CHAPTER 3
ARYAN ORIGIN

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to show that Vedic religion and society has evolved indigenously without any "ARYAN Invasion". To substantiate our claim we have to expose the myth of the ARYAN Invasion Theory. It deals with India's historical evolution. The subject is as relevant today as it was a hundred years ago when it was cleverly introduced by the British rulers in school textbooks. The fact that the pioneers of the ancient Vedic culture were the indigenous people of India is mendaciously denied by the ARYAN Invasion Theory.

The foundation of Indian culture and religion has been laid over the centuries of proceeding millennia by India's ancient rishis, who at the banks of the holy rivers of Saptasindhu and Sarasvati composed the Vedic literature, and realized the eternal truths about the Creator and His creation. These forerunners of the ancient Vedic culture were the original inhabitants of Ancient India. This fact is denied by the ARYAN Invasion theory, and thereby challenges the very raison d'être of Indian culture and nationhood. In this chapter an attempt has been made to expose the myth of the ARYAN Invasion Theory (AIT) by quoting scriptural, historical and archaeological evidence, and presenting a proper interpretation of the Vedic literature.

Theory of ARYAN Origin

According to this theory, northern India was invaded and conquered by a nomadic, light-skinned race of people called 'ARYANS' who supposedly descended
from central Asia (or some unknown land?) around 1500 BC, and destroyed an earlier and more advanced civilization inhabiting the Indus Valley, and then imposed upon them their culture and language. These Indus Valley people were supposed to be either Drāvidians or Śudras class.

**Defination of Āryā and Dasyu**

The term Ārya, Āarya, Ari, with various senses to toil, to fight, to climb, to rise, to travel, to prepare the sacrifice; for the work of the Āryan is a sacrifice which is at once a battle and an ascent and a journey. The man who seeks to fulfill himself by the Vedic action which is of the nature of a sacrifice, the man who labors towards the heights, fights his way on in a march, a progress and an ascent. Ārya meant one who is the warrior of Light and the traveller on the path of Truth. The traveller on the Path, the aspirant to immortality by the divine sacrifice, a Worshiper of the Truth, a fighter in the battle against the powers of darkness who obstruct the human journey towards light.

"The whole struggle of man is to replace the ordinary unillumind sense activities of life by the luminous working of mind and life which comes from above through the mental existence. Whoever thus aspires, labours, battles, travels, ascends the hill of being is the Āryān; For the work of the Āryān is a sacrifice which is at once a battle and a journey, a battle against the powers of darkness, an ascent to the highest peaks of the mountain beyond earth and heaven." ¹
Dasyu

The undivine being that does no sacrifice, he, who cannot speak the word or mentalise the superconscient Truth, hates the Word, the Gods and the sacrifice and gives nothing of himself to the higher existences but robs and withholds his wealth from the Āryān. He is the thief, the enemy, the devourer, the divider, the obstructer, and the confiner. The dasyus are powers of darkness and ignorance that opposes the seeker of the Truth and immortality. They are powers of Darkness.

"There are two great divisions of the Dasyus, the Panis who intercept both the cows and the waters but are especially associated with the refusal of the cows, the Vṛtras who intercept the waters and the light, but are especially associated with the withholding of the waters; all Dasyus without exception stand in the way of the ascent to Svar and oppose the acquisition of the wealth by the Āryān seers."

The motive behind Āryān invasion theory

In England, Macaulay was looking for a Sanskrit scholar who possessed a deep knowledge of the Vedas and who could be used for a subtle proselytizing propaganda. Through the offices of H.H. Wilson and Baron Bunson, he came to know of F. Max Muller, a reputed Vedic scholar of Germany, who seemed fit for the work which Macaulay had in view.

Macaulay met Max Muller in December 1854. At that time, Macaulay was 55 years old and an experienced politician, whereas Max Muller was a young
man of 32. They had a discussion for a long time in which Macaulay told Max Muller that the East India Company was prepared to spend a lakh of rupees if he could translate the Rgveda in a manner which would destroy the belief of the Hindus in the Vedic religion. He assured him that in creating disrespect in the hearts of the Hindus for the Vedas, his co-operation would be highly appreciated by the British Government. It would strengthen the foundation of the Empire by making the Christianized Hindus the loyal and faithful allies of their rulers.

The unsuspecting people of India, ignorant of the devious game of the English, thought that Max Muller was rendering a great service to India by promoting Vedic research. They did not realize that Max Muller’s real object was to poison the Indian psyche, to launch an attack on the very basis of Indian thought and faith, and to prepare a ground for the spread of Christianity. Recent research has exposed the dubious intentions of Max Muller. Let us look at the following three letters: -

Letter No.1 —

This letter Mr. Max Muller wrote to his wife in 1866, in which he said, ....

