

## The Banality of Indology: Franco, Pollock, and the Friedrich Weller Prize

Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee

In the early and important *Declaration of Allegiance ... to Adolph Hitler* [...], the names of a good number of the most distinguished Indologists of the period are prominent (including Schubring, Nobel, Hertel,

F. Weller). [...] No German Indologist made any public statement on the state appropriation of Indological learning—perhaps none could have made such a statement, since there was little discernable appreciation of the politics of interpretation.

—Sheldon Pollock “Deep Orientalism?” (1993)

ABSTRACT: In 2019, Sheldon Pollock accepted the Friedrich Weller Prize, named after a former professor of Indology at Leipzig University. The previous award went to Wendy Doniger, Professor Emerita at the University of Chicago. The laudatio for Pollock was delivered by Eli Franco,<sup>1</sup> current holder of the chair of Indology at Leipzig University and stellvertretender Vorsitzender of the prize commission responsible for selecting awardees.<sup>2</sup> Neither recipient appears to have familiarized himself or herself with the history of the chair: Johannes Hertel’s anti-Semitism and Weller’s Nazi antecedents. Pollock, who found Weller’s signing of the *Bekanntnis der Professoren [...] zu Adolf Hitler und dem nationalsozialistischen Staat* discomfiting in “Deep Orientalism?” evidently did not find it an obstacle to accepting the award, even though he made his career primarily as spokesperson for a new, “critical” philology. This paper examines the causes and reasons for this oversight, including the disappearance of several key documents pertaining to Weller’s Nazism, Franco’s plagiarism and repetition of disciplinary hagiography, and the trade in honors.

This paper constitutes the final portion of our investigation into the Leipzig chair of Indology—the Franco Files.<sup>3</sup> It is simultaneously the first in a series of discipline-reflexive studies we have planned. These studies are about ideas and actions, and their consequences—

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.saw-leipzig.de/de/aktuelles/rueckblick-auf-die-oeffentliche-fruehjahrssitzung-2019>. The laudatio for Doniger was delivered by Matthias Schwarz, Prorector of Leipzig University: see [https://www.saw-leipzig.de/de/presse/bildmaterial/herbstsitzung-2015/saw\\_herbstsitzung\\_25.jpg/view](https://www.saw-leipzig.de/de/presse/bildmaterial/herbstsitzung-2015/saw_herbstsitzung_25.jpg/view) (all links accessed January 20, 2020).

<sup>2</sup> The prize commission’s composition may be found at <https://www.saw-leipzig.de/de/ueber-die-akademie/Friedrich-Weller-Preis> (January 20, 2020). Franco is additionally director of the Institut für Indologie und Zentralasienwissenschaften at Leipzig University and the current holder of the chair formerly occupied by Weller. He was also the sole Indologist on the commission.

<sup>3</sup> Parts I–V appeared as Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, “Theses on Indology,” <https://www.academia.edu/30584186> (accessed February 12, 2019); Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, “Jews and Hindus in Indology,” <https://www.academia.edu/30937643> (accessed February 12, 2019); Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, “Adaptive Reuse: Eli Franco, Plagiarism, and the Chair of Indology at Leipzig University,” <https://www.academia.edu/38844141> (accessed May 1, 2019); Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, “Cry Hindutva: How Rhetoric Trumps Intellect in South Asian Studies,” <https://www.academia.edu/40082617> (accessed October 18, 2019); and Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, “Author’s Response to Book Review of *The Nay Science. A History of German Indology*,” *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 42, no. 4 (2019): 813–21.

not about persons.<sup>4</sup> In this paper, we turn from an epistemological critique of the discipline<sup>5</sup> and its methods<sup>6</sup> to an institutional inquiry: what are the non-epistemological strategies by which the institution maintains its power? By raising this question, we necessarily turn to the domain of ethics. We ask quite precisely: are the history, historiography, and the practices of the occupants of the Leipzig chair *ethical*? Beyond a doubt, the current occupant of the chair, Eli Franco, plagiarized.<sup>7</sup> In itself, this is a serious breach of ethics. But since Arendt, we have a more nuanced approach to the problem of evil: banality, the unthinking bureaucratization and failure to consider all points of view, is just as problematic. The institutional inquiry we undertake here

---

<sup>4</sup> Many Indologists appear not to understand the meaning of *ad hominem*. None of our work is *ad hominem*, even if we cite the statements or actions of individuals as examples to buttress our case. Thus, the argument here is not that Pollock's 1993 article is invalidated because he accepted the Friedrich Weller Prize (this would be an *ad hominem* circumstantial), but that Pollock himself presents an example of how what Pollock called "institutional orientalism" forces even scholars who are *aware of the problems with Indology* to collaborate because no individual can overcome its institutional structures. The argument of "Deep Orientalism?" in contrast, must be evaluated on its own merits. The only way, then, that orientalism can be critiqued is from a locus *outside the institution*. Such has been our chosen position. By contrast, once Pollock joined the institution, seeking respectability and recognition, he could no longer continue his critique. This paper is therefore not against any individual person (Franco, Pollock, or Weller) but the *institution itself*, which encourages and organizes certain behaviors. For the reference, see Sheldon Pollock, "Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power beyond the Raj," in *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia*, ed. Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993), 76–133.

<sup>5</sup> Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, *The Nay Science: A History of German Indology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), especially chapters 3–5.

<sup>6</sup> Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, "Paradigm Lost: The Application of the Historical-Critical Method to the *Bhagavadgītā*," *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 20, no. 2 (2016): 199–301; Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, *Philology and Criticism: A Guide to Mahābhārata Textual Criticism* (London: Anthem, 2018); <https://www.academia.edu/36999444> (accessed May 1, 2019).

<sup>7</sup> See Adluri and Bagchee, "Adaptive Reuse." For Franco's rejoinder, see Franco, "A Short Response to Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, 'Adaptive Reuse. Eli Franco, Plagiarism, and the Chair of Indology at Leipzig University'," <https://www.academia.edu/39556249> (accessed October 18, 2019). Among temerarious defenses he includes that those he plagiarized from were "glad" and "pleased" (plagiarism is not a matter of friendship), "compilatory work" (as much research is, yet it avoids being plagiarism), not "intended" "to be a piece of original work" (pretty much the definition of plagiarism), changes for "stylistic and pragmatic reasons" (as every plagiarist claims), "[reuse of] common-place judgments found in my sources" (doesn't justify the failure to credit sources), lack of "motive" (does plagiarism require a special motive beyond the desire to plagiarize?), "I could have easily presented the substance of Mylius' and von Rospatt's articles completely in my own words" (as close to an admission of plagiarism as we are likely to get), "I dared to write a scathing review" (done after the plagiarism so irrelevant), "I am Israeli and Jewish" (makes the plagiarism even harder to justify), and "a habit of Adluri, a failed Ph.D. student in Indology" (an *ad hominem* of both the personal and circumstantial varieties). As for the "verbatim correspondences" being "mostly accidental, innocuous or inevitable" this is for the reader to decide. The software standardly highlights runs of four or more identical words, but when commonplace information such as titles or names is followed by a continuation of Mylius's thought both the source and the plagiarism are clear. By cherry-picking instances when the software generates false positives (clear enough in context) Franco egregiously tries to distract attention from the fact that, in many paragraphs, the plagiarism exceeds *ninety percent*.

is to clarify, with documented evidence, whether the occupants of the Leipzig chair are guilty of this specific form of evil, which Arendt calls “banality.”<sup>8</sup>

Using archival research and collating it with the publications written under the authority of the Leipzig chair of Indology, a troubling picture emerges. The concrete example first: in a work claiming to provide a fact-based, authoritative history of Leipzig University,<sup>9</sup> Franco permitted himself to be coopted into whitewashing the problematic history of the Leipzig chair of Indology, not least its enmeshment in anti-Semitism and Aryan ideology. The unique prestige and authority accorded the professoriate, the financial cost of its maintenance to the state, and the trust accorded to it by the people obligate every professor to be a model for scholarship and ethics. As the Franco Files demonstrate, at least some professors have subjugated their commitment to critical scholarship and pedagogy for purely personal advancement. The *possibility of even one such professor is sufficient to demonstrate the need for radically rethinking the way universities function as institutions; and for public debate over how such a lapse could be prevented.* But as the Franco Files also demonstrate, the problem is far more widespread. The professoriate now functions as a potlatch system,<sup>10</sup> based on networking, self-

---

<sup>8</sup> Arendt’s original report of the Eichmann trial for *The New Yorker* does not mention “banality.” The term occurs for the first time in the subtitle of the 1963 book. In the book itself, the term appears only once, albeit in a powerful context: Eichmann’s last statement before execution: “After a short while, gentlemen, *we shall all meet again.* Such is the fate of all men. Long live Germany, long live Argentina, long live Austria. *I shall not forget them.*’ [...] It was as though in those last minutes he was summing up the lesson that this long course in human wickedness had taught us—the lesson of the fearsome, word-and-thought-defying *banality of evil.*” Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (New York: The Viking Press, 1964), 252 (italics in original). The sole clarification occurs in the “Postscript,” where Arendt notes that, while she can “well imagine that an authentic controversy might have arisen over the subtitle of the book,” the term itself was chosen “strictly factual[ly]” for “a phenomenon which stared one in the face at the trial.” *Ibid.*, 273. For the history of the controversy the term aroused, see Seyla Benhabib, “Arendt’s *Eichmann in Jerusalem*,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Hannah Arendt*, ed. Dana Villa (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 65–85. The best overview of reactions to Arendt’s charges, not only the “banality of evil” but also her controversial position on the collaboration of the “Judenrate,” is Amos Elon, “The Excommunication of Arendt,” *World Policy Journal* 23, no. 4 (2006/2007): 93–102, adapted from the 2006 re-release of her book.

<sup>9</sup> See Adluri and Bagchee, “Adaptive Reuse,” 2 and 8, n. 29.

