

Aryan Invasion Theory

DAVID FRAWLEY (Vamadeva Shastri)

THE RECENT find of a submerged city in the Gulf of Cambay, perhaps as old as 7500 BC, serves to highlight the existence of southern sources for the civilisation of ancient India. The Gulf of Cambay find is only the latest in a series that includes Lothal (S.R. Rao), Dholavira (R.S. Bisht) and others in Gujarat. These discoveries have been pushing the seats of ancient Indian civilisation deeper into the southern peninsula. We should not be surprised if more such sites are discovered in South India, especially the coastal regions, for the south has always played a significant if neglected role in ancient India going back to Vedic times.

I have argued for such a coastal origin for Vedic civilisation in my recent book *Rig Veda and the History of India*. This is largely because of the oceanic character of Vedic symbolism in which all the main Rig Vedic Gods as well as many of the Vedic rishis have close connections with samudra or the sea. In fact, the image of the ocean pervades the whole of the Rig Veda. Unfortunately many scholars who put forth opinions on ancient India seldom bother to study the Vedas in the original Sanskrit and few know the language well enough to do so. The result is that their interpretation of Vedic literature is often erroneous, trusting out of date and inaccurate interpretations from the Nineteenth century like the idea that the Vedic people never knew the sea!

Literary evidence

The Rig Veda states that "All the hymns praise Indra who is as expansive as the sea" (RV I.11.1) Agni wears the ocean as his vesture (RV VIII 102.4-6). The Sun is called the ocean (RVV.47.3). Soma is called the first ocean (RV IX.86.29). Varuna specifically is a God of the sea (RV I.161.14). These are just a few examples of out of well over a hundred references to samudra in the Rig Veda alone, including references to oceans as two, four or many (RVVI.50.13). This is obviously the poetry of a people intimately associated with the sea and not of any nomads from land-locked Central Asia or Eurasia.

Vedic seer families like the Bhrigus are descendants of Varuna, the God of the sea as the first Bhrigu is called Bhrigu Varuni - Bhrigu, the son of Varuna. The teachings of Varuna to Bhrigu are found in the Taittiriya Upanishad and Taittiriya tradition of the Yajur Veda, which has long been most popular in South India. The recent find at sea in the Gulf of Cambay is near Baroach or Bhrigu-kachchha, the famous ancient city of the very same Bhrigus.

These oceanic connections extend to other important Vedic rishis as well. In the Rig Veda, Agastya, who became the main rishi of South India, has twenty-five hymns in the first book of the Rig Veda and is mentioned in the other books as well. He is the elder brother of Vasishta who himself has the largest number of hymns in the text (about a hundred), those of the seventh book. Both rishis are said to have been born in a pot or kumbha, which may be a vessel or ship (RV VII.33.10-13). Vasishta is specifically connected to Varuna who was said to travel on a ship in the sea (RV VII.88.4-5). Both Vasishta and Agastya are descendants of Mitra and Varuna, the God of the sea.

Vishvamitra in the Rig Veda (III.53.16) mentions the sage Pulasti, who was regarded as the progenitor of Ravana and Kubera and whose city, Pulasti-Pura was located in ancient Sri Lanka. He is

mentioned along with Jamadagni, another common Rig Vedic sage and the father of Parshurama, the sixth incarnation of Lord Vishnu, before Rama and Krishna, whose main sphere of activity was in the south of India.

Manu himself, the Vedic primal sage and king, is a flood figure and the Angirases, the other main seer family apart from the Bhrigus, join him in his ship according to Puranic mythology. Southern peoples like the Yadus and Turvashas were said to have been glorified by Indra (RV X.49.8) and are mentioned a number of times in the Rig Veda as great Vedic peoples. So we have ample ancient literary evidence for the Vedic seer and royal families as connected with the ocean and southern regions.

The Cambay site is in the ancient delta of the now dry Sarasvati River, one branch of which flowed into the Gulf of Cambay, showing that this site was part of the greater Sarasvati region and culture, which was the main location for Harappan cities in the 3300-1900 BCE period. Such an ocean front was important for maritime trade for the inland regions to the north. In this regard, important Vedic kings like Sudas were said to receive tribute from the sea (RV I.47.6).

