indicators of this distinction is food habit: those who ate flesh and those who did not. It is now claimed by the ideologues of the Sangh Parivar that the Aryans did not partake of beef, although copious evidence exists, both literary and archaeological, to the contrary. After a survey of the evidence from various excavations since 1921, the doyen of Indian archaeologists, H.D. Sankalia, has opined that 'the attitude towards cow slaughter shows that until the beginning of the Christian era the cow/ ox were regularly slaughtered for food and for the sacrifice etc., in spite of the preaching of Ahimsa by Mahavira and the Buddha. Beef eating, however, did decrease owing to these preachings, but never died out completely'⁸. The literary evidence from the Vedic and later periods are also plenty. Panini, for instance, calls a guest a *Goghna*, which means one for whom a cow is killed⁹. Even Vivekananda refers to instances of Rama and Krishna drinking wine and eating meat and Sita offering meat, rice and wine to the river goddess Ganga in Ramayana and Mahabharata. In fact, he considered the meat eating habits of the Aryans a virtue and attributed the decline of the Hindus in modern

times to the departure from it!¹⁰ Yet, the slaughter of cow and eating beef are now invoked as signs of otherness in a bid to distinguish the indigenous from the ‘outsider’.

Apart from defiling the sacredness and purity of indigenous life, the communal history also attributes to the ‘outsider’ a politically disruptive role. The political history of India, in the account given by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, the progenitor of the concept of Hindutva, is a story of foreign invasions and Hindu resistance. According to him there were six major invasions of India, which were successfully met by the Hindus. He characterises them as six ‘glorious epochs’ in which the valour and bravery of the Hindus overcame the external threat. These ‘glorious epochs’ are the periods of Chandragupta and Pushyamitra when the Greek invasions were repelled, followed by those of Vikramaditya and Yashodharma who defeated the Shakas and the Huns respectively. In imagining the Hindu nation as a historically constituted political entity this religious view of the conflict with the ‘outsider’ is a major factor.¹¹

The consolidation and mobilisation of the Hindus are the main objectives of the communal construction of history of which Savarkar set a worthy example. Towards this political end a systematic attempt, embracing both the academic and popular histories, has been on the anvil for quite some time, particularly during the last two decades. The main thrust of this effort has been to further the communal consciousness of history. Whenever the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) or its earlier incarnation, the Jana Sangh, was able to gain access to power they have not spared any effort to promote Hinduised history at the expense of secular history. In 1977 at the instance of the Rashtriya Swyam Sevak Sangh (RSS) the government of the Janata party, of which the Jana Sangh was a partner, tried to withdraw the history books published by the National Council for Educational Research and Training (NCERT) on the ground that they were not sufficiently Hindu in their orientation. In more recent times the BJP governments in Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Delhi have revised their textbooks to introduce a communal view of the past, highlighting the achievements and contribution of the Hindus and undermining or misrepresenting the role of others. The present government at the Centre led by the BJP has tried to lend support to this effort by saffronising research institutions like the

Indian Council for Historical Research, Indian Council for Social Science Research, Centre for Advanced Studies and so on. Given the tradition of secular historical writing, these state interventions to further the influence of communal history have elicited strong resistance from the fraternity of professional historians, as they have realised the danger the communal mythification poses to the discipline of history.

Simultaneously several initiatives have been taken to transform the popular historical consciousness in favour of the communal. Among them the setting up of *Bharatiya Itihas Sankalan Samiti*, with four hundred branches all over the country, is particularly significant. Its brief is to prepare the history of all districts keeping as the ideal the history written by P.N. Oak, whose main contribution is the identification of every medieval monument as a Hindu structure. Incidentally, Mr. Oak recently approached the Supreme Court of India to declare the Taj Mahal as a Hindu building. The Supreme Court has indeed dismissed the plea stating that Mr. Oak seems to have ‘a bee in his bonnet’, but that has not deterred the Archaeological Survey of India, under the influence of the Sangh Parivar, to look for a Hindu temple under every medieval monument! The latest excavation is at Fatehpur Sikri, a monument constructed by the Mughal Emperor Akbar, from the vicinity of which Jain idols have been unearthed and promptly identified as disfigured by Akbar. The present chairman of the ICHR, Mr.B.R.Grover, who has distinguished himself by the statement that the Babri Masjid had collapsed and not destroyed, saw even the hand of Aurangzeb in this disfigurement! The archaeologists of the Sangh Parivar who are eager to excavate the site of every medieval monument are totally indifferent to the danger the excavations might spell to these heritage sites.

