

PERENNIAL HINDU CULTURE
AND
THE TWIN MYTHS

M. VAITIALINGAM

K. Sivaramalingam

Kandamada

24/9/1980

17. *Microtus pennsylvanicus*

Microtus pennsylvanicus

24/9/1982



PERENNIAL HINDU CULTURE
AND
THE TWIN MYTHS

by
M. VAITIALINGAM
(Retired Teacher)

Published by
V. Sachchithanantham

FIRST EDITION—1980

PRINTED AT THE THIRUMAKAL PRESS, CHUNNAKAM

To
my auntie

MRS. RAJAH SIVAPAKKIAM

Er e r s

12

2 227 22
~~20-9-19~~
20 27 28 29
8 9 4

FOREWORD

Ever since Sir William Jones sought to establish the affinity between European and Indian Languages nearly two centuries ago, the debate over the Aryan problem has been going on. The appearance of this book shows the extent to which it still remains a problem. The author Mr. M. Vaitialingam, after years of painstaking study in the midst of a busy and dedicated life as a teacher, has made a fascinating survey of this problem from the time of Sir William Jones and has exposed, in the process, the myth of the Aryan race. We live in a region of the earth where this myth raises its ugly head now and then and one cannot, under the circumstances, question the need for such a publication. We have to constantly remind ourselves that we live in an age in which we cannot talk of an Aryan or Dravidian race.

While the scientific-minded reader will agree with the author's treatment of the Aryan myth, the concluding chapter on the racial question in India is likely to be controversial. Here he treads on the knotty problems of the peopling of the Indian subcontinent and of the classification of the Indian languages. His path is no doubt beset with pitfalls and linguists, archaeologists and other scholars are still grappling with these problems.

Mr. Vaitialingam's book, however, is bound to stimulate fresh interest in this subject. It is indeed remarkable for a man who worked as a school-teacher in a place where he did not have the facilities of a proper research library to have undertaken this work, bringing together such a wealth of information and interpreting it in the way he has done. I hope this work will help many to understand the fundamental unity of the peoples of South Asia and of their varied cultures.

26 August 1980

Dr. K. Indrapala
University of Jaffna

PREFACE

The idea of writing this book occurred to me several years ago when the task of teaching ancient Indian history and Hindu religion fell to my lot. In the course of my teaching there arose a deep conflict which disquieted my mind. For I could not reconcile the views of historians of ancient India with the traditional views on Hindu religion. How could one reconcile the view that the Vedas are eternal and 'apaurusheya' (non-man-made) with the view that they were "the creations of a marauding race of cattle-raiders who irrupted into India some thousand-five hundred years B. C.

It was my good fortune that I came into contact with the late Mr. S. Kailasapathy an erudite scholar and philosopher who told me that the so-called 'Aryan race' and its invasion of India is a pure myth created by Prof. Max Muller. This tip put me on the proper track of pursuing my investigations. None-the-less, the fear that I was not competent to write a book of this nature deterred me for a long time. Accidentally I came across the UNESCO pamphlet '*Racial myths*' written by Prof. Juan Comas, of the School of Anthropology, Mexico. The learned anthropologist, after a thorough investigation of all the available facts concerning this myth, has exploded it.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to the UNESCO for its kind permission to quote a number of passages from this booklet and its allied publications.

I acknowledge my indebtedness to the following authors and publishers:

- (i) Race in Europe—Sir Dr. Julien Huxley, Oxford Univ. Press.
- (ii) Illusion of National Character—Mr. Hamilton Fyfe—Messrs Watts & Co. Lond.
- (iii) Race Prejudice and Education—Dr. Cyril Bibby—Messrs Heineman, Lond.
- (iv) Race and History—Prof. Eugene Pittard—International Univ. of Geneva.

- (v) Race and History—Claude Levi Strauss—A UNESCO pamphlet.
- (vi) Race, Heredity and Society—Prof L. C. Dunn and Prof. Dobzhomsky—Both of Columbia University.
- (vii) 'Aryans'—Mr. Frank H. Henkins. Encyclopaedia of The Social Sciences—Macmillan, New York.
- (viii) What Happened in History—Prof. Gordon Childe—Pelican Series.
- (ix) 'A Short History of the World'—H G. Wells—Pelican Series.
- (x) S K Chatterji & Bharat Vidya Bhavan.
- (xi) Encyclopaedia Britannica—Publishers.
- (xii) Encyclopaedia Americana—Publishers.
- (xiii) 'The Hindu', Madras.
- (xiv) Bhavan's Journal—Bharat Vidya Bhavan.
- (xv) Ramakrishna Mission & its Publications.

I should express my thanks to many of my friends and relatives for the help they have rendered to me in various forms in the production of this book. Special mention must be made of Mr. S. Veerasingham, Emeritus Principal, Sri Somaskanda College, Puttur, Sri Lanka, Mr. S. Paranirupasingham, Arunodaya College, Alaveddi, Mr. A. Sabaratnam, B. A., St. Anthony's College, Kayts and to Mr. C. Thillainathan, Mallakam, all of Jaffna, Sri Lanka.

My sincere thanks are to my friends Mr. M. Sabaratnam, Manager, Thanaluckumy Book Depot, Chunnakam and to Mr. A. Sabaratnam for reading through the proofs, and to Mrs. N. M. Kalavathy for typing a good portion of the manuscript.

I also thank the manager and workmen of Thirumakal Press for the neat job they have done.

In conclusion I express my sincere and heart-felt thanks to Dr. Indrapala, Professor of History, University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka, for giving me the Foreword and for consenting to preside over the ceremonial release of the book.

INTRODUCTION

The title of this thesis makes it necessary for the readers to have a correct view on Hinduism, because it is cluttered up with popular ideas which are not in conformity with the Sastras.

1. IT HAS NO FOUNDER

Hinduism has no founder to whom it owes either its name or its teachings. This is a unique characteristic of this religion. The Rig Veda, acclaimed by eminent scholars as the oldest book of humanity, is only a compilation by the great Rishi Vyasa at the beginning of Kali Yuga, some five thousand years ago. The Rishis of the Rig Veda do not lay any claim whatsoever to the founding of Hindu religion or to its teachings. On the other hand, the Rig Vedic Rishis make mention, in their hymns, of Rishis much more ancient than they.

“Ancient and modern seers”

Purvebhir rsibhir

ilīo nutanair uta.¹

2. IT IS AGELESS

Another unique characteristic of Hinduism is its agelessness. The time-sense in Hindu religion is astounding. When the Westerners calculated time in terms of millenniums, the ancient Hindus calculated time in terms of Yugas. There are four yugas and the running one is Kali Yuga which consists of four lacs and thirty-two thousand years. One Chatur Yuga alone, (sum total of four yugas) comprises four million and three hundred and twenty thousand years (4,320,000). Seventy one such Chatur Yugas form one Manvantra or the period covering the regime of one Manu, which period comprises three and a quarter billion years. This is not a fantastic calculation. It accords well with the discoveries of modern science.

“Before continuing further, it might be worthwhile to say something about the time scale with which we are dealing and to which we must fit. We must have some

idea of the earth in order to do that; and the time of the genesis of the earth is about 4,700 million years, somewhere in this period between two and four billion years ago organic evolution must have begun. It is this asymptotic point which we are seeking in our chemical analysis of the rocks".²

According to most modern scientific opinion, life appeared on the face of this earth about 1.2 billion years ago, and man in his fully developed form appeared some 75 million years ago. Some scientists bring down man's appearance to 30 (thirty) million years. To think that civilizations started only some five or six millenniums ago is a travesty of truth. There were civilizations which existed fifty thousand years B. C.

"In fact, the Levallois culture which we have already mentioned and which reached its peak between the 250th and 70th millenary B. C. attained to a perfection in the art of chipping stone which was scarcely equalled until the end of neolithic period 245,000 to 65,000 (sixtyfive thousand) years later and which we would find it extremely difficult to copy today".³

"The Maya civilization of America originated at some date which cannot be much earlier than the 20th millenary B. C. In twenty or twenty-five thousand years these men produced one of the most amazing examples of cumulative history the world has ever seen".³

The fact is that "progress is neither continuous nor inevitable; its course consists in a series of leaps and bounds or as the biologists would say, mutations. These leaps and bounds are not always in the same direction; the general trend may change too, rather like the progress of the knight in chess, who always have several moves open to him but never in the same direction".³

"This would not however mean the end of civilization as western historians might perhaps imagine. For as Toynbee has pointed out and Prof Barraclough repeatedly emphasises if history teaches anything it is that civilization is cyclic

in nature; the story of civilization is the story of many civilizations which have come and gone; and there is no such thing as progress in a continuous upward curve, but only a number of cultures each rising to a height and then falling into a trough when its creative powers have petered out".⁴

This is what actually happened to Hindu Civilization, and one cannot put his finger at any point, in the long vista of time and say that Hinduism originated at this particular point. To say that the Vedas and the Vedic way of life, is a creation of the so called 'Aryans' whom Prof. Max Muller, marched into India, from central Asia, through the Khyber Pass, some one thousand five hundred years B. C., is a grand-mother's tale.

3. THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF HINDUISM

The basic principle of Hinduism is that the three categories, God, Soul and the World are eternal—i. e. they have neither beginning nor end. This is the basic principle of Saiva Siddhanta school of Hinduism and in a modified form, true of other Hindu schools of thought. According to Saiva Siddhanta school of thought, the universe is a separate entity, a real one and not an illusion, but evolves and involves from the primordial material energy, through the influence of another finer energy called Chitsakti, which is part and parcel of God. The primordial material energy is eternal, and this principle is in complete agreement with the fundamental principle of chemistry that "matter is neither created nor destroyed"⁵. Suns, stars and solar systems appear and disappear in time like bubbles on a rainy day.

4. PRESENT HINDUISM IS A GIFT OF THE INDUS VALLEY PEOPLE

The oldest civilization on the Indian soil, so far as we now know, is the Indus Valley Civilization, which is now commonly called the 'Harappan Culture'. According to modern Archaeology, the Harappan Culture is only a scene in the whole panorama of Riverine civilizations found on the Bharat soil. It is the considered opinion of modern archaeologists that the Indus Valley Civilization is found in six or seven stratas and that only one or two

have been so far excavated and the rest still remain in the bowels of the earth, untouched by human hand. The date of the disappearance of this wonderful culture is variously fixed by scholars, but none of them has fixed the date later than 4,000 B. C.

The Hindu religion, in the form it is practised today is a heritage bequeathed by the Indus Valley People.⁶ The deities which the Indus Valley People worshipped viz. Siva, Vishnu, Ambal and Karthikeya (Murugan) are the same deities which are being worshipped to this day. This has been proved by Finnish and Russian scientists, who, independent of each other, have been attempting to decipher, with the help of computers, the hieroglyphic scripts left behind by the Indus Valley People.⁷ The way of life of the Hindus of today is very similar to that of the way of life of the Indus Valley People. This is shown in the body of this book. The civilization of the Indus Valley people was neither 'Aryan' nor 'Dravidian'. It was an indigenous one. Should there be any favoured area on this globe which can lay claim to be the 'seed-pot' of nations? If man can originate and develop in other countries why can't he originate and develop in India? What factors militated against this occurrence? Why should people be marched into India from other countries such as Central Asia and the Mediterranean shores, and even from Africa? Our shastras declare in unequivocal terms that Bharata Desa has been the habitat of sages and man from time immemorial. Conception of time which leads to the division of it into yugas and manvantaras testify clearly to this fact.

