

The Aryan Invasion Theory: The Final Nail in its Coffin

**(From a Chapter in "Advancements of Ancient India's Vedic Culture")
by Stephen Knapp**

The Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT) is the idea that the Vedic people were not indigenous to the area of northern India, but were invaders from the Caucasus Mountain region that descended on India around 1500 BCE, and then wrote the Vedic literature and forced the natives to accept their culture. In writing this chapter I want to emphasize that this book is not about the Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT), but we should at least include one chapter on it to show its place in discovering the real history of the development of ancient India and the origins of Vedic culture. In doing so, I acknowledge there have already been volumes written on this controversial topic, and on where the original homeland of the Indo Aryans might be. So anyone can read any of those books until one is nauseated with various viewpoints, but that is not what we are going to do here. Going into a long dissertation about how all the theories were developed and what evidence they found is the last thing I want to do. For all but the specialist researchers and readers, it would make for an extremely tedious book, at least more so than some may feel it is already. So, we are only going to summarize some of the most recent and concluding research that is available today.

Let us remember that the idea that the Vedic Aryans came from outside of ancient India and entered the region to start what became the Vedic civilization is a foreign idea. There was never any record, either historical, textual or archeological, that supports this premise for an Aryan invasion. There also is no record of who would have been the invaders. The fact is that it is a theory that came from mere linguistic speculation which happened during the nineteenth century when very little archeological excavation had yet been done around India.

There have been many researchers who have tried to study the linguistics of the people to gather an indication of where the original homeland of the Vedic Aryans was actually located. This was done to either try to uphold or refute the idea of the Aryan Invasion Theory. In my book, *Proof of Vedic Culture's Global Existence*, I dealt with linguistics and word similarities to a degree, but this topic, in spite of all the research, study, and books written on whatever findings were made, has done little to absolutely establish with clarity the original home of the Vedic Aryans.

Some scholars have always felt that the linguistic evidence is not sufficient to draw definite conclusions where the homeland of the Vedic Aryans was located.

Linguistics amongst some scholars have always been a speculative process, at best arriving at various conjectures about the origins of particular cultures and languages. Others have been even more dismissive of the idea of reconstructing a hypothetical language based on words that remain present in spoken languages thousands of years later. Thus, in trying to understand the Vedic Aryans and where their homeland may have been by analyzing some hypothetical Proto-Indo-European language that still has not been identified seems rather doubtful. At best, it may provide some basic hypothesis, which in reality may be most misleading. This also seems to say that there is little reason to hold the field of linguistics in such a high degree of respect, considering all the books that have been written that seem to use this process to determine so many conclusions, or conjectures, on the homeland of the Vedic Aryans.

As a further comment to this issue, G. P. Singh relates, "They (proponents of the Aryan Invasion Theory) are divided in their opinion regarding the exact location of the said common home, the reason for which is not far to discover. The speakers of Aryan languages have been clubbed together as an Aryan race which never existed as such. The philological and ethnological explanations regarding the identification of an Aryan language with an Aryan race are conflicting. The similarities of a few words do not necessarily constitute a proof of common origin of their speakers, rather they indicate commingling and sociocultural contacts and fellowship. The theory of a common home of members of a so-called Aryan family whether in Asia or Europe cannot be accepted merely on the evidence of linguistic paleontology... The Aryan invasion of India is a myth and not the truth. The Aryans were neither invaders nor conquerors. They were not the destroyers of the Harappan civilization but one of its authors." ¹

This does not mean, however, that we cannot still use linguistics to help recognize the many similarities of cultures by the closeness of words, in both spelling and meaning, that are used in the languages of various traditions, or where and how far the Vedic and Sanskrit influence has traveled, and how various cultures may have shared traditions with each other. But to supply proof of where the Vedic people originated, that is not possible. Plus, today we have so much more research and archeological evidence that tells far more than the study of linguistics, which will certainly lead us to the correct conclusion about this matter.

Up till today, there is still no culture from the time of ancient India that can be said to have originated outside and then invaded or brought the Vedic

culture to the interior of India. More evidence will be given as we discuss this topic. But for now, what this means is that if we look at the ancient ruins, or agricultural practices, artifacts, or social activities, it can be recognized that they were all based on indigenous techniques and traditions. They are not linked to anything that would have come from outside of India, although just the opposite is the case. Moreover, we can see a migration from India to the west or even eastward.

Traditionally, as we find in the *Manu-samhita* (2.17-18), Vedic culture was founded by the sage Manu between the banks of the Sarasvati and Drishadvati Rivers. And the Sarasvati River was the main river in the *Rig Veda*, which, according to modern land studies, was a massive and important river at the time (before 1900 BCE). Only after this did the emphasis shift to the sacred Ganga (Ganges) River. This would indicate that the Vedic tradition is indeed a product of the area of ancient India.

There was also no real divide between north and south India in terms of the so-called invading Aryans in the north and the Dravidians of the south. As explained by David Frawley, "Dravidian history does not contradict Vedic history either. It credits the invention of the Tamil language, the oldest Dravidian tongue, to the rishi Agastya, one of the most prominent sages in the *Rig Veda*. Dravidian kings historically have called themselves Aryans and trace their descent through Manu (who in the *Matsya Purana* is regarded as originally a south Indian king). Apart from language, moreover, both north and south India share a common religion and culture." ²

A recent landmark global study in population genetics by a team of internationally reputed scientists (as reported in *The History and Geography of Human Genes*, by Luca Cavalli-Sforza, Paolo Menozzi and Alberta Piazza, Princeton University Press) reveals that the people who inhabited the Indian subcontinent, including Europe, concludes that all belong to one single race of Caucasian type. This confirms once again that there really is no racial difference between north Indians and south Indian Dravidians.

Other scholars and researchers are also giving up the idea of the Aryan Invasion Theory. As further explained in the book *Origin of Indian Civilization*, based on the results of the conference of the same name, it was described that, "While not in complete agreement, yet for Professor Witzel and Eltsov to acknowledge that the Harappan and Vedic civilizations were concurrent, is an important landmark in the debate on the Indic civilization. Prof. Witzel also stated for the first time to many in the audience that he and his colleagues no longer subscribe to the Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT). Prof. Witzel of Harvard agreed with the scholars present that the Aryan invasion theory is a nineteenth-century concept and a spent force today. He said, 'nobody in the right mind believes in something like Aryan Invasion Theory.'" ³

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ARYAN INVASION THEORY

Before the 1857 uprising it was recognized that British rule in India could not be sustained without a large number of supporters and collaborators from within the Indian population. Recognizing this, it was influential men like Thomas Babbington Macaulay, who, as Chairman of the Education Board, sought to set up an educational system modeled after the British system, which, in the case of India, would serve to undermine the Hindu tradition. While not a missionary himself, Macaulay came from a deeply religious family steeped in the Protestant Christian faith. His father was a Presbyterian minister and his mother a Quaker. He believed that the conversion of Hindus to Christianity held the answer to the problems of administering India. His idea was to create a class of English educated elite that would repudiate its tradition and become British collaborators. In 1836, while serving as chairman of the Education Board in India, he enthusiastically wrote his father about his idea and how it was proceeding:

"Our English schools are flourishing wonderfully. The effect of this education on the Hindus is prodigious... It is my belief that if our plans of education are followed up, there will not be a single idolator among the respectable classes in Bengal thirty years hence. And this will be effected without any efforts to proselytise, without the smallest interference with religious liberty, by natural operation of knowledge and reflection. I heartily rejoice in the project."

So the point was that religious conversion and colonialism were to go hand in hand. European Christian missions were an appendage of the colonial government, with missionaries working side by side with the government. In this case, we could ask if over the years much has really changed in the purpose of the Christian missions in India.

The key point here is Macaulay's belief that "knowledge and reflection" on the part of the Hindus, especially the Brahmanas, would cause them to give up their age-old belief in anything Vedic in favor of Christianity. The purpose was to turn the strength of Hindu intellectuals against their own kind by utilizing their commitment to scholarship in uprooting their own tradition, which Macaulay viewed as nothing more than superstitions. His plan was to educate the Hindus to become Christians and turn them into collaborators. He persisted with this idea for fifteen years until he found the money and the right man for turning his utopian idea into reality.

He needed someone who would translate and interpret the Vedic texts in such a way that the newly educated Indian elite would see the superiority of the Bible and choose that over everything else. Upon his return to England,

after a good deal of effort he found a talented but impoverished young German Vedic scholar by name Friedrich Max Muller who was willing to take on the arduous job. Macaulay used his influence with the East India Company to find funds for Max Muller's translation of the *Rig Veda*. Though an ardent German nationalist, Max Muller agreed for the sake of Christianity to work for the East India Company, which in reality meant the British Government of India. He also badly needed a major sponsor for his ambitious plans, which he felt he had at last found.

The fact is that Max Muller was paid by the East India Company to further its colonial aims, and worked in cooperation with others who were motivated by the superiority of the German race through the white Aryan race theory.

This was the genesis of his great enterprise, translating the *Rig Veda* with Sayana's commentary and the editing of the fifty-volume *Sacred Books of the East*. In this way, there can be no doubt regarding Max Muller's initial aim and commitment to converting Indians to Christianity. Writing to his wife in 1866 he observed:

"It [the *Rig Veda*] is the root of their religion and to show them what the root is, I feel sure, is the only way of uprooting all that has sprung from it during the last three thousand years."

Two years later he also wrote the Duke of Argyle, then acting Secretary of State for India: "The ancient religion of India is doomed. And if Christianity does not take its place, whose fault will it be?" This makes it very clear that Max Muller was an agent of the British government paid to advance its colonial interests. Nonetheless, he still remained an ardent German nationalist even while working in England. This helps explain why he used his position as a recognized Vedic and Sanskrit scholar to promote the idea of the "Aryan race" and the "Aryan nation," a theory amongst a certain class of so-called scholars, which has maintained its influence even until today.