<sup>10</sup> Except that the gift trading in academia is based on spending *other people’s money*. Grants are written expressly to name and invite each other and also publish and review each other. Books are sent out for review *with prior knowledge, indeed, the approval of the readers*. Thus, the “fixing of the potlatch” to ensure that only other people’s money is spent requires another art. Deceptive, but nevertheless an art, grant writing maintains the illusion that the scholar is actively propagating the state’s interests, whether it be liberal democracy, communism, or Aryanism. Weller’s files—what’s left of them, the Nazi period files are missing en masse—sufficiently demonstrate that Indology actively propagated itself by baptizing grant writing as “*Wissenschaft*.” One must learn the use of metaphors (layers, cores, originals), metonyms (margins, other voices, disenfranchised perspectives), hagiographies (as the great F.A. Wolf said...), nostalgia (philology, “the queen of the sciences”), disingenuous promises (a *definitive* edition), and self-serving escape clauses (this new research opens up so many exciting new avenues). Do we not hear the steady clinking of coins with which Kant’s “*sapere aude!*” has advanced for almost three centuries? Academia has become a means to preserve privilege. Our universities, originally incepted as “our churches” (Hegel), have become medieval monasteries or, dare we say it, temples of an upper caste.

advancement, celebrityhood, and mindless inflated publication. *Not only Franco but many others also abandoned the investigation into the collusion of German Indology with National Socialism and Aryanism precisely in order to participate in this potlatch system* (see Figure 1).<sup>11</sup>

- 1914 Johannes Hertel joins the Conservative Party (2f)
- 1919 Hertel joins the Deutschnationale Volkspartei (2f):<sup>12</sup>  
—Secretary and co-founder of the Döbeln chapter  
—“Fought Marxism and liberalism in all its variations”
- 1933 Hertel: “follower of Hitler [since 1923] and member of the Opferring since its establishment”; “a Hitler voter [...] supported all collections of his party” (2f)
- 1933 Hertel and Weller sign the *Bekennnis der Professoren [...] zu Adolf Hitler und dem nationalsozialistischen Staat*
- 1933 Hertel recommends his student Weller as his successor (2b)  
—“The main argument for him will be that, out of conviction, he works wholeheartedly for the National-Socialist state and influences [people] by his example”  
—“He considers it the self-evident duty of every academic teacher to support the cause of National Socialism with all his abilities”
- 1933 Heinrich Junker recommendation for Weller (2c):  
—“He is positively disposed towards and willing to build up the new state”
- 1933 Faculty recommendation for Weller (1r):<sup>13</sup>  
—“The main argument for him will be that, out of conviction, he works wholeheartedly for the National-Socialist state and influences [people] by his example”  
—“Like all those who have breathed foreign air, he is positively disposed towards and willing to build up the new state”
- 1934 Hertel swears oath to the Führer (2g):  
—“I swear: I will be loyal and obedient to the Führer of the German empire and people, Adolf Hitler, follow the laws, and conscientiously fulfill my official duties, so help me God”
- 1936 Emil Sieg, Indologist and fellow signatory of the *Bekennnis der Professoren [...] zu Adolf Hitler und dem nationalsozialistischen Staat*, recommendation for Weller (1s):<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> After raising desultory criticisms of German Indology in 1993, Pollock found it more expedient to abandon this line of inquiry. Reinhold Grünendahl repeatedly attacked him and Pollock moved on from raising ethical questions pertaining to Indology. He recast himself as a champion of German historicist philology (see Sheldon Pollock, “Introduction,” in *World Philology*, ed. Sheldon Pollock, Benjamin A. Elman, and Ku-Ming Kevin Chang [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015], 1–24; and see also Vishwa Adluri, review of *World Philology*, ed. by Sheldon Pollock, Benjamin A. Elman, and Ku-Ming Kevin Chang, *American Historical Review* 121, no. 3 [2016]: 908–10), and was rewarded with invitations to lecture and research in Germany. The tragic irony takes on a Sophoclean note when Franco awards him the Friedrich Weller Prize.

<sup>12</sup> A reactionary party espousing *völkische* and anti-Semitic ideology. The main national-conservative party during the Weimer Republic, after 1929 the DNV entered into an alliance with the NSDAP. After its dissolution in 1933 its remaining parliamentary fraction merged with the NSDAP.

<sup>13</sup> This recommendation is unsigned and undated; it is included as part of Weller’s personnel file. From its text, it appears Hertel wrote the major part of it with some input from Junker.

- “He feels duty bound to serve the new National-Socialist Germany with all his abilities”
- 1936 Siegfried Koeppen (head of the NSDDB) evaluation of Weller (1a):  
 —“After his return from China in May 1933, Weller joined National Socialism”  
 —“He has demonstrated loyal obedience to the movement”  
 —Praises Weller’s “National-Socialist mentality [*Gesinnung*]”<sup>15</sup>
- 1937 Weller commits himself to the National-Socialist state (2d, e):  
 —“I commit myself [...] to follow the laws and other orders of the National-Socialist state”
- 1938 The Kreisleitung Leipzig der NSDAP and the Sicherheitsdienst des Reichsführers SS submit political evaluations for Weller (1b):<sup>16</sup>  
 — Studentkowski remarks that the evaluations are “positive in every respect” (1n)<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> According to Rau, Weller received the position because “besides Sten Konow and Heinrich Lüders,” NSDAP-member Bernhard Breloer also recommended him. Weller’s file, however, only contains recommendations from Lüders and Sieg. Wilhelm Rau, “Friedrich Weller (1889–1980),” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 132, no. 1 (1982): 3.

<sup>15</sup> Koeppen notes, “after his return from China in May 1933, Weller joined National Socialism. He has demonstrated loyal obedience to the movement, and has joined different suborganizations of the party: NSV, Dozentenschaft, NSLB. He has demonstrated his National-Socialist mentality [*Gesinnung*] through his cooperation in the NSV. In response to the Dozentenschaft’s telephone inquiry (9.9.36), the local group Osten B (Leipzig C1, Lindenstr. 8) provided the information that Weller performs his duties as a block officer [*Blockwart*] gladly and properly and that he is cherished as a good comrade.”

<sup>16</sup> Studentkowski, Oberregierungsrat in the Sächsischen Ministerium für Volksbildung, notes that “the necessary political evaluations for the recommended individuals [Weller, Ernst Waldschmidt, and Ludwig Alsdorf] will be obtained.” The report includes a request for political evaluations addressed to the Kreisleitung Leipzig der NSDAP (for Weller), the Gauleitung Groß-Berlin (for Waldschmidt and Alsdorf), and the Sicherheitsdienst des Reichsführers SS (for all three). We actually find evaluations for Waldschmidt from the Gauleitung Groß-Berlin and the Sicherheitsdienst des Reichsführers SS (1c and 1d in the list above) and for Alsdorf from the Sicherheitsdienst des Reichsführers SS (1e and 1i) and from the Gauleitung Berlin (1j). We do not find evaluations for Weller. However, from the many references to them we know these must once have existed. Thus, in 1f we find a handwritten note, “Political evaluations for Weller and Waldschmidt have been received”; in 1g we find instructions from Studentkowski to submit these evaluations (above all, for Weller); in 1h we find that they were actually submitted; in 1k we find confirmation that the evaluations were forwarded from Berlin to Munich (with the additional note, “It may be assumed that there will be no objections from there and we will then be authorized to negotiate with Weller”); in 1l Studentkowski notes, “Fundamental objections against Prof. Weller’s nomination as per the Faculty’s recommendation have not arisen as yet”; in 1m Studentkowski expressly notes, “on 8.3.1937, regarding the same issue, I forwarded all the political evaluations from the relevant Gau- or Kreisleitung and the Sicherheitsdienst des SS for the candidates recommended by the faculty for this professorship that I received in the meantime”; in 1n he confirms, “I have already submitted political evaluations for Prof. Weller with my report from 8.3 of this year—A: 3fL2”; and in 1p we read that the report has been forwarded by the Staatskanzlei on November 2, 1937 and that the Stellv. d. [Stellvertretender des] Führers has received an evaluation from the Gauleitung on December 23, 1937. Here we also read that “this must be checkable from a corresponding letter [?] of the Gaugeschäftsführer to me among Weller’s personnel files.”

- 1945–1948? Weller’s political evaluations go missing<sup>18</sup>
- 1974–1984 Mylius, Taube, and others reframe Weller as a critic and victim of National Socialism<sup>19</sup>
- 1993 Sheldon Pollock publishes “Deep Orientalism?”  
—Notes that Hertel and Weller signed the *Bekanntnis der Professoren [...] zu Adolf Hitler und dem nationalsozialistischen Staat*<sup>20</sup>
- 2003 Horst Junginger draws attention to Hertel’s anti-Semitism<sup>21</sup>  
—He provides a source: Phil. Fak. 39 in the Leipzig University Archives<sup>22</sup>
- 2004 Eli Franco appointed (present occupant)
- 2007 Maria Schetelich publishes a biography of Hertel<sup>23</sup>  
—Denies anti-Semitism<sup>24</sup>  
—Claims Hertel’s Aryanism was scientific and apolitical; speaks of his “integrity”<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Studentkowski, after stating in print, “I have already submitted political evaluations for Prof. Weller with my report from 8.3 of this year—A: 3fL2” adds the handwritten note: “which express themselves positively about him in every respect.” Weller’s evaluation was evidently positive enough to secure him the job over NSDAP-member Alsdorf (at the time, Waldschmidt was not yet a member, as noted in 1d; his membership dates to May 1, 1937).

<sup>18</sup> The dates are approximate. The evaluations must have disappeared before an inventory was made of his personnel file’s contents, since this inventory mentions Waldschmidt’s and Alsdorf’s evaluations but not Weller’s. The circumstance that Weller was asked to provide a personal testimony for Hertel in 1948 speaks for the fact that its disappearance occurred before this date. See also Figure 2 for the post-war reframing of Weller as a victim of National Socialism.

<sup>19</sup> See Figure 2.

<sup>20</sup> Pollock, “Deep Orientalism?” 94. See also *ibid.*, 95 and 122, n. 34 for Pollock’s comments on the necessity of further inquiries: “No German Indologist ... has undertaken an analysis of the field and the relationship of the questions of scholarship and the questions of state since the war” and “As far as I know, no history of the DMG exists, and this is a real desideratum for the study of institutional orientalism, especially in the NS and postwar years.”

<sup>21</sup> Horst Junginger, “Das ‘Arische Seminar’ der Universität Tübingen, 1940–1945,” in *Indienforschung im Zeitenwandel: Analysen und Dokumente zur Indologie und Religionswissenschaft in Tübingen*, ed. Heidrun Brückner, et al. (Tübingen: Attempo-Verlag, 2003), 187 and 187, n. 13.

<sup>22</sup> The file has since been renumbered and is now Phil. Fak. A 02/20:04:Bd. 1 (Dozentenakten im Allgemeinen).

<sup>23</sup> Maria Schetelich, “Johannes Hertel,” in Johannes Hertel, *Kleine Schriften*, ed. Barbara Bomhoff (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), xiii–xxv.

<sup>24</sup> “That Hertel was at various times accused of anti-Semitism may perhaps have had to do with his harsh expressions. [But] such expressions did not have a political background and emphatically so when they concerned persons. One only has to read the detailed eulogy of Theodor Benfey that Hertel published in the Göttingen newspaper on January 28, 1909 on the occasion of his 100th birthday. Neither the Jewish home Benfey came from nor Jewish education and culture are mentioned negatively in any way.” *Ibid.*, xxii. Perhaps Schetelich imagines that Jews faced with anti-Semitic comments must take comfort from the fact that these do not have “a political background,” but merely express personal hatred. Or perhaps she thinks that “the Jew Oldenberg” is an acceptable albeit “harsh” expression. For the world outside of Leipzig Indology it is, of course, the very definition of anti-Semitism.

<sup>25</sup> “Regarded superficially and above all for outsiders [to the discipline] the ‘Aryan fire doctrine’ might appear to let itself be dangerously easily connected with the concept of an ‘Ur-Aryan’ religion with its

- 2009 Franco publishes “Indologie”<sup>26</sup>  
 —Claims Hertel’s relationship to Nazism was “ambivalent”<sup>27</sup>  
 —Fails to mention Hertel’s anti-Semitism
- 2012 Frank Neubert reveals further details of Hertel’s anti-Semitism<sup>28</sup>  
 —Provides an additional source: NL 271 in the University Library
- 2015 Wendy Doniger and Petra Kieffer-Pülz accept the Friedrich Weller Prize
- 2019 Sheldon Pollock and Jens Wilkins accept the Friedrich Weller Prize
- 2019 The Department of Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African Studies, Columbia University posts a notice of Pollock’s being awarded the Friedrich Weller Prize on its homepage; the whitewashing of Weller is complete

### Figure 1. The Leipzig Chair of Indology under National Socialism

The ethical argument now completes more than a decade of our work on Indology. This work was conducted as a dialogue with Nietzsche, specifically as a verification of his critique of university education. In his lectures titled *On the Future of Our Educational Institutions*, the essay titled “Schopenhauer as Educator,” and the notes collected as “We Philologists,” Nietzsche had predicted the epistemic, methodological, cultural, and ethical diremption at the heart of our university educational system.<sup>29</sup> In 1865, Nietzsche arrived at Leipzig to study

---

fire-cult, worship of the sun and the light, and the male fraternities, which the National Socialists made a part of their ideology. But it is absolutely forbidden to dignify such a parallelization or, worse, to place Johannes Hertel’s theories in a line with fascist ideology. The first and most important reason for this is Hertel’s declared aversion to every politicization or political marketing of his scientific research and every appropriation by a political party. He was convinced that this would impair the integrity [*Wahrhaftigkeit*] in research that was the highest moral principle for the scientist. Whoever violated this credo he [Hertel] opposed publicly and with great personal courage without regard for the person’s esteem. [...] Hertel was, after all, a purist on all levels.” Ibid., xii–xiii. For evidence of Hertel’s “purism” “on all levels” see the previous note and see also Adluri and Bagchee, “Adaptive Reuse,” 6, n. 25.