“I hope I shall finish my work and I feel convinced, though I shall not live to see it, yet this edition of mine, and the translation of the Veda will hereafter, tell to a great extent, on the fate of India and on the growth of millions of souls in that country. It is the root of their religion and to show them what the root is, I feel sure, is the only way of up-rooting all that has sprung from it, during the last 3000 years.”

3
Letter No.2. –

In 1899, Mr. Max Muller wrote to Mr. N.K. Mazumdar, a Brāhma-Samājist leader to the effect, “You know for how many years I have matched your efforts to purify the popular religion of India, and thereby to bring it near to the purity and perfection of other religions, particularly, of Christianity. Tell me some of your chief difficulties that prevent you and your countrymen from openly following Christ.”

Letter No.3. –

An extract from a letter to his son: -

“Would you say that any one sacred book is superior to all others in the world? It may sound prejudiced, but taking all in all, I say the New Testament. After that I should place the Korān, which, in its moral teachings, is hardly more than a later edition of the New Testament. Then would follow the Old Testament, the Southern Buddhist Tripiṭaka, the Taote King of Laotize, the Kings of Confucius, the Veda and the Avest. There is no doubt, however, that the ethical teaching is far more prominent in the old and New Testament than in any other sacred book. Therein lies the distinctiveness of the Bible. Other sacred books are generally collections of whatever was remembered of ancient times.”

What a pity Max Muller ranks the Veda as inferior to the Bible and the Korān, whereas in the lofty ethical teachings these books stand in no comparison with the Veda. The disparaging remarks of the scholar are based on ignorance or misunderstanding of the true purport of the Vedas. It would be rather harsh and unjust to say that Max Muller has made these remarks intentionally to
degrade the Vedas in the eyes to the civilized world. It appears to be the work of an ignorant and arrogant mind.

Macaulay was born in a family of priests and rose to the rank of Lord. He came to India in 1834 as legal adviser to the Council of India. Here he became the Chairman of the Education Board, and stayed for four years. During that period, he visited various parts of the country and found that given the way in which East India Company was running the Government, it would not be possible to convert the Hindus to the Christian religion. The first thing therefore he did, was to recommend the stoppage of grants to the institutions in which Sanskrit was being taught. He managed to get the grant to the Local College in Calcutta discontinued.

On reaching England in 1839, he explained why the study and teaching of Sanskrit had to be stopped. He argued that if the teaching of Sanskrit had been allowed to continue, the propagation of English culture among the Hindus and their consequent conversion to Christianity would have been almost impossible.

He knew that Sanskrit was the key to the Hindu religion and its scriptures. By putting an end to the learning of Sanskrit and promoting the knowledge of English through the State-controlled schools and Universities, he visualized that the Hindus, particularly the aristocratic Hindu families of Bengal, would voluntarily embrace Christianity without any effort on the part of the Government or the Church.
A letter Macaulay wrote to his Father clearly depicts his intentions. The following is an extract from the letter:

"Our English schools are flourishing wonderfully. The effect of this education on the Hindus is prodigious. No Hindu, who has received the English education, ever remains sincerely attached to his religion. Some continue to profess it as a matter of policy, and some embrace Christianity. It is my belief that, if our plans of education are followed up, there will not be a single idolater among the respectable caste in Bengal thirty years hence. And this will be effected without any efforts to proselytize, without the smallest interference with religious liberty, by natural operations of knowledge and reflection. I heartily rejoice in the prospect." 6

Validity of Ārṇān Invasion Theory

It is unfortunate that Hindus have not questioned this approach. Even though Indian Vedic scholars like Dayānanda Sarasvati, Bāl Gangādhāra Tilak and Śrī Aurobindo rejected it, most Hindus today passively accept it. They allow Western, generally Christian, scholars to interpret their history for them and quite naturally Hinduism is portrayed in a negative light. Many Hindus still accept, read or even honor the translations of the ‘Vedas’ done by such Christian missionary scholars as Max Muller, Griffith, Monier Williams and H. H. Wilson. Would modern Christians accept an interpretation of the Bible or Biblical history done by Hindus aimed at converting them to Hinduism? Universities in India still use the Western history books and Western Vedic translations that propound views that denigrate their own culture and country.
1. Max Muller’s view

The Indus valley culture was pronounced pre-Āryān for several reasons that have largely to do with the cultural milieu of nineteenth century European thought. As scholars following Max Muller had decided that the Āryāns came into India around 1500 BC, since the Indus valley culture was earlier than this, they concluded that it had to be pre-Āryān. Yet the rationale behind the late date for the Vedic culture given by Muller was totally speculative. Max Muller, like many of the Christian scholars of his era, believed in Biblical chronology. He possessed a rigid mind not open to other possibilities and therefore can not be called unbiased. This placed the beginning of the world at 4000 BC and the flood around 2500 BC. Assuming those two dates, it became difficult to get the Āryāns in India before 1500 BC.