5. HINDUISM IS A VEDIC RELIGION

Hinduism is a way of life laid down by the Vedas. The Indus Valley people, in all probability, led a Vedic way of life. Among the several finds in the ruins of Mohenjo-Daro, there is a seal which depicts an important mantra found in the Vedas. The mantra is as follows:

"Two birds of beautiful plumage closely related in friendship reside on the self-same tree; one of them eats the fruit thereof, the other shines resplendent without eating"⁸

There is another seal from Mohenjo-Daro the figures on which, according to the late T. N. Ramachandran, Director-General of Archaeology, Government of India, represent the Medhyatithi hymn of the Rig Veda.⁹

Also among the seals found in Mohenjo-Daro, there are some, which bear figures with six fishes, three on either side. This, presumably, represent God Karthikeya (Murugan) and the six 'Kartikai' women who, according to the Puranas filled the role of the wet-nurses of Murugan. This shows, in the worship of the people of Indus Valley, the Puranic legend of Murugan was popular.

6. THE SOURCE OF HINDUISM

The original source of Hinduism is the Vedas. It is the source for all the three sects of Hinduism, viz., Saivaism, Vaishnavism and Saktism, though each of them has separate Agamas. In the beginning the Veda was one; but at the beginning of this Yuga, Vyasa Rishi divided it into four.¹¹ The Vedas are eternal and impersonal, i. e., the texts are not made by any person at any particular period. They are statements which the sages have made on Dharma, which unlike man-made laws is eternal. Therefore statements about moral laws are eternal too.

"People talk light-heartedly about Hindus believing in a Veda that transcends human authorship and regard such belief as superstition. But the fact is that the validity of a Vedic statement is no more a superstition than the validity of the statement of a scientific law like the law of planetary motion. The distinction between Veda and ordinary language is the distinction between the statement of an objective fact and the statement of a subjective view. There is no superstition in the belief in the Vedas, and it is the true scientific position to take in matters of moral law and absolute truths."

"What is meant by a Vedic statement is not the opinion of a person like the statement that there are fruits on the banks of river, but it is the statement of a fact like the statement of relation of the sides and angles in a triangle, where the personal view of Euclid does not find a place."²¹

7. THE LANGUAGE OF MANTRAS

In the main, the language of the Vedic Mantras is symbolic. The hymns are not to be understood literally, behind every one of them is a hidden meaning. In fact, the definition of a mantra by the great Tamil Grammarian Tholkapiar runs thus:—

“A mantra is a pronouncement of a sage expressed in a language with a hidden meaning”.¹⁴

Thiruvalluvar who is credited with infallibility by all Tamil scholars accepts the greatness of the sages and their pronouncements in the form of mantras,¹⁵ which have hidden meanings.

Therefore the vedas are called ‘Maraimoli’ (Hidden word) in the Tamil Language. His Holiness Kumara-guruparaswamy, a great Saiva saint and founder of Thirup-pananthal mutt in Tamil Nadu in one of his works says:

“In the Vedic mantras, truth is hidden and therefore the Vedas are called “Marai” (Hidden Knowledge) by the learned in Tamil.”¹⁶

Thirumular, another Saiva saint who had travelled from North India to South India to meet the great Vedic Rishi Agastiar at Pothikai Hill, is the author of a book called ‘Thirumantram’—‘A garland of mantras’—couched in a language which is mainly symbolic, but verses 2866—2935 are wholly symbolic which passes ordinary human understanding. One such mantra, which is given below literally translated, sounds very ridiculous to the ordinary human ear.

“When brinjal seeds were planted, bitter-gourd plants
sprang up
When I dug up the loose sand, pumkin began to flower;
The cultivators ran away worshipping
The plantains got fully ripe.”

The above literal translation looks most absurd. There is an inner meaning which only Thirumular, his disciples and the traditionally initiated know. There is another way of knowing the meaning of such mantras. It is by intuition developed by yoga practice—called ‘Yogakadchi’. The

translation and interpretation of a few Vedic mantras by Mahayogi Sri Aurobindo was achieved by such yoga-intuition. His book "On the Veda" is an example of such interpretation. This is a book every Hindu must study.

8. HINDUISM MISCALLED 'BRAHMINISM'

Hinduism has often been miscalled 'Brahminism' which would mean 'a religion of the brahmins, professed and propounded by brahmins'. This is a very prejudiced view. There are a number of seers in the Rig Veda who are non-brahmins. In fact, the seer of the first sūkta of the First Mandala of the Rig Veda is a non-brahmin. He is Madhuchandas, son of Visvamitra. The hymns of Mandala III are ascribed to the Rishi Visvamitra or to the members of his family. Visvamitra, as we know, was born a kshatriya, but by virtue of his intense tapas attained brahminhood. The Western scholars have even imagined a rivalry between Visvamitra and the Rishi Vasistha and have referred to them as founders of two opposing schools of thought, brahmin and non-brahmin. The Gayatri mantra (M. III. S 64. M. 10)¹⁷ the celebrated verse in the Rig Veda which forms the main part of the devotions of the brahmins is a production of a non-brahmin—Visvamitra. Brahmins as priests, no doubt, have made a much greater contribution to the philosophy and rituals of the religion than laymen.

9. BRAHMINS ARE MADE NOT BORN

A priest in Hindu religion is called a brahmin. His position is similar to that of the priests in other religions. In the beginning brahmins were made and not born. The Veda puts the following mantra in the mouth of Goddess Sarasvathi.

*I, verily, myself say this
Which is welcome to the Devas and to men
Him whom I love I make mighty
I make him a brahmin, a Rishi, a man of talent.*¹⁸

"It is clear from the above that in the Vedic sense a brahmin is made, not born. To be a brahmin is not to belong to a specially favoured caste but to be divinely inspired with wisdom"¹⁹

“A sudra becomes a brahmana and brahmana a sudra (by conduct)—Know the same (rule to apply) to him who is born of a Kshatriya and Vaisya”.²⁰

In the Mahabharata, the great sage Vyasa, through Yudhishthira expresses the same view. The thirtieth question of the Yaksha is as follows:—

O! King! by what does brahminhood result? Is it by Kula or ancestry, Vritta or conduct, swadhyaya or study of the Vedas or sruta, hearing or culture? Tell me definitely.

The answer of Dharmaputra is as follows:

“Listen, O Respected Yaksha! it is not ancestry or study or learning of Veda or hearing or culture that is the cause of brahminhood. *Without doubt it is conduct that is the cause of brahminhood.....* The teachers and pupils and all who *merely study* the sastras are to be regarded as fools. He alone who possesses conduct is the man of real knowledge”²¹

Thiruvalluva Nāyanar teaches the same truth, when he says:—

“An Anthanan (brahmin) is a man of conduct and he loves all beings alike”.²²

Thirumular says the same thing—

“They are anthanas who are in duty bound to do the six-fold duties”.—²³

“Brahminhood is the ideal of humanity in India. This Brahmana, the man of God, *he who has known Brahman* the ideal man, the perfect man, must remain; he must not go. The ideal at one end is the Brahmana and ideal at other end is the chandala and the whole work is to raise the chandala up to the Brahmana”²⁴

“But Varnashrama scheme, despite exceptions, has been greatly misunderstood and misinterpreted by a host of European scholars and by their uncritical Indian students too..... The ideals of Varnashrama dharma should never be confused with the lapses of the people in their application. Much of social inhumanity has been practised in India.. We condemn it in the strongest terms. But we equally

and strongly say that the Varnashrama dharma in its superb ideality and theory, stands even today, as an unexcelled social scheme."²⁵

The interpretations of the Varnashrama dharma are very often fallacious. No one, with any common sense, will ever believe that "one ominous night a band of brahmins sat in a Satanic Clique to invent the engine of tyranny that was Varnashrama scheme and that having invented it successfully and remorselessly imposed it on the millions, who in all obedience said 'amen' to it". Such absurd notions are spread broadcast by enemies of Hinduism and most of our people also believe it. Though the sastras place the brahmin in the most pre-eminent position in Hindu society, he is called upon to fulfill the most exacting obligations and render the most beneficent service to the society as a whole. The dignity of a brahmin does not lie on his accidental birth or the sacred thread that he wears. One has to dry his flesh and dehydrate his bones and purify his mind thoroughly in the flames of relentless tapas, before one could actually claim to be a brahmana—a brahmana by guna and Karma.

"Vipra who does not know the true nature and being of Brahman, but is always proud of his sacrificial thread is for that sin called a beast".²⁶

The king is enjoined to punish a brahmin who neglects his duties and whose conduct becomes wicked.

"The king should never treat indifferently those brahmanas who do not observe their duties. For the sake of making his people virtuous he should punish and take them away from their betters".²⁷

"The king shall punish the village where brahmanas failing to observe their sacred duties and the study of the Vedas, live by begging *for it feeds the thieves*".²⁸

Thirumular in several of his mantras expresses the same view.²⁹

These views may look out of place and elaborate, but the need for a lengthy and true statement becomes necessary because of the colossal ignorance that prevails even among the educated Hindus on brahminhood and priesthood. In

the Saiva Siddhanta school of Hinduism, members of all the four varnas are eligible for priesthood. *This is clearly and plainly laid down in the Saiva Agamas and other subsidiary works.*³⁰

10. UNIVERSALITY OF THE VEDAS

The Vedas and Vedic knowledge are not meant for a few privileged classes. They have a universality transcending all human barriers. The sages who revealed them felt that they should declare them to their fellow-men irrespective of their social or cultural status. The following mantras from the Vedas substantiate this point:

*“Asvins Lords of Light
fill me with sweet honey
So that I may speak the glorious word
to the masses of mankind”.*³¹

This is an important feature of the Vedic religion. This distinguishes it from occult sects. In the above verse the sage prays for sweet speech so that he *may spread the sacred words to the whole humanity.*

In another verse another sage prays:

Lord of seven communities and the eight comprising
all beings.

Make the pathways pleasant

And may there be concord between me and that

So may I speak *these blissful words* to the
masses of men

To the Brahmana and the Kshatriya

To the Sudra and the Vaishya

To my own people and the foreigner.³²

Again it is said in the Rig Veda,

“Brihaspathi, born of Eternal order, give us that wonderful treasure with which the good man excels, which, consisting of brilliance and wisdom, shines among the people and is effulgent with power.”

Here a Vedic Rishi prays Brihaspati or Brahmanaspati, Lord of Vedic knowledge, for the gift of the greatest treasure, the spiritual and intellectual knowledge embodied in the Vedas, so that he may make it shine among the

people. It should be noted here that the missionary activities of the sages were not backed by secular authority.

