

February 15, 2022

To: The President of the Royal Historical Society

Re: Further Examples of Potential Plagiarism in the work of Dr. Vikram Sampath

Dear Dr. Griffin,

We write with regard to our previous correspondence dated February 11, 2022. In that letter, we sought to alert you to our findings regarding evidence of plagiarism in Dr. Sampath's work. Since our initial correspondence, the issue has been covered in Indian news.¹ As we mentioned in that letter, the examples we enclosed were only a few of the ones we discovered. While that letter largely focused on his earlier work, these examples pertain to his two-volume biography of V.D. Savarkar. We have also contacted the affected scholars with our findings.

Our findings are enclosed as an appendix to this letter.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ananya Chakravarti
Associate Professor of History, Georgetown University

Dr. Audrey Truschke
Associate Professor of History, Rutgers University

Dr. Rohit Chopra
Associate Professor of Communication and Media Studies, Santa Clara University

¹ "Savarkar Biographer Vikram Sampath Accused of Plagiarism, Historians Say Others' Work Not Cited Fairly," *The Wire*, February 14, 2022. Available online: <https://thewire.in/history/vikram-sampath-savarkar-accused-plagiarism> (accessed February 15, 2022)

Appendix

<p>Catanach (1984): “The general tendency in Poona was to assert, again, that the deeds were the work of isolated cranks. But <i>Kal</i>, a newspaper edited by the impetuous S.M. Paranjpe, published an editorial which appeared to argue that the assassins in both 1897 and 1899 had acted according to what they believed to be the law of God – a higher law than the law of man. 102” p. 9</p>	<p>Sampath (2019): “The general tendency in Poona and the rest of Bombay Presidency was to assert that these revolutionary deeds were the work of isolated cranks. ... But it was the <i>Kal</i>, a newspaper edited by the indefatigable Shivram Mahadev Paranjpe (1864–1929), that published an editorial which appeared to argue that the Chapekars had acted according to what they believed to be the law of God—a law higher than that of man. 31” p. 116</p>
<p>Kamra (2016): “The Bombay government claimed that the writings in question—an unsigned report on the June 1897 Shivaji festival, at which Tilak and others spoke, and a poem written under a pseudonym, which was far from unique in subject, opinion or rhetorical strategies—were an incitement to ‘disaffection of the Government’ .14” p. 549</p>	<p>Sampath (2019): “The Bombay government claimed that an unsigned report on the Shivaji festival at which Tilak and others spoke, and a poem written under a pseudonym, which was far from unique in subject, opinion or rhetorical strategies were an incitement to ‘disaffection of the Government’ .33” pp. 117–18</p>
<p>Kamra (2016): “The poem, entitled ‘Shivaji’s Utterances’ (and signed ‘mark of the Bhawani Sword’),¹⁸ appeared in the editorial columns of <i>Kesari</i>, but was ‘treated as an editorial’ .¹⁹ In it, the eponymous figure laments the condition of the country in language that traffics in opacity, at least in its English translation.²⁰” p. 550</p>	<p>Sampath (2019): “The poem ‘Shivaji’s Utterances’ (and signed ‘mark of the Bhawani Sword’) appeared in the editorial columns of the <i>Kesari</i>. In it, the eponymous figure laments the plight of India in a language that traffics in opacity. ” p. 118</p> <p>*Additional parts of the next several pages are flagged by plagiarism detection software as lifted from Dr. Kamra.</p>

<p>Dr. Majumdar (1963): “The Moderates, though not wholly satisfied, stood for ungrudging and whole-hearted co-operation for working it as successfully as possible within the limited sphere. A strong section was inclined to reject it altogether. But Tilak, who dominated the Nationalist Party and the Congress, stuck to the middle way all along advocated by him.” p. 50</p>	<p>Dr. Sampath (2019): “The moderates, though not fully satisfied, advocated ungrudging cooperation within the contours of the new reforms to help them succeed. A strong section was inclined to reject it altogether. Tilak, who by then dominated the Congress after the death of Gokhale in 1915, stuck to a middle path of ‘Responsive Cooperation’ that would depend on how the government acted on each of its promises.” pp. 738–39</p>
---	---

<p>Dr. Majumdar (1963): “The Government offered to release Gandhi during the fast—a concession which the latter refused—but declined to set him free. There was a great commotion all over India and prominent Indian leaders appealed to the Viceroy and Prime Minister of Britain; three members of the Governor-General’s Executive Council resigned in protest.” pp. 692–93</p>	<p>Savarkar (2021): “The government offered to release Gandhi during the fast, a concession, which the latter refused. There was a lot of political uproar with prominent Indian leaders pressing the government to release Gandhi and other Congress leaders, given that they had spent more than six months in imprisonment after the Quit India movement.” p. 766</p>
---	--

<p>(MacLean 2014) “Today, Vohra, better known as ‘Durga Bhabhi’, is renowned for her role in assisting Bhagat Singh’s escape from Lahore, following the Saunders murder in December 1928, by posing as his wife. It is not widely known that she took up arms herself, opening fire on a police officer and his wife in Bombay in October 1930, an attack subsequently known to British officialdom as the Lamington Road Outrage (Maclean, 2013a). This incident was entered into the annals of anti-imperialism in India as ‘the first instance in which a woman figured prominently in a terrorist outrage’ (Note on</p>	<p>(Sampath 2021): “She had played an important role in assisting Bhagat Singh’s escape from Lahore following Saunders’s murder in December 1928, by posing as his wife.”</p> <p>....</p> <p>“This incident was entered into the annals of anti-imperialism in India as ‘the first instance in which a woman figured prominently in a terrorist outrage’ .57” pp. 326 and 328–29</p>
---	--

Terrorism’, 1932, IOR, L/PJ/12/404: 106).” pp. 29–30	
--	--

Malgonkar (2008): “Gandhi walked briskly across the lawn and climbed the five shallow semi-circular steps that led to the raised portion of the lawn where the prayer-meeting audience awaited him.” chap. 11	Sampath (2021): “Walking briskly across the lawn, Gandhi climbed the five shallow semicircular steps that led to the raised portion of the lawn where the audience waited for him anxiously and greeted him enthusiastically on catching sight of his visage.” p. 891 *Additional parts of this chapter were flagged by plagiarism detection software as lifted from Mr. Malgonkar
---	---

Sources

Catanach, I. J. “Poona politicians and the plague” *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 7.2 (1984): 1–18.

Kamra, Sukeshi. “Law and Radical Rhetoric in British India: The 1897 Trial of Bal Gangadhar Tilak.” *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 39.3 (2016): 546–559.

Maclean, Kama. “Imagining the Indian nationalist movement: Revolutionary metaphors in imagery of the freedom struggle.” *Journal of Material Culture* Vol. 19.1 (2014): 7–34.

Majumdar, R. C. *History of the Freedom Movement in India*. Volume 3. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1963.

Malgonkar, Manohar. *The Men Who Killed Gandhi*. New Delhi: Roli Books, 2008, digital edition published in 2015.

Sampath, Vikram. *Savarkar: Echoes from a Forgotten Past, 1883–1924*. Gurgaon: Penguin, 2019.

Sampath, Vikram. *Savarkar: A contested legacy, 1924–1966*. Delhi: Penguin, 2021.