2. Sanskrit Language

Muller therefore assumed that the five layers made up by the four ‘Vedas’ & the ‘Upanisāds’ were each composed in 200 year periods before the Buddha at 500 BC. However, there are more changes of language in Vedic Sanskrit itself than there are in classical Sanskrit since Panini, also regarded as a figure from around 500 BC, or over a period of 2500 years. Hence it is clear that each of these periods could have existed for any number of centuries and that the 200 year figure is totally arbitrary and is in most likelihood too short a figure.
3. Missionaries

It was assumed by these scholars many of whom were also Christian missionaries unsympathetic to the ‘Vedas’ that the Vedic culture was that of primitive nomads from Central Asia. Hence they could not have founded any urban culture like that of the Indus valley. The only basis for this was a rather questionable interpretation of the ‘Rg Veda’ that they made, ignoring the sophisticated nature of the culture presented within it, or was it that their uncultured and untrained mind was unable to grasp the vast and refined knowledge which was contained in the Vedas?

4. Outside Invasion

Meanwhile, it was also pointed out that in the middle of the second millennium BC, a number of Indo-European invasions apparently occurred in the Middle East, wherein Indo-European peoples, the Hittites, Mittani and Kassites conquered and ruled Mesopotamia for some centuries. An Āryān invasion of India would have been another version of this same movement of Indo-European peoples. On top of this, excavators of the Indus valley culture, like Wheeler, thought they found evidence of destruction of the culture by an outside invasion, thus supposedly confirming this theory.

5. Chariots

The Vedic culture was thus said to be that of primitive nomads who came out of Central Asia with their horse-drawn chariots and iron weapons and overthrew the cities of the more advanced Indus Valley culture with their superior
battle tactics. It was pointed out that no horses, chariots or iron was discovered in Indus Valley sites. This was how the Āryan invasion theory formed and has remained since. Though little has been discovered that confirms this theory, there has been much hesitancy to question it, much less to give it up.

Further excavations discovered horses not only in Indus Valley sites but also in pre-Indus sites. The use of the horse has thus been proven for the whole range of ancient Indian history. Evidence of the wheel, and an Indus seal showing a spoked wheel as used in chariots, has also been found, suggesting the usage of chariots.

Moreover, the whole idea of nomads with chariots has been challenged. Chariots are not the vehicles of nomads. Their usage occurred only in ancient urban cultures with much flat land, of which the river plain of north India was the most suitable. Chariots are totally unsuitable for crossing mountains and deserts, as the so-called Āryan invasion required.

6. Iron

The Vedic culture used iron & must hence date later than the introduction of iron around 1500 BC. This argument revolves around the meaning of the Vedic term “ayas”, interpreted as Iron. ‘Ayas’ in other Indo- European languages like Latin or German usually means copper, bronze or ore generally, not specially iron. There is no reason to insist that in such earlier Vedic times, ‘ayas’ meant iron, particularly since other metals are not mentioned in the ‘RgVeda’ (except gold that is much more commonly referred to than ayas). Moreover, the ‘Athrva Veda’ and ‘Yajur Veda’ speak of different colors of ‘ayas’ (such
as red & black), showing that it was a generic term. Hence it is clear that ‘ayas’ generally meant metal and not specifically iron.

Moreover, the enemies of the Vedic people in the ‘RgVeda’ also use ayas, even for making their cities, as do the Vedic people themselves. Hence there is nothing in Vedic literature to show that either the Vedic culture was an iron based culture or that there enemies were not.

7. Cities

The ‘RgVeda’ describes its Gods as ‘destroyers of cities’. This was used also to regard the Vedic as a primitive non-urban culture that destroys cities and urban civilization. However, there are also many verses in the ‘RgVeda’ that speak of the Āryāns as having cities of their own and being protected by cities unto a hundred in number. Āryan Gods like Indra, Agni, Sarasvatī and the Ādityas are praised as being like a city. Many ancient kings, including those of Egypt and Mesopotamia, had titles like destroyer or conqueror of cities. This does not turn them into nomads. Destruction of cities also happens in modern wars; this does not make those who do this nomads. Hence the idea of Vedic culture as destroying but not building the cities is based upon ignoring what the Vedas actually say about their own cities.