When the Greeks under Alexander came to India in the Fourth century BCE, the Greek writer Megasthenes in his *Indika*, fragments of which are recorded in several Greek writings, mentioned that the Indians (Hindus) had a record of 153 kings going back over 6400 years (showing that the Hindus were conscious of the great antiquity of their culture even then). This would yield a date that now amounts to 6700 BCE, a date that might be reflected in the Gulf of Cambay site which has been tentatively dated to 7500 BCE. So the old Vedic- Puranic king lists may not be that far off after all!

Material evidence

A few scholars, like Witzel in the United States — in spite of such massive evidence as the Sarasvati River and its intimate connection to Vedic literature — still try to separate Vedic culture from India and attribute it to a largely illiterate and nomadic culture that migrated into India from the northwest of the country in the post- Harappan period (after 1500 BCE). Ignoring all other evidence that connects the Vedic and Harappan, they point out the importance of the horse in the Rig Veda and argue that not enough evidence of horses has been found in Harappan sites to prove a Vedic connection. They fall back upon this one shot argument to ignore any other evidence to the contrary.

However, one should note that these invasionists or migrationists are even more deficient in horse evidence to prove their own theory. There is no trail of horse bones or horse encampments into ancient India from Afghanistan during the 1500-1000 BCE period that is required for their theory of Aryan intrusion. In fact, there is no solid evidence for such a movement of peoples at all in the form of camps, skeletal remains or anything else.

Those who claim that Vedic culture must have originated outside India because of its lauding of the horse are even more lacking in horse evidence. The real problem is not 'no horse at Harappa' but 'no horse evidence, in fact no real evidence of any kind, to prove any Aryan migration/invasion'. It has been convincingly shown that what the Rig Veda with its seventeen-ribbed horse (RV I.162.18) describes is a native Indian breed and not any Central Asian or Eurasian horse that has eighteen ribs.

The Rig Veda mentions many Indian animals like the water buffalo (*Mahisha*), which is said to be the main animal sacred to Soma (RV IX.96.6), which does occur commonly on Harappan seals. The

humped Brahma bull (*Vrishha, Vrishabha*), another common Harappan depiction, is the main animal of Indra, the foremost of the Vedic Gods. Elephants are also mentioned.

Most of the animals depicted on Harappan seals are mythical, not zoological specimens anyway. Most common is a one-horned animal that is reflected in the one-horned boar or Varaha of the Mahabharata and the boar incarnation of Lord Vishnu. Many other Harappan depictions are of animals with multiple heads or half-animal/half-human figures. This is similar to the depictions in Vedic imagery which largely consist of mythical animals of this type. For example, Harappan seals portray a three-headed bull-like animal. Such an animal is described in the Rig Veda (III.56.6).

A smokescreen

The horse issue is meant as a smokescreen to avoid facing the facts of the Sarasvati River and the many new archaeological sites in India. These show no such break in the continuity of civilisation in the region as an Aryan invasion/migration requires, including the existence of fire altars and fire worship from the early Harappan period. Vedic and Puranic literature itself records the shift of the centre of culture from the Sarasvati to the Ganga at the end of the Vedic period, referring to the drying up of the river. Scholars like Witzel would have the Vedic people coming into India after the Sarasvati was already gone and yet making the river their ancestral homeland and most sacred region!

Vedic literature is the largest preserved from the ancient world, dwarfing in size anything left by other cultures like Egypt, Greece or Babylonia. The Harappan-Sarasvati urban civilisation of India was by far the largest of its time (3100-1900 BCE) in the ancient world spreading from Punjab to Kachchh. We can no longer separate this great literature and this great civilisation, particularly given that both were based on the Sarasvati River, whose authenticity as a historical river before 1900 BCE has been confirmed by numerous geological studies. This great Vedic literature requires a great urban culture to explain it, just as the great Harappan urban culture requires a literature to explain it. Both come from the same region and cannot be separated.