The Sangh Parivar, with the support of the government if possible and without it if necessary, has been engaged in the construction and dissemination of mythified histories which would help further its religious politics. Among the innumerable examples of such mythification the ‘histories’ of Ayodhya circulated during the Ramjanmabhoomi campaign through political and religious networks, using audio, video and print materials are the most instructive. In fact, mythified histories of Ayodhya considerably helped to propel the campaign. The mythification mainly served two objectives. Firstly, to prove

the deliberate and hostile acts of the ‘outsider’ and secondly, to invoke the tradition of resistance and struggle the Hindus had waged since the sixteenth century in defence of their faith. These histories foregrounded many a myth as established ‘facts’ of history which later found their way into the textbooks in schools in BJP ruled states and those run by the Rashtrya Swayam Sewak Sangh (RSS)

In these ‘histories’ the construction of the Babri Masjid in 1528 by Mir Baqui, a noble of Mughal Emperor Babur, was an act of hostility to the Hindus, as it was raised not only at the place of Ram’s birth, but was done so by demolishing a temple commemorating it. A pamphlet entitled, *Shri Ram Janmabhoomi Ka Rakt Ranjit Itihas* (The Blood Stained History of Shri Ram Janmabhoomi), published by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) claimed that at the time of the demolition of the temple 1,74,000 Hindus sacrificed their lives fighting against the Muslims. The pamphlet then goes on to record the seventy-seven battles fought thereafter to reclaim the temple in which 3,50,000 Hindus had laid down their lives. The facticity of the event is thus sought to be established by inventing the exact number of people who were involved in these fights.¹² Such a factual basis, though imaginary, facilitates the social acceptance of myth as history.

This is not to argue that myth, though lack historicity, are ‘hollow tales’ without any element of historical truth¹³. The origin of the myth of seventy-seven battles, for instance, can be traced to an actual historical incident, even if it was not linked with the Ramjanmabhoomi temple: a fight between the Muslims and the Hindus in 1855 over a temple located near the Babri Masjid and dedicated to Hanuman¹⁴. Interestingly though this battle was waged by a Muslim faqir who claimed the existence of a mosque below this temple. During the course of the inquiry into this incident conducted by an official of the Nawab of Awad and the British Resident the local inhabitants did not refer either to the existence of the Ramjanmabhoomi temple or conflicts in the past between the Hindus and the Muslims over possession of the mosque¹⁵. The Myths about the Mandir was therefore a later construction, in all probability an outcome of property disputes and political interests.

Larger Context

The rewriting of History in which the Sangh Parivar is currently engaged is not internal to the movements within the discipline of History. It is integral to a larger and long-term project aimed at reordering the secular character that informed the educational and cultural policies of independent India. Towards this end the Sangh Parivar has already undertaken several initiatives. Prominent among them are the changes in the content of education, the organisation of a parallel school system and the control over cultural institutions.

In the field of education the University Grants Commission (UGC) and the National Council for Educational Research and Training (NCERT) appears to be pursuing a communal agenda. The UGC is reportedly working on a uniform syllabus for the country and as a part of it has suggested two post-graduate level courses: one on Vedic studies and another on astrology. The UGC also insists that all universities and institutions under them be subjected to the recognition of the National Accreditation Council. It is feared that such a standardisation will undermine the autonomy of universities and thus facilitate the introduction of a national curriculum.