8. Floods

Further excavation revealed that the Indus Valley culture was not destroyed by outside invasion, but according to internal causes and, most likely, floods. Most recently a new set of cities has been found in India (like the Dvarakā
and Bet Dvarakā sites by S.R. Rao of the National Institute of Oceanography in India) which are intermediate between those of the Indus culture and later ancient India as visited by the Greeks. This may eliminate the so-called dark age following the presumed Āryān invasion and shows a continuous urban occupation in India back to the beginning of the Indus culture.

Allchin argues that there is clear indication that the rainfall pattern, which had initially brought fertility, had become adverse in the Sīndh region. And theorizes that, given the instability of the Himalayan region, there may have been a massive earthquake that possibly changed the course of rivers such as the Sarasvati and affected many Indus cities. The Indus people then migrated eastward. Lal talks of steep decline in trade because of problems in Summer that resulted in a Great Depression and turned many urban centres into ghost cities.

9. Excavation

The interpretation of the religion of the Indus Valley culture made incidentally by scholars such as Wheeler who were not religious scholars much less students of Hinduism- was that its religion was different than the Vedic and more like the later Šaivite religion. However, further excavations both in Indus Valley site in Gujarat, like Lothal, and those in Rajasthan, like Kalibangas show a large number of fire altars like those used in the Vedic religion, along with bones of oxen, potsherds, shell jewelry and other items used in the rituals described in the ‘Vedic Brāhmaṇas’. Hence the Indus Valley culture shows evidence of many Vedic practices that cannot be merely coincidental. That some of its practices appeared non-Vedic to its excavators may also be attrib-
uted to their misunderstanding or lack of knowledge of Vedic and Hindu culture generally, wherein Vedism and Śaivism are the same basic tradition.

10. Colour

We must remember that ruins do not necessarily have one interpretation, nor does the ability to discover ruins necessarily give the ability to interpret them correctly. The Vedic people were thought to have been a fair-skinned race like the Europeans owing to the Vedic idea of a war between light and darkness, and the Vedic people being presented as children of light or children of the sun. Yet this idea of a war between light and darkness exists in most ancient cultures, including the Persian and the Egyptian. Why don’t we interpret their scriptures as a war between light and dark-skinned people? It is purely a spiritual poetic metaphor, not a cultural statement. Moreover, no real traces of such a race are found in India.

So neither in the religious scriptures nor by tradition the word Ārya denote a race or a language. There are only four primary races, namely, Caucasian, Mongolian, Australians and Negroid. Both the Āryāns and Drāvidians are related branches of the Caucasian race generally placed in the same Mediterranean sub-branch. The difference between the so-called Āryāns of the north and the Drāvidians of the south or other communities of the Indian subcontinent is not a racial type. Biologically all are the same Caucasian type, only when closer to the equator the skin gets darker, and under the influence of constant heat the bodily frame tends to get a little smaller. And these differences cannot be the basis of two altogether different races. Similar differences can be observed even more distinctly
among the people of the pure Caucasian races of Europe. Caucasian can be of any color ranging from pure white to almost pure black with every shade of brown in between. Similarly, the Mongolian race is not yellow, many Chinese have skin whiter than many so-called Caucasians.

11. Continuity

Anthropologists have observed that the present population of Gujarat is composed of more or less the same ethnic groups as are noticed at Lothal in 2000 BC. Similarly, the present population of the Punjab is said to be ethnically the same as the population of Harappa and Rupar 4000 years ago. Linguistically the present day population of Gujarat and Punjab belong to the Indo-Āryān language speaking group. The only inference that can be drawn from the anthropological and linguistic evidence adduced above is that the Harappan population in the Indus Valley and Gujarat in 2000 BC was composed of two or more groups, the more dominant among them having very close ethnic affinities with the present day Indo-Āryan speaking population of India. In other words there is no racial evidence of any such Indo-Āryan invasion of India but only of a continuity of the same group of people who traditionally considered themselves to be Āryans.

Bhagwan S.Gidwani’s says, his novel will give a mosaic of a long-forgotten past to show that the Āryāns did not belong to a different species, culture or race. Their cradle-grounds were the Sindhu, Gangā and Drāvidian civilizations and there is an unbroken continuity—spiritual, social and secular—between the pre-ancient civilizations of Bhāratvarṣa and the Āryans of 5000 BC....
"The Āryans who left Bharat Varsha were not warriors or conquerors, not men of genius or madness; they were not adventurers or soldiers of fortune; and certainly, they were not religious zealots, fanatics or crusaders. These travelers simply had a dream that led them on towards the 'unreachable goal of finding a land that was pure and free from evil and it was a road that led everywhere but finally nowhere' and at last they came to realize that there was no land of pure, except what a man might make of his own efforts.'”

