

## Abstract

It was an ‘acquired language’, not the ‘language of our emotional make up’, with which the fate of India got intertwined—going by the claim that English remains till now the chosen language for fashioning postcolonial rejoinders, or as Ashcroft may put it, the language in which the (postcolonial) Empire writes back. On the other hand, it were a few British civilians who ended up establishing institutions like the Asiatic society and the Fort William College that determined the differential orientations, or what we may call, ‘the postcolonial future(s)’ of the institutions like Sahitya Akademi. In this sense, it was the fate of Sahitya Akademi as much as that of our nation to be governed by the overconfident enlightenment logic that fashioned the western sensibility, and the limits of which the colonial diplomatic tactlessness in the colonies exposed and epitomized. Though one may get tempted to dismiss this as a re-iteration of the staunch resistant postcoloniality that Ngugi expressed when he said that language was the carrier of a civilization’s history, Sahitya Akademi, set up in 1954, with a clear eyed logic to promote the ‘home grown’ literatures, the native babble, as the British said, did expose in its workings what it was modeled on, the Nehurivite consensus, the indigenous subservience to the enlightenment logic that went on to shape western modernity and later what we may call the *futurality* of the decolonized nations. The aim to interrogate the objective of Sahitya Akademi that this work reflects, in a sense, then is an effort to integrate with, if not begin, the endeavor to postcolonize our institutions, given that Nehurivite consensus was a fine mimicry of the reason-driven effort to homogenize the dispersed collectivities of a nation into a whole, the kind that western civilization had dreamt of becoming by unleashing its colonial assimilatory drive. Post-colonization of Sahitya Akademi then, as this work exposes, is a strategy or better an urge to refashion what we may call the rightist inclination of institutes not exactly in the lines of disseminatory logic that governs our times, but in the lines of constant negotiation and appropriation that postcoloniality seems to be all about. In fact, further intellectualization of this institute that this work seeks—given that desiring to lend Akademi an Ashcroftian touch is nothing but exposing the limits of Nehurivite consensus—is based on the conviction that Akademi must function, as it had always done in the past, in an ambience of a-politicality, keen not to preserve but to transform ideologies for the new times.

**Key words:** postcolonial rejoinders, enlightenment logic, Nehurivite consensus, mimicry, assimilatory drive.