The NCERT is also engaged in preparing a national curriculum framework for school education. The discussion document clearly underlines a change from secular to religious education. Most of the suggestions in this report have a revivalist and chauvinistic ring about them. It advocates an indigenous curriculum which would 'celebrate the ideas of native thinkers' among whom non-Hindus are conspicuous by absence. One of the aims of the new curriculum is 'to inculcate and maintain a sense of pride in being an Indian through a conscious understanding of the growth of Indian civilisation and also contributions of India to the world civilisations in its thoughts, actions and deeds.' The external influences on the shaping of the Indian civilisation are completely overlooked. The concept of secularism itself is sought to be given a religious meaning by suggesting that *sarvadharmā samābhava* would facilitate 'the view that religion in its basic form

(devoid of dogma, myth and ritual) would draw younger generations to basic moral and spiritual values'¹⁶.

Both the UGC and the NCERT appear to draw inspiration from the scheme prepared by a RSS education outfit, Vidhya Bharati, and presented by the Human Resource Development Minister, Murali Manohar Joshi, to the conference of state ministers of education in 1998. In the name of 'Indianising, nationalising and spiritualising' education the attempt then was to replace secular education with an indigenous system rooted in Hindu knowledge. To achieve that end Sanskrit was proposed as a compulsory subject in schools and the induction of the valuable heritage of the Vedas and Upanishads in the curriculum from the primary to the higher level, including the vocational stream. Besides these, Indian culture, conceived in Hindu religious terms, was to form an integral part of all courses¹⁷. Although this scheme had to be abandoned due to secular opposition it gave a foretaste of the future, if and when the Sangh Parivar gained sufficient political clout.

The attempt to Hinduise the system of education had, however, begun much before the BJP gained access to government power. As early as 1942 the RSS had initiated steps to organise its own educational network. Since then the number of schools run by the Parivar has steadily increased. It is estimated that there are about 70,000 schools under its control now. And the VHP has recently announced its intention to further expand its educational activities, particularly in tribal areas. With the financial and administrative assistance proffered by the present government a parallel system of Hindu education is being brought into existence, under the guidance of an all India organisation called the Vidya Bharati Shiksha Sanstan, set up in 1978. It was to help this system that the Minister for Human Resource Development recently mooted the idea of extending the educational privileges so far enjoyed by the minorities under the articles 29 and 30 of the Constitution to all others¹⁸. The rather well organised attack on Christians, who own a fairly large number of educational institutions, are also rooted, at least partially, in this interest, as it is not possible to capture the educational sector without eliminating the Christians.

The curriculum of these schools is unambiguously Hindu and militantly communal, be it related to history, politics or literature. The textbooks, particularly of history, prescribed in these schools are so oriented to lend legitimacy to communal politics by stigmatising the ‘outsider’ and valorising the Hindu. In the process history is turned into myth, which tends to inculcate in the young minds, a false sense of religious pride and hostility to the members of other denominations. Not only the entire cultural tradition is appropriated as Hindu, the past is represented as a saga of Hindu valour and bravery. In fact, the defeat of almost every Hindu ruler at the hands of an ‘outsider’ is reinterpreted as a victory. A good example of such mythification is an account of the war between Muhammad Ghori and Prithviraj Chauhan. In the second battle of Tarain, which Prithviraj lost, he was captured and executed by Ghori. This historical event is described in one of the textbooks as follows: ‘Muhammad Ghori killed lakhs of people and converted Vishwnath temple and Bhagawan Krishna’s birthplace into mosques. He took Prithviraj to Gazni, but Prithviraj killed him there with one arrow and Muhammad Ghori’s corpse lay on the feet of Prithviraj as if narrating the tale of his sins.’¹⁹