12. River Sarasvati

There are many points in fact that prove the Vedic nature of the Indus Valley culture. Further excavation has shown that the great majority of the sites of the Indus Valley culture were east, not west of the Indus. In fact, the largest concentration of sites appears in an area of Punjab and Rajastahan near the dry banks of ancient Sarasvati and Drśadvati rivers. The Vedic culture was said to have been founded by the sage Manu between the banks of the river Sarasvati and the Drśadvati. The Sarasvati is lauded as the main river (naditamā) in the ‘ṚgVeda’ & is the most frequently mentioned in the text. It is said that it had great flow and was very wide, even endless in size. Hence the people in Vedic age were well acquainted with this river and regarded it as their home and from times immemorial. The Sarasvati, as modern land studies now reveal, was indeed one of the largest, if not the largest river in India. In early ancient and pre-historic times, it drained the Sutlej, Yamunā and the Gāṅa, their course of flow were much different from what they are today. However, the Sarasvati river went dry towards the end of the Indus Valley culture and before the so-called Āryān invasion or before 1500 BC. In fact this may have
been the central cause that brought about the end of the Indus culture. How could the Vedic Āryāns know of this river and establish their culture on its banks if it had dried before they arrived? Indeed the Sarasvati as described in the ‘RgVeda’ appears to show clearly that it was prior in existence to the Indus Valley culture, as in the Indus era it was already in decline.

The river called Sarasvati is the most important of the rivers mentioned in the RgVeda. The image of this ‘great goddess stream’ dominates the text. It is not only the most sacred river but the Goddess of wisdom. She is said to be the Mother of the Veda.

A few lines from RgVedic hymns, which mention Sarasvati River, are presented below:

“amitame ntidam devitame sarasvati”

(The best mother, the best river, the best Goddess, sarasvati)

“maho arnah sarasvati pra cetayati ketuna dhiyo viśva virājati”

(Sarasvati like a great ocean appears with her ray, she rules all inspirations)

“tva dadhe vara a prthivyā ilayspade sudinaive ahnam
ni śrśadvatyam manuse apayayam sarasvatyam revad agne didhi”

(We set you down, oh sacred fire, at the most holy place on Earth, in the land of Ila, in the clear brightness of the days. On the Drśadvati, the Apaya
and the Sarasvati rivers, shine out brilliantly for men)

“citra id raja rajaka id anyake sarasvatim anu; parjanya iva
tatanadhi vṛṣṭya sahasram ayuta dadat”

(Splendor is the king, all others are princes, who dwell along the Sarasvati river. Like the Rain God extending with rain he grants a thousand times ten thousand cattle)

“Sarasvati like a bronze city: ayasi; surpassing all other rivers and waters: viśva āpo mahina sindhur anyah; pure in her course from the mountains to the sea: śucir yati girbhya samudrāt”

All these indicate that the composers of the Vedic literature were quite familiar with the river Sarasvatī, and were inspired by her beauty and her vastness that they composed several hymns in her praise and glorification. This also indicates that the Vedas were composed much earlier than the Mahābhārata. Mahābhārata mentions Sarasvatī as a dying river.

13. Astronomy

Vedic and late Vedic texts also contain interesting astronomical lore. The Vedic calendar was based upon astronomical sightings of the equinoxes and solstices. Such texts as ‘Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa’ speak of a time when the vernal equinox was in the middle of the Nakṣtra Aslesha (or about 23 degrees 20 Cancer). This gives a date of 1300 BC. The ‘Yajur Veda’ and ‘Atharva Veda’ speak of the vernal equinox in the Krīttikās (Pleiades; early Taurus) and the
summer solstice (ayana) in Magha (early Leo). This gives a date about 2400 BC. Yet earlier eras are mentioned but these two have numerous references to substantiate them. They prove that the Vedic culture existed at these periods and already had a sophisticated system of astronomy. Such references were merely ignored or pronounced unintelligible by Western scholars because they yielded too early a date for the ‘Vedas’ than what they presumed, not because such references did not exist. It thus suited their purpose to ignore these glaring facts.

Vedic texts like ‘Shatapatha Brähmana’ and ‘Aitareya Brähmana’ that mention these astronomical references list a group of 11 Vedic Kings, including a number of figures of the ‘RgVeda’, said to have conquered the region of India from ‘sea to sea’. Lands of the Āryans are mentioned in them from Gāndhāra (Afganistan) in the west to Videha (Nepal) in the east, and south to Vidarbha (Maharashtra). Hence the Vedic people were in these regions by the Kṛttikā equinox or before 2400 BC. These passages were also ignored by Western scholars and it was said by them that the ‘Vedas’ had no evidence of large empires in India in Vedic times. Hence a pattern of ignoring literary evidence or misinterpreting them to suit the Āryan invasion idea became prevalent, even to the point of changing the meaning of Vedic words to suit this theory.