MAX MULLER DENIES HIS OWN THEORY

It was in the nineteenth century when Max Muller tried to date the *Vedas* to 1200 BCE. Then he accepted the *Sutra* literature to the sixth century BCE and assigned a duration of just 200 years to each of the periods of Vedic literature, namely the *Aranyakas*, *Brahmanas* and *Vedas*. But when his contemporary scholars, like Goldstucker, Whitney and Wilson, raised a fuss about this, he had to regress and stated (in his Preface to the *Rgveda*): "I have repeatedly dwelt on the merely hypothetical character of the dates, which I have ventured to assign to the first periods of Vedic literature. All I have claimed for them has been that they are minimum dates, and that the

literary productions of each period which either still exist or which formerly existed could hardly be accounted for within shorter limits of time than those suggested." ⁴

This indicates his admission that he really did not know and he was expressing nothing but conjecture. This is not exactly a scholarly action. But still being pressed by his contemporaries, he finally admitted it in a publication in 1890 (*Physical Religion*) and reflected the responsibility by saying no one can figure it out: "If now we ask how we can fix the dates of these periods, it is quite clear that we cannot hope to fix a *terminum a qua*. Whether the Vedic hymns were composed [in] 1000 or 1500 or 2000 or 3000 BC, no power on earth will ever determine." ⁵

Although Max Muller was the one who cleverly came up with the Aryan Invasion Theory, he later worked to bring out the *Sacred Books of the East* series, which helped promote the spiritual wisdom of the East to the general public in Europe. Later, though a German by birth, he was living comfortably in England when in 1872, after the German nationalists finally achieved unification, he marched into a university in German occupied France (Strasbourg) and denounced the German doctrine of the superior Aryan race. It was at this time that he began to clarify that by Aryan he meant language and not a race. This was in stark contrast with his previous views, which had all been well documented, and which kept following him since politicians and propagandists kept using his conclusions as authority for their own race ideas. At last, he stated clearly in 1888:

"I have declared again and again that if I say Aryan, I mean neither blood nor bones, nor skull nor hair; I mean simply those who speak the Aryan language... To me an ethnologist who speaks of Aryan blood, Aryan race, Aryan eyes and hair is as great a sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolicocephalic dictionary or of brachycephalic grammar." ⁶

Just as he had previously been a proponent of the Aryan race theory for the first 20 years of his life, he remained an opponent of it for the remaining 30 years of his life. However, in spite of this fact, we still find Indian scholars who still hold onto Muller's previous views, however inaccurate they may have been, in their own conclusions on India's history.

THE DAMAGE DONE BY THE ARYAN INVASION THEORY

The premise of the Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT) was used as a perfect tool, especially by the British, to divide the Hindu society and the state of India. The North Indian "Aryans" were then pit against the South Indian "Dravidians," along with high-caste against low-caste, mainstream Hindus against tribals, Vedic orthodoxy against the indigenous orthodox sects, and

later to neutralize Hindu criticism of the forced Islamic occupation of India, since "Hindus themselves entered India in the same way as Muslims did." Even today, the theory has still been used as the basis for the growth of secularist and even Marxist forces.

The problem with all of this is that people of Indian descent, especially the youth, when they hear all of this Aryan Invasion theory nonsense, they begin to lose faith in their own country, culture and history, and especially in the Vedic tradition and epics. They think it is all just stories, fiction, or even a lie. But that is not the case at all, which is why it is important to show where this theory came from, what its purpose was, and why we should throw it away and take a second and much deeper look at what the Vedic tradition has to offer, and how it was actually the source of much of the world's advancement in so many areas.

Even in India today it is often the case that schools teach the Western views of Indian history and even use European translations of the great Vedic texts. Children are taught that their culture is inherently inferior to the Western developments, and that Hinduism is archaic, outdated, with nothing to offer people today. Therefore, in this view, Indian students should no longer value their own culture and instead look toward the West for everything they need. But this notion is absolutely false. They do not know how much the Western youth looks toward India for its spiritual inspiration, and are using the ancient Indian and Vedic traditions, such as yoga, Jyotish, Vastu, Ayurveda, and the Vedic philosophy to reach their highest potential and well-being. They would not do that if they were not experiencing the benefits of it. In fact, it is all becoming increasingly popular because there is more curiosity, inquiry, and need to find something of substance rather than being content with the shallow nature of Western society and its values.

Part of the problem today is in the educational system of India, and everywhere for that matter, that still often projects the idea that the native Indians were undeveloped and pushed out of the area that was taken over by the invading Aryans, who then pushed their language, culture, and religion onto the people who remained. Those who went south to avoid the invading Aryans were called the Dravidians. The British missionaries, even as early as 1840, went on to use this theory as a means to persuade people of South India to reject the Vedic tradition, since it had been forced on them by invaders, and accept Christianity. By using the typical "divide and rule" policy that the British were known for, they helped create a schism in the people of India which gave them better means to control and manipulate them under the guise of giving them back the respect they had always deserved. Of course, if they became Christian they would deserve even more respect, as portrayed by the missionaries. So, the Aryan Invasion Theory, which had originally been

developed by a Christian certainly continued to serve the Christian interests well, unbeknownst to the people who falsely accepted the Dravidian identity. In this regard, Chandrasekharendra Saraswati summed it up very nicely: "Their conclusions would permit them to regard the ancient rishis as primitive men inferior to the moderns... their analysis of our religious texts was motivated by the desire to show Christianity as a better religion." ⁷

Thus, the real truth was kept hidden so their agenda could be served. But was not that the whole purpose behind the Aryan Invasion Theory from the start? After all, as N. S. Rajaram has succinctly related, "English translations of the *Rigveda*... represent a massive misinterpretation built on the preconception that the *Vedas* are the primitive poetry of the nomadic barbarians. Nothing could be further from the truth." ⁸

Even of late, there have been leaders in Tamil Nadu who have promoted this Dravidian identity, and gave reasons why they should reject Hinduism, which is but an imposition on the natives. Of course, now, through the use of genetics, it has been proven that there never was any division, except in name only, between the Vedic Aryans and the native Dravidians. They were all part of the same native and indigenous fabric of ancient Indian civilization. Any other divisions were all but hypothetical and theory only. But this was part of the damage that such mental speculation had caused. And it still goes on. That is why books and information such as this needs to be spread, so that the truth of the matter can finally be displayed for all to see, and the unity to help preserve and protect the truth of the depth and profound nature of the Vedic civilization can be properly understood.

OBJECTIONS TO THE ARYAN INVASION THEORY

As archeologists B. B. Lal explains, it was Mortimer Wheeler who, after reporting a few skeletons being found at Mohenjodaro, said that the people of Mohenjodaro had been massacred in the invasion of the region. However, the skeletons had been found at different stratigraphic levels of the site—some from intermediate levels, late levels, and also from the deposits that had accumulated at the site after its desertion. This showed that Wheeler was wrong in his assessment. Recent skeletons would have been no where but the uppermost levels.

Thus, the conclusion would have to be that no evidence whatsoever of an invasion has been found at any of the hundreds of Harappan sites. Furthermore, at most of these sites, there is ample proof of continuity of habitation. An outside invasion also means the presence and entry of a new people, but no such evidence exists. A detailed study of human skeletal remains by Hemphill and his colleagues (1991) showed that no new people

arrived between 4500–800 BCE, during which the "Aryan invasion" was said to have happened (around 1500 BCE). Therefore, no evidence for an invasion exists, and certainly not by any Aryans.

Furthermore, when new invaders arrive, place names of some towns and rivers remain from the previous people who occupied the area. But no Dravidian names exist for any such objects in the entire area once occupied by the Harappans.⁹

Another point is that before the *Vedas* were written, it had been an oral tradition. However, an oral tradition of this kind of philosophy and culture cannot be maintained by a people in constant movement for decades if not centuries over many thousands of miles, which is what the Aryan Invasion Theory proposes. Such a tradition as the Vedic culture could be preserved only by a sedentary people where the older generation would have the necessary time to pass the communal lore to the younger generation.¹⁰

In fact, as we have established in *Proof of Vedic Culture's Global Existence*, the Vedic texts make no mention of any migration at all. Surely, if that had happened there would have been some narration of it, or history of a previous location. But nothing exists like that, nor any language previous to the Vedic culture that existed in the Gangetic plains as would be expected.

There are many reasons why common sense can tell you that there could not have been any invasion into Aryavarta (India) by Vedic Aryans from outside. The question is that if the Aryans were supposed to be rambling barbarians, as viewed by some, yet were able to develop such a sophisticated language (Sanskrit) and compositions (the *Vedas*), then how did they not leave in the countries they left behind a rich culture that shows their previous developments? What happened to their descendants who should have kept the remnants of their culture and language? Why were not similar developments made by those who remained in Eastern Europe? And what happened to the pre-Sanskrit language and culture of the area that the Aryans invaded, if that is what happened? No answers have been found regarding these points.

Furthermore, as Dr. B. B. Lal relates, "Let it be squarely stated that the earliest book of the Aryans, the *Rig Veda*, does not mention any of the species of cold-climate trees enumerated. On the other hand, all the trees mentioned in the *Rig Veda*, such as the *Ashvatha* (*Ficus religiosa* L.), *Khadira* (*Acacia catechu* Wild), *Nigrodhas* (*Ficus benghalensis* L.), do not belong to a cold climate but to a tropical one. Likewise, the *Rig Vedic* fauna, comprising such species as the lion, elephant, peacock, also belong to a tropical climate. Further, during the *Rig Vedic* period the Sarasvati was a mighty river, but it gradually dried up. The evidence of archeology, hydrology and radiocarbon dates shows that the Sarasvati dried up around 2000 BCE.