Finally it is sad to note how intellectuals in India are quick to denigrate the extent and antiquity of their history, even when geological evidence like the Sarasvati River or archaeological evidence like the Harappan and Cambay sites are so clear. However one may interpret these, the truth that civilisation in India was quite ancient and profound cannot be ignored. I don't think there is any other nation on earth that would be so negative if such ancient glories were found in their lands.

By **raj (Raj)** on **Tuesday, September 28, 1999 - 07:26 am**:

I agree with Mr. Pillay about the meaning of word Arya. The people of India especially the educated ones, I mean those who went to British education in India in last 150 years have been completely brainwashed to accept the theories put forward by the European Indologists of 19th and early 20th century. When I was young and going to a Methodist school, in the history books all I read was that Indian Hindu civilisation was once a great civilisation but later was replaced by the "powerful" Muslim rule and then by "sophisticated, educated, technically advanced" British. As a child and in my teen years I always aspired to be equal to what I considered a better thing to become in order to acquire a

social position of good standing. At certain times I looked down at my own people, especially the poor and "uneducated" of India (inspite of my parents teaching me otherwise).

I have come a long way since then. I have studied the research done by archeologists in past 40-50 years, in India, Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan, areas of present day Georgia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, etc. Between a period of 10,000 B.C. to 500 B.C., the research shows that there was some continuity in the artefacts discovered at many of these sites. Which in itself does not mean that all these people were of same kind. At the most, it indicates that there was some kind of exchange of ideas, or movement of the people due to migration, displacement during war, and things like this. Contrary to popular notion of continuity of language's similarity, it was most likely possible that the tribes which were living just 100 miles apart were using languages that had no connection at all. This is very much possible if you know about the fortification and ghetto kind of phenomena and its manifestation.

In any case the argument that the Aryans signifies race and they came to India from outside is based on only one and one, and I would like to stress it again, that it is only one fact, that there is similarity in the roots of many words.

Now, what I want all of the participants to do is to ask why a similar movement of people was not possible from India to other parts west of Indus valley. Also, why your brain does not readily accept this idea. Is it because you really really believe in superiority of whiteness of skin, or is it because you think that if Indians were really that smart, how come they were overtaken by the moslems, or you believe that the British had a right to write the history of India as they please, but not the Indians. Is it any different than me as a teenager looking down at the level of intellect of my own people. Also, what are the criteria I am using. Does there have to be a criteria to establish the truth?

In my present understanding, Arya means "person of noble bearing" and Davida means "a person who is rich and have good character" and I will strive to popularize the use of these words in their true original sense. Any other use of these words is separatism on false notions. Choose what you want to do.

Under the heading "Indus Valley Civilization" Mr. Madho Sarup Vats, M.A. (Former Director General Of Archeology in India, New Delhi) has this to say:

"The epoch making discoveries made by the Archeological Survey of India, in the twenties of this century, at the city-sites of Harrapa in Mongomery District of the Punjab and Mohenjo-daro in Larkana District of Sind, have revealed to us that, in the third millenium B.C., a full-fledge civilization, already age old and stereotyped, flourished on Indian soil based upon a highly developed urban economy and discipline."

He named it 'HARRAPA CULTURE', after the established custom of modern archeology. Further, as the elements of this civilization have been noticed at various places, between the Himalayas and the Arabian Sea, mainly along the Sindhu and the former Ghaggar systems, but not in the Ganga-Yamuna plain, this civilization is also known as the 'Indus Valley Civilization'.

From our knowledge derived through the excavations, it seems that excessive deforestation (partly done by the Indus brick makers), fall in the agricultural standard, and other such socio-economic

factors, as also the foreign invasion, probably of the Aryans, brought about the destruction of the Harrapa civilization."

The author, whom I can say as a authority of the findings at the time of excavation has written 20 pages on this subject that includes religion, cremation rites, administration, trading and etc.. has a 1st hand knowledge on what he is writing about.