<sup>26</sup> Eli Franco, “Indologie,” in *Geschichte der Universität Leipzig 1409–2009*, vol. 4: *Fakultäten, Institute, Zentrale Einrichtungen*, ed. Ulrich von Hehl, et al. (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2009), 393–406.

<sup>27</sup> “Zwiespältig war auch Hertels Haltung zum Nationalsozialismus. In dem eben erwähnten Brief spricht er von „der gewaltigen Persönlichkeit eines Hitler“ und von „der gewaltigen Revolution, in der wir mitten inne stehen“. Doch die faschistische Wirklichkeit zerstörte rasch die Illusionen.” Ibid., 403.

<sup>28</sup> Frank Neubert, “Johannes Hertel vs. Mathilde Ludendorff: Prozesse und Diskurse,” in *200 Jahre Indienforschung: Geschichte(n), Netzwerke, Diskurse*, ed. Heidrun Brückner (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), 45–68.

<sup>29</sup> We are not the first to note these problems. As early as the 1960s, Arrowsmith warned against the “Teutonicization” of American higher education, “the cult of the fact and the naive faith in the accumulation of data; an obsession with methodology and classification; a profound unwillingness to make normative judgments; a preoccupation with ‘problems’ and the purely informational definition of knowledge.” It was Arrowsmith, again, who warned that “we have devised a system of ruthless and stultifying professionalism.” William Arrowsmith, “The Shame of the Graduate Schools: A Plea for a New American Scholar,” *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, 3rd series, 2, no. 2/3 (1992–1993): 161 and 171 (the article originally appeared in the March 1966 edition of *Harper’s Magazine*). Unfortunately, his warnings went unheeded. The result was the spectacular collapse of the humanities,

philology, a discipline he would abandon a few years later to become the prophet-philosopher we know him as. Brilliant, and with a singular gift for penetrating the mask of academic hypocrisy, Nietzsche soon came to see the university as embodying all that was problematic about contemporary German culture,<sup>30</sup> in particular, its Bismarckian and Protestant elements.<sup>31</sup> In this work of ours, we showed how all of Nietzsche's criticisms, especially what he called "the

---

apparent to all but the most obtuse or obdurately self-serving today. (Andrew Kay tells this story with brilliance, verve, and lack of resentment in "Academe's Extinction Event: Failure, Whiskey, and Professional Collapse At The MLA," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 10, 2019, <https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/20190510-academes-extinction-event> [accessed January 1, 2020]). The second, equally expected outcome, was the creation of a class system, in which stakeholders (in our case, the mainly Protestant German Indologists) profit from the dispossession of the marginalized (Jews, Brahmans, indigenous scholars). See Kevin Birmingham, "The Great Shame of Our Profession: How the Humanities survive on Exploitation," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 12, 2017, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Great-Shame-of-Our/239148/> (accessed January 1, 2020). At stake is neither pedagogy nor the well-being of German students nor, despite the many cries of "*Wissenschaft*," the quantity and quality of research, but the Indologists' self-interest.

<sup>30</sup> Paul Reitter and Chad Wellmon summarize the crux of Nietzsche's critique thus: "In *On the Future of Our Educational Institutions*, philology and the culture of nineteenth-century German scholarship, or *Wissenschaft*, become one of modernity's most pressing problems. Philology and *Wissenschaft* distort and diminish precisely the resource that might help modernity redeem itself: namely, ancient forms of life. A figure in the lectures remarks, 'Philologists perish and are reduced to dust because of the Greeks—that is a loss we can live with—but for Antiquity itself to be shattered because of the philologists!' Here the figure is not merely amplifying the complaint that classical scholars have a special gift to drain the life from their material; he is making an argument that places the destructive tendencies of classical scholarship within a complex causal web, whose strands include an ascendant consumerism, progressive pedagogical ideals and practices, an emerging culture of mass journalism, the modernization of academic labor, the cynicism of modern scholars, and in the middle of it all, the newly expanded Prussian state, which, according to Nietzsche's protagonist, wants to suppress the drive for true education and culture." Reitter and Wellmon, *Anti-Education*, ix.

<sup>31</sup> Nietzsche was not the only one to regard the new German state as "a force dangerous for culture," as Reitter and Wellmon put it. His Basel audience shared his concerns and Burckhardt, whom he admired greatly, had issued similar warnings. For Nietzsche's criticisms of Bismarck and German education, see the late *Twilight of the Idols*, the section "What the Germans Lack," especially §§1 and 3. Note also his critique of the idea of the "*Kulturstaat*" in §4 ("Culture and the state—let's not fool ourselves about this—are antagonists: the "cultured state" is just a modern idea. One lives off the other, one prospers at the expense of the other. All the great ages of culture are ages of decline, politically speaking: what is great in the cultural sense has been unpolitical, even *anti-political* . . .") and §§5–7 for his criticism of German education, particularly for its "brutal breaking-in" of students for "the purpose of making a huge number of young men usable, *exploitable* for service to the state"; its "mediocrity" and "indecent haste," its "celebrated 'objectivity'" (described by Nietzsche as "leaving all one's doors open, submissively flopping belly-down before every little fact, a constant readiness to jump in and interfere, to *plunge into* other people and other things"); and its "coarsely grabbing hand" and lack of "*fingers* for nuances." These are the very qualities the Indologists exemplify and therefore they were chosen as a test case to verify Nietzsche's theses. All italics are in the original; the translation is Polt's.

*de-spiritualizing* influence of our contemporary science business” (*Wissenschaftsbetrieb*),<sup>32</sup> were borne out in depressing detail by Indology.

From the Indologists’ perspective, it would, of course, be preferable if we repeated the official narratives—for instance, that Indology is “*Wissenschaft*” or that Hertel was a great scholar.<sup>33</sup> Yet, when we look at Hertel’s scholarship with unjaundiced eyes, we see that his contributions were marginal. Who today is benefited by his having solved “the fundamental question of Indology” (he means the question of Aryan migration):<sup>34</sup> Who was benefited then, except other cranks, equally obsessed with Aryans?<sup>35</sup> And yet the hagiography of Hertel continues because once he has crossed over from ordinary mortal to professor,<sup>36</sup> the institution requires his canonization (see Figure 2).

- 1943 Hertel claims he has solved “the fundamental question of Indology,” the question of Aryan migration (2o)
- 1948 He applies for a research grant for “The Aryan Migration into India” (2s)
- 1958 Weller publishes “Johannes Hertel: 13.3.1872–27.10.1955”<sup>37</sup>  
—Does not mention Hertel’s political views or his anti-Semitism  
—Elides Hertel’s “Aryan research”; displaces focus on to his work on the Pañcatantra and Vedas, albeit without mentioning his thesis of a “Semitization” of the sources<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> See *ibid.*, §3: “Here and there I come in contact with German universities: what an atmosphere prevails among their scholars, what a barren spirituality that has grown self-satisfied and lukewarm! It would be a deep misunderstanding to hold up German science as an objection to me on this point—and furthermore, it would be proof that one hadn’t read a single word I have written. For seventeen years I have not tired of shedding light on the *de-spiritualizing* influence of our contemporary science business. The burdensome serfdom to which the immense range of the sciences condemns every individual today is the main reason why natures with fuller, richer, *deeper* constitutions can no longer find any suitable education *or educators*. Nothing makes our culture suffer *more* than the oversupply of arrogant loafers and fragments of humanity; our universities, *despite* themselves, are really the greenhouses for this sort of stunting of spiritual instincts.”

<sup>33</sup> This is the central point of contention Franco raises versus our book: that we do not follow the official hagiographies of Indology, for example, its great beginnings as “the study of Indian philology” with A. W. Schlegel or the two-hundred tradition of disciplinary consolidation mapped in Ernst Windisch’s account. See Eli Franco, review of *The Nay Science: A History of German Indology*, by Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 39, no. 3 (2016): 696 and 696–98.

<sup>34</sup> See 2o.

<sup>35</sup> For which see the testimony in 2v.

<sup>36</sup> Nietzsche famously once confided to Burckhardt that he would “much rather be a Basel professor than God.” The circumstance that he did so *after* he had quit his Basel professorship renders the observation especially piquant.

<sup>37</sup> Friedrich Weller, “Johannes Hertel: 13.3.1872–27.10.1955,” *Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Jahrbuch 1954–1956* (1958): 259–64.

<sup>38</sup> And see *ibid.*, 262 for Weller’s concluding evaluation of Hertel: “Hertel’s Vedic investigations are symbolically characteristic of his entire existence as a scientist; over and above this, they can also serve as an expression of his entire life. He was a fighting spirit in science and in life. He stood unshakably on the battlement, ready to defend on this side and that whatever he considered right. He fought fearlessly in science as in life to exterminate whatever he considered incorrect. Just as he was unforgiving towards himself, he could also be harsh with others. He took the right to do so from the consciousness of his

- 1974 Mylius publishes “Friedrich Weller—85 Jahre”<sup>39</sup>  
 —Claims Weller suffered under the Nazis<sup>40</sup>
- 1979 Mylius publishes “Bedeutende Traditionen der Indologie an der Universität Leipzig”<sup>41</sup>  
 —Claims Hertel’s attitude to National Socialism was “ambivalent”  
 —Repeats Weller’s (that is, ultimately Hertel’s) account of why he turned against Hitler  
 —Cites “a friend, oral communication” by Weller as his source<sup>42</sup>
- 1981 Manfred Taube publishes “Friedrich Weller 22.6.1889–11.11.1980”<sup>43</sup>  
 —Weller suffered “numerous humiliations” under Nazism<sup>44</sup>
- 1981 Mylius and Taube publish “Friedrich Weller—1889 bis 1980”<sup>45</sup>  
 —Weller “never made a secret of his distaste for fascist ideology”

---

personality. This was based on his unusual industry, his rich knowledge, which extended beyond the domain of Indology, and his ability. As a researcher he is now among the great names of his field, of Indology.” Even when they do not plagiarize as crudely and obviously as Franco did, Indologists are reduced to repeating formulaic praise. Franco asks, “Of course, the authors are right when they state that necrologies are laudatory. What do they expect them to be? Defamatory and denigrating à la *The Nay Science?*” But there is a difference between producing probing albeit laudatory evaluations and the kind of inane platitudes that Weller does. The entire discipline now rests on the uninterrupted production of self-serving hagiography. See Eli Franco, “On ‘Theses on Indology’ by Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee,” <https://www.academia.edu/31668658> (accessed October 18, 2019), 3, n. 3.