There is another Sūkta in the Rig Veda which describes the spiritual activities of a class of sages called 'Munis' who wearing 'garments soiled of yellow hue' and being divinely inspired "treading the path of sylvan beasts, Gandharvas and Apsarases, come to know the wishes of the people and become associates in the holy work of every god".³⁴

Von Roth, the great German scholar commends on this Sūkta thus: "The hymn shows the conception that by a life of sanctity the Muni can attain to the fellowship of the deities of the air, the Vayus, the Rudras, the Apsarase and the Gandharvas; and furnished like them with wonderful powers, can travel along with them on their course".³⁵ This is typical of every Rishi in the Rig Veda.

"The Vedic sages gave no name to their religion, for they did not preach a set form of creed but a moral and spiritual ideal and a culture and a character pattern of which they themselves were the model. And so they came to share their spiritual discovery and their moral discipline with the vast masses of mankind at home and abroad. It is no wonder that the Vedas call them "world-builders" (Buta-kriith). They built so strongly that their spiritual edifice has stood firm for thousands of years".³⁶

It must be clear that all that has been said in the Smritis against this universality of Vedic knowledge, is spurious interpolations by selfish and self-interested people.

11. WRONG NOTIONS ABOUT SOMA DRINK

Nearly all the hymns of Mandala nine are addressed to Soma Pavamāna, which according to Western scholars is deified soma juice. Many western scholars consider it an intoxicating drink. Our ancient Rishis were not a crowd of senseless drunkards to sing songs in praise of an intoxicating drink. Any one who goes through even the literal translations of the hymns will know that the hymns do not and cannot refer to an intoxicating drink. The whole Vedic symbolism runs through the entire Sūktas of the ninth

Mandala also. The act of producing Soma drink is symbolic of producing Amrita in the human body. The human body is divided into three Mandalas—fire, sun and moon. It is well known in yoga sastras, that nectar (amrita) is in the head of all living creatures and kundali reaching there by yoga practice releases the amrita which moistens the yogin's body whereupon the yogin gets enlightenment and bliss. "within it (sahasrara) is the full moon, without the mark of the hare, resplendent as in a clear sky. It sheds its rays in profusion and is moist and cool like nectar. Inside it (Chandra-Mandala) constantly shining is the triangle and inside this, again, shines the great Void (Parabindu or Iswara) which is served in secret by all the Suras"³⁷

"The yogi who has gained steadiness of mind makes offering (Tarpana) to the Ishta-devata and to the Devatas in the six centres (chakra), Dākini and others, with that stream of celestial nectar which is in the Vessel of Brahmanda, the knowledge whereof he has gained through the tradition of the gurus"³⁸. For a full description of the nature and practice of this yoga readers are referred to the classical work of Arthur Avalon (Sir John Woodroffe) 'The Serpent Power'.

The epithets that are used to describe the Soma drink and its influence on human body will dispel all confusion about this symbolic drink. Soma drink is always mixed with milk before it is drunk or offered as an oblation to the deities. Milk and intoxicating drinks do not go well together. The Soma juice does not benumb a person's intelligence nor does it produce stupor in the person who takes it.

A few epithets that are used to describe the Soma juice and its work:

1. Lords of many Holy Laws.
2. Win thou the light, win heavenly light and, Soma, all felicities and make us better than we are.
3. Flow for prosperity and constant vigour, flow on for happiness high perfection.

Father of Holy Hymns, Soma flow onward, Father of the Earth and Father of Heaven.

Father of Agni, Surya's generator, Father who begot Indra and Vishnu.

Brahman of Gods, the leader of the poets, Rishi of Sages etc. (ix-96—4 to 6.)

4. Blent with milk prolongest our existence.
5. Light-Winner, Rishi-minded, Rishi-maker. (ix-96-18.)
6. The prudent finds it easy to distinguish the true and false. Their words oppose each other:
Of this two that which is the true and honest Soma protects and brings the false to nothing.
Never does Soma aid and guide the wicked, he slays the fiend and him who speaks untruly. (vii-104-12 to 13.)
Soma, outwardly is the juice of a plant, but inwardly it is the nectar that makes a mortal, immortal.

ARYA VERSUS DASYUS

"Apart from these general considerations, certain fallacies of unscientific 'racial' conceptions and in particular the myth of an 'Aryan race' call for separate discussion"³⁹ The history of this fallacious racial concept is fully treated in the body of this book. Here it is only noted that by 'about 1853 Prof. Max Muller introduced into English usage the unlucky term 'Aryan' for a mythical race'. The term 'Arya', and 'Aryas' occur very frequently in the Rig Veda. It is used in many senses. In *Prabuddhakerala* a monthly journal of the Ramakrishna Mission, all the full mantras in the Rig Veda where this 'unlucky term' occurs, are selected and annotated, giving in each case the meaning of this term, appropriate to each context. In these mantras there is not a single instance in which this term means a race. "The theory of race is an innovation by Britishers vis a vis Indian history. It is Vincent Smith that gave much importance to the most unscientific theory of an Aryan invasion of our country"⁴⁰.

Most of the Western scholars who translated the Rig Veda have read into the hymns the 'Aryan race' theory. Most noteworthy among them was Mr. R. T. H. Griffith. To him, the term 'Arya', or 'Aryas' in the Veda is either

'Aryan race' or 'Aryan tribe'. He cannot be blamed for it, for the whole atmosphere was charged with this idea and in the beginning, there was no one who seriously challenged it. There are numerous instances in his translation where the 'Aryan race' theory is unnecessarily introduced. Here is one such:

Indra who rules with single sway, men, riches and the
five-fold race.

Of those who dwell upon earth. 1-7-9.

His footnote on the phrase 'the five-fold race' runs thus:

"Benfey explains this as 'the whole inhabited world'. But the expression seems to mean the 'Aryan settlements' or tribes only and not the indigenous inhabitants of the country".⁴¹

Prof. Wilson translates this mantra thus:

"Indra, who alone rules over men, over Rishis and over the five classes of the dwellers on earth".

Once the 'Aryan race' theory is proved a myth, then all confusion about 'Arya' and 'Dasyu' must disappear. The simple truth must be known to all. An 'Arya' is a man of faith who has really understood and accepted the Eternal Law—the Rita, and the Dasyu is one who does not believe in the eternal values and does not either stand for goodness or oppose evil. It is plainly said so in the Vedas:

"Around us is the Dasyu, riteless, void of sense, inhuman, keeping Alien Laws"—Griffith⁴².

Here again Mr. Griffith translates the word 'Amanusha' as 'inhuman' whereas Apte's Sanskrit dictionary gives the following meanings: non-human, supernatural, unearthly etc. What Mr. Griffith translates as *Keeping Alien Laws* is translated as *Keeping False Laws* by Wilson.

The antithesis between Arya and Dasyu is an antithesis between enlightenment and ignorance, goodness and wickedness, lawful life and lawlessness. The Veda preaches open battle against all forces of evil. It is clearly said in the Rig Veda (VIII-51-9) that God is the God of Dasa as well as of Arya.

“Yasyam Vishva aryo dasah sevashipa arih”

“Lord God of glory is He to whom both Arya and Dasa belong”.

Vedic Rishis pray for the forgiveness of sins which they might have committed unwittingly even against a foreigner.

If, Varuna, we have sinned against the man who loves us or against a friend, or a comrade for ever or a brother or against a neighbour who is always with us or against a stranger,

from that sin may thou release us.⁴³

In the Adharva Veda it is said :

God is that in which things converge

He is that in which things diverge

He is of our own land, He is of foreign land

*He is divine, He is human.*⁴⁴

There are mantras which extend this principle to all living beings “*Sarvani bhutani*”. *Vedic Hinduism is a brotherhood of not only human beings but also of all living beings*

A Vedic Rishi prays thus :—

May all beings look on me with the eye of a friend

May I look on all beings with the eye of a friend

May we look on one another with the eye of a friend.⁴⁵

Therefore, there is no place whatsoever for an Aryan and ‘Dravidian’ conflict in the Vedas.

13. SCIENCE AND RELIGION

It is not out of place here to consider at this stage the impact of modern science and technology on religion, in general, and on Hindu religion in particular. It is a matter of the greatest importance to every one to realise that religion and science are not permanently opposed to each other. No doubt, the phenomenal progress of science and technology are making the people to lose their faith in religion. Also material prosperity and superficial scientific ideas help lose the faith in religion. We must also concede that Hinduism, as a result of foreign domination for centuries, and a complete failure by its adherents, of an effective

propaganda of its fundamentals, has lost its pristine purity and vigour and is nearly smothered by thicket of superstitions and meaningless ceremonials. In its present state it may seem inadequate to the aspirations of modern youths whose minds are filled with new ideals of life and with pseudo-scientific theories. *The religion cannot be blamed for the lapses of its adherents.* In the early stages of scientific development a conflict between science and religion did occur. Now science itself has been forced to give up that arrogance that characterised it in its earlier development. The deeper the science probes into matter and farther it goes into the unending vastness of outer space, the more clearly does it stand puzzled before the mystery of life and the mystery of this 'Mysterious Universe'. Therefore, while on the surface it may appear that there is a sharp conflict between science and religion, a deeper view shows that there is a convergence between these two approaches of life. One can now see the parallel quest between the two; science into the structure of atom and outer-space and religion into spirit of life and into the inner-space known as 'Chitakasa'. Leading scientists are of opinion that there is no conflict between science and religion.

Sir Edwin Ray Lankester, F. R. S. a famous Zoologist and a firm supporter of Darwin's natural selection says:—

"It is not true that there is an essential antagonism between scientific spirit and what is called the religious sentiment. Men of science seek, in all reverence, to discover the Almighty, the Everlasting".

Sir Archibald Geike F. R. S. a great geologist and at one time president of the Royal Society says:

"One grand object of science is to gain deeper insight into the harmony and beauty of creation with yet profound reverence for Him who made and upholds it all."

Sir Oliver Lodge F. R. S., J. G. Mackendrick F. R. S. and many other great scientists, all Fellows of the Royal Society hold the same view.

Many will be surprised to read what Charles Darwin author of the Theory of Evolution wrote "The birth of the

individual and species are equally parts of that grand sequence of events which refuses to accept as the result of blind chance. The understanding revolts from such a conclusion". In another place he wrote: "In my most extreme fluctuations I have never been an athiest in the sense of denying the existence of God".

Dr. Sir C. V. Raman F. R. S. The Nobel-prize Lauriate for Physics says: "I am being looked upon in various quarters as an atheist, but I am not....." "The growing discoveries in the science of Astronomy and Physics seems to me to be further and further revelations of God".

Dr. Alexis Carrel—Nobel-Prize Laureate for Medicine says:— In all ages and in nearly all countries he (man) has felt the need to adore. The tendency to adore is almost as natural to him as the tendency to love. This search for God is probably a necessary consequence of the structure of the mind".

Albert Einstein, one of the greatest scientist of modern times says:— "The most beautiful and most profound emotion we can experience is the sensation of the mystical. It is the power of all true science... "The cosmic religious experience is the strongest and oldest mainspring of scientific research"... "*science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind.*"⁴⁶

14. PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGION

Psychology is one of the numerous sciences that has grown during the course of this century. Its impact on religion is tremendous. It has revealed to us many exciting truths. Psychology deals with the structure of the mind and its work as expressed in human behaviour. Psychologists have classified three levels of mind, conscious, pre-conscious and unconscious. Most of the psychological investigation concerned itself with the first two levels till the advent of Dr. Sigmund Freud. Before Freud the unconscious was considered a mere limbo filled with unwanted and discarded ideas, without any proper function.