14. Ocean

According to this theory, the Vedic people were nomads in the Punjab, coming down from Central Asia. However, the ‘RgVeda’ itself has nearly 100 references to the ocean (samudra), as well as dozens of references to ships, and to rivers flowing in to the sea. Vedic ancestors like Manu, Turvasha, Yadu
and Bhujyu are flood figures, saved from across the sea. The Vedic God of the sea, Varuna, is the father of many Vedic seers and seer families like Vaśiṣṭha, Agastya and the Bhṛgu seers. To preserve the Āryan invasion idea it was assumed that the Vedic (and later sanskrit) term for ocean, samudra, originally did not mean the ocean but any large body of water, especially the Indus river in Punjab. Here the clear meaning of a term in the ‘RgVeda’ a term confirmed in later times by mention of rivers like Sarasvati as flowing into the sea was altered to make the Āryan invasion theory feasible. Yet if we look at the index to translation of the ‘RgVeda’ by Griffith for example, who held to this idea that samudra didn’t really mean the ocean, we find over 70 references to ocean or sea. If samudra does not mean ocean why was it translated as such? It is therefore without basis to locate Vedic kings in Central Asia far from any ocean or from the massive Sarasvati river, which form the background of their land and the symbolism of their hymns.

15. Painted Grey Pottery

One of the latest archeological ideas is that the Vedic culture is characterized by Painted Grey Ware pottery in north India, which appears to date around 1000 BC and comes from the same region between the Ganges and Yamuna as later Vedic culture is related to. It is thought to be an inferior grade of pottery and to be associated with the use of iron that the ‘Vedas’ are thought to mention. However it is associated with a pig and rice culture, not the cow and barley culture of the ‘Vedas’. Moreover it is now found to be an organic development of indigenous pottery, not an introduction of invaders. Painted Grey Ware culture represents an indigenous cultural development and does not reflect any cultural intrusion from the West i.e. an Indo-Āryan invasion. There-
fore, there is no archeological evidence corroborating the fact of an *Indo-
Āryan* invasion.

16 Origin of Śīva Worship

The advocates of the Āryan Invasion Theory argue that the inhabitants of the
Indus valley were Śīva worshippers and since the Śīva cult is more prevalent
among South Indian Drāvidians, therefore the habitants of Indus valley
must have been Drāvidians. But Śīva worship is not alien to Vedic culture,
and not confined to South India only. The words Śīva and Śambhu are not
derived from the Tamil words cīva (to redden, to become angry) and cembru
(copper, the red metal), but from the Sanskrit roots śī (therefore meaning
“auspicious, gracious, benevolent, helpful kind”)\(^{13}\) and sam (therefore meaning
“being or existing for happiness or welfare, granting or causing happi-
ness, benevolent, helpful, kind”)\(^{14}\) and the words are used in this sense only,
right from their very first occurrence. (Sanskrit-English Dictionary by Sir M.
Monier-Williams). Moreover, the most important symbols of Śaivites are
located in North India: Kāśī is the most revered and auspicious seat of
Śaivism and is in the north, the traditional holy abode of Śīva is Kailāś
which is in the far-north. Furthermore there are passages in the *Rgveda* which
mention Śīva and Rudra and consider him an important deity. Indra himself is
called Śīva several times in the *RgVeda* (2:20:3,6:45:17, 8:93:3). Śīva is not
a Drāvidīān god only and by no means a non-Vedic god. The proponents of
the Āryan Invasion Theory also present terra-cotta lamps found in the fire-
alter at Harappa and other sites as an evidence of Śivalinga, implying that
the Śīva cult was prevalent among the people of Indus valley. But these
terra-cotta lamps have been proved to be measures for weighing commodi-
ties by shopkeepers and merchants. Their weights have been found to be in perfect integral ratios, like 1 gm, 2 gms, 5 gms, 10 gms etc. They were not used as Śiva lingas for worship, but as weighing measurements.

17. Brāhmi Scripts

By analyzing statistical computer-concordances, Subhash Kak has shown that “the most frequent letters of the Indus-Sarasvati and the Brāhmi scripts look almost identical and share a rather similar frequency of occurrence.” Kak also found that “the texts on the steatite seals follow grammatical rules like that of Sanskrit.” Although the deciphering of the script yet remains to be done, he suggests that the Brāhmi script is derived from Indus-Sarasvati.