<sup>39</sup> Klaus Mylius, “Friedrich Weller—85 Jahre,” *Asien, Afrika, Lateinamerika* 2, no. 5 (1974): 861–62.

<sup>40</sup> “The imperialist Second World War unleashed by the fascist aggressors initially put an end to Friedrich Weller’s scholarly activities [*Wirken*] and caused deep wounds in Leipzig Indology. [...] Friedrich Weller, who was already at that time an honored and famous scholar, was, instead of being able to continue his scientific work, conscripted as a clerk. After the destruction of fascism by the victorious Red Army, it was Friedrich Weller’s particular achievement that he applied himself to the democratic aim [*Anliegen*] of the period without hesitation and brought his entire knowledge, his entire personality to bear upon its realization.” *Ibid.*, 861.

<sup>41</sup> Klaus Mylius, “Bedeutende Traditionen der Indologie an der Universität Leipzig,” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl Marx Universität*, Gesellschafts- u. sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe 28, no. 1 (1979): 47–66.

<sup>42</sup> See *ibid.*, 61 and 61, n. 28. Mylius footnotes the remark, “This personal experience [the Ludendorff trial] and not least the imperialist Second World War led Hertel to speak out in increasing measure against Hitler’s fascism,” with the words “according to a friendly oral communication [!] from F. Weller.” Franco repeats Mylius’s statement verbatim in “Indologie,” albeit without crediting Mylius or listing its source (see Adluri and Bagchee, “Adaptive Reuse,” 4, n. 17). Weller’s exoneration of Hertel, directly or indirectly the source of all claims, *including Franco’s*, of Hertel’s “ambivalence” towards Nazism, however, was based on Hertel’s own testimony. It does not bear up to examination.

<sup>43</sup> Manfred Taube, “Friedrich Weller 22.6.1889–11.11.1980,” *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 76 (1981): 5–6.

<sup>44</sup> “Following the collapse of the fascist regime, under which he had to suffer numerous humiliations, his scientific achievement gained the recognition it deserved: state and international institutions awarded him the highest honors, national and international societies nominated him as an honorary member.” *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> Klaus Mylius and Manfred Taube, “Friedrich Weller—1889 bis 1980,” *Asien, Afrika, Lateinamerika* 9, no. 2 (1974): 385–86.

- Suffered “numerous humiliations,” but his nomination could not be “prevented thanks to his great international reputation”<sup>46</sup>
- 1982 Mylius publishes “Friedrich Weller (1889–1980)”<sup>47</sup>  
—Repeats account of Weller not finding recognition under Nazis<sup>48</sup>
- 1982 Taube publishes “Friedrich Weller 22.7.1889–19.11.1980”<sup>49</sup>  
—The Nazi period was “the worst period of his [Weller’s] life”  
—Weller paid a price for his opposition to “fascist ideology”<sup>50</sup>  
—His opposition nearly lost him the chair, but “the quantity and quality of his scientific works” proved decisive<sup>51</sup>
- 1994 Mylius publishes “Die Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie an der Universität Leipzig”<sup>52</sup>  
—Weller was harassed for working with the Jew B. Schindler<sup>53</sup>
- 2002 Maria Schetelich publishes “Bild, Abbild, Mythos—die Arier in den Arbeiten deutscher Indologen”<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> “In May of 1933 he [Weller] returned to Germany and experienced here the terrible years of fascism, which brought him numerous indignities since he had never made a secret of his distaste for fascist ideology. Thus, among other things, he was denied participation in international congresses, and when the Saxon Academy elected him as a full member in 1943, the responsible ministry refused to grant its approval, so that his official induction could only take place after the war in 1948. By contrast, one could not prevent his nomination to the professorship [*Ordinarius*] and as director of the Indian Institute prevented thanks to his great international reputation.” *Ibid.*, 385.

<sup>47</sup> Klaus Mylius, “Friedrich Weller (1889–1980),” *Namhafte Hochschullehrer der Karl-Marx-Universität* 7 (1985): 33–39.

<sup>48</sup> “It is self-evident that Friedrich Weller’s life work could only find its true and genuine recognition under the socialist conditions of the German Democratic Republic after the destruction of Hitler fascism and the racist mania immanent to it.” *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>49</sup> Manfred Taube, “Friedrich Weller 22.7.1889–19.11.1980: Ein Leben für die Erforschung der Asia Major,” *Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Jahrbuch 1979–1980* (1982): 237–53.

<sup>50</sup> “Fascist ideology and, in particular, the ‘racial theory’ were deeply abhorrent to him, and, in his naïve sincerity, he saw no reason to make a secret of this distaste and, for example, the break off the collaboration with Jewish colleagues. The consequences would soon be clear [...]” *Ibid.*, 245.

<sup>51</sup> “The attacks on Weller once again reached a peak, when, in March of 1933, following Hertel’s retirement, the question of occupying the chair for Indology became current. Beides Weller, at the time his younger colleagues Ernst *Waldschmidt* and Ludwig *Alsdorf* were considered. The things that came out during Weller’s application once again concerned his collaboration with Bruno Schindler. [...] However, the quantity and quality of his scientific works had expanded so greatly in the past few years and, thereby, his international reputation that the Philosophical Faculty and the responsible ministry could not overlook these achievements.” *Ibid.*, 246.

<sup>52</sup> Klaus Mylius, “Die Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie an der Universität Leipzig von den Anfängen bis zur Emeritierung von Friedrich Weller 1958,” *Bulletin of the Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute* 54–55 (1994–1995): 133–43.

<sup>53</sup> “Having returned in 1933 to what was now fascist Germany, those newly in power created great difficulties for him because of his political stance and because of the continued collaboration with B. Schindler, who was of Jewish extraction, within the framework of the journal ‘Asia Major.’ He was not permitted to participate in the XIX International Congress of Orientalists in Rome, and when the Saxon Academy elected him as a full member on June 3, 1943, the responsible ministry refused to grant its approval.” *Ibid.*, 140.

- Tries to wash Hertel clean of the charge of Aryanism<sup>55</sup>
  - Defends his research<sup>56</sup>
  - Claims he is a scientist whose work is independent of his political views<sup>57</sup>
  - Does not mention his anti-Semitism, despite citing sources in the archives
- 2009 Franco publishes “Indologie”
- Plagiarizes from Mylius and others
  - Notes that he has relied on an unpublished manuscript by Schetelich for sections on Windisch and Hertel
  - Repeats Weller’s sanitized account of Hertel
  - Does not mention Hertel’s “Aryan researches,” even though, by Hertel’s own testimony, this was his main focus and contribution

## Figure 2. Historical Revisionism and Retrospective Canonization

The irony here is that, in their quest to preserve their privileges, Indologists have not only tolerated bad and poor scholarship; they have also failed to keep their promises of providing critical historical research. In Indology, orthodoxy is “*Wissenschaft*” and mutual citation of one’s peers is “*Forschung*.” The only form in which scholarship is permissible today is as an ahistorical homage to nineteenth-century figures and ideas as the period when the discipline took form and was institutionally established. This is true no less of Pollock with his promise of a “truly critical philology” to come than it is of Franco.<sup>58</sup> In both their cases, philology has deteriorated to a mere slogan: a useful name with which to market their discipline but hardly a program for practicing Indology.<sup>59</sup> Meanwhile, the discipline will cover up matters as grave as

---

<sup>54</sup> Maria Schetelich, “Bild, Abbild, Mythos—Die Arier in den Arbeiten deutscher Indologen,” in “*Arier und ‘Draviden’: Konstruktionen der Vergangenheit als Grundlage für Selbst- und Fremdwahrnehmungen Südasians*,” ed. Michael Bergunder and Rahul Peter Das (Halle: Verlag der Franckeschen Stiftungen zu Halle, 2002), 40–56.

<sup>55</sup> Hertel provides an illustration of the “complicated situation in which an Indologist who preoccupied himself with Aryan antiquity could land up in with the gradual institutionalization of the National-Socialist idea and the seizure of political power by the NSDAP.” *Ibid.*, 50.

<sup>56</sup> “Whereas Heinrich Zimmer’s scientific work is highly valued even today and Leopold von Schroeder too is respected as a scholar of the Veda, the judgment about Johannes Hertel in regard to his ‘Aryan researches’ is, to put it mildly, somewhat uncertain. [...] Only today is the picture of the Aryans that he described gradually gaining its critical appreciation; since the 1960s it has also been confirmed in some respects through advances in archaeological research in Central Asia and Iran.” *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> “When one preoccupies oneself with his publications and in particular with the papers of his literary estate one sees the contradiction in which he lived. Quite manifestly, he was a highly idiosyncratic, principled individual, a purist in philology, a consequent defender of integrity in science, who, in his political convictions, also knew how to quite explicitly distinguish between political ideology and scientific responsibility.” *Ibid.*, 52.

<sup>58</sup> Sheldon Pollock, “Future Philology? The Fate of a Soft Science in a Hard World,” *Critical Inquiry* 35, no. 4 (2009): 935 and 958; Franco, review of *The Nay Science*, 697–98.

<sup>59</sup> Pollock began with overcoming “deep Orientalism” and moved on to philology as “biography.” En route, he formulated “critical philology,” “future philology,” “philology in three dimensions,” etc. Most recently, philology has been transmuted into “world philology,” an invitation to non-Europeans to claim

Hertel's anti-Semitism, while hoping utterances of "*Wissenschaft*" will somehow discourage critics and, as in the past, keep funds rolling in.<sup>60</sup>

Indologists will, of course, protest that we have not engaged with the Indological "*Wissenschaft*" of Hertel and Weller.<sup>61</sup> They will argue that their various editions, based on manuscript evidence,<sup>62</sup> are exemplary examples of painstaking text-critical work, indispensable

---

their seat at the table under Pollock's pastoral care. Are we the only ones to notice that, in this tableau, philology, "the queen of the sciences in the nineteenth-century European university," has drawn up a seat at the table not as David's but as Magritte's Madame Récamier (see <https://www.gallery.ca/magazine/artists/proud-coffin-rene-magrittes-perspective-madame-recamier-by-david>)? Pollock, "Introduction," in *World Philology*, 2.

<sup>60</sup> See appendix items 4d–j and see also Weller's explanation of the "*Zukunftsaufgaben*" (future tasks) of Indology (4a and b).

<sup>61</sup> Indological "*Wissenschaft*," consisting of the tendentious identification of "layers" in texts and attempts to reconstruct a hypothetical "*Urtext*," has been shown to be speculative, unscientific, and arbitrary. In *The Nay Science*, we identified the principles—fantasies about original Aryan or Indo-Germanic inheritances, the thesis of Brahmanic "corruption," the idea that whatever corresponded to the scholar's ideas of rational philosophy, historical self-awareness, and ethics must correspond to the earlier, pre-Dravidian or pre-Hindu layer, and a naïve belief in the power of the scholar to identify these elements—that sustained these reconstructions. In "Paradigm Lost," we demonstrated that the Indologists' application of the "text-historical" method had not led to objective results in even one instance: no two scholars could agree on the extent of the so-called original Bhagavadgītā. Worse, their arguments were manifest instances of *petitio principii*. *Philology and Criticism* demonstrated that Indologists had not grasped basic principles of textual criticism, including the definition of the archetype, how manuscripts are classified, and how stemmata are drawn. Their so-called criticism consisted, yet again, of eliminating portions they considered "Brahmanic" as later, or, yet more perverse, of adding them to the constituted text of the Mahābhārata critical edition as "proof" of what the Brahmins must have done (see *ibid.*, 75–88). These problems apply no less to Hertel's and Weller's work. See, for instance, Johannes Hertel, "Einwanderung der Indogermanen nach Indien," *Archiv Orientalní* xix, no. 1–2 (1950): 207–12, esp. *ibid.*, 210: "I have nowhere encountered signs in the Vedic corpus, no matter how carefully I looked, that the Vedic tribes either lived or migrated together with the foreign races [*Fremdrassigen*] that is to say, that alliances existed such as that between Arjuna and the foreign-raced, as the name already tells us, *black Kṛṣṇa* [*dem fremdrassigen, wie schon sein Name besagt, schwarzen Kṛṣṇa*]. I therefore consider the Mohenjodaro and Harappa culture to be purely Semitic." This is, yet again, Lassen's thesis of a racial significance to the names Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa; Hertel's only innovation is to add an anti-Semitic moment. And see also Friedrich Weller, *Versuch einer Kritik der Kāthopaniṣad*, Veröffentlichung, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Bd. 12 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1953), a tendentious and, frankly, inane attempt to reconstruct the "original" form of the Kāthā Upaniṣad that found zero acceptance among scholars. Neither work inspires confidence in the respective author's "philological" competence.