It is now generally accepted that the unconscious mind influences powerfully and profoundly the personality and conscious life of a person. It is also regarded as the home of the instincts which can and do often over-ride the will and reason of a human being. It is the seat of unconscious desires which motivate a large portion of our conscious life. Above all it is the depository of incredible stores of memory both racial and personal.

Dr. C. G. Jung, a break-away pupil of Freud classifies unconscious into personal unconscious and collective unconscious; "Personal unconscious belongs to the individual, it is formed from his repressed infinite impulses and wishes, sub-liminal perceptions and countless forgotten experiences". The collective unconscious is a deeper stratum of the unconscious, it is the unknown material from which our consciousness emerges. Dr. Jung called the content of the collective unconscious 'Archetypes' which is the Psychological counterpart of instincts. The study of the 'Archetypes' of the collective unconscious has led Jung to some very interesting conclusions, of which one of the most important is that man possesses 'a natural religious function' and that his psychic health and stability depend on the proper expression of this just as much as on the expression of instincts.

"Through the study of the archetypes of the collective unconscious we find that man possesses 'a religious function' and that this influences him in its way as powerfully as do the instincts of sexuality and aggression..... In spite of the modern attitude of denigration, men and women are just as naturally religious as ever they were"⁴⁷.

"Man needs to experience the God image and to feel its correspondence with the forms that his religion gives to it. If this does not happen, there is a split in his nature he may be outwardly civilized but inwardly he is a barbarian"⁴⁸. Dr. C. G. Jung writes: "During the past thirty years among all my patients in the second half of life (i. e. over thirty-five) there has not been one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious

outlook on life. It is safe to say that every one of them fell ill because he had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers and none of them has been really healed who did not regain his religious outlook. It is indeed high time for the clergyman and the psychotherapist to join forces to meet this great spiritual task".⁴⁹

Another well-known Psychologist and a pupil of Freud was A. Adler. He too, broke-away from Freud and established a school for himself. According to Adler a man's life consists of a conscious striving towards betterment and perfection. This, according to him, is man's supreme ideal. Man tries to achieve this ideal first by realising his weakness and then striving towards perfection. If man's strivings for superiority does not find some socially constructive goal, he will find a less desirable one, such as crime, imaginary illness or excessive criticism of others etc. Of the various goals worth striving for, by man, Adler lists religion as one. He regards it as an important and valuable one.

Adler says:

"The best conception hitherto gained for the *elevation of humanity, is the idea of God*. There can be no question that the idea of God really includes within it as a goal, the movement towards perfection, and that as a concrete goal it best corresponds to the obscure yearnings of human beings to reach perfection. There are, no doubt, conceptions of God that from the very start, fall far short of the principle of perfection; but in its purest form we can say, here the presentation of the goal of perfection has been successful."⁵⁰

Adler's theory accords well with the Hindu conception of life. In Hindu religion the ideal of a human being is to make himself into the mould of God. It is clearly said in the Saiva Sidhanta School of Hinduism, that the work of 'Chitsakti' which is inseparable from Siva, is to make a soul into the mould of Siva himself.⁵¹

REFERENCES

1. The Rig Veda Mandala I. Sukta I. Mantra 2.
2. 'Chemical Evolution of life on Earth' Vide Earth In Space Voiet of America Forum lectures.
3. Race and History by Claude Levi-Strauss. A UNESCO pamphlet pp. 23—24.
4. From, a Review of Baraoclough's book. *The Hindu-Madras* July 9-1956
5. General Chemistry by Glinko Moscow
6. Rev. Fr. Heras Vide—Page 36 of this booklet
7. Vide Their separate Reports. Also an Interview with Dr. Parpola of Finland as reported in *The Hindu Madras*.
8. The Rig Veda M. I. Sukta 164 M. 20, 21.
9. *The Hindu* April 1978: Dr. R. Nagasamy. Director of Archaeology Tamil Nadu, in an interview with Dr. Nikitu Gurov; Aast. Professor, Leningrad University.
10. Dr. Parpola of Finland.
11. Vide Devi Bagavata I, III. 19
12. Dr. Kunhan Raja. Prof. of Sanskrit. *Bhavana's Journal* Jan. 27, 1957. "Authority of the Vedas".
13. Thirumantram 51 & 55.
14. Tholkāpīam Porruḷ 450
15. Thirukkural ch. 3. 8
16. Thiruvārur NānmaniMālai verse 35
17. Thirumantram 2891. Mandala III sukta 64. Mantra 10.
18. Vide The Rig Veda x. 125—5
19. The Call of the Vedas p. 112. by Dr. A. C. Bose
20. Manusmṛiti ch. 10—64
21. Yakṣa Prāsaṇa p. 71 Bharata Vidya Bhavan series
22. Thirukkural
23. Thirumantram 224
24. Swami Vivekananda—Vide—Complete Works of the Swamy
25. From *Vedanta Kesari*—Vol. xxxviii No. 9. Jan. 1952
26. Atri Samhita 372. Taken from *Vedanta Kesari* Oct. 1952
27. Mahabharata Santi—Parva Lxxvi-5
28. Vasishtha Samhita III

29. Thirumantram
30. Vide "Saiva Neri" by Marai Gnana Sambandar. Arumuganavalar's Commentary Verses 344
31. Vide The Atharva Veda, IV 69-2 & ix-1-19
32. Vide The Yasur Veda 26-1-2
33. The Rig Veda. II. 23, 15
34. The Rig Veda x. 136
35. Quoted by Dr. Muir O. S. Texts IV 39
36. The Call of the Vedas p. 297
- 37, 38. Vide Shatchakra Nirupana verses 41 & 53
Also Serpent Power by Arthur Avalon (Sir John Woodroffe)
pp. 430 & 483 (second Edition)
39. Sir (Dr.) Julien Huxley F. R. S. 'Race in Europe'
40. Vide *The Hindu* (Madras) Letter to the Editor
Narasima Rao of Kalahasti
41. Vide Griffith's Translation of the Rig Veda Vol. I page 10 (Second Edition) Footnote
42. Ibid. Vol. II page 441
43. The Rig Veda V. 85-7
44. The Athurva Veda IV-16-8
45. Yajur Veda - 26.2
46. From *Bhavans Journal* 1973. Diwali Number
47. Vide an Introduction to Jung's Psychology p. 70
A Pelican Original
48. Ibid. 74
49. Dr. C. G. Jung, Humanity in Search of a Soul—p. 264
50. A Adler: Social Interest pp. 272—273 Faber and Faber Ltd. Lond.
51. 'Thiruarulpayan' by Umapathisivam ch. I verse 2.

CHAPTER I

THE ARYAN RACE THEORY IN EUROPE

The idea of an 'Aryan race' would not have come into vogue but for a few European Scholars who took to the study of Sanskrit and, through it, our sastras mainly the four Vedas. This happened at a time when India was a dependant country and ruled by England.

With the British rule in India, English became the medium of instruction and English educated Indians accepted without any hesitation or murmur European ideas and modes of living. To many, the native culture was semi-barbarous and the 'native faiths were a mass of unredeemed darkness and error'. So the English educated Indian never thought of challenging whatever the European said, but simply said 'Amen'. It was in this environment the theory of the 'Aryan race' was born.

The idea of an 'Aryan race' was first mooted by Sir William Jones. Sir William was a linguist of very high repute. He was a pundit in many European languages including the classics (Greek and Latin). Besides he knew Hebrew, Arabic, Persian and Turkish. He was appointed Judge of the Supreme Court of Bengal and embarked for India in a sailing ship called 'The Crocodile Frigate' in April 1783 and landed in Calcutta in September 1783. Sir William Jones studied Sanskrit in India and translated the Manusmirti which was published in 1794, a little before his death. In January 1784 he founded the Royal Asiatic Society of which he became the first President. On the 2nd of February 1786, in his Third Anniversary Discourse to the Royal Asiatic Society, he propounded two theories one on the Gods of Greece, Italy and India and the other about their languages. He said: "Be all this as it may, I am persuaded that a connection subsisted between the old idolatrous nations of Egypt, India, Greece and Italy long before they migrated to their several settlements and consequently before

the birth of Moses.” “It will be sufficient in this dissertation to assume what might be proved beyond controversy, that we now live among the adorers of those deities who were worshipped under different names in old Greeze and Italy.” He maintained that the Hindu God Ganesha was not different from the two-headed Janus of Italian mythology. His reason was based on the similarity of sound of the two names. He said “The Sanskrit Language whatever be its antiquity is of wonderful structure, more perfect than Greek, more copious than Latin and more exquisitely refined than either; yet bearing to both of them a strong affinity, both in the roots of verbs and in the forms of Grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident; so strong indeed that no philologer could examine them all three without believing them to have sprung from some common source which perhaps no longer exists”. To this ‘Common source’ or ancient hypothetical language, Sir William gave the name ‘Aryan’ not because the ancient tongue bore the name ‘Aryan’ but because the people who use the Sanskrit Language at the present time, the Hindus, call themselves ‘Aryas’. He repeatedly said that he was inclined to call only the hypothetical language ‘Aryan’ not any race nor a people. Here lies what others treated as the germ of the ‘Aryan race’ theory.

The linguistic theory of Sir William Jones caught the imagination of many European Scholars, especially the Germans. The European Scholars accepted the theory of Sir William as gospel truth and started amplifying and developing it. We must not forget the fact when the theory was evolved it was purely a linguistic one and not at all racial. But from the very beginning the idea of language and race got mixed up as one concept and even great scholars fell into the error of thinking of race in terms of language, with the result the idea of an ‘Aryan’ race who spoke the hypothetical ‘Aryan Language’ came to be accepted by philologists. The idea was rapidly taken up in Germany, in England and in France. At various times, the English, the French and the Germans have all been proudly claiming themselves ‘Aryans’.

Twenty-seven years after Sir William Jones, another Englishman, the well-known physician and physicist Thomas Young in an article in the Tenth volume of the Quarterly Review of Oct. 1813, invented the term "Indo-European" and used it in place of the term 'Aryan' to denote the group of languages comprising Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Celtic etc. He used the term without any remark as to its being a new coinage. The word was used by him to indicate a family of Languages, but from the beginning it has been found very difficult to keep apart the use of the term as indicating languages only and it came to be applied, not only to the speakers of the various languages belonging to the family, but also to a supposed original speakers of a hypothetical original language, the parent of all the languages of the family. The effect of this confusion has been serious.²

Before proceeding further we must have a clear idea of what has happened so far:—

I. Sir William Jones created a hypothetical 'ancient language' the supposed parent language of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Celtic etc. and named it 'Aryan'.

II. Thomas Young advocated the use of the term "Indo-European" in place of the term 'Aryan'. He gave no reasons for the change nor did he disclose the fact that he himself coined it.