Further to this Mr. Bata Krishna Ghosh, D.Phil., D.Litt. wrote in the same book under the title "The origin of the Indo-Aryans" has this to say;

"INDIA, vast in size and bounded off from the outer world by the seemingly impenetrable mountain ranges constituting her northern boundry, naturally developed from early times the notion that she is a world by herself, unsullied by extraneous contaminations. That the Indian civilization has roots far bryond the precincts of Brahmavarta or Aryavarta, our forefathers would have never believed, for there is not a single passage in the vast Vedic literature to suggest clearly that Aryan India had ever any connection with the world outside. Yet it is certain that the Aryans came to India from outside. The very language used by our Indo-Aryan forefathers betrays this fact."

More to come...

Thandabani

By **Vishal Agarwal (Vishal)** on **Wednesday, October 6, 1999 - 07:43 am:**

I do not deny your references but you must realise the the model of Aryan Invasion was based on shallow premises and pre-conceived notions. It was formulated prior to the discovery of the 'Harappan Culture' and was colored heavily by the racial notions of the then historians, Indians not excepted. In recent times, the entire data has been re-interpreted and looked at afresh by Indian as well as foreign Historians and Archaeologists and their is an emerging majority which is emphatic that there is absolutely not evidence that the towns were destroyed. It has been calculated that a few square km of land was sufficient to make the bricks for construction of IVC cities. With the discovery of 300 sites on the dried course of Sarasvati, it is clear now that the culture ought to be renamed as Sindhu-Sarasvati culture and not as IVC or Harappan Culture. When we do not yet know anything of the language of Harappa yet, it is a little presumptuous on the part of Sri Batakrishna Ghosh to declare that the IA language was different from that spoken by IVC natives (while acknowledging that the Vedas beray no knowledge of an 'Aryan' immigration). Just FYI, Sri Ghosh was alleged to have plaigarized the book "Vaidik Vanmaya ka Itihasa" of Pt. Bhagvad Datta while writing his PhD. thesis (published later as the book "Fragments of the Lost Brahmanas"). I examined the two books and concluded that the charge is not baseless and Sri Ghosh has clearly indulged in academic dishonesty.

The writings of the host of historians cited by you have been superceded by the works of

1. Wakankar
2. S. P. Gupta
3. Mughal (of Pakistan)
4. Navaratna Rajaram
5. Natwar Jha
6. Shaffer
7. Michael Witzel
8. K. D. Sethna

9. Edwin Bryant
10. Asko Parpola
11. B B Lal
12. David Frawley
12. Satya Svarupa Misra
12. Srikant Talageri
13. S. Kalyanaraman
14. Koernraad Elst
15. S. R. Rao

and a host of others. None of the above believes in the invasion theory now. In the list above, Bryant believes that there is no evidence, linguistic or otherwise, that the Aryans came from out of India as of yet. Witzel does believe the AIT (Aryan Immigration Model) but declares that the Aryan speakers displaced the proto - Munda speakers (not Dravidians). Parpola believes that the IVC natives were Dravidians but cannot interpret a single seal or provide any proof. However, he too rejects the Invasion paradigm.

Talageri and Misra provide linguistic evidence for the OIT (Out of India) paradigm and state that Aryans actually originated in N. India. Wakankar and Sethna have shown that the domestication of Horse in India pre-dates the supposed date for the arrival of Aryans in India. Mughal has shown that more than 70% sites of the so called Harappan Culture are actually lie on or besides the dried beds of Sarasvati. Wakankar and Rajaram have mapped the lost tracks of Sarasvati and have shown the this river, celebrated in the Vedic texts, dried much before the supposed arrival of Aryans. This proves that the IVC and Aryan presence in India were at least contemporary (with the Aryan culture east of IVC) and not otherwise. Rajaram has highlighted the hollowness of the 'Aryan Invasion' paradigms and has exposed the racial motives of many old Western Indologists. David Frawley has demonstrated, on the evidence of Vedic Literature, that it depicts a maritime civilization and not a pastoral and a nomadic culture as presumed by the Invasionists and the Migrationists. Elst has looked at the astronomical evidence in Hindu scriptures and placed them several millenia before B.C.E. He has also shown that Hindus did not back calculate planetary positions because doing so would have required complicated Calculus. Therefore, the tradition Hindu notion that our culture is several millenia old (much more than 3500 B.C.E.) is valid. Several traditional dates have also been verified thus. For instance, Kalidas indeed existed in 1st Century B.C.E. The date of Mahabharata was indeed 31st Cent. B.C.E and so on. S P Gupta has written enlightening works on the Sarasvati sites (Rakhigarhi being several times large than Harappa and Mohenjodaro put together). B B Lal, a former invasionist, has reversed his opinion and now declares that the IVC was predominantly Sanskritic. S R Rao has pioneered marine archaeology and has established the existence of the submerged Dsarka. He too believes that the IVC was Sanskritic.