<sup>62</sup> This was said already by Weller of Hertel: "Even his dissertation was based on manuscripts. To build up on them: this objective can be traced throughout his life. On his own, he initially strove to push back the uncertain transmission of the works through critical text editions in order thus to gain a firm foundation for scientific work." Weller, "Johannes Hertel (13.3.1872–27.10.1955)," 260. This has been the Indological parlor-trick par excellence: find some obscure manuscript, dispute the entire reception of the text, declare its transmission hopelessly corrupt, ridicule all extant editions, and claim that this one manuscript alone, when suitably edited—preferably in a multi-year DFG-funded project (cf. the Mokṣopāya project)—alone holds the key to understanding the text. Then, wait for the invitations to

foundations for any future research. *But how else are we to understand their editions except historically?* Without paying attention to their historical context—the conditions under which they were produced, the scholars’ particular social circumstances, their position in German society, their religious views and political affiliations, their specific motivations in producing these editions (be it to advance their careers, affirm Protestantism, or elbow aside their Jewish colleagues), and the benefits (money, prestige, status, etc.) that flowed to them from them—we cannot understand their work. To demand of us, as Franco does,<sup>63</sup> that we understand their work in terms the scholars themselves saw it in is to be unhistorical.<sup>64</sup> If “historical criticism and the historical interpretation of texts” are, indeed, “ultimately inseparable and mutually interdependent,”<sup>65</sup> then the social and historical conditions of the Indologists’ work constitutes not only the proper but the *sole* hermeneutic horizon against which their “scientific” claims must be understood and evaluated.<sup>66</sup>

---

roll in from suitably awed Americans or Canadians incapable of understanding or evaluating the edition. Like all parlor-tricks, its novelty has by now worn off.

<sup>63</sup> See Franco, review of *The Nay Science*, 697–98 and “On ‘Theses on Indology’,” 2–3 and 7–8.

<sup>64</sup> Steiner calls Indology “a fundamental historical science [*eine historische Grundlagenwissenschaft*]” and tells us that “every text thus has its history, which we must reconstruct as successfully as we can, in order to be able to locate the text and its development in a larger historical [context], for example, [its] intellectual-historical and culture-historical context. The alternative would consist in receiving a work in a version accidentally available to us, without inquiring into how it arose, on what it is based, and from which period it is.” But can he seriously argue against the premise that the texts of our European present are “to be treated *not otherwise*, that means, not with any less critical rigor” than “the testimonies of Indian history and culture”? Roland Steiner, “Indologie? Vom Feiern und Sterben,” *Südasiens Zeitschrift des Südasiensbüros e.V.* 38, no. 3 (2018): 19 and 17 (all italics in the original).

<sup>65</sup> Roland Steiner, “One just has to read,” December 21, 2019, comment on Eli Franco, “A short response to Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee,” Academia.edu session.

<sup>66</sup> Either Indologists accept historicism as the highest episteme or they do not. In the former case, to trust in Indological writings without critically studying the history of Indology is perilous (as Franco’s example demonstrates). In the latter case, something (such as the ultimate concerns of mortals or ethics) transcends historicism. The Indologists’ work, then, suffers from a double deficit: it neither fulfills the humanities’ pedagogic mission (Nietzsche’s critique) nor does it enable self-discipline and an “ethics of the self” (Foucault’s critique). We shall not dignify the third option, namely, that Indology is a “science” with consideration: we already demonstrated that this was emphatically not the case. If Indologists fail to take our critique on board, their work, already irrelevant to the humanities, will also lose its university status. Indology has failed to meet minimum criteria for “*Wissenschaft*”; its so-called text-historical method cannot function if it jettisons its prejudices and cannot be sustained if it does not jettison them. The choice Indology faces is thus dire: reform or vanish. Perhaps Indologists today should stop muttering incantations such as “history,” “historical methods,” “historical-critical,” and either supply alternative approaches or simply close up shop. Their work has *not* met the standards of scholarly objectivity demanded of the historian. Their alleged textual “histories” of the Mahābhārata and the Bhagavadgītā have not borne up to scrutiny. Their historical metanarrative was a spin-off of Christian supersessionism with explicit racialist and anti-Semitic overtones. Their research did not serve the purpose of mere “fact-gathering,” and hence was neither ethically nor epistemically neutral. Rather, the facts, such as they were, were selectively chosen and melded into a powerful legitimating narrative for themselves. Neither did the Indologists’ interest in historical research extend to their discipline. Finally, there is the claim that Indologists do “textual criticism.” This is manifestly not true: their editions have

Readers may wonder what purpose a critique of Indology's past today serves. Since Indologists have frequently misunderstood us on this point, we address it here. Jürgen Hanneder, relativizing Erich Frauwallner's Nazism, writes: "Naturally [!], like many others, he was a beneficiary of the expulsion of Jewish or [otherwise] politically undesirable scientists." He adds: "If what is at stake is collective moral responsibility, the entire professoriate must be accused of the fact that they overwhelmingly did not protest against the ouster of their Jewish colleagues!"<sup>67</sup> And who can forget Reinhold Grünendahl's infamous "Let he who never wrote [grant] application prose cast the first stone!"<sup>68</sup> Pollock, who has written reams of application prose and also accepted the Friedrich Weller Prize, even though he *knew of and critiqued* Weller's support for Hitler,<sup>69</sup> wisely did not contest Grünendahl's accusations. What does it say about the professoriate today that it is willing to set aside the question of ethics for pecuniary gain?

Admittedly, by the standards of the chief functionaries or ideologues of Nazism, Indologists appear innocuous. There is much evidence to show Hertel and Weller were undistinguished men—the type of the petty bourgeoisie, whose life consists entirely of looking for career opportunities, jealously guarding its newly acquired privileges, and orienting itself according to the ideology of the day to secure its socioeconomic position. But our argument has never been that Indologists were exceptional Nazis. Rather, it has always been: How was it that the university failed to resist National Socialism? In what way did the rhetoric of *Wissenschaftlichkeit* (scientificity) lead the humanities to neglect ethical self-cultivation and pedagogy and thus contribute to the German collapse?<sup>70</sup> At an institutional level, what were the factors—from a reactionary professoriate mainly interested in protecting its class interests to social parvenus such as Hertel and Weller willing to affirm the reigning ideology to advance

---

consisted of a priori "textual histories" (*Textgeschichten*), applied reductively in the form of "internal criteria" to create entirely *new* editions after their own fancy. See, for example, the volumes in *Anonymus Casmiriensis, Mokṣopāya: Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe herausgegeben unter der Leitung von Walter Slaje* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011–2019). See, in particular, Jürgen Hanneder, Peter Stephan, and Stanislav Jager, eds., *Mokṣopāya. Das dritte Buch, Utpatti prakaraṇa: Kritische Edition* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011). To call this edition "critical" is unscientific and dishonest. This is why, in *Philology and Criticism*, aware of Indologists' misuse of the term "critical edition" we proposed a limited definition. See Adluri and Bagchee, *Philology and Criticism*, 324.

<sup>67</sup> Jürgen Hanneder, review of *Der arische Ansatz. Erich Frauwallner und der Nationalsozialismus*, by Jakob Stuchlik, and *Die Philosophie des Buddhismus by Erich Frauwallner*, by Eli Franco und Karin Preisendanz, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 162, no. 1 (2012): 255.

<sup>68</sup> Reinhold Grünendahl, "History in the Making: On Sheldon Pollock's 'NS Indology' and Vishwa Adluri's 'Pride and Prejudice,'" *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 16, no. 2 (2012): 225.

<sup>69</sup> Pollock, "Deep Orientalism?" 94.

<sup>70</sup> These themes were already discussed in Vishwa Adluri, "Pride and Prejudice: Orientalism and German Indology," *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 15, no. 3 (2011): 253–92. Indologists either did not understand our argument or they understood it perfectly and chose to misunderstand it and simulate mock outrage. Our critique, however, never contained an accusation of Nazism. When Franco falsely accused us in Franco, review of *The Nay Science*, 697, we provided full and complete citations from "Pride and Prejudice" (in Adluri and Bagchee, "Theses on Indology," 44, n. 57). Yet, Franco, along with a host of others (Hanneder, Houben, etc.), continues to falsely claim we called Indologists "Nazis." (see, for example, Franco, "A Short Response," 6). After all, what is perjury once you have plagiarized?

their careers—that facilitated *Gleichschaltung* (cooptation)? The Hertel-Weller files are valuable precisely because they reveal the inner workings of this system of personal favors and mutual recommendations, while also providing insight into the personal lives and concerns of the lower academic bureaucracy around the turn of the last century.

To explain the functioning of Indology, then, we need something more than Nietzsche’s analysis of morality. We need to underscore how evil is not a spectacular crime such as producing incontrovertible evidence of high Nazi crimes. Bureaucratic unthinking, so characteristic of the mind-numbing incantations and hagiographies produced by Indologists, are evil in an unspectacular but no less pernicious sense. The evil here is, as Arendt shows, *banal* in the most literal sense. Only on this point must we correct Franco directly: he imagines that the point of “comparison” (his term) with Eichmann was that Eichmann was a Nazi, or that he was a mass murderer, or that he was an anti-Semite, and the like. Nothing of the kind. *We did not compare Franco to Eichmann at all, either directly or indirectly.* Our reference to Arendt’s analysis of Eichmann in the epigraph had a deeper point—one that Franco entirely missed. It was to point to *unthinking* as the root of evil, that same unthinking that replaces philosophical inquiry with a mechanical method and that same unthinking that we have, in obedience to our teachers, been on the track of since our first book. Here is Arendt herself:

Eichmann was not Iago and not Macbeth, and nothing would have been farther from his mind than to determine with Richard III ‘to prove a villain.’ Except for an extraordinary diligence in looking out for his personal advancement, he had no motives at all. And this diligence in itself was in no way criminal; he certainly would never have murdered his superior in order to inherit his post. He *merely*, to put the matter colloquially, *never realized what he was doing.*<sup>71</sup>

Thus, if it can be said that no Indologist was evil in the sense of actively murdering his superior in order to inherit his chair—not even Hanneder who thinks it “natural” to despoil one’s Jewish colleagues and, in the same breath, insists it was a “methodological necessity” for German Indologists to expropriate the knowledge of indigenous pandits<sup>72</sup>—then this is true of Eichmann also.<sup>73</sup> The evil lies elsewhere.