III. From the beginning the terms 'Aryan' and 'Indo-European', though purported to denote same *hypothetical language* came to be used for:

- (a) The 'hypothetical language' considered to be the parent of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin etc.
- (b) The speakers of this 'hypothetical language' and they were called 'Aryans' or 'Indo-Europeans'.
- (c) A family of Languages comprising Sanskrit, Greek, Latin etc. and they have been variously called to this day 'Aryan Languages' 'Indo-European Languages' 'Indo-Aryan Languages'.
- (d) The Communities speaking these languages at various times.

Now we proceed;

Thomas Young's use of the term 'Indo-European' to designate the "hypothetical parent Language" quickly gained currency and the idea of an 'Indo-European people' came into existence as a natural consequence. Then the question arose as to the original habitat of this people, and T. G. Rhode in 1820, located their original home in Central Asia.

The German philologists did not very much appreciate the use of the term 'Indo-European' for the term naturally covered most of the languages spoken in Europe and consequently all the communities speaking those languages. Therefore J. Von Kalproth suggested that the term 'Indo-European' be replaced by 'Indo-Germanic'. The use of this term became very popular by the works of Prichard and F. Popp. By about 1840 F. A. Pott shifted the habitat of the 'Indo-European people', as fixed by Rhode to a new habitat consisting of the Valleys of Oxus and Iaxarte and the slopes of the Hindukush. He too, gave no reasons for the change, but his hypothesis was accepted until the end of the nineteenth century.

The theory of a primitive 'Aryan race' or 'Indo-European' people' was popularised in Europe by a Frenchman called Joseph de Goubinau (1816—1882). He was a man of letters and happened to live in Persia, for four years, as a French diplomat. Here he drank with delight the wonders of the East and exchanged views with the leaders of learning and spiritual life and acquired valuable knowledge. He was the author of large volumes on ethnology, Cuneiform writing, Persian History and Literature. Besides he wrote many historical, political and philosophical essays. His most popular work was a book on ethnology translated into English with the title "The Inequality of Human Races". In this book, he proclaimed the superiority of the 'Aryan race' over other great strains and laid down the doctrine of 'Aryanism' in its fullness. His ideas had a considerable influence on philosophical and political thought in Europe. At first his writings were more warmly received in Germany than in France. In Germany he made contact with Richard Wagner, the great musician, who helped him to spread his ideas.

Gobineau's concept of 'Aryanism' differed greatly from earlier concepts. His 'Aryan race' was a class or caste. It was a 'superior caste' the pure-bred, select and privileged minority born to govern and direct the destinies of the 'inferior' cross-bred masses in any country. It was a class concept of aristocracy against a bastard proletariat. He merely asserted the superior pure 'Aryan' descent of aristocracy in whatever country".

Gobineau was not very definite as to the characteristics or traits of his 'Aryans'. They may be brachycephalic or dolichocephalic; their eyes may be light in colour, may be dark or even black. It is said that Gobineau himself was a dark-eyed Frenchman. It was left to his followers to create an 'Aryan Type' of humanity.

This class concept of Gobineau again underwent a change. In 1948, a young German Scholar Friedrich Max Muller by name settled in Oxford where he remained for the rest of his life. This anglicised German studied Sanskrit in Paris under Eugene Burnouf who taught at the College of France in the early forties of the nineteenth century. Burnouf gathered around him a circle of pupils who later became Vedic scholars and laid the foundation of Vedic studies in Europe. He had two prominent disciples, one was Rudolph Roth and the other was Max Muller. The great Petersburg Dictionary was compiled by Otto Bothlink and Rudolph Roth in 1875, while Max Muller published the hymns of the Rig Veda along with the commentary of Sayana between 1849—1875. Max Muller was responsible for publishing the Sacred Books of the East Series in 51 Volumes out of which three were his own contributions.

Prof. Max Muller in an article in the Ninth Edition of Encyclopaedia Britannica Volume II Page 672, advocated the re-introduction of the term 'Aryan' into the field of Philology. He repeatedly stressed the desirability of replacing the terms 'Indo-European' and 'Indo-Germanic' by 'Aryan' on the ground that the people who invaded India in the remote past and whose language was Sanskrit, called themselves 'Aryas'. According to him the primitive 'Aryan Language' implied the existence of a primitive

'Aryan race'. This 'Aryan race' Max Muller maintained was the common ancestor of Hindus, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Slavs, Celts, Germans etc. Max Muller says "Hindus etc. once lived together in Central Asia within the same enclosure nay under the same roof and spoke one language containing the germs of all the great languages."

Max Muller's 'Aryan race' theory differed very much from the 'Aryan race' theory of earlier philologists. It was a comprehensive theory with four aspects, each of which must be considered separately. Besides it is a racist theory. The four aspects of his theory are:—

- (1) The Racial Aspect: That there existed an 'Aryan race', at some remote past apart from an 'Aryan' language. This 'Aryan race' was the common ancestor of Hindus, Persians, Greeks etc.
- (2) The Geographical Aspect: That this hypothetical ancient race lived in Ariana in Central Asia before they divided into two groups, one marching Eastwards entering India and the other marching Westwards entering Greece and thence into Europe. The probable date of this migration was conveniently fixed to be some fifteen centuries before Christ.
- (3) The Linguistic Aspect: That this hypothetical ancient people spoke a language also called 'Aryan' which contained the germ of the so-called 'Aryan family' of languages. viz. Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, German etc.
- (4) The Cultural Aspect: That all the ancient civilizations of the world, both Eastern and Western were created by this 'Aryan race'; 'Where the 'Aryan race' has not penetrated there is no civilization'.

We can now see why the 'Aryan race' theory became very popular in Europe and was readily accepted by the various European countries. 'Aryans' were the creators of all ancient civilizations including the Chinese. Who does not wish to have had noble ancestors? So the belief in an 'Aryan race' had become accepted by every country in Europe because they were dominating the world at that time.

Every aspect of Max Muller's 'Aryan race' theory has been disproved by modern scientific researches.

Let us consider the racial aspect first. The idea of an 'Aryan race' was rapidly taken up in England and in Germany. In England "It affected to some extent a certain number of the nationalist historical and romantic writers, none of whom had ethnological training". "Of the English group it will be enough to recall some of the ablest, Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) J. A. Froude (1818-94) Charles Kingsly (1819-75) and J. R. Green (1837-83) what these men have written on the subject has been cast by historians into the limbo of discarded and discredited theories"⁴

In Germany, after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1871, Aryanism as a doctrine, proclaiming the innate superiority of the German people, was popularised. Men of letters, politicians and Pseudo-Scientists devoted their energies to demonstrate that the triumphs of civilization were due exclusively to their own people. Chief among the protagonists of the "Aryan race" theory was a Germanised Englishman Houston Stuart Chamberlain, who married Richard Wagner's daughter and settled in Germany for the rest of his life.

Chamberlain wrote a book in German Language running into three volumes and was published in Munich (1901). He gave a nationalist twist to the class concept of Gobineau. He adopted the terms 'Teutonic race' 'Teuton blood' and identified it with 'Aryan'. He maintained that the Teutons—the blond Germans—were the direct descendants of the 'Primitive Aryans' and as such had a God-Given Mission to fulfill and that 'the Teutons are the aristocracy of humanity', whereas "Latins are a degenerate population group". He goes on to assert. "Where the Germanic element has not penetrated, there is no civilization in our sense."

The national twist of 'Aryan racism' of H. S. Chamberlain, Waltman, Theodore Pesche, Karl Penca and Richard Wagner found convinced adherents, who played a powerful part as propagandists and caused the hypothesis of the supremacy

of the 'Aryan race' or 'Teutonic race' to take root in Germany. "In 1894 belief in the God ordained superiority of Germans became a quasi-religious cult with foundation in Freiburg under the chairmanship of L. Schemann, of the "Gobineau Vereinigung". Hence the doctrines of "race purity" and "race superiority" attained much greater importance in Germany than elsewhere, and finally became articles of faith, dangerous by the time of the first world war."⁵

The Post war period (1919—1939) saw the growth of 'Aryan race' theory again and serve the political interests of the Nazis. J. L. Reimer even proposed the establishment of a system of castes based on the varying proportion of 'German-blood'—'Aryan-blood'.

- (i) An upper caste of 'Pure-blooded Germans', ideal Teutons (Aryans) to enjoy full political and social privileges.
- (ii) An intermediate caste of 'Partly German blood' to have restricted privileges only.
- (iii) A caste of non-Germans deprived of all political rights who should be sterilized, so as to safeguard the state and the future of Civilization.

One of the theorists of Hitlerite 'Aryan racism' was F. K. Gunther. He described the Alpine type as psychologically, 'specially fitted to end up as the muddle-headed owner of a cottage and a patch of garden'. While the Alpine woman will turn into a "faded little creature growing old in a debased and narrow world". Alpines according to him are "petty criminals, small-time swindlers, sneak thieves and sexual perverts. While 'Aryans' on the other hand are capable of the nobler crimes."

However, there were other racist fanatics even wilder than Gunther, according to Gauch "the difference in anatomical and histological structure (hair, bones, teeth and tegument) between man and animals is less than that between Nordics (Aryans) and other human races; only Nordics (Aryans) possess perfect articulate speech; only in Nordics do we find the correct biped position etc. He

ends by suggesting that strict line should be drawn between Nordic man (Aryan Man) and the animal world, the latter comprising all non-nordic humanity".⁵

Hitler himself wrote in his *Meinkamp* about German superiority thus "It is outstandingly evident from history that when the 'Aryan' has mixed his blood with that of the inferior peoples the result of the miscegenation has invariably been the ruin of the civilizing races." According to Hitler "All races other than the German Aryans are predestined to irremediable biological degeneration and hence to live under the rule of the pure Aryan German race."⁵

So much about the 'Aryan race' theory in Germany. Let us now turn to France and notice what happened there. In spite of the fact that Gobineau was a Frenchman his 'Aryan race' theory became popular first in Germany and then only in France. One of the results of Franco-Prussian war of 1870—1871 was a strong development of French nationalism. It asserted that it was the Celtic type, which inhabits France with distinctive Somato-Psychic characteristics, was superior to other white strains. Celticism became a rival counterpart of German Teutonism. "Whereas Gobineau, Lapouge, Ammon, Chamberlain, Waltman etc. attribute the creative genius of France to the 'Aryan' or Teutonic element, celticism presents equally valid arguments for the racial superiority of the celts".⁶

A. de Quatrefages, in his book *La race Prussienne* 1872, holds that the racial descent of the Prussians is entirely different from that of the French and concludes "There is nothing Aryan about the Prussians".

Broca in 1871, affirmed that France was a nation of brachycephalic (alpine) Gauls and maintained the superiority of that strain over the dolichocephalic German 'Nordic'.

Issac Tylor, author of 'The Origin of the Aryans' held that the celts were a tall brachycephalic race and the only "Aryans".

Lapouge in his book *L 'Aryan'* (1899) identifies 'Aryans' with the 'Nordics' and claims the French to be 'Aryan-Nordics'.

Thus we see, there are different schools of thought in France about its people, some regard France as peopled by Celts, others by Gauls, still others by Teutons and each of these claims that they alone are "Aryans".