In addition, we now have corroborative evidence from genetics, Metallurgy, astronomy and so on.

If you want, I can give references for each of the above (books, articles). I can also post the discussions I have been having with the Pro-migration/invasion believers privately if you want. This will prove how we have been fooled all along.

Regards

Vishal

By **Thandabani (Bani)** on **Wednesday, October 6, 1999 - 09:18 pm:**
Mr. Vishal,

The book I referred to has 4 volumes and 3000 over pages combined, with more then 100 participants from various field. Any attempt to invalidate such works by Dr. Radhakrishnan and team is not going to be an easy task. I believe that our present team of thinkers as listed by you should team up together and counter produce AN ENCYCLOPEDIA OF INDIAN CULTURE as an authorise texts for the present generations and for the generations to come. Such a work could be carried out under the leadership of Dr. Rajaram or Dr. David Frawley with other members as contributors. The books which I reffered to is obtainable from Ramakrishna missions worldwide, which can be used for reference purposes.

Challenging with bit and pieces here and there is not going to work in favour of Hinduism and the Sarasvati-Sindhu civilization. We should go on a offensive drive to validate such claims.

The book which I reffered to has found its way to the western society and has been recognised as an encyclopaedia of Indian culture by famous institutes. To challenge such works as false requires super effort from now on by present day hindu thinkers. All attempts should be done sincerely without any manipulations. If the findings shows that the Hindu civilization derived from a pre-hindu civilization, than it should be revealed and accepted by Hindus with good faith.

Albert Einstein once said; "We owe a lot to the Indians, who taught us how to count, without which no worthwhile scientific discovry could have been made." I am quoting it here just to show how sincere he is. So, if there is anything found whereby Hindus studied from pre-established civilizations in India or from outside, we should accept it in good faith. Attempts to include works of other civilizations into Hindu manifold with the intention of showing greatness of Hindu culture should be avoided at any cost. So, all works should be carried out to reveal history in its original form without any favoritism. Why I reffered to the books in my hand is just because it was written sincerely without any favoritism to any culture, tradition or religion. All the papers submitted were of to the best interpretation possible at the time of presentation.

Since you have insights about IVC or Sarasvati-Sindhu civilization, than go ahead and put up on this board, it may help all the participants to understand the truth behind.

Thandabani

By **Chirag Kapadia (Chiragkapadia)** on **Thursday, October 7, 1999 - 02:56 am:**
Thandabani,

I think you have missed some of the point of Vishal's argument. Obviously Hindu culture evolved from "pre-Hindu" culture, if we choose to use these types of somewhat arbitrary terms. But the main point is, is this "pre-hindu" culture native to India, or not? Vishal's argument is that Hindu culture evolved solely and completely from the framework of the culture of India; it did not come from outside, in some type of invasion of light-skinned people. The British supported this theory because it fed into their prejudices and because it provided a foundation for some of what they wanted to do in India. But the Aryan Invasion theory has now been proven false.

Even a brief glance at Hinduism can reveal, even to a common layman like myself, a multicultural, multiracial origin -- this makes it unique amongst major world religions. But the origins of Sanatana Dharma are purely Indian only; all of our ancient historical texts back this argument; it is only the "twists" given to it by biased historians which make it seem otherwise. Of course, there were many tribes/races in India in ancient times, as there are today -- "Arya" was a Sanskrit term used to refer to the noble amongst them.