18. Drāvidian Language

Scholars have identified some twenty Drāvidian loan words in the RgVeda, the Drāvidian languages have borrowed at least fifty percent of their vocabulary from (Āryan) Sanskrit. Moreover, many Drāvidian scholars credit the creation of Tamil, the oldest Drāvidian tongue, to Agastya, who figures in the RgVeda as one of the prominent sages of his era. The Drāvidian kings historically have called themselves Āryans and have traced their descent through Manu....northern and southern India share a common culture and religion... God Śiva clearly is synonymous with the Vedic God Rudra. There was no Āryan invasion, no Drāvidian invasion, no Āryan - Drāvidian war. Sanskrit has been shown to include elements of Mundā, the language of the tribals. All three language groups are indigenous developments.
19. Holy Place

If the Āryan Hindus were outsiders, why don’t they name places outside India as their most holy places? Why should they sing paeans in the praise of India’s numerous rivers which crisscross the entire peninsula, and mountains - repositories of life giving water and natural resources, even bestow them a status of goddesses and gods? If the Āryans were outsiders why should they consider this land as the “holy land” and not their original land as the ‘holy land’ or motherland? For the Muslims, their holy place is Mecca. For the Catholics it is Rome or Jerusalem. For the Hindus, their pilgrim centers range from Kailāsa in the North, to Rāmeśvaram in the South; and from Hingalaj (Sindh) in the West to Paruśurām Kūṇḍ (Arunchala Pradesh) in the East. The seven holy cities of Hinduism include Kanchipuram in the south, Dvārakā in the west and Ujjain in central India. The twelve jyotirlingas include Rāmaśvaram in Tamil Nadu, Śriśailam in Andhra Pradesh, Naśik in Maharashtra, Somnāth in Gujarat and Kāśi in Uttar Pradesh. All these are located in India. No Hindu from any part of India has felt a stranger in any other part of India when on a pilgrimage. The seven holy rivers in Hinduism, indeed, seem to chart out the map of the holy land. The Sindhu and the now extinct Sarasvati originate from the Himalayas and move westward and southwards into the western sea; the Ganga and the Yamuna also start in the Himalayas and move eastward into the north-eastern sea; the Narmadā starts in central India and the Godāvari starts in western India, while the Kāveri winds its way through the south to move into the southern sea. More than a thousand years ago, Ādi Śankarācārya, who was born in Kerala, established several mathas (religious and spiritual centers) including at Badrināth in the north (Uttar Pradesh), Puri in the east (Orissa), Dvārakā
in the west (Gujarat), and at Śringeri and Kānchi in the south. That is ancient India, that is modern Bhārat, and that is Hinduism.

20. Migration

Bisht says that after the quake hit the heart of the civilisation, the Indus people migrated east which acted like a sort of bypass to their woes. And like a dying candle, it shone brilliantly again but briefly before being snuffed out. Dholavira, Banawali, Mehrgarh, Harappā — in fact, all the major cities show that as the cities declined, encroachments on streets that were unseen at its peak began to occur with alarming regularity. There was a breakdown in sanitation and cities like their modern-day counterparts in India simply ran themselves aground. They were replaced by massive squatter colonies and an explosion of rural sites as people, disillusioned with cities, went back to farming communities. A giant step backward.

CONCLUSION

These are some of the obvious and serious objections, inconsistencies, and glaring anomalies to which the invasionists have no convincing or plausible explanations which could reconcile the above facts with the Āryan invasion theory and destruction of the Indus Valley civilization. The main elements on which the entire structure of the Āryan Invasion Theory has been built are: Ārya is a racial group, they were nomadic, light-skinned, their original home was outside India, their invasion occurred around 1500 BC, they destroyed an advanced civilization of the Indus valley, etc. And the evidence the Āryan Invasion Theory advocates in support of all these wild
conjectures can be summarized as follows:

A. Evidence for Invasion: Mention of Conflicts in Vedic literature, findings of skeletons at the excavated sites of Mohanjodro and Harappā.

B. Evidence for Āryan being Nomadic and Light-skinned: None whatsoever, pure conjecture except some misinterpreted quotes from Vedas.

C. Evidence for Non-Āryan / Drāvidian Nature of Indus civilization: Absence of horse, Śiva worshippers, chariots, racial differences, etc.

D. Evidence for proposed date of invasion, 1500 BC: Arbitrary and speculative, in Mesopotamia and Iraq the presence of the people worshipping Vedic gods around 1700BC, Biblical chronology.

Now let us examine the facts about the so-called evidence in support of the Āryan Invasion Theory:
In closing, it is important to examine the social and religious implications of the Āryan invasion idea:

1. It served to divide India into a northern Āryan and southern Drāvidian culture which were made hostile to each other. This kept the Hindus divided and is still a source of social tension.