---

<sup>71</sup> Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, 287 (Arendt’s emphasis).

<sup>72</sup> Jürgen Hanneder, review of *The Pandit. Traditional Scholarship in India*, ed. by Michael Axels, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 155, no. 2 (2005): 672.

<sup>73</sup> More recent scholarship, above all, Bettina Stangneth, *Eichmann Before Jerusalem: The Unexamined Life of a Mass Murderer*, trans. Ruth Martin (New York: Vintage, 2015) has shown that Eichmann was not the “mere ‘cog’ in the Nazi machinery of extermination” (Wolin) as which he presented himself. Stangneth convincingly demonstrates that Eichmann played a far more active role in the extermination of European Jewry than hitherto supposed. In similar fashion, we can imagine that later historians, once personnel files for present-day Indologists become available, might discover far greater self-awareness on the part of the participants—for instance, that Hertel’s anti-Semitism was common knowledge or an explicit quid pro quo. But this would not change our analysis, which, as Benhabib elegantly puts it, concerns the thesis that “It was not this evil which was banal, but the quality of mind and character of the perpetrators.” Thus, the banality we mean here is quite specific, namely, the thoughtlessness that reigns when individuals place getting ahead and getting along with one’s peers before ethics. See Seyla Benhabib, “Richard Wolin on Arendt’s ‘Banality of Evil’ Thesis,” *Jewish Review of Books*, October 14,

As this research demonstrates, not only Hertel and Weller but Franco also succumbed to the pressures of academic position, peer-estimation, and the rewards and prestige that accompanied institutional membership. The circumstance that Franco did not ethically conduct the research expected of him when providing a history of the chair he occupies and from which he has profited financially is the least of it. That he went on a rampage against a book that identified and critiqued the underlying anti-Semitic biases of German text-historicism with surgical precision weighs heavier.<sup>74</sup> When we defended our work against his bullying, Franco occluded scientific points with rhetoric, indulging in orgies of adjectives and tribunals of judgment: sloppy, eccentric, unscientific, etc. Yet, in no part was he able to answer the charges *The Nay Science* raised: that the Indologists' application of the "text-historical" method to the Mahābhārata and the Bhagavadgītā had failed; that this application had been arbitrary and tendentious; that it had elevated central prejudices of German anti-Semitism to first principles; that German scholarship on these texts emerged from, and was only intelligible in the context of, Protestant anti-Catholic sentiments; that Indologists had tried to cover up this deficient episteme with polemic, question-begging arguments, and the rhetoric of "*Wissenschaft*"; etc.

Through a careful reading of documentary evidence relating to Leipzig University's Indological chair, we realize the inadequacy of the account provided by its current occupant: Eli Franco. All the information we collected and presented here was available to Franco. Moreover, Franco is salaried by the University to conduct careful research—research of the kind we have provided in this piece. Instead he succumbed, as did his predecessors to the chair, to the pressures and rituals of his vocational club.<sup>75</sup> Between writing up glowing hagiographies,

---

2014, <https://jewishreviewofbooks.com/articles/1313/richard-wolin-on-arendts-banality-of-evil-thesis/> (accessed December 21, 2019). The reference is to Richard Wolin, "Thoughtlessness Revisited: A Response to Seyla Benhabib," *Jewish Review of Books*, September 30, 2014, <https://jewishreviewofbooks.com/articles/1287/in-still-not-banal-a-response-to-seyla-benhabib/> (accessed December 21, 2019)

<sup>74</sup> Franco's review of *The Nay Science* was such a crude, naked attempt at swinging the "Hindutva" club that it has brought the entire practice to a collapse. When professors who have covered up the Nazism and anti-Semitism of their predecessors threaten to accuse those who would expose them with "Hindutva," there is nowhere left for Indologists to hide. Can we seriously trust them to protect us from Hindutva knowing that they have collaborated with every regime from Nazism to Marxism, indeed, that they grew rich precisely from placing their "*Wissenschaft*" in service of whatever ideology was in power at the time? *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*

<sup>75</sup> Mylius's and Taube's biographies provide the best testimony for this. After producing the kind of selective hagiographies of Weller that we have seen, both were rewarded with the Friedrich Weller Prize (Mylius in 1985; Taube in 1987). No doubt, if the German Democratic Republic had not collapsed, they would have made similarly splendid careers as Hertel and Weller before them (for complaints regarding which, see Mylius, "Die Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie an der Universität Leipzig" and Lars Göhler, "Sanskritistik und Indische Altertumskunde in Leipzig"). For a complete list of scholars awarded the prize, see <https://www.saw-leipzig.de/de/ueber-die-akademie/Friedrich-Weller-Preis> (accessed July 9, 2019). There have been sixteen recipients so far: Mylius (1985); Taube and Marlene Njammasch (1987); Eberhardt Richter (1989); Erika Taube (1996); Johannes Mehlig (1998); Sebastian Richter (2000); Oskar von Hinüber (2001); Mudagamuwe Maithrimurthi (2003); Olaf Czaja (2009); Isabelle Ratié (2012); Seishi Karashima (2013); Wendy Doniger and Petra Kieffer-Pülz (2015); and Sheldon Pollock and Jens Wilkens (2019). And see the next note.

ignoring and attacking critical voices and naysayers, and exchanging prizes and enjoying privileges, Franco's article "Indologie" reveals the distinction between participating in the club and ethical and rigorous scholarship.<sup>76</sup> Our multi-part critique, the Franco Files, documents how the institutionalized form of humanities—as a system—is broken. Whatever the marginal utility of the editions, volumes, and jejune insights produced under the present regime,<sup>77</sup> no

---

<sup>76</sup> In any other field, critical historical research of the kind we have provided would have been welcomed. In Indology, it has led to vituperative personal attacks, anti-immigrant and anti-Hindu diatribes, racist generalizations, and pointed exclusion from Indological venues. The following letter from the President of the German Oriental Society, in response to an application for membership, is characteristic. After delivering a lesson in the "civilized manners in the European cultural sphere" (apparently, for Slaje, European "manners" also include attacking Jewish colleagues, and defending Nazis such as Erich Frauwallner), it explains that "the aim of the DMG is 'the deepening and broadening of the knowledge of the Orient' (§1), not the deepening and broadening of the knowledge of German Indology. In light of the devastating reception of your works concerning this [topic] by recognized scientists such as, among others, the professors Michael Hahn, Jürgen Hanneder, and, most recently, Eli Franco, one cannot consider the tenability of your published results as given even in the slightest degree. In these writings furthermore you accuse a whole lot of regular members, honorary members, and presidial members of the DMG of biased research methods and in part subject them to a racist general suspicion. It is not credible that someone who takes such a view of the German research on India, which is to a large extent gathered in the DMG, and attacks them in numerous publications himself wishes to be a member. As per §6 (2, 4) of the bylaws, it would be a reason for expulsion from the society 'when a member grossly damages the esteem or the interests of the society.'" Walter Slaje, "Mitgliedschaft Adluri (20–09–2016)," letter sent to Vishwa Adluri, September 20, 2016. But is the continued cover-up of the Nazism of certain Indologists more damaging to the society's interests or is it precisely the fact that German Indologists have hindered all external scrutiny that has hurt Indology? Had the Saxon Academy, for instance, conducted an independent investigation into Weller rather than relying on the self-serving hagiographies of Mylius and Taube, and the plagiarizing repetition of those bromides by Franco, it would not today be facing the embarrassment of having conferred a prize named after someone who was, minimally, a Nazi-*Konjunkturritter* on two Jewish scholars.

<sup>77</sup> The question of what purpose the Indologists' historical fact-gathering serves has not been answered even today. Indologists insist that without critical editions of Sanskrit texts we can neither read nor interpret them, but they forget that entire cultures—not just India and ancient Greece but also every other culture in human history—got along for centuries without them. Generations of readers made perfect sense of their texts without the Indologists or their questionable "text-critical" expertise (see Adluri and Bagchee, *Philology and Criticism*, especially the section "The Argument from Expertise"). It is only in nineteenth-century Germany that this activity of thoughtful reinterpretation came to an end. *We are the poorer for it*. Neither have Indologists answered the question of how their work contributes to the pedagogy of German youth. Are German students, filled with a passion for discovery, longing to encounter India, really being given the education they deserve? Are their minds being broadened, their artistic and intellectual sensibilities developed? Or, are we inculcating in them the same narrow-mindedness, prejudice, and *misanthropy* characteristic of so many Indologists? Are we not, instead, giving them an education in the worst traits of the petty bourgeois? Indologists swing between claiming the study of Indology expands horizons (when they think it advantageous for preserving their chairs) to claiming that it teaches students precisely to remain skeptical of and hostile towards the foreign culture. At times, we hear that Indology trains students in the methodical use of their faculties; then again, we are told the purpose of Indology is not really self-development but oversight over Indians (lest they misuse their texts for "caste distinction, Hindu nationalism, Brahmin supremacy, Right-wing militarism

thinking person can seriously argue for its continuation. It is time for the diseased nineteenth-century academic model to step aside so a new form of humanities can be envisioned.<sup>78</sup> Here we say nothing more than Nietzsche did: we only say it having studied the evidence. Hence, our criticism is not about the person Franco. Franco, like Pollock, is merely a symptom. But in his failing lies a learning moment, one that humbles us and ought to humble every scholar. Failure to subject who we are and what we do as academics to continuous criticism has horrific ramifications.<sup>79</sup> At no point did we call Franco or anyone else anti-Semitic.<sup>80</sup> We merely

---

and fascism”; Franco, review of *The Nay Science*, 698). This suspicion is then extended to Indians of every kind proving at last that the Indologist is a racist, but, more than that, that he is a *racist of opportunity*.

<sup>78</sup> No German philologist has produced a work of the rank of Homer or, closer to home, even of Schiller. Who would claim that Witzel’s self-congratulatory musings in “European Philology” represent a peak of literary achievement? What we have done is replaced the artist with the critic, and buried all true culture, all true love of the human spirit, with mindless historicism. The real advantage of such historicism is that it appeals to the most plebian instincts of humans and, over and above this, provides endless employment opportunities for the academic laboring class. Here also Nietzsche was ahead of us: he correctly identified the anti-heroic, nihilistic tendency at work in the modern “humanities” and their *ad infinitum* logic. See *The Gay Science*, §7: “Something for the industrious.” (The Witzel reference is to Michael Witzel, “Textual Criticism in Indology and in European Philology during the 19th and 20th Centuries,” *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 21, no. 3 [2014]: 9–91.)