All this proves that the *Rig Veda* antedated the magic figure. Again, the *Rig Vedic* geography covers the area from the Ganga-Yamuna on the east to the west of the Indus. Likewise, the archeological evidence shows that prior to 2,000 BCE it was the Harappan Civilization that flourished in this region. Thus, the textual and archeological data combine to establish a perfect spatial-cum-chronological oneness between the *Rig Vedic* and Harappan cultures. And since, as demonstrated in this book, the Harappans were 'the sons of the soil', it squarely follows that the *Rig Vedic* people were indigenous." ¹¹

We also need to understand from what frivolous basis came the term "Aryan race." The people who created this term, and the Aryan Invasion Theory itself, were not biologists, archeologists, or scientists, though some of them later adopted this. But they were only linguists of questionable qualifications. Even in 1929, Sir Julian Huxley, one of the great natural scientists of the twentieth century related (in *Oxford Pamphlet*, No. 5, OUP: p.9):

"In 1848, the young German scholar Friederich Max Muller (1823-1900) settled in Oxford... About 1853 he introduced into the English language the unlucky term *Aryan* as applied to a large group of languages.

"Moreover, Max Muller threw another apple of discord. He introduced a proposition that is demonstrably false. He spoke not only of a definite Aryan language and its descendants, but also of a corresponding 'Aryan race.' The idea was rapidly taken up both in Germany and in England." ¹²

Part of the problem was a misinterpretation of the word *aryan*. With the AIT, it was meaning a race of people, or even a separate language. But the word *arya* was always meant to be used as an honorific title for someone who lead a pure life, who was on the path for attaining a pure and spiritual consciousness. *Arya* actually means clear as in light consciousness, not as a light-skinned person of another separate race. An Aryan in this case meant an ethical, social and spiritual ideal of a well-governed life, for someone who was noble, straightforward in his dealings, was courageous, gentle, kind, compassionate, protector of the weak, eager for knowledge, and displayed respect for the wise and learned. Thus, everything that was opposite of this, such as mean, cruel, rude, false, ignoble, was considered *non-aryan*.

Huxley, regarding the scientific view at the time (1939), said the following: "In England and America the phrase 'Aryan race' has quite ceased to be used by writers with scientific knowledge, though it appears occasionally in political and propagandist literature... In Germany, the idea of the 'Aryan race' received no more scientific support than in England. Nevertheless, it found able and very persistent literary advocates who made it appear very flattering to local vanity. It therefore steadily spread, fostered by special interests."

In this regard, N. S. Rajaram explains: "Those 'special conditions' were the rise of Nazism in Germany and British imperial interests in India. While both Germany and Britain took to the idea of the Aryan race, the courses taken by this racial theory in the two countries were quite different. Its perversion in Germany leading eventually to Nazism and its horrors is too well known to be repeated here. The British, however, put it to more creative use for imperial purposes, especially as a tool in making their rule acceptable to Indians. A BBC report admitted (6 October, 2005):

"It [AIT] gave a historical precedent to justify the role and status of the British Raj, who could argue that they were transforming India for the better in the same way that the Aryans had done thousands of years earlier." ¹³

This was the way the British could justify their presence in India as a new and improved brand of Aryans that were doing the same thing that the present Indians who were the previous invading Aryans had done in the past. Thus, the Aryan Invasion Theory was perpetuated by special interests rather than by true historical evidence. In such a case, when the truth finally becomes apparent, such false notions have to dwindle and fade. That is why I have written about how those who believe in the false history of India are but a dying breed. The modern archeologists simply do not believe or see enough evidence to accept the Aryan Invasion Theory. Thus, it becomes self-evident that the Vedic culture was part of the indigenous tradition of India all along, and not brought to India by any outside invaders.

MISLEADING DATES OF THE ARYAN INVASION THEORY

When the idea for the Aryan invasion was developed by Max Muller, he was formulating dates based on his familiarity and loyalty to the Biblical tradition, which tries to establish that the world was created in 4004 BCE. Therefore, whatever dates he came up with had to fit into this scheme of things. So, as we know, he decided that the Aryans had to have invaded India in 1500 BCE, and then developed the *Rig Veda* thereafter in 1200 BCE. This means that such calculations are based on faith in the Bible, and, accordingly, a group of linguistically unified people must have been existing around the Caspian Sea before invading India. It is this Biblical reference that formed the foundation of these dates of Max Muller's for the Aryan Invasion Theory and when the *Rig Veda* may have been written. These were merely assumptions, many of which have been left uncontested, especially outside of India, up until a few decades ago.

Furthermore, Dr. Narahari Achar, a physicist from the University of Memphis clearly showed with astronomical analysis that the *Mahabharata* War took place in 3067 BCE, seriously challenging the

outside "Aryan" origin of Vedic people. ¹⁴ Therefore, if we accept the year 3102 BCE as the date for the beginning of Kali-yuga, and 3067 BCE as the time for the *Mahabharata* war, this surely means that human society itself had been in existence for many, many years before the Christian date of 4004 BCE as the date for the creation of the world. This would make the 4004 BCE date of creation and the stories that go with it complete fiction.

The real problem with this is that these dates of 1500 BCE for the invasion of the Aryan forces and 1200 BCE for the creation of the *Rig Veda* have been propagated in both school and college books for many years as if they are the substantiated truth. However, even Muller admitted many times later in his life that these dates were arbitrary in nature, or merely guesses grounded on his own view of things, which were precarious opinions based on his allegiance to the Bible. He had written in admission, "I need hardly say that I agree with everyone of my critics. I have repeatedly dwelt on the entirely hypothetical character of the dates that I venture to assign [to the Vedic literature]. ... Whether the Vedic hymns were composed 1000, 1500 or 2000 or 3000 BC, no power on earth will ever determine."

As we have seen, it is the findings in archeology and the statements and history within the *Rig Veda* that have contradicted the dates of the fictional Aryan Invasion and the idea of an invasion itself. For example, the *Rig Veda* has described the ancient and glorious Sarasvati River, which is known to have dried up around 1900 BCE, and was probably already in the process of drying up back in 3000 BCE. This could not have been written by any invaders who entered India around 1500 BCE. How could they have described worshipping a river that had already ceased to exist 500 hundred years earlier? This is impossible. It would be like a haunting ghost story, still talking about things that had disappeared many generations ago.

This indicates that the *Rig Veda* had to have been in existence while the Sarasvati River was in her prime. This also means that the dates that many Western scholars have assigned for the formation of the *Rig Veda* are also in error by probably 2000 years or more. Of course, it was Max Muller who was paid by the British Government to write a negative interpretation of the *Vedas* to undermine the view Hindus themselves had for their own scripture, so he may have also been under pressure for his employment if he did not provide such viewpoints. Nonetheless, he had his own ambitions, as was outlined in a letter to his wife in 1866 about his edition of the *Rig Veda* having "a great extent on the fate of India and the growth of millions of souls in that country. It is the root of their religion and to show them what that root is, I feel sure, is the only way of uprooting all that has sprung from it in the last three thousand years."

Well, his purpose did not work, but certainly created a major distraction in finding the truth of the matter, which, fortunately, there have been many scholars that have now shown the inaccuracy of the views that had originated from Max Muller's hypothesis and guesswork.

THE SARASVATI RIVER IN THE RIG VEDA

The Sarasvati River is mentioned in the *Rig Veda* over 60 times, with three hymns that make Sarasvati the subject, namely in book 6, hymn 61, and book 7, hymns 95 & 96. The most noted verse from the *Rig Veda* that refers to the mighty Sarasvati river and its civilization is 7.95.1.1-2, which states:

*pra kshodasa dhayada sasra
esha sarasvati dharunamayasi puh
prababadhana rathyeva yati
vishva apo mahina sindhuranyaha*

"Pure in her course from the mountains to the ocean, alone of streams Sarasvati hath listened."

Thus, it stands to reason that the Sarasvati acquired this state of reverence during its prime and not after it started drying up. In other verses that describe her, we find it said in the *Rig Veda* (7.36.6) she is the holiest and greatest of all rivers, the best of the seven rivers, and Mother of the rivers and the Sindhu River. Then again she is the best of the seven rivers (6.61.9-10), and is fed by three, five or seven streams (6.61.12), and nourishes all of the Vedic people, and flows through the mountains and crushes boulders like the stems of lotus flowers (6.61.2), and that Sarasvati was the best of mothers, the best river and best goddess (6.41.16).

For further insight into this, we can see how the *Rig Veda* described the Sarasvati River. Some of the Sanskrit words used to describe the Sarasvati in the *Rig Veda* are *naditama*, *ambitama*, and *devitama*, which mean best river, best mother and best goddess (2.41.16); it is swollen and fed by three or more rivers *pinvamana sindhubhih* (6.52.6); it is endless, swift moving, roaring, most dear among her sister rivers; together with her divine aspect, it nourishes the tribes (6.61.8-13). In 7.95.2 it is said *giribhyah a samudrat*, it flows in a pure course from the mountains to the ocean. Then 7.96.2 and 10.177 mentions to pray to the river goddess for sustenance and good fortune, and 10.64.9 calls upon her (and Sarayu and Indus) as great and nourishing. Thus, the descriptions indicate a live and flowing river of great importance, flowing from the Himalayas to the ocean. ¹⁵

The *Rig Veda* (10.75.5) also indicates where the Sarasvati was located by listing the main northern rivers in order from the east, in which case places the Sarasvati between the Yamuna and the Shutudri (modern Sutlej), as found in the verse:

*imam me gange yamune sarasvati shutudri stomam parushnya
asiknya marudvridhe vitastya arjikiye shrinuhya sushomaya*

"Ganga, Yamuna, Sarasvati, Shutudri (Sutlej) Parushni (Ravi) Asikni, Manuvridha, Vitasta, Arjikiye, Shrinuhya, and Sushomaya."

