

# Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter full of sadness and indignation. Until very recently I had carelessly overlooked the fact that a review of Dr. Abolghasem Dadvar's book *Iranians in Mughal Politics and Society, 1606–1658* (Gyan Publishing House, New Delhi, 1999) had appeared in your journal (vol. 33, 2000, pp. 250–52). In the review, the reviewer offers a rather favorable opinion of the book. In order to protect both the copyright of the original author and the basic rules of the academic world, I find it necessary to write the present letter.

The unpleasant truth is that Dr. Dadvar's book contains a number of serious plagiarisms. In several places in the book, the author copies word for word from an earlier article of mine entitled "Emigration of Iranian Elites to India during the 16th–18th centuries" (*Cahiers d'Asie Centrale*, nos. 3–4, 1997, pp. 129–43). To make matters worse, Dr. Dadvar makes no reference whatsoever to my article at any point in his book (except for one footnote on p. 200 and in the bibliography). In one place, the author actually copies my exact sentences for more than an entire page, including the footnotes. The following is a list of the copyright violations made by Dr. Dadvar that I have noticed so far:

1. p. 23, line 8 from the bottom to p. 24, line 7 corresponds to p. 130, lines 11–32 of my article (slightly modified and abridged);
2. p. 31, lines 2–7 correspond to p. 138, lines. 5–10 of my article;
3. pp. 139, line 3–p. 140, line 3 of the book corresponds to p. 135, line 12–136, line 10 of my article;
4. footnotes 5–13 on p. 164 correspond to my footnotes 27–35, pp. 141–42;
5. p. 185, lines 15–37 corresponds to p. 136, lines 12–32 and p. 137, lines 7–10 of my article;
6. and p. 370, lines 1–22 correspond to p. 131, line 32–p. 132, line 10 of my article.

I believe that the essence of the book, that is, the enumeration and classification of nearly five hundred Iranians who emigrated to India during the first half of the seventeenth century, is the original work of the author (notwithstanding the sections on the careers of two nobles which are copied from my article) and I agree that it is a useful and timely work. However, neither the framework of the book, nor the four objectives set down by the author are the result of his own original research. Anyone reading my article will readily observe that I have already discussed these same questions there.

I find it difficult to credit that the author—who obtained his degree under the supervision of so distinguished a scholar as Prof. Muzaffar Alam—has so utterly failed to grasp the basic rules of the academic world. Is it not the first step for any researcher to refer to the original works of scholarship from which he has drawn his facts, ideas, or inspiration?

I sent a letter of protest to Gyan Publishing House, the publishers of Dr. Dadvar's book. The only response I have received so far is a very short letter informing me that a copy of my letter is being forwarded to the author. I have not yet received any contact from the author himself.

I have no intention at all of blaming either the reviewer, Dr. Stephen Dale, or the book review editor, Dr. Rudi Matthee, for this problem. I should have sent them a copy of my article when it was published, and I also should have reviewed the book myself. My purpose in writing this letter is simply to claim my original copyright and make public Dr. Dadvar's unfair actions in the hope that they will never happen again.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Masashi Haneda  
Professor, Institute of Oriental Culture  
University of Tokyo