Obviously, our history is very complex, and the entire thing is complicated much further by the sad facts of colonization. Colonized countries have not had a chance to write their own history; instead we follow the history handed to us by the colonizers. Fortunately India is starting to break out of this trap.

And if you want one more "authority," please see the writings of Paramahansa Yogananda, founder of the Self-Realization fellowship; towards the end of his "Autobiography of a Yogi" he completely and fully disavows the Aryan Invasion theory. Sanatana Dharma is for the whole world, but its origins are purely Indian.

Chirag

By **Thandabani (Bani)** on **Friday, October 8, 1999 - 03:23 am:**
Mr. Chirag,

I am not denying the fact that Indian civilization evolved in Indian soil itself. Such question to AIT (Aryan Invasion Theory) popped up because of the great unsimilarities between the vedic culture from Rig Veda and the pre vedic culture. The question is the collapse of an established civilization. The collapse of a civilization with well established administration, public utility and residential planning is the core of AIT, whereby believed to be destroyed by the warrior group, Aryans from outside.

Historical evidence on collapsed civilizations clearly shows foreign invasion or transmigration. Any challenge to such AIT should come up with a solution for the collapse of the 'Harapa Civilization' as well. Without a solution for the collapse of an established civilization is not going to go well with pro- AIT-ists.

Thandabani

By **Julie Maitra (Juliem)** on **Friday, October 8, 1999 - 12:44 pm:**
It is sad that the north v. south divide is not resolved.

Hinduism managed to survive and flourish in the South, while the North was being overrun by Moslem invasions. When my husband and I went to the recent exhibition on Devi at the Smithsonian Institution, he asked why so many of the artifacts came from the South. The docent, a lady of non-Indian background, replied that many icons in North India were smashed and used in building the portals of mosques, and that there were geographic obstacles that hindered the Moslem invaders from penetrating the South overland. It was interesting that this woman candidly offered these explanations!

By **Vishal Agarwal (Vishal)** on **Friday, October 8, 1999 - 10:04 pm:**

Dear Si Thandabani,

I note that you have started another thread on the AIT. Therefore, I will consider only the peripheral issues in your last two posts, reserving comments on the core issues for the other thread.

To understand the genesis of the AIT, it must be realized first that the IE (Indo-European) origin of Sanskritic languages was first postulated several decades before discovery of the IVC. The protagonists of the AIT at this stage were highly colored by the ideas of race and language which are considered outdated now a days. When the Vedas started appearing in print, Mueller, Wilson and Griffith etc. started reading invasions, slaughter of dark, stub nosed Indian natives in the Rigveda due to misinterpretation of the Mantras. The date of RV (Rigveda) was established at 1200 B.C.E on the basis of the assumption that the Universe was created in 4004 B.C.E. The distinction between the so called 'Dravidian' and Indo-Aryan (a subset of IE) was not clear yet, but starting with the Christian missionary Bishop Caldwell, this notion was given a concrete foundation.

A few decades later, when the ruins of IVC started appearing, it was a windfall for these invasionists. The new data was retrofitted into a baseless model and it was postulated that IVC was Dravidian culture and that it was destroyed by tall, fair, (sometimes also blond and blue eyed!!!), sharp nosed 'Aryans' who descended in hordes from Central Asia riding their two wheeled, horse driven chariots. The linguists took further flights of fancy and constructed 'proto-Dravidian' and 'Proto-Munda' languages based on flimsy and highly conjectural and non-verifiable linguistic principles. Then, they started discovering these Proto-Munda and Proto-Dravidian substratums in the RV language.

In this entire analysis, it was forgotten that the model of AIT had totally unscientific foundations to start with. All emerging data was force fitted into these AIT paradigms and then this force-fit was actually used to 'prove' the AIT paradigms. In short, circular arguments and non-verifiable, unscientific techniques have been used to 'prove' and 'propose' AIT at the same time.