Now we turn to Italy. Mussolini said in 1932. "There are no pure races and no anti-Semitism in Italy". But after the German Italian alliance in 1936 an anti-Jewish campaign was started and the idea of a pure Italian race came into existence. The Facist Manifesto of July 14, 1938 proclaims "There is a pure Italian race. The question of race in Italy should be dealt with from a purely biological angle independent of philosophical or religious considerations. The concept of race in Italy must be essentially Italian and Aryan-Nordic"⁷.

"This Facist claim that there exists in Italy a pure Italian-race of 'Aryan-Nordic' type would be laughable if not tragic."⁸ It is a clumsy imitation of German 'Aryanism'.

What about Japan? The 'Aryan' Germans should have regarded the Japanese people as inferior people, a race of sub-men on account of their colour. But what happened? Political poets in Germany found compromise necessary after the formation of the Axis treaty. An explanation was found that "the white Ainus of Japan had interbred considerably with the yellow races, hence the Japanese today, while presenting the aspect of yellow men", nevertheless possess all the moral and intellectual qualities of an 'Aryan' and even of Nordic people.⁹ On the strength of this theory Alfred Rosenberg (1935) declared "that Japanese leaders are as biologically reliable as the Germans".¹⁰

Ruth Benedict commented on this statement thus: "No distortion of anthropomorphic facts is too absurd to be used by propaganda backed by force and the Concentration Camp."¹¹

Thus every country in Europe claimed that its people were the true descendants of the 'Aryan' race because of the theory that the "Aryans" were the civilized and civilizing race of the world.

But the growth of the 'Aryan' race theory in Europe did not go unchallenged. The so called 'less civilized races', the inferior peoples, in their turn alleged that the 'Aryan' were Asiatic Huns, lacking all elements of culture, that they had no concept of liberty and democracy and deserve to be exterminated to the last man.¹²

No falsehood can live for ever. This 'Aryan race' theory which is one of the biggest frauds ever committed by man on man, stands exposed by modern scientists. A strong reaction has set in. The chief author of this theory viz Prof. Max Muller, was ironically one of those, who repudicated his own theory when he was convinced by his scientific friends of the enormity of his error. He did his very best to make amends. Thus he wrote in 1888 "I have declared again and again that if I say 'Aryas' I mean neither blood nor bones, nor hair nor skull; I mean simply those who spoke an 'Aryan' Language..... When I speak of them I commit myself to no anatomical characteristics..... To me, an ethnologist who speaks of an 'Aryan race' 'Aryan blood', 'Aryan eyes and hair' is as great a sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolichocephalic dictionary or a brachycephalic grammar"¹³ In another place he says "Aryan in scientific Language is utterly inapplicable to race. It means language and nothing but language"¹⁴.

"Max Muller frequently repeated his protest but 'alas, the evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones.' Who does not wish to have had noble ancestors? The belief in an 'Aryan race' had become accepted by philologists who knew nothing of science"¹⁵

The reaction of Prof. Max Muller against his own theory is no great surprise compared to the reaction of the Germanised Englishman Houston Stuart Chamberlain against his own pet 'Aryan' theory.

"A moment came, however, when even the creators of the 'Aryan' racial myth began to realise little by little that the physical types for which they claimed superiority and the inferior non-Aryan were non-existent figments of the mind".

However, contradictions under this head reached their worst when Chamberlain who had described the blond Teuton type (the Aryan type) at one point started asking "In fact what type of a man was the 'Aryan'?" and explained that philosophy, anthropology and ethnology cannot give an exact and detail description of the 'Aryan people' and added "Who knows what will be taught about the 'Aryans' in 1950?"¹⁶.

A very appropriate answer is given to this question of Mr. Chamberlain by Dr. Cyril Bibby M. Sc., M. A., Ph. D. in his book 'Race Prejudice and Education'. His book is fully authoritative; the manuscript was commissioned by UNESCO and revised in the light of comments from twenty-six experts who came from lands as far apart as Mexico, Poland, Canada, Germany and India.

Dr. Cyril Bibby is well known for his books on biology, sex education and health education. He is lecturer at the Institute of Education, London University and at the College of S. Mark and S. John London.

This book has also been circulated by UNESCO to all its member states so that they may consider whether similar books, perhaps based on it, could be prepared for use in their countries.

Dr. Cyril Bibby writes "Aryan is a linguistic term for a hypothetical early language; .. indeed, to speak of an 'Aryan' race is as great an abuse of words as to speak of a 'black-skinned Language' and this should be made clear to children."¹⁷ He continues "Intolerance and cruelty and exploitation are things too ugly to be willingly accepted by most decent people; they have to be wrapped up in an ideological dressing which will disguise their ugliness and muddled ideas of race have often provided such a dressing. At various times, the French, the English and the Germans have all been claimed as 'Aryans' and in Nazi Germany the myths of an 'Aryan race' and a 'Jewish race' were twin strands in an elaborate pattern of prejudice, discrimination, cruelty and finally mass murder."¹⁸

Dr. Cyril Bibby's book was first published in the United Kingdom in 1959. But scepticism about 'Aryan race' had started growing long before it.

Frank H. Henkins, writing in the American Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences says "The obvious impossibility of actually locating the 'Aryan' cradle-land and other reasons led scholars of the first rank even before 1890 to declare that the 'Aryan' doctrine was a figment of the professorial imagination or that it was incapable of classification because the crucial evidence was apparently lost for ever."¹⁹

Robert Edward Von Hartmann (1842–1906) the great German philologist and philosopher aptly declared "The Aryans were no more than a figment of certain writers' imagination begotten in the study."²⁰

"There was once a good scientist, Max Müller, who on an unlucky day used the words 'Aryan race' to describe peoples who spoke certain group of languages. Max Müller soon recognised his mistake, for differences in speech need not have anything to do with biological racial differences. But while this mistake died early in science it lived in politics and thus there arose truly out of talk alone, an imaginary creature 'Aryanman' which became one of the Nazi Gods."²¹

We shall end this racial aspect of the theory with an apt and interesting quotation from Eugene Pittard, Professor of Anthropology in the International University of Geneva.

"That great lumbered region in which the plateau of Pamir stands amid the mountain massif and whose snows feed in different directions the four rivers of Asia—a vision betokening uninterrupted communication, assurance of infinite fertility and valleys providing natural highways, down which mankind may flow if it so disposed as easily as the waters themselves".

"This region of Idyllic fancy whence the hypothetical Indo-Europeans (the 'Aryans' of Prof. Max Muller) driven away, it is said, by its increasing cold, scattered over the world they inhabit to this day. It is the hypothesis of monogenist Anthropology, of human Geography and especially of Philology."

“This mental vision—scientifically it is no more — this arm-chair creation, this moral fable, whose posterity goes back to Rhode, was given to the cultivated world, like some gospel, chiefly by the Geneva savant Adolphe Picet, in a book that made a great stir”²².

Finally, when the ‘Aryan race’ theorists, in Germany were unable to uphold their theory against the rising tide of criticism by scientists both within and without Germany they cast aside every pretence of justification of their pet theory and started declaring “An Aryan soul may be joined to a non-Aryan body” and that “An Aryan man may be recognised by his deeds and not by the length of his nose or the colour of his eyes”.

Thus, at long last, the ‘German Aryan race’ theorists arrived at a definition of the word Aryan almost similar to the true meaning of the word, in which the vedic Rishis have used it ‘noble men’. Once the racial aspect of Max Muller’s ‘Aryan race theory’ is exploded, the other aspects disappear automatically. The linguistic aspect may survive till it is also disproved;

Now, we will consider the geographical aspect very briefly, and show how the frantic endeavours of the racial theorists to locate the original habitat of this hypothetical race, go to disprove the theory itself.

We saw earlier :-

- (i) How certain linguistic similarities between Sanskrit on the one hand and Greek, Latin, German and the Celtic tongues on the other, prompted Sir William Jones to enunciate the theory of a hypothetical ‘Aryan Language’ as the parent of all these Languages.
- (ii) How this hypothetical ‘Aryan tongue’ got converted into a hypothetical “Aryan race”.
- (iii) How one Thomas Young in 1813 adopted the term “Indo-European” to designate the ‘hypothetical ancient language’, the ‘Aryan tongue’.

- (iv) How the 'Indo-European Language' got converted into 'Indo-European People'—'the Aryan race'.
- (v) And how the ideas of an "Indo-European People"—the idea of an 'Aryan race' gained currency in Europe.

When the question arose as to the original habitat of this hypothetical 'Aryan race' J. H. Rhode in 1820 located their original home in Central Asia. Rhode gave no reasons whatever, for no reasons can be given. In 1840 F. A. Pott suggested the valleys of the Oxus and Iaxarte and the slopes of the Hindu Kush as the original home of the primitive 'Aryan' people, also without any solid basis. This hypothesis was accepted for some time. But when the term 'Indo-European' was replaced by 'Indo-Germanic' through the efforts of the German philologists, the idea of an Asiatic origin had to be given up in favour of a European habitat. It was from Central Asia the barbarous Huns also issued out to destroy the civilizations. So the 'Aryan' cradle was conveniently shifted to the North European forest about the Baltic and North Sea coasts. It was Max Muller who again introduced the idea of an Asiatic origin of the 'Aryan race'. He gives his own reasons for such a change in his article in the Ninth Edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica Vol II page 672. The belief in the Asiatic origin of the 'Aryans' became widespread, especially after the replacements of the terms. 'Indo-European' and 'Indo-Germanic' by 'Aryan'. Max Muller's theory required a Central Asian origin. He was trying to bring about a connection between the Indian Civilization and the Western Civilization. The only way he could do, at that time, was by creating an 'Aryan race' with a Central Asian habitat. So he marched a stream of his 'Aryan race' into India through the Kyber Pass and another portion into Europe through Greece and Italy. The Greek Civilization, the Roman Civilization and the Indian Civilization were all created by the 'Aryans'. India owes its civilization to the 'Aryans' from whom the Britishers also descended. It was a pleasing thought to the Britisher that the "Aryans" who conquered India and ruled over it, even in the remote past, were their own kith and kin and it was a great pride to the Indians, that they too, belonged to the ruling white

race. The rulers and the ruled belonged to the same race. What a beautiful idea! The 'Aryan race' theory provided Max Muller an opportunity to become an escapist.

But Max Muller's theory of Asiatic origin of the "Aryan race" did not go unchallenged, even before he himself repudiated his theory. J. J. d. Omalius d Halloy, R. T. Latham, Bulwar Lytton, Adolphe Pictet and many others did not subscribe to the view about the Asiatic origin of the 'Aryans' but favoured a European origin. Even though these writers favoured a European origin, they were not agreed in respect of any particular place from which this hypothetical race spread. There are as many opinions as the number of writers on this topic. Here are some of them :

- (1) Latham Robert Gordon (1812—1888) an English ethnologist and philologist in his book 'Elements of Comparative Philology' (1862) advanced the view that the 'Aryan race' originated not in Central Asia but in Europe.
- (2) Theodor Benfey (1809—1881) was a German Sanskrit Scholar and a comparative philologist and author of 'A Complete Grammar of Sanskrit Language' (1852) held that "Aryans came from the Northern shores of the Black Sea between the Danube and the Caspian."
- (3) J. G. Cunox (1870) located their home in the area between the Northern Sea and the Urals.
- (4) Louis Leiger (1870) located the home of the 'Aryans' on the Southern shores of the Baltic.
- (5) D. G. Brinton, an American Anthropologist thought that the 'Aryans' came from West Africa. This view was supported by the English ethnologist A. H. Keane (1896).
- (6) K. F. Johnson (1900) held the view that the waves of 'Aryan' immigration had spread outwards from the Baltic.
- (7) Peter Giles (1922) thought that the 'Aryans' came from the plains of Hungary.