Many great Vedic rishis were also mentioned in the *Rig Veda* as having a connection with the Sarasvati River, such as Vasistha and Jamadagni (7.96.3), Gritsamada (2.41.16), and Bharadvaj (6.61). Also kings like Divodas (6.61) and Bharatas such as Devavat and Devashravas (3.23) are mentioned in connection with the Sarasvati. Also of the *Rig Veda* are the clan of the Purus who resided along the Sarasvati, in which it says, "Sarasvati, on both whose plant-laden banks the Purus dwell." (7.96.2) ¹⁶

The importance of the Sarasvati, as herein demonstrated, cannot go unnoticed. Besides references to the Sarasvati River in the *Rig Veda*, we can find some in the *Atharva Veda* as well. One reference (6.30.1) refers to Indra ploughing the banks of the Sarasvati to cultivate barley, which was not only one of the items for offering into the fire during the *yajna* ritual, but was also one of the earliest staple foods.

During sacrifices, we find (AV 5.27.9) Sarasvati as the goddess was invoked along with goddesses Ida, Mahi and Bharathi. Then in hymns (AV 7.68 and 18.1.41) she is called to accept oblations during the ritual. We also find (AV 7.57.1) where Vamadeva was shaken due to the apathy and derogatory words of the people, and invokes Sarasvati to reduce tension and cleanse the mind. In a similar way, we find (AV 19.40.1) where Sarasvati is praised in order to overcome frailties of the mind.

PROOF OF THE SARASVATI RIVER

While surveying the course of the Sarasvati River, geologist Sir Auriel Stein (1862-1943) concluded that there was indeed such a river that had dried up when the course of the Sutlej changed, and discontinued being the main contributory of the Sarasvati River. Thus, as the Sarasvati began to dry, the cities and residents that depended on the river also had to move. With the satellite images made through earth sensing satellites from 1978 by NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) and the ISRO (Indian Space Research Organization) that revealed the ancient river courses, these show

that the Sarasvati was a channel that ranged from six to eight kilometers wide, and up to 14 kilometers in some parts. Thus, the greatness of the Sarasvati River, as described in the *Rig Veda*, was verified.

This was further confirmed by an aerial survey conducted by the American Landsat satellite in 1990 that showed a dried tract of 1000 miles where the Sarasvati would have flowed from the Himalayas to the Sourashtrian coast. This changed the way many researchers viewed this issue. This was later followed up in 1996 by the Indian remote sensing satellite of the Indian Space Research Organization, the color images of which also clearly showed marks of a palaeochannel as wide as 3 km to 12 km in the same stretch.

Furthermore, in 1998, there were 24 wells dug by the Central Ground Water Commission along the dry bed, all of which produced potable water but one. Also in 1998, after the Pokhran atomic test, the Baba Atomic Research Center (BARC) drilled down 70 meters for sub-soil water to confirm that the aquifers had not been affected by radioactive material and found that the water was of Himalayan origin from as far back as 14,000 years.

This discovery of the Sarasvati also solved the reason why there were alluvial deposits in the Gulf of Cambay, discovered in 1869 by archeologist Alex Rogue. It was odd because there was no known river that flowed from the Himalayas at the time. ¹⁷

THE DEMISE OF THE SARASVATI

The *Rig Veda* describes the Sarasvati River as a mighty flowing river. So if we know that it dried up completely around 2000 BCE, and had to have been in the process of drying by 3000 BCE or before, then the *Rig Veda* had to have been written before it started to dry up. There is nothing in the *Rig Veda* about the Sarasvati diminishing in any way. However, we do find in the *Mahabharata* where the Sarasvati was decreasing to a shorter course, such as in 3.130.3; 6.7.47; 6.37.1-4; 9.34.81; and 9.36.1-2.

The *Mahabharata* (*Shalya Parva*, 36-55) also describes the Sarasvati in relation to Balarama's pilgrimage, which He took to occupy Himself rather than participate in the war at Kurukshetra with His brother Lord Krishna. It states that the Sarasvati was still significant in its holiness, but from its origin it flowed only for a forty-day journey by horse into the desert where it disappeared. All that was left were the holy places that used to be on its banks (as also mentioned in 3.80.84; 3.88.2; & 9.34.15-8).

The *Mahabharata* also describes the geographical location of the river, saying that it flows near Kurukshetra (3.81.125). Similar information along with the

place where the Sarasvati disappears, Vinashana, is found in the *Manu-samhita* (2.21).

All of this also indicates that the *Rig Veda* had to have existed well before 2000 BCE because it is described therein that the Sarasvati was a mighty flowing river during the *Rig Vedic* times, before it finally dried in 2000 BCE. According to the *Rig Veda* (10.75.5-6), the Vedic people occupied the area from the Ganga in the east to the Indus in the west. And as we have established in *Proof of Vedic Culture's Global Existence*, the Harappan civilization was a part of the Vedic culture in the form of its continuance and diversity, or regional variations. In fact, the *Rig Veda* was already in existence before the Harappan Civilization came into its prime.

From other research we have found that the whole of the Sarasvati River had dried by about 2000 to 1800 BCE, and was at best a few small lakes. But the site of the Harappan Civilization called Kalibangan, that sits along the bank of the Sarasvati, after hydrological investigations (Raikes 1968), reveals that it was abandoned because of the drying up of the river. And this happened because of the rise of the Bata-Markanda Terrace in the Himalayas (Puri and Verma 1998). Even the *Panchavimsha Brahmana* (15.10.16) mentions the drying up of the Sarasvati. Radiocarbon dates also show that Kalibangan was abandoned around 2000 BCE. ¹⁸

Research explains that the demise of the Sarasvati River was caused by the lack of water it had previously received from the Yamuna, which had changed its course to flow eastward into the Ganga. Then the Sutlej also turned southwest, while the glacial melt also decreased, all of which greatly weakened the flow of the Sarasvati. This resulted in the Sarasvati disappearing into the desert at a place called Vinashana, or Samantapanchaka in the *Mahabharata*, before it reached the sea. ¹⁹

This, along with the world drought that was known to have happened around 2200 to 1900 BCE, contributed to drying up the Sarasvati and Drishavati rivers and to the disappearance of the Harappan or Indus Valley Civilization. It also created the Thar desert. After this many people were forced to abandon this area and whatever towns and cities flourished there at that time. This massive worldwide drought not only impacted the Harappan civilization, but is also known to have affected or ended the civilizations of not only Egypt, but also of the Sumer-Akkad regions in Mesopotamia. All of this caused a deterioration of the Vedic bond in this area, and a rise in small political groups known as Janapadas, which is described in the Buddhist and Jain literature. Sanskrit also lost influence while Prakrits, regional languages, like Pali and Ardhamagadhi were used, as we find in the Buddhist and Jain texts of that era.

As further explained by N.S. Rajaram, it was sometime around 3000 BCE when the Yamuna River changed its course and started its flow into the Ganga River. This may have been due to earthquakes or something similar. That, of course, weakened the flow of the Sarasvati River, wherein it soon disappeared into the desert at a place called Vinashana. Some archeologists have identified this place as Kalibangan in Rajasthan, which is also where Harappan and pre-Harappan settlements have been found, as well as signs of possible earthquakes in the area. This corresponds to descriptions found in the *Jaiminiya Brahmana* and the *Mahabharata*.

The lower part of the Sarasvati River was still fed by the Sutlej and other rivers for some time, which continued to flow through the Thar desert and support some of the Harappan settlements in Rajasthan, Sindh and Cholistan to the Rann of Kutch. However, the Sutlej later also changed course, so this stretch of the river also dried up in stages from 2200 to 1900, when it is known to have disappeared completely, putting an end to whatever was left of the Harappan society in that area. This means that the Harappan civilization came to an end by natural causes, not any invaders, and then moved farther east into the Gangetic plains. Some Harappan people may have also moved westward into West Asia where they contributed to the growing tribes there. Some of the Kassite rulers seemed to have been of Indian origin who established an empire there.

Since Mohenjodaro and Harappa were first discovered in 1922, numerous other settlements have been uncovered, which now number over 2500, which stretches from Baluchistan to the Ganga and beyond, and down to the Tapti Valley. All of this covers nearly a million and a half square miles, all of which have been researched by archeologists. And 75% of all of these are concentrated around the dried up Sarasvati River bed. However, this also means that it was not an invasion that forced the abandonment of these towns and cities, but it was the drying up of the Sarasvati River, which was a catastrophe that led to an outflow of people going in different directions from here to resettle elsewhere, especially into the Gangetic plain, but also including westward into Iran, Mesopotamia and other areas.

Even a most recent study, as reported in *The Daily Mail* in London, combining the latest archaeological evidence with state-of-the-art geoscience technologies provides evidence that climate change was a key ingredient in the collapse of the great Indus or Harappan Civilization almost 4000 years ago.

Liviu Giosan, a geologist with Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI) and lead author of the study published the week of May 28, 2012, in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, "We reconstructed the dynamic landscape of the plain where the Indus civilization developed 5200

years ago, built its cities, and slowly disintegrated between 3900 and 3000 years ago. Until now, speculations abounded about the links between this mysterious ancient culture and its life-giving mighty rivers... We considered that it is high time for a team of interdisciplinary scientists to contribute to the debate about the enigmatic fate of these people," Giosan explained.