In recent times, the very genesis of the AIT has been examined minutely and it is being demonstrated that if we ignore our pre-conceived notions of the AIT paradigms, the data does not seem to support the AIT on its own. In fact, it presents a very different picture--that of evolution and origination of Hindu Civilization over several millenia over an area stretching from River Sita (Jaxtres in Central Asia) to Cauvery in the south.

As expected, such a 'revisionist' version is drawing massive protests from the academic establishment. Why? Because if it is demonstrated that IVC is actually 'Indo-Aryan' and RV actually predates IVC, then in one stroke, all the texts on History, Archaeology, Linguistics, Indology per se become invalidated automatically.

You have stated that the encyclopedia you read contains articles by 100 specialists. I do not disagree and am infact extremely conversant with the writings of many of the names cited by you (although I have not read the Encyclopedia in question) like Ghosal, Hazra, Radhakrishnan, B K Ghosh, Suniti Kumar Chatterjee etc. All of them fell into the same trap--of retrofitting emergent data into a preconceived, baseless model.

Contrary to your statement, enormous literature has in fact started emerging in the refutation of the AIT paradigms. Very recently, Dr. Elst wrote a 450 pages long update on the AIT research (I will post a review of the same by Dr. Rajaram soon). Besides the dozens already available in the market, two more are coming by this year end:

1. History in the Rigveda by Srikant Talageri (Aditya Prakashan)
2. Decipherment of the Indus Script by Drs. Jha and Rajaram.

I myself have about 20 books by Frawley, Gupta, Rajaram, etc. debunking the AIT paradigms. Needless to say, the Academicians prefer to ignore them and do not review them in their own writings, dismissing these scholars as members of a 'lunatic fringe.'

Contrary to your apprehensions, the opponents of AIT do not see India as the centre of all Human Culture and Civilization. In fact, they concord with traditional Hindu accounts which speak of Vaivasta Manu descending from Trivistapa (Tibet) along a trans Himalayan River (Saryu?) and establishing a kingdom in Ayodhya. The descendants of Vaivasta Manu then moved westward into W. Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab, Afghanistan and thence into W. Asia and Europe. This theory finds linguistic support in the writings of Satya Svarupa Misra and Talageri. In particular, the theory actually states that IVC 'POST DATES' Rigveda and the other Vedas and Brahmanas and actually belongs to the Sutra period. This is a startling revelation indeed, and goes against all conventional notions of Human Civilization.

As to the solution to collapse of IVC, the consensus now is that invasion as a cause is clearly ruled out because we do not find any traces of burnt inhabitations, massacre sites, and so on. Rather, a gradual cultural decay is discerned, probably caused by a 3 century drought which incidently also ruined the Sumerian and Egyptian civilization. Many structures show signs of devastation by floods and earthquakes too. There seem to be signs of an Eastward shift of population from the Sindhu Sarasvati basin towards the Ganga basin then (i.e., the population first moved from Saryu to Sindhu and then back to Ganga) and these eastward movements are actually alluded to in texts like Shatapatha Brahmana.

There is no proof for any 'Pre-Hindu' civilization as such in India. The IVC sites themselves exhibit a great diversity from Harappa to Surkotada proving that the area was as diverse then as it is now. Diversity is this not new to India. There is also no proof that Dravidians migrated from Sindhu valley to Dravida land in peninsular India. Besides, once we realize that the RV represents very elitist literature (only 5 out of the approximately 300 Rishis of RV are non-Brahmins), it becomes clear that the non-Vedic elements of Hindu culture might as well be derived from the non-Brahminical aspects of ancient Hindu civilization.

One thing I agree with you is that a very comprehensive refutation of the AIT is yet to be compiled. But whatever exists is also sufficient to expose the hollowness of the AIT (I= immigration or invasion) paradigms. Indians might have indeed come to India from outside, but this happened in such a distant past that even the RV betrays no trace of any foreign origin. Those who say otherwise are relying on questionable interpretations of the text. More under the appropriate thread.