- (8) Gordon Childe in his book 'A Story of Indo-European Origins' argued for South Russia.
- (9) G. Kossina believed them to have come from Northern Europe.
- (10) While Lokmanya Bala Gangadara Tilak vigorously argued for the North Pole.
- (11) But there are some Indian 'Aryan' race theorists who hold that this race is native to India and that waves of 'Aryan' emigration had taken place in the remote past.
- (12) "How have so many linguists arrived at a wrong conclusion! In search of the original home of the Aryans they have travelled from the North-Pole down to Greece and thence towards India as far as Pamir; therefrom they wended their steps back towards North through pathless tracts and searched in vain here and there to spot out the cradle of the primitive Aryans and to make their pilgrimage end in joy. But the peculiarity is that they have unfortunately left out India for reasons best known to themselves."^{28a}

The above examples are a few of the opinions held by the protagonists of the 'Aryan race' theory about the original habitat of this mythical race. In many cases the opinions flatly contradict one another. This led Prof. Juan Comas, of the School of Anthropology, Mexico, to declare "This must bring us to the conviction that the existence of the so called 'Aryan people' or race is a mere myth, since we find purely subjective criteria employed in the attempt to determine its home without the slightest factual and scientific foundation."^{28b}

The third aspect of Prof. Max Muller's theory requires very careful consideration. The Linguistic aspect of his theory is the basic foundation of the whole racial theories.

The consideration of this aspect is postponed to chapter 4 of this book which deals with Aryam and Tamil, because a full understanding of this aspect is not possible without an analysis of these two languages. Philologists, mostly

Western, had jumped to hasty conclusions without making a comparative study of these two ancient languages. Besides, their theories were one sided. They had formulated their theories from a comparative study of Sanskrit and European Languages only. They never cared to study Tamil, one of the most ancient languages which had existed side by side with Sanskrit. If they had made a comparative study of Vedic Sanskrit (Aryam) and Tamil of the Sangam period and Western classical Languages, their theories would have been definitely different.

The Fourth aspect of Max Muller's 'Aryan-race' theory will be considered now. This aspect, the cultural aspect, is the real cause for the wide acceptance of the racial theory in Europe. Ironically enough it became the most portant cause of destruction of the theory itself. The theorists ascribe to the race almost all the great achievements of mankind, during both Pre-historic and historic times. This led the various nations of the world to claim their descent from this mythical race. The Indians were no exception! Only love of a glorious descent led the various peoples of the world to claim 'Aryans' as their ancestors.

Let us examine a few of the features of this fantastic theory which is sure to convince any reasonable man of its absurdity. The 'Aryan' race theorists held that European civilization, even in countries classed as Slavonic and Latins was the work of the 'Aryan' race. The Greek civilization, the Roman civilization, the Renaissance, the French Revolution were all work of the 'Aryans'. In short the 'Aryan race' theorists held that "where the 'Aryan' element has not penetrated there is no civilization at all." This belief induced the theorists to indulge in fantastic arguments. One such argument is that the 'Aryan' Greeks were successful in the Arts but lacked the spirit of political organization as a result of micegenation between their race and the Semitics. "By the same process of imagination run mad, Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Leonardo da Vinci, Galileo, Voltaire, Marco Polo, Roger Bacon, Giotto, Galvani, Lavoisier, Watt and many others are all claimed

as 'Aryans' and Napoleon himself is regarded as probably descended from the Vandals." This School of writers held that even Apostle Paul and Jesus Christ to be 'Aryans'.

When one considers the characteristics or traits ascribed to the 'Aryan race' by the protagonists of the theory, one will be easily led to the conclusion that it is a Myth. Gobinaeu was not very definite as to the characteristics of the 'Aryans'. They may be brachycephalic or dolichocephalic; their eyes may be light in colour or dark or even black. But it was his followers who ascribe to the 'Aryans' all the noble qualities, a human being can possibly possess. An 'Aryan' is physically tall, with blue eyes, fair hair, and long head. His colour is fair and never dark. The following psychic qualities are attributed to him. "Virility; innate nobility; natural aggressiveness; imperturbable objectivity; dislike of useless words and vain rhetoric; distaste for the amorphous mass; precise intelligence; the spirit of independence; sternness to themselves and others; well developed sense of responsibility; great foresight; tenacity of will; the qualities of a race of leaders; men of great undertakings; large and well thought-out ideas etc".²⁴ Who will not desire to belong to this superior race? But a man of common sense can easily see that all these physical and mental attributes are only subjective and cannot have any objective validity. This alone is enough to prove that the 'Aryan' race is a Myth, 'a figment of the imagination begotten in the study'.

"Generalizations about the 'Aryan' race and its superiority are based on arguments which lack all objective validity and are erroneous, contradictory and unscientific."²⁵

"The contentions which ascribed to the Nordic race (Aryan race) most of the great advances of mankind during recorded history appear to be based on nothing more serious than self-interest and wish-fulfilment."²⁶

Even those writers who firmly believed in the 'Aryan race' theory accept the fact that "The parent people (Aryan) cannot be identified archaeologically, still less by its physical racial type".²⁷

An attempt made by Kaiser William II of Germany to prove that all the Germans are 'Aryans' ended in a fiasco. It is recorded by Prof. Juan Comas in his learned and illuminating booklet "Racial Myths".

"Before 1914 William II of Germany wished a racial map of Germany to be produced displaying the incidence of the 'Aryan' element; however the data assembled could not be published since heterogeneity was so marked and in the whole region such as Baden there were no Nórdics (Aryans) at all".

Recently, in the West, the 'Aryan race' theory of Max Muller, especially the cultural aspect, has undergone a severe modification at the hands of scientific historians. According to them the 'Aryans' were barbaric tribes who issued out of Northern Forests and came rudely upon the scene of ancient civilizations. Such is the opinion of H. G. Wells and others. H. G. wells writes: "But after about 1200 B. C. and perhaps earlier a new set of names would come into the map of the ancient world, from the North-East and North-West. These would be the names of certain barbaric tribes, armed with iron weapons and using horse-chariots, who were becoming a great affliction to the Aegean and Semitic civilizations, on the Northern borders. They all spoke the variants of what once must have been the same language "Aryan". They were raiders and robbers and plunderers of cities these 'Aryans' East and West alike. They were all kindred and similiar peoples hardy herdsmen who had taken to plunder".

Of these 'Aryans' who came thus rudely upon the scene of civilizations, we will tell more fully in a later section. Here we note simply all this stir and immigration amidst the area of the ancient civilizations that was set up by the swirl of the gradual and continuous advance of these Aryan barbarians out of the Northern Forests and wildernesses between 1600 and 600 B. C."²⁸

"All these conclusions are confirmed by the historical fact in the whole Mediterranean and sub-tropical belt from Gibraltar to Calcutta where ancient, refined

civilizations flourished, we see the Indo-Europeans, arriving as Northern barbarians from the year 2000 B. C. on, destroying or assimilating previous native cultures Minoan, Hittites, Babylonian etc. all belonging, it seems to non Indo-European peoples.”²⁹

We shall end this chapter with an appropriate quotation from Sir Julian Huxley F. R. S.: “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. A foreign secretary recently blundered into using it. In Germany the idea of an ‘Aryan race’ received no more scientific support than in England. Nevertheless, it found able and very persistent advocates who made it appear very flattering to local vanity”.³⁰

REFERENCES

1. Collected works of Sir William Jones. Vol. III, page 32. (First Edition)
2. Vide: Encyclopaedia Britannica on this word “Indo-European”. Ed. 14.
3. “Racial Myths” page 35, by Prof. Juan Comas, UNESCO Pamphlet. (1951).
4. Vide: We Europeans “by Sir Julian Huxley F. R. S.: and Dr. A. C. Haddon F. R. S.: Part of this book is reprinted as Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs No. 5 page 21.
5. Vide: “Racial Myths” page 39.
6. Ibid page 40.
7. „ „ 40.
8. „ „ 42.
9. „ „ 28.
10. „ „ 46.
11. „ „ 46.
12. „ „ 39.
13. Vide: “Biographies of words and the Home of the Aryas” London 1888 p. 120, quoted by Sir Julian Huxley. F. R. S., in his booklet “Race in Europe” Oxford pamphlet No. 5 1939.
14. Max Muller’s Collected Works Vol. X. Page 90.
15. Sir Julian Huxley F. R. S.: Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs No. 5 (Page 22)
16. “Racial Myths”. UNESCO Pamphlet.

17. 'Race, Prejudice and Education' by Dr. Cyril Bibby page 7.
18. Ibid. Page 8.
19. Vide: The American Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences—The Article on 'Aryans' by Frank H. Henkins.
20. Article on Von Hartman—Encyclopaedia Britannica.
21. "Race, Heredity and Society". p. 13 by Prof. L. C. Dunn and Prof. Theodosius Dobzhansky. Both of Columbia University.
22. "Race and History " by Prof. Eugene Pittard.
- 23a. 'Aryan Home' page 35. by Pandit Kopalle Sivakameswara Rao.
- 23b. "Racial Myths." Prof. Juan Comas.
24. Ibid (P. 35 & 36.)
25. Ibid (P. 44.)
26. "Race in Europe" by Sir Julian Huxley (P. 27)
27. "What Happened in History?" Prof Gordon Childe (P. 168).
28. "A Short History of the World"—(P. 70, P. 71.), 1949.
29. Juliana Bonfonte of Princeton University in "Encyclopaedia Americana"—vol. xv (P. 69.)
30. Race in Europe (P: 21.)

CHAPTER 2

ARYAN RACE THEORY IN INDIA

The facts dealt with in the preceding chapter refer mainly to the 'Aryan-race theory' that held sway all over Europe at one time. Let us come nearer home and see what happened in India. It is unfortunate for India that her historians of the early British period were all foreigners; and even the few native historians simply followed the foreigners' footsteps. Smith, Dodwell, Rapson and others will long be remembered by all students of Indian history. To them we must give credit for doing the spade work. Many of the present Indian historians are simply repeating the findings of the foreign savants and building on the false foundations laid by them; for the foreign historians have done irreparable harm to the course of Indian history by importing wholesale the 'Aryan' Myth. They could not help it; the atmosphere was heavily charged with this Myth. Evidences such as archaeological finds or anthropological reasonings were then too scanty to offer any serious challenge. Besides, it was very pleasing and flattering to the vanity of many a native historian to be told that at least some of the Indians were a part of a very superior 'Aryan' race and therefore of the ruling Britisher with the result the whole Indian historical writing is vitiated by this Myth.

We are quoting here four small passages from "An Advanced History Of India" by three eminent scholars, Dr. Majumdar, Dr. Raychaudhuri and Dr. Datta. If we examine the passages carefully we can see many contradictions not to say of absurdities all due to their wrong belief in the 'Aryan race' theory which has not ceased to influence even these eminent writers.