As the report related, the research was conducted between 2003 and 2008 in Pakistan, from the coast of the Arabian Sea into the fertile irrigated valleys of Punjab and the northern Thar Desert. The international team included scientists from the U.S., U.K., Pakistan, India, and Romania with specialties in geology, geomorphology, archaeology, and mathematics. By combining satellite photos and topographic data collected by the Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM), the researchers prepared and analyzed digital maps of landforms constructed by the Indus and neighboring rivers, which were then probed in the field by drilling, coring, and even manually-dug trenches. Collected samples were used to determine the sediments' origins, whether brought in and shaped by rivers or wind, and their age, in order to develop a chronology of landscape changes.

The new study suggests the same conclusions as had previously been arrived at by other researchers, that the decline in monsoon rains led to weakened river dynamics, and played a critical role both in the development and the collapse of the Harappan culture, which relied on river floods to fuel their agricultural surpluses.

From the new research, a compelling picture of 10,000 years of changing landscapes emerges. Before the plain was massively settled, the wild and forceful Indus and its tributaries flowing from the Himalaya cut valleys into their own deposits and left high "interfluvial" stretches of land between them. In the east, reliable monsoon rains sustained perennial rivers that crisscrossed the desert leaving behind their sedimentary deposits across a broad region.

The new research argues that the Sarasvati (Ghaggar-Hakra) was primarily a perennial monsoon-supported watercourse, and that aridification reduced it to short seasonal flows. Therefore, the conclusion of their research, in this regard, is that the slow drying of the Sarasvati River was the primary reason for the movement of the Indus Valley Civilization from the region, not invaders who took over the area. By 3900 years ago, their rivers drying, the Harappans had an escape route to the east toward the Ganges basin, where monsoon rains remained reliable.²⁰

LOCATION OF VINASHANA

It is said that the place of Vinashana is where the Sarasvati River stopped flowing. However, not everyone is sure of exactly where it was located. Some historians and archaeologists locate it near Bharner, others near Kalibanga, and others in Rajasthan. But the popular convention of the lists of holy places in the *Puranas* locates it in the Kurukshetra region, Samanta-panchaka. Whereas the *Padma Purana* (18.247) seems to locate the site of Vinashana as far downstream as Pushkaranya. The *Skanda Purana* (Nagara Khanda, 164.39) appears to say that the flow of the Sarasvati went underground after it reached Pushkaranya in her westward flow.

As related in *New Discoveries About Vedic Sarasvati*, "Pushkaranya of Kurukshetra was the forest area located close to present Jind or Jayantika. Still this place is famous as Pokharan. There is a pond, which is known even today as a pond where Duryodhana hid himself after being defeated by Bhima in mace fighting. So it is crystal clear from this reference that Vinashana is located in Haryana itself and not Rajasthan."

"Sridharasvani (c1400 AD) cited by C. Rayachaudhuri ²¹ in his gloss on *Bhagavata Purana* (1.9.1) locates Vinashana in Kurukshetra itself. The fact is that during the age of composition of the *Brahmanas* and *Sutras*, when the sacrificial cult was at its climax, the name of Vinashana stuck to one particular locality, which almost constantly remained humming with all sorts of sacrificial activity. As we have already described, Beri, close to Bisan, being such a holy place, the geographical identification of Vinashana of the Kurukshetra region with the area of Bisan near Beri of Rohtak will not be a farfetched one." ²²

The *Bhagavata Purana* (10.79.23) further describes Vinashana as the place where Balarama went to forestall the mace duel between Bhima and Durodhana, which gives more credence to the whereabouts of Vinashana, since the mace duel took place in the region of Kurukshetra. Plus, modern Bisan in Rohtak is a place close to Pokaran in Jind where Duryodhana, according to tradition, is said to have hid himself after his defeat in the duel. This is also in the region where Bhisma fell after the 18 days of battle in the war of Kurukshetra, which is a famous place near Kurukshetra.

THE ARGUMENT OF NO HORSE IN HARAPPA

In analyzing the culture of the Harappans, one of the arguments has been that there was no horse, and that no horse bones have been found there. This is to justify the idea that the horse was not indigenous to the region and was brought into the area by invading Aryans. However, when we research the Harappan seals, we find what is called the Horse Seal, which means the horse had been a part of the Harappan culture. Furthermore, horse bones have been found at all levels at several Harappan sites. Furthermore,

when deciphering the seals, the word *ashva* (a Sanskrit word for horse) is a commonly occurring word on the seals. Therefore, the idea of a horseless Harappan culture is a fallacy that has been proved wrong by evidence.²³ Horse remains have also been found in places like Koldihwa and Mahagara in the interior of India dating back to 6500 BCE.

As further elaborated by B. B. Lal: "A study of the horse anatomy shows that there were two types of horses in the ancient world that we still find today. There is an Indian type that has seventeen ribs and a West and Central Asian horse that has eighteen ribs. The *Rig Vedic* horse, as described in the Ashwamedha or horse offering of the *Rig Veda*, has thirty-four ribs (seventeen times two for the right and left side). (*Rig Veda* 1.162.18) This shows that the *Rig Vedic* horse did not come from Central Asia but was the South Asian breed. The *Rig Vedic* horse is born of the ocean, which indicates southern connections. (*Rig Veda* 1.163.1)"

As further explained, "Relative to the idea some people have that there are no horse remains at Harappa, Sir John Marshall who excavated Harappa and Mohenjodaro gave measurements of the horse remains he had found at Mohenjodaro (see his *Mohenjodaro Indus Civilization*, Vol.II, pages 653-4). Clay horse figurines, like the terracotta horse, have also been found from Lothal. In this regard, noted archeologist B. B. Lal states²⁴ :

"Even the much touted argument about the absence of the horse from the Harappan Civilization has no validity in the light of the new evidence regarding its presence. The noted international authority on the palaeontology of the horse, Sandor Bokonyi of the Archaeological Institute, Budapest, after duly examining the faunal remains concerned, had declared as far back as 1993 that 'the domestic nature of Surkotada horse (a Harappan site in Kachchh) is undoubtful'"²⁵

Furthermore, Sir John Marshall, Director General of the Archaeological Survey, when excavating Harappa and Mohenjodaro, recorded the presence of what he called the "Mohenjodaro horse":

"It will be seen that there is a considerable degree of similarity between these various examples, and it is probable the Anau horse, the Mohenjo-daro horse, and the example of *Equus caballus* of the Zoological Survey of India, are all of the type of the 'Indian country bred,' a small breed of a horse, the Anau horse being slightly smaller than the others."²⁶

This is quite prominent evidence for the existence of the horse. However, the idea that if the horse was not already present in the Harappan area, that it was brought into ancient India by invading Aryans, then it would have to be proved, which is not actually possible because the *Rig Veda* (1.162.18) also describes the horse as having 34 ribs, with a similar description in the *Yajur Veda*, while the Central Asian horse as 36 ribs. This shows that the native

Indian horse has been in India for many hundreds of years. This should clearly nullify the whole argument of no horse in the Harappa region, along with another factor used to try to justify the Aryan Invasion Theory.

The thing about the horse is that it was a greatly prized and valuable animal. So, there may not be many circumstances that would allow for horse bones to be found. However, the Sanskrit word for horse, *ashva*, is found 215 times in the *Rig Veda*. Also, many personalities had names connected with the word as well. Thus, the horse was highly valued.

The conclusions of whether the inhabitants of Harappa were Vedic Aryans or not were based on excavations in 1930-40 when they were not so complete, and when they found few remains of horses at the Harappan Indus sites, which gave way for the argument of no horse in Harappa. However, now that numerous sites along the Indus and the dried Sarasvati River have been excavated more thoroughly, bones of domesticated horses have been found at various locations. Dr. S. R. Rao, the renowned archeologist, informs us that horse bones have been found from the "Mature Harappan" and "Late Harappan" levels of these sites. Many other scholars have also unearthed numerous bones of horses of both domesticated and combatant types. Thus, if any scholar still clings to the idea that the Indus Valley inhabitants can not be connected to or were not a part of the Vedic Aryan culture because of no horse remains, then they have not updated their research. This also clarifies the fact that this civilization was indeed a part of the Vedic culture.

Besides the evidence for horse bones being found at places already mentioned, Edwin Bryant describes additional places where the bones of horses have been found. "The report claiming the earliest date for the domesticated horse in India, ca. 4500 BCE, comes from a find from Bagor, Rajasthan, at the base of the Aravalli Hills (Ghosh, 1989). In Rana Ghundai, Baluchistan, excavated by E. J. Ross, equine teeth were reported from a pre-Harappan level (Guha and Chatterjee 1946, 315-316). Interestingly, equine bones have been reported from Mahagara, near Allahabad, where six sample absolute carbon 14 tests have given dates ranging from 2265 BCE to 1480 BCE. (Sharma et al. 1980, 220-221). Even more significantly, horse bones from the Neolithic site Hallur in Karnataka (1500-1300 BCE) have also been identified by the archaeozoologist K. R. Alur (1971, 123). These findings of the domestic horse from Mahagara in the east, and Hallur in the south, are significant because they would seem inconsistent with the axiom that the Aryans introduced the domesticated horse into the Northwest of the subcontinent in the later part of the second millennium BCE...

"In the Indus Valley and its environs, Sewell and Guha, as early as 1931, had reported the existence of the true horse, *Equus caballus* Linn from Mohenjo-Daro itself, and Bholanath (1963) reported the same from Harappa,

Ropar, and Lothal. Even Mortimer Wheeler (1953) identified a horse figurine and accepted that 'it is likely enough that camel, horse and ass were in fact all a familiar feature of the Indus caravan.' Another early evidence of the horse in the Indus Valley was reported by Mackay, in 1938, who identified a clay model of the animal at Mohenjo-Daro, Piggott (1952, 126, 130) reports a horse figurine from Periano Ghundai in the Indus Valley, dated somewhere between Early Dynastic and Akkadian times. Bones from Harappa, previously thought to have belonged to the domestic ass, have been reportedly critically reexamined and attributed to a small horse (Sharma 1992-93, 31). Additional evidence of the horse in the form of bones, teeth, or figurines has been reported in other Indus sites such as Kalibangan (Sharma 1992-93, 31); Lothal (Rao 1979), Surkotada (Sharma 1974), and Malvan (Sharma 1992-93, 32). Other later sites include the Swat Valley (Stacul 1969); Gumla (Sankalia 1974, 330); Pirak (Jarrige 1985); Kuntasi (Sharma 1995, 24); and Rangpur (Rao 1979, 219)." ²⁷

In spite of these considerable findings of the horse in ancient India, many archeologists ignored them and kept pointing back to the idea that the true domesticated horse was never known to the Harappans. This only kept the confusion of the real date for the Harappans and history of the Indus Valley Civilization in circulation, when actually it was something that would help show that it was an indigenous society.