<sup>79</sup> Who now would accept an ersatz honor from Franco, knowing it comes laced with a poison pill? But not only Pollock and Doniger; *Franco himself* was an unwitting participant in a proxy conflict within Indology. The history of Indology, as we demonstrated in “Jews and Hindus in Indology,” has been a subset of the history of German anti-Semitism. First-generation Jews in Indology Theodor Benfey, Theodor Goldstücker, and Theodor Aufrecht either had to submit to the anti-Jewish diatribes of their colleagues, emigrate, or convert to Christianity (in the end, all three did, though it did not always improve their situation). A second generation, among them Betty Heimann and Heinrich Zimmer, likewise suffered from anti-Jewish sentiment in the Third Reich. Lucian Scherman, Isidor Scheftelowitz, Betty Heimann, Walter Ruben, and Heinrich Zimmer emigrated. Walter Neisser took his own life, apparently in order to escape “the immediately expected deportation and certain death in a concentration camp.” Otto Stein was interned in Łódź Ghetto. He and his wife Gerruda likely died on one of the notorious transports to a concentration camp. Moritz Spitzer (1900–1982) fled to the Palestine. Otto Strauß died in exile in Bloemendaal, Netherlands. Nothing is known about the circumstances of Richard Simon’s death in 1934. (This portion of the note reproduced from Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee, “Jews and Hindus in Indology,” [www.academia.edu/30937643/](http://www.academia.edu/30937643/) [accessed April 14, 2017], 27, n. 107. See *ibid.* for full citations.) Franco, to our knowledge, the first full professor of Jewish origin to hold a chair of Indology post-reunification, was likewise subjected to repeated attacks (by Slaje and Grünendahl) on the German Indology listserv. It appears, then, that Jews in German Indology have only been suffered on the condition that they not raise difficult questions. To this day, the German Oriental Society has not apologized for the mistreatment of Jewish scholars in the National-Socialist period, to say nothing of distancing itself from individuals such as Walter Slaje who have attacked scholars for researching Indologists’ involvement in National Socialism. See Walter Slaje, review of *Der arische Ansatz: Erich Frauwallner und der Nationalsozialismus*, by Jakob Stuchlik, *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 64, no. 2 (2010): 447–63.

<sup>80</sup> See Hanneder’s email to the German Indology list: “Bagchi [*sic*] und sein Co-Autor Adluri hatten nach dem Widerstand gegen Aduris [*sic*] Promotion in Marburg zunächst nur gegen die beteiligten Indologen gehetzt, schließlich auf die ganze deutsche Indologie. In Marburg wurde Adluri, als er drohte,

gathered evidence of pervasive anti-Semitism in Indology and highlighted the unwillingness to discuss it. We are careful writers, and we have always critiqued the true and banal source of evil—prejudice and humbug, anti-Semitism and nationalism, and every other form of othering: in short, the inhumanities. Those who participated in Franco’s shoddy attempt at a cover up, including repeating his temerarious defenses and engaging in vile immigrant bashing, have only made our case for us.<sup>81</sup> Indology in its present right-wing, apologist, anti-Semitic guise has no place at Leipzig University. But not only Indology but also South Asian studies, characterized by academic monoculture, incestuous hiring practices, facile self-righteousness, sense of entitlement, and “who whom?” (*kto kogo?*) logic, are untenable in their present form. In our next paper, we shall trace the roots of these institutional aspects of South Asian studies.

## Appendices

### 1. Friedrich Weller and National Socialism<sup>82</sup>

---

die ‚Nazi-Methoden‘ des Fachbereichs in einem Interview mit einer großen Zeitung publik zu machen, unter Ausschluß der ‚deutschen‘ Indologie auf Anordnung des Justiziariats in Indologie promoviert. Adluri und Bagchi haben den Mechanismus dann jahrelang so erfolgreich ausgenützt, daß ihnen wohl das Augenmaß abhanden gekommen ist. Mit dem Vorwurf des Antisemitismus an Eli Franco auf academia.edu (er hatte ihr Werk negativ besprochen) und dem auf der Indology-list berichteten Auftritt auf der WSC in Vancouver scheinen sie sich aber verhaben zu haben und konnten keine Sympathien in der amerikanischen Indologie mehr erwarten. Um ihr Weltbild zu retten, wurde nun die amerikanische Indologie von Adluri als offshoot der bösen deutschen Indologie erklärt. Seither dienen sie sich in erneuter Kehrtwende dem politisch rechten Rand der indischen Sanskritistik an.” Jürgen Hanneder, email to Indologie-List, September 29, 2019.

<sup>81</sup> See Asko Parpola, “There could be no more exhaustive and fully convincing rebuttal,” June 18, 2019, comment on Eli Franco, “A short response to Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee,” Academia.edu session: “There could be no more exhaustive and fully convincing rebuttal of all unfounded accusations and insinuations of Adluri and Bagchee. These Indians seem to gladly enjoy the comforts and advantages offered to them by Germany, but ungratefully in return spread hate and slander on scholars of their host land, when these do not appreciate and accept their sloppy work. It is sad that much valuable time must be wasted to this sort of corrective writing.” See also Robert Mayer, “If those whom,” June 16, 2019, comment on Eli Franco, “A short response to Vishwa Adluri and Joydeep Bagchee,” Academia.edu session: “If those whom he is said to have plagiarised, Klaus Mylius, Manfred Taube, and Alexander von Rospatt, have no argument with Eli Franco, then neither should anyone else. There can be no further discussion of the matter, it dies there. Internet hate-mongering and bullying, and the telling of lies on an industrial scale, have been widely commented on in the international press as dangerous features of contemporary Indian life, linked with the resurgence of Hindu fundamentalism and Hindu fascism. I have not followed this particular controversy at all, but it looks to me that maybe this accusation must be seen in that light.”

<sup>82</sup> Note: All documents are cited by their signatures. The citations are given in German for ease of accession; the pagination follows that of the respective archive (typically, a small penciled number in the upper margin). The following abbreviations are in use: HStA (Hauptstaatsarchiv); UAL (Universitätsarchiv Leipzig); Phil. Fak. (Philosophische Fakultät); PA (Personalakte = personnel file); NA (Nachlaß = literary estate); Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss. (Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften = Saxon Academy of Sciences and Humanities); Bd. (Band = volume); Bl. (Blatt/Blätter = folio/s).

This is a complete scan of HStA Dresden, 10230/57, Besetzung des ord. Lehrstuhls für indische Philologie (Nachfolge Hertel/Weller). Especially noteworthy are the following documents:

- 1a. Siegfried Koepfen, Gutachten der Dozentenschaft der Universität Leipzig über Professor Dr. Friedrich Weller, undatiert, Bl. 23–26;
- 1b. Werner Studentkowski, Bericht des Dekans der Phil. Fak. vom 12.11.1937, Wiederbesetzung der ordentl. Professur für indische Philologie (des Sanskrit), 17.12.1937, an den Herrn Reichs- und Preussischen Minister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung u. Volksbildung, Bl. 39;
- 1c. Hartmann, Politische Beurteilung betr. Dr. phil. Ernst Waldschmit, 7.1.1937, Bl. 41;
- 1d. ? Politische Beurteilung betr. Dr. phil. Ernst Waldschmit, 1.2.1937, Bl. 42;
- 1e. ? Politische Beurteilung betr. Dr. phil. Ludwig Alsdorf, 17.2.1937, Bl. 45–46;
- 1f. i.A.Manh ...? Schreiben betr. Ermittlungen zu Dr. phil. Ludwig Alsdorf, am 24.2.1937 an den Reichsstatthalter in Sachsen, Ministerium für Volksbildung, Bl. 47;
- 1g. Hänig, Aktennotiz (Diktirt von Herr ORR. Studentkowski in Gegenwart von Herrn Geh. Rat v. Seydewitz und Herrn Reg. Ass. Dr. Müller am 27.2.1937), Bl. 48;
- 1h. Göring, Politischen Beurteilungen der Kreisleitung Leipzig bzw. der Gauleitung Groß-Berlin der NSDAP und des Sicherheitsdienstes des Reichsführers–SS über Prof. Dr. Weller–Leipzig und Doz. Dr. Waldschmidt–Berlin sowie eine politische Beurteilung des Sicherheitsdienstes über Doz. Dr. Alsdorf–Berlin (mit drei Anlagen), am 8.3.1937 an den Herrn Reichs- und Preuß. Minister für Wi., Erz. u. Vo. geschickt, Bl. 49;
- 1i. ? Weitere Erörterungen über Dr. phil. Ludwig Alsdorf, 23.3.1937, Bl. 50;
- 1j. ? Politisches Führungszeugnis, am 5.5.1937 an das Ministerium für Volksbildung geschickt, Bl. 55;
- 1k. Werner Studentkowski, Besprechungsprotokoll (Besprechung mit Prof. Dr. Mattiat im Reichserz. Min. am 21.5.1937), Bl. 56–58;
- 1l. Werner Studentkowski, Besprechungsprotokoll (Besprechung mit dem Dekan der Philologisch-historischen Abteilung der Philosophischen Fakultät Prof. Dr. Bräunlich am 3.6.1937), Bl. 59–61;
- 1m. Werner Studentkowski, Brief betr. der Wiederbesetzung des Lehrstuhls für indische Philologie (Sanskrit) an der Universität Leipzig, am 22.6.1937 an den Herrn Regierungsrat Dr. Grüninger geschickt, Bl. 62–64;
- 1n. Werner Studentkowski, Brief betr. der Wiederbesetzung des Lehrstuhls für indische Philologie (Sanskrit) an der Univ. Leipzig, am 28.9.1937 an den Herrn Reichs- und Preussischen Minister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung u. Volksbildung geschickt, Bl. 84–85;
- 1o. Vorschlag zur Ernennung des nichtbeamteten außerordentlichen Professors Dr. Phil. Friedrich Weller zum ordentlichen Professor, Bl. 86–87;
- 1p. Handschriftliche Notiz, Bl. 88;
- 1q. Friedrich Weller, diverse Briefe (unterzeichnet mit „Heil Hitler“), Bl. 53, 67, 69, 71, 76, 80, 82.

To this complete file, we add two additional pieces of evidence from Weller’s personnel file—UAL, PA 1115 (Weller, Friedrich):

- 1r. Gutachten der Philosophischen Fakultät über F. Weller, undatiert, ohne Unterschrift, PA 1115 (Weller, Friedrich), Bl. 102–104;

- 1s. Emil Sieg, Gutachten über F. Weller, am 22.6.1936 an den Herrn Führer der Dozentenschaft geschickt, UAL, PA 1115 (Weller, Friedrich), unnummeriert (zw. Bl. 120 u. Bl. 121).

## 2. Aryanism and anti-Semitism

This contains the following documents:

- 2a. BArch R 4901/13280 (Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung), Bl. 446 (zu Weller, Friedrich);
- 2b. Johannes Hertel, Gutachten J. Hertels über F. Weller, am 18.10.1933 an den Dekan der Philosophischen Fakultät Hans Freyer geschickt, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 1, Bl. 66;
- 2c. Heinrich Junker, Würdigung des Prof. Wellers, am 18.10.1933 an die Philosophische Fakultät der Universität Leipzig geschickt, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 1, Bl. 71;
- 2d. Knick, Brief betr. der Verpflichtung der nichtbeamteten Lehrkräfte (mit einer Anlage), am 16.6.1937 an die Herren Dekane und Direktoren der Institute und Seminare einschliesslich der Universitätsbibliothek, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 3, Bl. 4–5;
- 2e. Erich Bräunlich, Brief betr. der Verpflichtungserklärung der nichtbeamteten Lehrkräfte (mit einer Anlage), am 29.6.1937 an den Herrn Rektor der Universität geschickt, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 3, Bl. 7–10;
- 2f. Johannes Hertel, Fragebogen (möglicherweise „Fragebogen zur Durchführung des Gesetzes zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums vom 7. April 1933“), undatiert, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 2–3, plus one unnummeriert folio;
- 2g. Johannes Hertel, Eid auf den Führer des Deutschen Reiches und Volkes, Adolf Hitler, am 25.8.1934 geleistet, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 40;
- 2h. Von Seydewitz, Brief betr. der Entpflichtung der Professoren Johannes Hertel und Wilhelm Böttger, am 27.10.1936 an den Herrn Reichs- und Preussischen Minister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung u. Volksbildung geschickt, HStA Dresden, 10230/57, Besetzung des ord. Lehrstuhls für indische Philologie (Nachfolge Hertel/Weller), Bl. 7;
- 2i. Hans Münster (?), Vorschläge für die Wiederbesetzung der ordentlichen Professur der indischen Philologie (des Sanskrit), am 12.11.1936 an das Reichs- und Preussische Ministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung u. Volksbildung geschickt, HStA Dresden, 10230/57, Besetzung des ord. Lehrstuhls für indische Philologie (Nachfolge Hertel/Weller), Bl. 9–16 and 37–38;
- 2j. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Herrn Geheimrat (Prof. Dr. Brandenburg?), 24.1.1938, Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Personalakte Hertel, unnummeriert;
- 2k. Johannes Hertel, Brief an den Sekretär der phil.-hist. Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Herrn Geheimrat Prof. Dr. Brandenburg, 2.4.1938, Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Personalakte Hertel, unnummeriert;
- 2l. Johannes Hertel, Brief an den Rektor der Universität Herrn Prof. Dr. Bernhard Schweitzer, 15.8.1945, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 14;
- 2m. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Herrn Medizinalrat, 20.8.1945, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 29–31;
- 2n. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Walter Porzig, 27.12.1943, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 37–38;