The main objective of the rewriting of history is to impart certain historical legitimacy to communal politics. The way the Indian national movement is represented in the textbooks used in RSS administered schools and the desperate attempt of the Indian Council for Historical Research to suppress the volumes of *Toward Freedom* are among the many ongoing efforts in this direction. It is common knowledge that the RSS hardly had any role in the national movement, except as active collaborators of colonialism. Yet, the Sangh Parivar is keen on appropriating its legacy, as it would give a much needed national legitimacy. The History of the national movement is therefore being rewritten to establish that the RSS had indeed played a positive role in the anti-colonial struggle. This requires the projection of its leaders as freedom fighters on the one hand and the suppression of their actual role, on the other. In such rewritten history incorporated in all textbooks of Vidhya Bharati the founder of the RSS, Keshav Baliram Hedgewar, figure as a great leader of the anti-colonial struggle, much ahead of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru.²⁰ In a textbook prescribed by the Uttarpradesh government, out of about twenty pages devoted to the Freedom movement three pages take up the

contribution of Hedgewar, who is credited with the leadership of the agitation against the partition of Bengal.²¹

The successful projection of such a positive image of the RSS and its leaders would depend upon the suppression or elimination of counter factual evidence. That appears to be the brief of the ICHR, as evident from the attempt to withdraw the volumes of *Towards Freedom*. The published volumes of *Towards Freedom* do not credit the RSS with any role in the anti-colonial struggle. Instead there is evidence in them, in the form of letters and speeches of its leaders, about its active collaboration with the British colonial rule. The ICHR, now firmly under the control of the RSS, is understandably eager to prevent the publication of further volumes and withdraw the existing ones, as they, being documentary histories, would expose the claims of the RSS. The knowledge about the role of the RSS, to which the public will have access through these volumes, is likely to undermine the nationalist credentials of the Sangh Parivar. It is this fear of history, which has prompted the ICHR to make the rather desperate move to withdraw the volumes from the Press. In the process all institutional procedures have been violated and the academic freedom of the authors have been infringed.

What the ICHR has tried to do rather clumsily and secretly- the authors who were commissioned to edit the volumes were not even informed, let alone consulted- is not an isolated incident, but part of an anti-secular, anti-democratic rightwing agenda which the present government with the active participation of various arms of the Sangh Parivar has been pursuing. Towards this end secular opinion has been systematically eliminated from all research institutions and cultural organisations funded by the government and replaced by the activists or loyalists of the RSS. There is also well planned and systematic vilification of secular intelligentsia, as evident from the false and malicious accusations recently levelled against historians by Arun Shourie, an RSS ideologue and a minister in the present government.

The freedom of expression is particularly under surveillance in the cultural field. No effort is spared to suppress the long cherished and historically evolved

plural and secular traditions. The artists and cultural activists who follow such traditions have been under severe strain, often faced with threats and even physical attacks. Some time back a panel on Ramayana based on Jataka tales in an exhibition on Ayodhya mounted by a cultural organisation, SAHMAT, was destroyed by the members of the Sangh Parivar. M.F.Hussain's paintings and Deepa Mehta's films have also aroused the ire of the Sangh Parivar for alleged disrespect to Indian tradition. On the whole there is a tendency to control the intellectual and cultural life in conformity with a fundamentalist view. In the way such a view is implemented, irrationally and aggressively, there are unmistakable signs of fascist tendencies.

The instrumentalist role of the rewriting of history currently being promoted by the government and the Sangh Parivar for defining and demarcating the nation as Hindu imparts to it an essentially political character. The stigmatisation of the 'outsider' as enemy validated by historical experience lends the rationale for the communal programme of marginalising, if not externalising, the members of other denominations. Derivatively it also legitimises the claim of the 'indigenous' to the nation. The otherness of 'outsider' therefore serves as a signifier for internal consolidation and homogenisation. To the early ideologues of communalism like V.D. Savarkar and M.S.Golwalkar the religious interpretation of history was the necessary ideological groundwork for recovering the Hindu nation. The present engagement of the communal forces with history is with no other intent which, if succeeds, would unsettle the secular character of the nation. Therefore the current debate about history in India is as much about the integrity of the discipline as about the future well being of the country.