THE URBAN OR RURAL ARGUMENT

Another argument had been that the Harappan society was not part of the Aryan Civilization because Harappa was urban while the Aryans were rural pastoralists. Therefore, they had to be two separate societies. However, B. B. Lal explains: "Just as there were cities, towns and villages in the Harappan ensemble (as there are even today in any society) there were both rural and urban components in the Vedic times." ²⁸

S. P. Gupta also shares a similar thought on this that helps make it more clear that the Harappan or Indus Civilization was merely an outgrowth and a part of the Vedic culture: "Once it becomes reasonably clear that the *Vedas* do contain enough material which shows that the authors of the hymns were fully aware of the cities, city life, long-distance overseas and overland trade, etc... it becomes easier for us to appreciate the theory that the Indus-Sarasvati and Vedic civilizations may have been just the two complementary elements of one and the same civilization. And this, it is important to note, is not a presupposition against the cattle-keeping image of the Vedic Aryans. After all, ancient civilizations had both the components, the village and the city, and numerically villages were many times more than the

cities. In India presently there are around 6.5 lakhs of villages but hardly 600 towns and cities put together.... Plainly, if the Vedic literature reflects primarily the village life and not the urban life, it does not at all surprise us." ²⁹

DECIPHERING THE INDUS SEALS

Many scholars have suggested that the final clue in understanding the location of the Indo-Aryans would be if and when the Indus Seals could be deciphered. With the book of N. Jha and N. S. Rajaram, *The Deciphered Indus Script: Methodology, Readings, Interpretations*, it would seem that a big step in that direction has been made, if not completed.

With this new information, it would seem to corroborate the notion that in reality the Vedic Age was developed before the Indus Valley Civilization. Many scholars previously have tried to separate the two completely, saying that the Indus Valley Civilization, such as places like Harappa and Mohenjodaro were not a part of the Vedic culture, but that is not accurate. They indeed were a part of it, and their seals represented a form of the Vedic language. This would also indicate that a largely indigenous civilization must have been flourishing a thousand years before what became the development of Dynastic Egypt and Mesopotamia.

The Sarasvati-Indus Valley Civilization was probably in its prime about 3100 to 1900 BCE. But if we accept the dates that were given by Muller and his followers, that Vedic culture did not start until 1500 BCE, then that is why many are those that say Harappa and Mohenjodaro could not have been part of the Vedic Aryans. This brings us to what is called "Frawley's Paradox", for as David Frawley points out, it gives us a history without a literature for the Harappans, and a literature without history, archeology or geography for the Aryans. This makes no sense. How can there be one without the other for any developed civilization?

Therefore, it becomes more apparent that the Vedic literature is far older than most thought, and the Harappans were a part of the Vedic culture. And the Indus seals help make that clear. It is generally accepted that the year 3067 is when the war at Kurukshetra took place. The Vedic Aryans were already well established and were a part of that war. This means that most if not all of the *Rig Veda* hymns had already been developed by 3500 BCE, not later, though they may have been written or compiled later. The Harappans had to have participated to some degree in that war. This was also about the time when the Indus seals had been formed. In fact, as N. S. Rajaram explains, "the *Mahabharata*, in the Shanti Parva, contains a description of the etymological texts whose contents are recorded on the seals, as well as the Vedic symbolism relating to the images on them... This is what holds the key

not only to the decipherment [of the seals], but also to an understanding of the culture and civilization of the Harappans." ³⁰

In the deciphering of the Indus script, it was found that there are close connections between the structure of the Indus script and the rules of grammar and phonetics described in such primary works on Vedic Sanskrit as the *Rik-Pratishakhya* of Shaunaka, and the *Nighantu* by Yaska. This helped pave the way for understanding the seals. Many of the words on the seals can be traced back to the *Nighantu*.

Actually, several investigators before the publication of the work of N. Jha in 1996 recognized that the language on the Indus script had to be Vedic Sanskrit. N. S. Rajaram himself had concluded the writings were connected with the *Sutras*, based on short statements or meanings. In this way, the Indus seals have provided further insights into the original location and time period of the Vedic culture.

GENETICS SHOW AN EAST TO WEST MOVEMENT

From the scientific perspective, Dr. Chandrakant Panse presented a paper that explained that the tissue antigens of the north and south Indians were completely distinct from those of the Europeans. "The stark lack of similarities in the gene pools of the Indian subcontinent and Europe, vividly evident in the mtDNA and the MHC complex, destroys any Aryan invasion notions, and confirms the genetic uniformity of people of the Indian subcontinent." ³¹

Another aspect for the dismissal of the Aryan Invasion Theory based on genetics was reported in *The Hindu* newspaper on June 24, 2006. The report was that Chairman of the Indian Council of Historical Research, D. N. Tripathi, in Bangalore explained that geneticists from Pakistan had collected samples for genetics analysis of the people of the Indian subcontinent and sent them to cellular and molecular biology laboratories in the U.S. From the DNA tests of the blood samples from the people in the Indian subcontinent, the scientists concluded that the human race spread out of Africa 60,000 years before Christ. They had settled in the subcontinent region. However, from these tests, the geneticists concluded that people living in both the northern and southern regions of India, and those in the West Asian region were from the same gene pool. This indicated that the human race had its origins in Africa and not Europe or Central Asia, as claimed by a few historians, and then went primarily to and spread out from ancient India. ³²

When asked about the argument of many historians that the lineage of people in north India is traced to the Aryans outside of India who later entered or invaded India, Professor Tripathi said that test results had proved this

wrong. "We have the results of studies. The conclusion of some historians that Aryans came here 1500 years before Christ does not hold water."

As further explained in this regard by N. S. Rajaram, "A particular trait that we choose as characterizing a population group is called a genetic marker. One such marker that has proven useful is the M17 genetic marker. It is common in India and in adjacent regions, but becomes increasingly rare as we move westward into Europe. This, combined with the fact that Indian carriers of M17 are genetically more diverse than European carriers shows that the Indian population is older than the European." ³³

"Noting that the mtDNA is carried by the female line, while Y-chromosome is passed on through the male line, what this means is that the Indian population is largely indigenous in origin and has received negligible external input (gene flow) since the end of the last Ice Age (Holocene). This means that various migration theories like the Aryan invasion in 1500 BCE simply cannot be true." ³⁴

Furthermore, the Oxford geneticist Stephen Oppenheimer is quite clear on this and, while focusing on the M17 marker, explains: "... South Asia is logically the ultimate origin of M17 and his ancestors; and sure enough we find highest rates and greatest diversity of the M17 line in Pakistan, India and eastern Iran, and low rates in the Caucasus. M17 is not only more diverse in South Asia than in Central Asia, but diversity characterizes its presence in isolated tribal groups in the south, thus undermining any theory of M17 as a marker of a 'male Aryan invasion' of India."

"One age estimate for the origin of this line in India is as much as 51,000 years. All this suggests that M17 could have found his way initially from India or Pakistan, through Kashmir, then via Central Asia and Russia, before finally coming to Europe." ³⁵

He also explains that the eastward movement of those people with the M17 marker traveled from India westward through Kashmir, Central Asia, up into Russia and then into Europe after 40,000 BP (38,000 BCE). Thus, as we have been saying, all migration in this regard has been from the east westward. ³⁶

So the conclusion is that there could have been no thing called the Aryan Invasion as some propose, and that the tribal people of India are ancestrally no different than the rest of the Indian population. Therefore, anyone saying something different is only proposing such for some special interest or divisive purpose, and, thus, they should not be trusted. There are many of us who have known this, but it can take a long time to continue gathering enough evidence to present it in a way that establishes the truth. Furthermore, the divisions in India known as the northern Aryans and the southern Dravidians

is also a fallacy based on conjecture, used now only to facilitate "special interests" that need to divide people for political, financial or other reasons.

In this way, we can understand that the idea that the Vedic culture and people of the area now called India have not developed out of invaders who are said to have brought the culture to the region. The idea that the Vedic and Dharmic culture was brought out of the Caucasus and into ancient India cannot be taken seriously without losing one's credibility. If anything, it is the Europeans who are descendants of the migrants from India, going back as far as 40,000 years, making them a younger population than the much older Indian population.

All of this also pushes the dates back much farther by several thousand years than the foolishly proposed guesstimate of 1500 BCE.