2. It gave the British an excuse in their conquest of India. They could claim to be doing only what the Āryan ancestors of the Hindus had previously done millennia ago.
3. It served to make Vedic culture later than and possibly derived from Middle Eastern cultures. With the proximity and relationship of the latter with the Bible and Christianity, this kept the Hindu religion as a sidelight to the development of religion and civilization to the West.

4. It allowed the sciences of India to be given a Greek basis, as any Vedic basis was largely disqualified by the primitive nature of the Vedic culture.

5. This discredited not only the ‘Vedas’ but the genealogies of the ‘Puranas’ and their long list of kings before the Buddha or Krishna were left without any historical basis. The ‘Mahābhārata’, instead of a civil war in which all the main kings of India participated as it is described, became a local skirmish among petty princes that was later exaggerated by poets. In short, it discredited most of the Hindu tradition and almost all its ancient literature. It turned its scriptures and sages into fantasies and exaggerations.

6. This served a social, political and economic purpose of domination, proving the superiority of Western culture and religion. It made the Hindus feel that their culture was not the great thing that their sages and ancestors had said it was. It made Hindus feel ashamed of their culture that its basis was neither historical nor scientific. It made them feel that the main line of civilization was developed first in the Middle East and then in Europe and that the culture of India was peripheral and secondary to the real development of world culture. And the Indian mind is still, even after realizing the game that was played upon it, unable to hold its head high and claim that it is a Hindu; still is mentally affected by a great inferiority complex which hampers the natural blooming of any nation, and that was the motive behind this misrepresenting the facts and creating the Theory of Āryan Invasion.
7. Such a view is not good scholarship or archeology but merely cultural imperialism. The Western Vedic scholars did in the intellectual spheres what the British army did in the political realm — discredit, divide and conquer the Hindus. In short, the compelling reasons for the Āryan invasion theory were neither literary nor archeological but political and religious that is to say, not motivated by scholarship but by prejudice. Such prejudice may not have been intentional but deep-seated political and religious views easily cloud and blur our thinking.

8. The modern Western academic world is sensitive to criticism of cultural and social biases. If scholars took a stand against this biased interpretation of the ‘Vedas’ would indeed cause a reexamination of many of these historical ideas that cannot stand objective scrutiny. But if Hindu scholars are silent or passively accept the misinterpretation of their own culture, it will undoubtedly continue, and they will have no one to blame but themselves. It is not an issue to be taken lightly, because how a culture is defined historically creates the perspective from which it is viewed in the modern social and intellectual context. Tolerance is not in allowing a false view of one’s own culture and religion to be propagated without question. That is merely self-betrayal and cowardice. Therefore it is of crucial importance to show that Vedic society has evolved indigenously without any Āryan invasion.

9. On the basis of this theory, the propaganda by the Macaulayists was that there was nothing great in Hindu culture and its founders and sages. Most Hindus fell for this devious plan. It made Hindus feel ashamed of their own culture - that its basis was neither historical nor scientific, the Vedas were the work of nomadic shepherds and not the divine revelations or eternal truth
perceived by the riṣis during their spiritual journeys; and hence there is nothing to feel proud about India’s past, nothing to be proud of being Hindu.

In short such a view in conjunction with this concocted Āryan Invasion theory by a few European historians in order to prove the supremacy of Christianity and Western civilization, served (still serves) the purpose: ‘divide and conquer the Hindus’.

To conclude and sum up this section an apt quote from Swami Vivekananda, a seer—

“Our archaeologist’s dream of India being full of dark-eyed aborigines, and the bright Āryans came from - the Lord knows where. According to some, they came from Central Tibet; others will have it that they came from Central Asia. There are patriotic Englishmen who think that the Āryans were all red haired. Others, according to their idea, think that they were all black-haired. If the writer happens to be a black-haired man, the Āryans were all black-haired. Of late, there was an attempt made to prove that the Āryans lived on Swiss lake. I should not be sorry if they had been all drowned there, theory and all. Some say now that they lived at the North Pole. Lord bless the Āryans and their habitations! As far as the truth of these theories, there is not one word in our scriptures, not one, to prove that the Āryans came from anywhere outside of India, and in ancient India was included Afghanistan. There it ends...” 17

“And the theory that the Śudra caste were all non-Āryans and they were a multitude, is equally illogical and irrational. It could not have been possible
in those days that a few Āryans settled and lived there with a hundred thou-
sand slaves at their command. The slaves would have eaten them up, made
chutney of them in five minutes. The only explanation is to be found in the
Mahābhārata, which says that in the beginning of the Satya Yuga there was
only one caste, the Brāhmin, and then by differences of occupations they
went on dividing themselves into different castes, and that is the only true
and rational explanation that has been given. And in the coming Satya Yuga
all other castes will have to go back to the same condition.” 18