¹ . Maurice Godellier, *Perspectives in Marxist Anthropology*, Cambridge, 1977, pp.207-09

² . Tapan Roy Choudhry, *Perceptions, Emotions, Sensibilities*, New Delhi, 1999 and John Zavos, *The Emergence of Hindu Nationalism in India*, New Delhi, 2000.

³ Romila Thapar, 'The Image of the Barbarian in Early India' in *Ancient Indian Social History*, New Delhi, 1998, pp.152-192; Aloka Parasher, *Mlecchas in Early India*, New Delhi, 1991 and Brajadulal Chattopadhyaya, *Representing the Other? Sanskrit Sources and the Muslims*, New Delhi, 1998.

⁴ K.S.Singh, *People of India: An Introduction*, New Delhi, 1995.

⁵ M.S.Golwalkar, *We or our Nationhood Defined*, Nagpur, 1947.

⁶ Romila Thapar, The Rgveda: encapsulating Social Change in K.N.Panikkar et.al. (ed) *The Making of History*, New Delhi, 2000, pp.11-40; R.S. Sharma, *Advent of the Aryans in India*, New Delhi, 1999 Shireen Ratnagar, *End of the Great Harappan Tradition*, New Delhi, 2000.

⁷ An advocate of this theory is a computer scientist based in North America, N.S. Rajaram, who has authored two books, *Aryan Invasion of India* (1993) and *The Politics of History* (1995). The arguments and

interpretations in these two books are found to be fictional and historically unfounded. See Shereen Ratnagar, 'Revisionist at work: A chauvinistic Inversion of the Aryan Invasion Theory', *Frontline*, February 9, 1996. More grievously Rajaram has been found faking evidence by Michael Witzel, Wales Professor of Sanskrit at Harvard University. For his findings and criticism see website, [http:// ww. Safarmer.com/ horseal/ update.html](http://ww.Safarmer.com/horseal/update.html)

⁸ H.D. Sankalia, 'In History', *Seminar*, No. 93, May 1967, pp.12-16. Also see Alan Heston, 'An Approach to the Sacred Cow of India' *Current Anthropology*, Vol.12, No.2, April 1971 and Marvin Harris, 'The Cultural Ecology of India's Sacred cattle', *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol.7, No. 1, Feb.1966

⁹ P.V.Kane, *History of the Dharma Shastras*, Pune, 1975, Vol.ii, pp.772-76.

¹⁰ *Complete Works of Vivekananda*, Vol.V, Calcutta, 1966, pp.477-498.

¹¹ Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, *Six Glorious Epochs of Indian History*, Bombay, 1966.

¹² K.N. Panikkar (ed.), *The Concerned Indian's Guide to Communalism*, 'Introduction', New Delhi, 1999, p.xiii.

¹³ Paul Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in the Myth?*, Chicago, 1983.

¹⁴ K.N. Panikkar, 'An Overview' in S. Gopal (ed.) *Anatomy of a Confrontation: Babri Masjid-Ramjanmabhumi Issue*, New Delhi, 1991.

¹⁵ The details of this incident and the report of the enquiry are available in *Foreign Political Consultation*, No.34, 28 Dec. 1855, National Archives of India, New Delhi

¹⁶ *National Curriculum Framework for School Education- A Discussion Document*, NCERT, New Delhi, 2000, p.24.

¹⁷ 'Conference of State Education Ministers and Education Secretaries, October 22-24, Agenda Papers, Annexure.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ National Steering Committee on Textbook Evaluation: Recommendations and Report, NCERT, p.6, New Delhi, 1998.

²⁰ See *Sanskar Saurab* Series published by the Bharatiya Shiksha Samiti, Rajasthan.

²¹ National Steering Committee on Textbook Evaluation: Recommendations and Report, NCERT, p.14