CONCLUSION: THERE NEVER WAS ANY ARYAN INVASION

Though there have been many scholars and researchers who have written and provided evidence that establishes that there never was an Aryan invasion, and that the Vedic people and its culture were indeed originally from the area of India, Nicholas Kazanas, the Greek professor, was the most recent to provide evidence and articles that were published in academic journals, thus forcing the academics to take another look at this issue. The theory of the Aryan invasion still has held much influence, if not bias and prejudice, at the way academics view the history of India, which is something that should have changed and been corrected years ago. Thus, after years of promoting the Aryan Invasion Theory, and then rejecting it after having done his own research, Kazanas concludes:

"The Aryan Invasion Theory, despite its 150-year-long life, has no real support anywhere except continued prejudice. It has now been substituted in a similar shameless frame of mind, by 'migration' of an alleged complex and, to the archaeologist or anthropologist, incomprehensible nature; this is a deception, since the aryanisation of North India on so an enormous a scale could not possibly have been effected without conquest and coercion—for which there is no testimony of any sort. Why this preposterous proposition should have acquired the status of historical fact among serious Indologists is for me a mystery. There may have been racist prejudice as many writers aver (Shaffer 1984; Leach 1990; Frawley 1991, 1994; Feuerstein 1995; Trautman 1997; Bryant chs 1-2, 13; many Indian writers like Talageri 2000, and Indian-American Kak 2000); this was perpetuated by mechanical repetition rather than logical consideration. Renfrew too was right perhaps in seeing nothing in the *Rig Veda* demonstrating that the Indoaryans 'were intrusive to the area:

this comes rather from a historical assumption about the 'coming of the IndoEuropeans' (1989: 182)...

"In sharp contrast, all the primary materials of a historian agree in showing no evidence at all for any entry. On the contrary, such testimony as had been preserved, early historical documentation and later traditions testify that Indoaryans are indigenous to Saptasindhu [land of seven rivers in Northern India]. These traditions (corroborated by foreign writers of the 4th cent BC) affirm that the Indoaryans have been in Saptasindhu since at least the 4th millennium [BCE]; this is now fully supported by Archaeoastronomy which places the great Bharata war at 3067, a *Brahmana* text c 3000 – 2900 and the *Vedanga Jyotish* c 1800. Given that archaeologists, anthropologists et al, specializing in the prehistory of that area, affirm unequivocally since 1980 that the local culture has an uninterrupted continuity since c 7000 (except for a break in the skeletal record c 4500), we can say that the Indoaryans have been in North India since that time. There is also the fact that the *Rig Veda* knows nothing of elements in the Indus-Sarasvati-Civilization whereas the later texts have these elements; moreover even in very late hymns the Sarasvati is a large river supporting the Aryans on its banks: therefore the *Rig Veda* must belong to a period before 3000." ³⁷

This is an important point, that the Vedic texts make no mention of any entry into the region by outside invaders, or that they were a part of a culture of invaders. Plus, due to their content, it can be discerned that they had to have been existing before 3000 BCE.

In the *Rig Veda* (and later Indic texts) there is no hint of any invading Aryas coming into the Sarasvati or Saptasindhu, the area of the seven rivers in North India and Pakistan. A. B. Keith ³⁸ wrote, "It is certain... that the *Rig Veda* offers no assistance in determining the mode in which the Vedic Aryans entered India... the bulk at least [of the *Rig Veda*] seems to have been composed rather in the country round the Sarasvati River." ³⁹

The Vedic texts further refer to people being exiled or driven away from the area of northern India, such as in the *Aitareya Brahmana* (8.33.6 or 8.18) which tells of how the sage Vishvamitra exiled his 50 disobedient sons so that, in later periods, most of those people called the Dasyus are known as the descendants of Vishvamitra. Therefore, the *Rig Veda* provides no reference for an Aryan entry or displacement of the natives, but points out how Aryans and Dasyus went westward from the area of Northern India. ⁴⁰

Therefore, the idea that the Indoaryans migrated into the vast area of the Sarasvati region, including the Punjab, Gujarat, Haryana, and so on, back in 1700 to 1500 BCE at which time the local natives learned the complicated language of the Vedic Aryans, after which numerous mountains, rivers, etc.,

suddenly had Sanskrit names is something you might find in a fairy tale rather than real history. There is no real explanation for this to have happened [except that they were an indigenous people].⁴¹

Because of these factors, there have been those who always spoke against the idea of an Aryan Invasion. Vivekananda was one such strong opponent of the Aryan Invasion Theory. He boldly challenged in this way (5:534-535): "And what your European pundits say about the Aryans swooping down from some foreign land, snatching away the lands of the aborigines and settling in India by exterminating them, is all pure nonsense, foolish talk! In what *Veda*, in what *Sukta* do you find that the Aryans came into India from a foreign country? Where do you get the idea that they slaughtered the wild aborigines? What do you gain by talking such nonsense? Strange that our Indian scholars, too, say amen to them; and all these monstrous lies are being taught to our boys!... Whenever the Europeans find an opportunity, they exterminate the aborigines and settle down with ease and comfort on their lands; and therefore they think the Aryans must have done the same!... But where is your proof? Guess work? Then keep your fanciful ideas to yourself. I strongly protested against these ideas at the Paris Congress. I have been talking with the Indian and European savants on the subject, and hope to raise many objections to this theory in detail, when time permits. And this I say to you—to our pundits—also, 'You are learned men, hunt up your old books and scriptures, please, and draw your own conclusions.'"

Dayananda Sarasvati (February 12, 1824 to September 26, 1883), the founder of the Arya Samaj (1875), was another who had strong words against it: "No Sanskrit book or history records that the Aryas came here from Iran... How then can the writings of foreigners be worth believing in the teeth of this testimony."

We cannot forget Aurobindo who had voiced his opinion about this many times, such as: "The indications in the *Veda* on which this theory of a recent Aryan invasion is built are very scanty in quantity and uncertain in significance. There is no actual mention of any such invasion."⁴²

Jim Shaffer, a western archeologist, was another to strongly protest the idea of an Aryan invasion. In his article, *The Indo-Aryan Invasions: Cultural Myth and Archaeological Reality*, he explains how he thinks after all of his work and research: "Current archaeological data do not support the existence of an Indo-Aryan or European invasion into South Asia at any time in the pre- or protohistoric periods. Instead, it is possible to document archaeologically a series of cultural changes reflecting indigenous cultural development from prehistoric or historic periods... The Indo-Aryan invasion as an academic concept in 18th- and 19th-century Europe reflected the cultural milieu of that period. Linguistic data were used to validate the concept that in turn was used

to interpret archaeological and anthropological data. What was theory became unquestioned fact that was used to interpret and organize all subsequent data. It is time to end the 'linguistic tyranny' that has prescribed interpretive frameworks of pre- and protohistoric cultural development in South Asia." ⁴³

After having done extensive research into the issue at hand, Nicholas Kazanas explains how he came to his own conclusions: "Having held and taught for more than 18 years, but without investigating, the received doctrine that the Indo-European branches dispersed from the South Russian or Pontic Steppe (as per Mallory 1997, 1989; Gimbutas 1985, 1970; and others), and that the Indo Aryans had entered Saptasindhu c1500 [BCE], I began to examine these mainstream notions thoroughly and in c1997 abandoned them. I decided that no evidence of any kind supported them; on the contrary, the evidence showed that by 1500 [BCE] the Indo Aryans were wholly indigenous and that the elusive Indo-European homeland was very probably Saptasindhu and the adjacent area—the Land of Seven Rivers in what is today N-W India and Pakistan; this area could well have extended as far northwest as the Steppe.

"Apart from the recent genetic studies, which at the time were not so well-known nor so secure, the decisive evidence for me now is the antiquity of Sanskrit, indicated by its inner coherence and its preservation of apparently original PIE [Proto-Indo-European] linguistic features (like the *dhatu*, five families of phonemes, etc) and cultural elements. The Vedic language as seen in the *RV* alone, despite much obvious attrition and several innovations, has preserved many more features from the putative PIE [Proto-Indo-European] language and wider culture. This was due to its well attested and incomparable system of oral tradition which preserved the ancient texts fairly intact and continued even into the 20th century. An oral tradition of this kind cannot be maintained by a people on the move for decades if not centuries over many thousands of miles, as the AIT proposes. Such a tradition could be preserved only by a sedentary people where the older generation would have the necessary leisure to pass the communal lore to the younger one." ⁴⁴

Kazanas also brings up the argument that even if the Vedic Aryans had been maintaining their language and literacy during an invasion or migration into the Saptasindhu region, why then is there no mention of it in any of the Vedic literature? Why was there no mention of their travels, mishaps, dangers in meeting alien people, etc? The reason is simple: they did not migrate, but were the original inhabitants of the area.

The only reason that has kept this defective and deformed doctrine alive is the personal and political interests that had an agenda to fulfill for their own purposes. There have been those, as there still are, who have a purpose in demeaning and belittling the Indian Vedic tradition and its early history. Even,

as odd as it may seem, many Indian scholars also dumb-down the profound history and nature and the early advanced developments that came out of ancient India. Hopefully they will stop doing this and actually take a deep interest and research into their own culture to see what it really had to offer, and still does offer the world of today. Why not? What do they have to lose? That is the telltale question.

Therefore, as Nicholas Kazanas summarizes, which I quote because I could not say it better than he does, "Let us hope that the noxious AIT and all notions rooted in it will sooner than later end up in the only place they should be—the dustbin of history." ⁴⁵

SCHOLARS WHO BELIEVE IN THE FALSE HISTORY OF INDIA ARE A DYING BREED

Now that India has been free for a number of decades from British rule, researchers, historians, and archeologists can all begin to take a new look at the true history of India. We can have a more unbiased view of the numerous new findings that keep cropping up that give an increasingly accurate understanding of how ancient and how advanced was the Indian Vedic civilization. Now more than ever there is a serious lack of support and opposing evidence for the theories that were made popular by the British, such as the Aryan Invasion Theory, or that it was the invading Muslims who gave India the great contributions to Indian art, music, or even architecture. With the newer and more accurate historical findings, many of these ideas are falling apart like a house of cards.

These days there is much more evidence being presented by newer, younger and bolder researchers that show the falsity of these antiquated ideas. Furthermore, there are also more questions that are no longer answered by the old beliefs about India's history and the Aryan Invasion Theory. The theories of the old scholars are being overturned.

