

# Review of: "Social-Cultural Anthropology in the Oldest Department of Anthropology in India: Writing History or the Suppression of Records?"

Soni Wadhwa

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

I appreciate the sentiment from which this article comes. It highlights the unfairness or insensitivity with which well known academicians can sometimes approach the work done by others. This helps them come across as original or pioneering in drawing attention to new ideas or gaps in a domain. They also think that they can get away with anything because, well, who would challenge them?

Nevertheless, I think that this article needs rethinking on two counts:

It needs to be updated when Prof Chatterjee's lecture gets published so that the author can make stronger arguments about the omissions made by Prof Chatterjee.

Listing the names of the scholars and researchers and summarising their work in short paragraphs, as the author of this article does, also does injustice to the task of addressing omissions. "Minor" could be a relative term - in the sense Prof Chatterjee uses it. What the author of this article could do is dwell upon the work of these erased scholars

- a. by developing full fledged article(s) on their work,
- b. revealing their proper history,
- c. showing how they influenced other generations much more deeply

Uncharitable readers of this article might either dismiss it as lacking intellectual depth or see it as a sign of poor scholarship that is fixated on the word 'minor' without doing something 'major' about it.