- 2o. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Hans Eichler(?), 27.12.1943, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 39–41;
- 2p. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Herrn Fricker, 5.3.1946, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 106–108;
- 2q. Johannes Hertel, Brief an den Präsidenten der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Herrn Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Theodor Frings, 15.8.1945, Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Personalakte Hertel, unnummeriert;
- 2r. Johannes Hertel, Lebenslauf, 31.3.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 73–75 (Duplikat in 116–18);
- 2s. Johannes Hertel, Brief an den Herrn Dekan der Philosophischen Fakultät Herrn Prof. D. Dr. Baetke, 10.7.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 84;
- 2t. Walter Baetke, Brief betr. Erteilung eines Forschungsauftrags auf dem Gebiet der Indologie an Prof. Dr. Johannes Hertel, am 13.7.1948 an die Landesregierung Sachsen, Ministerium für Volksbildung, Abt. Hochschulen und Wissenschaft geschickt, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 85 (Duplikat in 128);
- 2u. Erwin Jacobi, Brief an den Herrn Dekan der Philosophischen Fakultät, 15.7.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 129–30;
- 2v. R. ? Brief an Johannes Hertel, 26.8.1945, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 25.

### **3. Collegial networks and mutual post-war exoneration**

This large appendix is subdivided into five sections: 3A. Hertel's support for Weller; 3B. Weller's return support for Hertel; 3C. Hertel's postwar account of the Ludendorff trial; 3D. Hertel's statements of party membership; and 3E. Weller's succession to Hertel's chair.

#### 3A. Hertel's support for Weller

- 3A-a. Redaktion der Orientalischen Literaturzeitung, Brief an einen unbennanten Kollegen, 14.11.31, Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Nachlaß Weller, unnummeriert;
- 3A-b. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Familie Weller, 14.10.1932, Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Nachlaß Weller, unnummeriert;
- 3A-c. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Frau Weller, 15.1.1933, Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Nachlaß Weller, unnummeriert;
- 3A-d. Helmut Berve, Brief an Johannes Hertel, 10.1.1935, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 48.

#### 3B. Weller's return support for Hertel

- 3B-a. Friedrich Weller, Brief an den Präsidenten der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Herrn Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Theodor Frings, 9.6.1947, Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Nachlaß Weller, unnummeriert;
- 3B-b. ?, Brief bittend um Charakteristik des em. Prof. Johannes Hertel, 19.1.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 56;
- 3B-c. Friedrich Weller, Charakteristik des em. Prof. Johannes Hertel, 23.1.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 58;
- 3B-d. Walter Baetke, Charakteristik des em. Prof. Johannes Hertel, 23.1.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 60;

- 3B-e. Eduard Erkes, Brief an Herrn Professor Dr. Weller, 30.8.1951, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 88;
- 3B-f. Friedrich Weller, Brief an den Herrn Dekan der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Leipzig, 30.8.1951, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 96;
- 3B-g. Erwin Jacobi, U. R. an den Herrn Vorstand des Universität-Rentamtes, 19.5.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 123;
- 3B-h. Erwin Jacobi, Brief an die Landesregierung Sachsen, Ministerium für Volksbildung, Abteilung Hochschulen und Wissenschaft, 7.6.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 124–26;
- 3B-i. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Herrn Prof. Dr. Erwin Jacobi, 10.7.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 127.

### 3C. Hertel's postwar account of the Ludendorff trial

- 3C-a. Johannes Hertel, Brief an den Herrn Staatsminister Dr. Hartnacke, Sächsisches Ministerium für Volksbildung, 2.1.1935, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 44–47;
- 3C-b. Heinrich Junker, Brief an den Dekan, 27.11.1934, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 39;
- 3C-c. Johannes Hertel, Brief an den Präsidenten der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Herrn Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Theodor Frings, 10.8.1947, Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss., Nachlaß Weller, unnummeriert;
- 3C-d. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Heddy [Heddy Kramer geb. Hertel], 2.12.1946, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 3–6;
- 3C-e. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Dr. phil. Kurt Krüger, 13.6.1948, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 21–22;
- 3C-f. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Trude [Gertrud Jäger (?) geb. Hertel], 26.6.1945, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 52–58;
- 3C-g. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Karl, 8.3.1946, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, 3 unnummeriert folios;
- 3C-h. Johannes Hertel, Ergänzungen zum nachfolgenden Bericht, 10.1.1946, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, 1 unnummeriert folio;
- 3C-i. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Karl, 8.12.1945, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, 11 unnummeriert folios;
- 3C-j. Johannes Hertel, Wiederaufnahme der Lehrtätigkeit durch emiritierte Professoren, 10.8.1947, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 62–63 (Duplikat in 99–100).

### 3D. Hertel's statements of party membership

- 3D-a. Johannes Hertel, Antrag auf Neufestsetzung des Steuerbetrags. Begründung, undatiert, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 35–36;
- 3D-b. Kurt Krüger, Brief an Johannes Hertel, 30.3.1946, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, 2 unnummeriert folios;
- 3D-c. Johannes Hertel, Brief an die Alte Leipziger Lebensversicherungsgesellschaft, 13.11.1945, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, 1 unnummeriert folio;
- 3D-d. Johannes Hertel, Fragebogen, 24.3.1948, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 71–72 (Duplikat in 114–15);

- 3D-e. Johannes Hertel, Beantwortung des „Persönlichen Fragebogens“, undatiert, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 77–78 (Duplikat in 120–21);
- 3D-f. Johannes Hertel, Fragebogen, 10.5.1945, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 97;
- 3D-g. Arbeitsausschuss der antifaschistischen Parteien, Brief betr. Johannes Hertel, am 28.8.1947 an das Rektorat der Universität Leipzig geschickt, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 101;
- 3D-h. Johannes Hertel, Fragebogen, 13.5.1945, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 102;
- 3D-i. Johannes Hertel, Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen, 24.5.1945, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 104–111.

#### 3E. Weller's succession to Hertel's chair

- 3E-a. Werner Studentkowski, Besprechungsprotokoll (Besprechung mit Herrn Reg. Rat Dr. Hinz am 3.6.1936), HStA Dresden, 10230/57, Besetzung des ord. Lehrstuhls für indische Philologie (Nachfolge Hertel/Weller), Bl. 1;
- 3E-b. Werner Studentkowski, Besprechungsprotokoll (Besprechung mit dem Dekan der Philosophischen Fakultät Prof. Dr. Münster am 3.9.1936), HStA Dresden, 10230/57, Besetzung des ord. Lehrstuhls für indische Philologie (Nachfolge Hertel/Weller), Bl. 3–6;
- 3E-c. Werner Studentkowski, Besprechungsprotokoll (Besprechung mit Reg. Rat Dr. Hinz am 17.12.1936), HStA Dresden, 10230/57, Besetzung des ord. Lehrstuhls für indische Philologie (Nachfolge Hertel/Weller), Bl. 40;
- 3E-d. Helmut Berve, Brief an die Herren Dekane der Universität Leipzig bittend um die Feststellung der Religionszugehörigkeit, 5.3.1941, UAL, Phil. Fak. B02/20a, Bl. 51 (Duplikat in 52);
- 3E-e. Wolfgang Wilmans, Brief an den Herrn Rektor der Universität Leipzig (mit einer Anlage), 11.3.1941, UAL, Phil. Fak. B02/20a, Bl. 49 u. 52–53;
- 3E-f. Dekan (Georg Steindorff?), Brief an das Ministerium des Kultus und öffentlichen Unterrichts betr. der Wiederbesetzung des Lehrstuhls der indischen Philosophie (des Sanskrits), 20.1.1919, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 13–20;
- 3E-g. Königlich-Sächsisches Ministerium des Kultus und öffentlichen Unterrichts, Brief an die Philosophische Fakultät der Universität Leipzig, 7.3.1919, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 21;
- 3E-h. Protokoll der Sitzung der Kommission für Wiederbesetzung der Professur für Sanskrit-Philologie, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 22;
- 3E-i. Sten Konow, Brief an einen unbenannten Kollegen, 24.4.19, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 31–32;
- 3E-j. Dekan (Georg Steindorff?), Brief an den Herrn Ministerialdirektor Geheimer Rat, Dr. Böhme, 16.5.1919, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 33;
- 3E-k. A. Fischer, Brief an den Herrn Dekan, 27.5.1919, UAL, PA 0572 (Hertel, Johannes), Bl. 34.

#### **4. Science as ideology and as national destiny**

This contains the following documents:

- 4a. Hans Freyer, Brief bittend um Erklärung über die Zukunftsausgaben, 14.10.1933, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 1, Bl. 133;
- 4b. Friedrich Weller, Erklärung über die Zukunftsausgaben, am 18.10.1933 an die Philosophische Fakultät der Universität Leipzig geschickt, UAL, 7A02/20-04, Bd. 1, Bl. 277–87;
- 4c. Johannes Hertel, Brief an Frau Noske, 27.10.1946, UAL, NA Hertel 16a, Bl. 44;
- 4d. Entwurf des Texts „Kundgebung der deutschen Wissenschaft. Ruf an die Gebildeten der Welt“, undatiert, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 2c, Bl. 162;
- 4e. Helmut Berve, Weiterleitung von „Entschliessung“, 10.11.1933, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 2c, Bl. 163–64;
- 4f. Friedrich Förster, Mitteilung an die Fakultäten der Universität Leipzig, 2.12.1933, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 2c, Bl. 166–68;
- 4g. Abschrift von „Ruf an die Gebildeten der Welt“, undatiert, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 2c, Bl. 169;
- 4h. Der Leiter des Sächsischen Ministeriums für Volksbildung, Brief betr. der Lage des Nachwuchses, am 7.9.1938 an den Rektor der Universität Leipzig geschickt, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 4, Bl. 1–2;
- 4i. Heinrich Junker, Entwurf einer Zusammenfassung über den Nachwuchsmangel (mit einer Anlage), 5.10.1938, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 4, Bl. 3–14;
- 4j. Erich Bräunlich u. Wolfgang Wilmanns, Bericht über die Frage der Heranbildung eines ausreichenden Nachwuchses für die akademischen Berufe (mit einer Anlage), 10.10.1938, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 4, Bl. 15–29;
- 4k. Friedrich Weller, Brief an den Dekan, 18.9.1938, UAL, Phil. Fak. A02/20-04, Bd. 4, Bl. 35–36.