We also see that new students of archeology and history are hesitant to accept these ideas in the face of the newer findings and evidence that keep being discovered, such as the latest discovery (January, 2002) that ancient Indian civilization could date back to 9,000 years ago.

I have even talked to some students who are informed about the truth of Indian history and archeology who confronted their professors about the outdated inaccuracies and overtly misleading information that they were teaching in schools and universities. One professor admitted that it was wrong, but she had to teach it because it was in the book the college was using and that is what she had to teach.

I have even had friends discuss with educated Muslims the idea that many ancient buildings of India were not built by the Muslim invaders who have been given the credit, but were only captured them, and they readily agreed that anyone who really knew their history would admit this was the case. There was no argument with this. India had the mathematics (*Shulba Shastras*) and architectural treatises and abilities, along with knowledgeable craftsmen, to have built such structures, while the invading Muslims did not bring such knowledge and facility. In fact, the chronicle of Al Biruni, who accompanied Mahmud Ghazni, relates the surprise and awe of the Muslim invaders to see such buildings. Thus, such structures had to have already been in existence.

It is interesting that the common laypersons are quicker to see the logic in the new research findings and in considering these new architectural discoveries than the academic scholars. The academicians who cling to such old ideas tend not to write more books justifying what they teach, but seem to spend more time on trying to debunk, criticize or discredit the new findings or theories that seem more relevant and able to answer or put to rest the age-old questions. Just a few of these questions include: Where is the pre-Aryan language that existed if the people of India were not part of the Vedic culture? What existed in India before the Vedic culture, if it was brought by invaders? If the Vedic Aryans invaded the Indus region after 1500 BCE, then how is it that the *Vedas* glorify the greatness of the Sarasvati River which is known to have dried up no later than 1800 BCE? How did the Vedic Aryans know of the Sarasvati River at all, unless they were already there and a part of the advanced Vedic culture from thousands of years ago? How is it that Arabic and European countries were able to make advancements in mathematics only after they learned the numeric system that originated in India, now called the Arabic numerals, with its unique symbol of zero? Why, when we seriously look at the way the area of India, the Middle East and Europe developed, it appears that the advanced nature of society came from India rather than from outside? When we read in the *Puranas* of the advanced organizational nature of the Vedic cities and their fabulous palaces and buildings such as in Dwaraka as found in the *Bhagavata Purana*, why should we think that India had no amazing structures before the Muslim invaders entered the country? Should we think that ancient Indians only lived in forests and tents? That is what it seems many academicians would have us believe. Anyway, these and other questions have not and can not be answered by the old ideas on India's history such as the Aryan Invasion Theory.

So it is unfortunate that many of these academics still hold on to these ideas as the basis of their views. The reason why some of these academics take this so personally is that they have the most to lose. The basis of their

job, or their own identity, and their value to society and the whole basis of everything they thought they knew about history becomes threatened if it is proved that what they have been teaching is false.

The fact of the matter is, unfortunately, and as we can plainly see, much historical analysis is but a big ego trip; theories and opinions meant to do little more than support the premise of the superiority of one culture over another. There is a need to take a new look at reason and cultural development without this sort of interference of ego.

Now more than ever before truth is prevailing, and the corruption of the British and Muslim theories and stories that have been put forth to demean India and the Indian race and its Vedic culture is being recognized on an increasing scale. For this reason, the academics that still cling to such theories as the Aryan invasion are a dying breed. Maybe then we can be free from their closed-minded prejudice that came from the theories and attempted validations meant to do nothing but support the premise of the superiority of the European and Caucasian races over the darker skinned Indian people.

Eventually, truth prevails. And after a few hundred years of ideas that were purposely contrived to demean the culture and history of India, we are now learning that the truth is quite different, and India was more advanced than the old British theories give it credit. And we can see that these old theories are falling by the way side.

The threat to the Aryan Invasion Theory is coming as a surprise only to those who have not kept up with, or outrightly rejected, all the new evidence that is continually being uncovered, and all the new questions that cannot be substantiated by such concepts as the Aryan Invasion Theory. Thus, it is a revolution that is going in like a needle and out like a plow to propose that the Aryan Invasion is but a fictional account, and that the Muslims who invaded India merely captured the major monuments of India without really building them.

As time goes on, more and more evidence will accumulate to show the truth of India's Vedic history. As the evidence mounts, the old theories will slip away and anyone still clinging to such ideas as the Aryan invasion or the false history of India's architectural wonders will only look foolish. It is taking some time to reveal this truth, but out of all the cultures of the world, it is India that has best withstood the tests of time and remains the oldest living culture in the world. And this is not due to remaining dependent on the views of outsiders who think they know India's culture and history better than Indians, or those who still are influenced by the stories of India from invaders and dominators who disliked or even despised India and its people.

Now is the time for those of us connected with, or who appreciate India's historical and Vedic culture to unite and work to reveal the true and advanced

nature of India's timeless Dharmic tradition, and its advancements, which were already in existence before the credits of its wonders were attempted to be taken by outsiders.

CHAPTER NOTES

1. G. P. Singh, *Facets of Ancient Indian History and Culture*.
2. David Frawley, *The Myth of the Aryan Invasion of India*, Voice of India, New Delhi, 2002, p. 43.
3. Bal Ram Singh, Editor, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 15.
4. B. B. Lal, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010. p. 23-24.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
6. Max Muller, *Biographies of Words and the Home of the Aryas*, by London, 1888, p. 120.
7. Chandrasekharendra Saraswati, *The Vedas*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1988, p. 16.
8. N. S. Rajaram, *The Politics of History*, Voice of India, New Delhi, 1995, p. xvi.
9. B. B. Lal, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010. p. 26.
10. Kazanas, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 57.
11. B. B. Lal, *The Home land of the Aryans, Evidence of Rig Vedic Flora and Fauna and Archeology*, Aryan Books International, Delhi, pp. 85-88.
12. N. S. Rajaram, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 166-67.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 167.
14. *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 17.
15. Kazanas, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 54.
16. Dr. David Frawley and Dr. Navaratna S. Rajaram, *Hidden Horizons, Unearthing 10,000 Years of Indian Culture*, Swaminarayan Aksharpith, Ahmedabad, India, 2006, p. 64-65.
17. *Pride of India: A Glimpse into India's Scientific Heritage*, Samskriti Bharati, New Delhi, 2006, p. 78-79.
18. B. B. Lal, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 34.

19. Dr. David Frawley and Dr. Navaratna S. Rajaram, *Hidden Horizons, Unearthing 10,000 Years of Indian Culture*, Swaminarayan Aksharpith, Ahmedabad, India, 2006, p70-71)
20. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2151143/Climate-change-wiped-worlds-great-civilisations-4-000-years-ago.html>.
21. C. Rayachaudhuri, *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, Calcutta, 1958, p. 134.
22. Dr. Ravi Prakash Arya, *New Discoveries About Vedic Sarasvati*, Indian Foundation for Vedic Science, Rohtak, Haryana, India, 2005, p. 26.
23. N. Jha and N. S. Rajaram, *The Deciphered Indus Script*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2000, p. 162.
24. Dr. David Frawley and Dr. Navaratna S. Rajaram, *Hidden Horizons, Unearthing 10,000 Years of Indian Culture*, Swaminarayan Aksharpith, Ahmedabad, India, 2006, p.106.
25. B. B. Lal, *Homeland of the Aryans: Evidence of Rig Vedic Flora and Fauna and Archaeology*, pp. 80-81.
26. Sir John Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, Vol. II, p. 654.
27. Edwin Bryant, *The Quest for the Origins of Vedic Culture*, Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 170-171.
28. B. B. Lal, *Colonialism, Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Archaeology*, Parts 1 and 2, *Review of Archaeology* 18, no. 2:1-14 and 35-47, 1997, p. 285.
29. S. P. Gupta, *The Indus Sarasvati Civilization*, Pratibha Prakashan, 1996, p. 147.
30. N. Jha and N. S. Rajaram, *The Deciphered Indus Script*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2000, p. 31.
31. Chandrakant Panse, *DNA, Genetics and Population Dynamics: Debunking the Aryan Invasion Propaganda*, Professor of Biotechnology, Newton, Massachusetts. Paper presented at the Third Annual Human Empowerment Conference at Houston, Texas, September, 2005.
32. <http://www.thehindu.com/2006/06/24/stories/2006062412870400.htm>.
33. N. S. Rajaram, *Origin of Indian Civilization*, Edited by Bal Ram Singh, Center for Indic Studies, Dartmouth, USA, 2010, p. 171.
34. Ibid., p. 173.
35. Stephen Oppenheimer, *Out of Eden: The Peopling of the World*, Constable, London, 2003, p. 152.
36. Stephen Oppenheimer, *The Real Eve: Modern Man's Journey Out of Africa*, Carroll & Graf, 2003, p. 152.
37. Nicholas Kazanas, *Indo-Aryan Origins and Other Vedic Issues*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2009, p. 62-3.
38. A. B. Keith, *The Age of the Rigveda*, *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, 1922, pp. 77-113.

39. Nicholas Kazanas, *Indo-Aryan Origins and Other Vedic Issues*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2009. p. 9.
40. Nicholas Kazanas, *Indo-Aryan Origins and Other Vedic Issues*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2009, p. 10-11.
41. Ibid., p. 243.
42. Shri Aurobindo, *The Secret of the Veda*, Shri Aurobindo Ashram, Pondicherry, 1971, p. 24.
43. Jim Shaffer, *The Indo-Aryan Invasions: Cultural Myth and Archaeological Reality* (in *The People of South Asia*, 77-90. Ed. John Lukacs, Plenum Press, New York, 1984, p. 88.
44. Nicholas Kazanas, *Indo-Aryan Origins and Other Vedic Issues*, by Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 2009, p. 302.
45. Ibid., p. 328.