"The next question and one of greater practical importance is the relationship of the Indus-valley culture with the Vedic civilization of the Indo-Aryans which is usually regarded as the source from which issued all the

subsequent civilizations in India. On the face of it there are striking differences between the two. The Vedic Aryans were largely rural, while the characteristic features of the Indus-Valley civilization are the amenities of a developed city life. There were important differences in respect of religious beliefs and practices. The Vedic Aryans worshipped the cow while the Indus-Valley people reserved their veneration for bulls. Not only do the Mother-Goddess and Siva, the chief deities of the Indus-Valley, play but a minor part in the early Veda, but they definitely condemn phallic worship. The worship of images was familiar in the Indus-Valley, almost unknown to the Vedic Aryans."

"In view of these striking dissimilarities the Indus-Valley civilization is usually regarded as different from and anterior to the culture of the Vedic period,"

"The Indus-Valley civilization goes back to the third millennium B. C. While the date usually assigned to the Rig Veda does not go beyond the second millennium B. C. But some would place the Vedic civilization before that of the Indus-Valley and shift the date of the Rig Veda to a period before 3000 B. C."

"We must therefore hold" say the learned Authors of 'An Advanced History Of India' "that there is an organic relationship between the ancient culture of the Indus-Valley and the Hinduism of today."

The Indus-Valley civilization is now accepted as the earliest civilization found on the Indian soil. It was an Urban civilization, no doubt. We are not sure of the creators of this civilization. Some say that the Indus-Valley people were Sumerians, while others hold that they were 'Dravidians'. There are others who hold that they were 'Aryans'. But 'Aryans' and 'Dravidians' are concepts comparatively very modern which were created by philologists of the nineteenth century. The Indus-Valley people had nothing to do with them. All are agreed that although the areas where the Indus-Valley civilization grew are now in ruins, the civilization as such—the culture of the Indus-Valley people—is not dead, but is still continu-

ing among the people of India. The name India itself is a word derived from Indus. The religion of the Indus-Valley people is the religion of the people of India today. Hinduism is a gift of the Indus-Valley people. According to modern research scholars—the Indus-Valley people worshipped Siva, Vishnu and Sakthi.² To this day, except in the case of a few fanatical Vaishnavites whose numbers are dwindling, thanks to the effort of the Sage of Kanchi, all Hindus worship the three aspects of the same God. But what is more surprising is that the Gods of the Indus-Valley people are also the 'Gods' of the Vedas and are 'Gods' of the Hindu religion worshipped to this day a fact which has compelled the writers of 'An Advanced History of India' to say "We must therefore hold that there is an organic relationship between the ancient culture of the Indus-Valley and the Hinduism of today".

Siva, one of the chief deities of the Indus-Valley people has an important place in the Vedic Pantheon, and 'not a minor place' in the Vedas as the learned authors hold. In the heart of Yajur Veda, which is one of the three important Vedas, and which occupies a middle place among them, we find a collection of mantras called 'Satarudriya or Sri Rudram which is the life centre of the Vedas, and the holy 'Panchaksharam' of the Saiva religion is in the very heart and centre of Sri Rudram.

According to some modern theorists, the Tamils are supposed to be the descendants of the "Dravidians" of the Indus-Valley. But the ancient literature of the Tamils, the Sangam Literature, does not mention the name Siva even once; whereas in Sri Rudram the word Siva and the feminine form Sivaa, are mentioned several times. Yet Siva is called a "Dravidian" God!

Indra occupies a prominent place in Rig Veda. He is invoked alone in about one-fourth of the hymns of the Rig Veda, far more than are addressed to any other deity. He is considered by Western Indologists as the national hero of the Vedic "Aryans". This "Aryan" hero was also the God of the ancient Tamils—the 'Dravidians'. Temples were built in ancient times in Tamilnadu for worshipping

Indra. Grand festivals were celebrated by the Tamil Kings in honour of Indra, “the national hero of the ‘Aryans’”. Indra was so much cherished by the Tamil people, that priority of worship was given to him in the great Epic *Silappadikaram*—the epic of the Anklet. Besides, references to Indra worship are found in *Tholkapiam* (600 BC) *Puranānūru*, *Paripādal* *Aingurunūru* and *Pattupāddu*, all belonging to the Sangam period. Certainly *Seran Senguttuvan*, his brother *Illango Adikal*, and, above all, the great Sangam Poets were not so naive as to accept Indra the war lord of the ‘Aryans’ who were the enemies of the ‘Dravidians’, as their God. How can historians reconcile these contradictory views? Attempts are made to explain away these views. But the truth can be easily discerned. The ‘Aryan’ and ‘Dravidian’ race theories are fantastic myths.

If an ‘Aryan’ invasion of ‘Dravidian’ India was assumed and the destruction of the Indus-Valley civilization of the ‘Dravidians’ by the ‘Aryans’ were accepted as Sir Mortimer Wheeler and a few others want us to accept, nobody knows what happened next. Were all the ‘Dravidians’ destroyed or were they driven out? After destroying the Indus-Valley civilization what did the ‘Aryans’ do? Some historians of India want us to believe, that the ‘Aryans’ left the scene of destruction, migrated further to the east, settled in the forests and started a rural civilization of their own—the Vedic civilization. This view is held by the learned authors of “*An Advanced History of India*”. The ‘Aryans’ would have nothing to do with the urban civilization of the Indus-Valley people and were reluctant to co-exist with the conquered. This school-boy attitude of the conquerors looks very childish and absurd. *On the other hand what did the ‘Dravidians’ do? All those who escaped the destruction migrated southwards, crossed the central mountain ranges, entered the Deccan plateau, settled down there and started building temples for Indra, the national hero of their inveterate enemy the ‘Aryans’, and began to honour him with grand festivals, all as a reward, for driving them out of their habitat. So naive were they!*

Rig Veda is a book of hymns—a book of prayers—by our ancient Rishis in a forest setting. They lived in a sylvan environment, to pray and to meditate, away from the hurly-burly of urban life. Therefore their prayers reflected a rural life. This does not mean they were strangers to urban life.

Thus we see, the ancient history of India is completely vitiated by these fantastic racial theories of the early philologists.

Certain ideas, by constant repetition, acquire such a hypnotic power, that all those who come to be influenced by them take them for gospel truths and no effort is made to question them. So are certain ideas in history which are mere products of fantasy, but which go as truths by constant repetition. One such idea is the 'Aryan' invasion of 'Dravidian' India.

Now let us deal with the question of how the 'Aryan race' theory was introduced into India. We are quoting extracts from a speech by Prof. S.K. De. M.A. D.Litt. in his address delivered at the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, Calcutta. The following extracts clearly show how and why the 'Aryan' race theory was accepted in India, when introduced by the Western Scholars.

"In the last century, most scholars headed by Max Muller formulated the hypothesis of a highly cultured Aryan race, the prototype of the present-day Europeans and Indians, spreading in ancient times as a great civilizing force. It was assumed that the original inhabitants of India were dark-skinned barbarians, if not actual savages, possessing very little material or intellectual culture. To this land of barbarians came a white race of 'Aryans' who for the first time brought with them civilization with its arts and ideals. This civilization was originally of the pastoral type, simple, idyllic and noble in comparison with the barbaric splendour of Egyptian and Babylonian Cultures . . .

"Their original home was unknown but a very central place was found in Central Asia. The Aboriginal

peoples of India were supposed to have submitted after a brief but unavailing resistance to the superior Aryans, who, as a matter of course, Aryanised India by imposing their rule and their civilization on the uncultured dark races”.

“Such was the picture of the origin and foundation of Indian culture, drawn by scholars, mostly Eupropean, in the last century and it found its way into our school and college text books to become almost canonical.”³

Here professor De adduces the following reasons for the easy acceptance of this theory in India. His views are summarised in his own words:

- (a) “As on the one hand it (the Aryan race theory) flattered the European sense of superiority and was readily accepted in Europe, so on the other hand, the higher and educated classes in India, who had absorbed the European mentality, from their European studies, found no difficulty in subscribing to it, in as much as the theory gave them, as the unquestioned descendants of the “Aryan” conquerors, a sense of glorious origin as well as the secret satisfaction of a close relationship with their English rulers”.
- (b) “Nothing or next to nothing was yet known of the history of the ancient world. Assyriology and Egyptology were just feeling their first steps haltingly” (True Indology did not even begin).
- (c) “Evidence from Archaeology, both historic and pre-historic, in India and in Persia as well as in Egypt, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor and the Aegean area were just beginning to be gathered.”
- (d) “In addition to all these, there was in India an absence of social assimilation of the higher classes with the masses, partly emphasised by the fully-defined Brahmanical notions of caste and further aggravated by the disintegrating force of European ideas which bred, in the newly educated Indians a sense of superiority to and aloofness from, the lower and uneducated groups”.³

“So, the theory of a civilized and civilizing ‘Aryans’, coming with a mission of culture to the dark races became fully established, and it was considered rank heresy to question the superiority of ‘Aryans’ in any walk of life.”³

The ‘Aryan race’ theory which was imposed on the Hindu population of India was vehemently criticised by the patriot and Hindu saint Swami Vivekananda. The great Swami spoke thus:-

“And what your European pandits say about the ‘Aryans’ sweeping down from some foreign land, snatching away the lands of the aborigines and settling in India by exterminating them, is a pure nonsense, foolish talk, strange that our Indian scholars too, say amen to them and all these *monstrous lies* are being taught to our boys. This is very bad indeed.

“I am an ignoramus myself; I do not pretend to any scholarship, but with the little that I understand I *strongly protested against these ideas at the Paris Congress*. I have been talking with the Indian and European savants on the subject and I hope to raise many objections to this theory in detail when time permits and this I say to you, to our Pandits also, you are learned men, hunt up your old books and scriptures please and draw your own conclusions.”

In what Veda, in what Sukta, do you find that the ‘Aryans’ came into India from a Foreign Country?”⁴

On another occasion he says: “As for the truth of these theories there is not one word in our scriptures, not one, to prove that the ‘Aryans’ ever come from anywhere outside India and in ancient India was included Afghanistan. There it ends”⁵

Sri Chakravarthi Rajagobalachariar, Our Rajaji of revered memory, said the same thing, about forty years ago. “These theories (‘Aryan’ and ‘Dravidian’ race theories) are found in books written by Western scholars. Their theories are imaginary tales. They were made and introduced with the object of dividing India into warring camps” How correct Rajaji was!

In another place Rajaji says "The native Pundits from English High Schools and Colleges started on their researches from the foundation laid down by these Western Scholars. It was they who magnified the differences by new and fantastic theories."⁶

Writing in 1933, Mr. Sundararaman, Professor of History, Government College, Kumbakonam, South India, said "During the last twenty or thirty years much mischief has been done by spreading the outworn view of the early Orientalists that the 'Aryans' were foreigners who originally migrated into India and made a political and spiritual conquest of the Autochthones, the 'Dravidians'. The mischief done has not spent itself and is most unscrupulously active today among some of our leaders and group of agitators who care only for the interests and impulses of the moment and do not come to inquire into the truth or permanent unity and solidarity of the Hindu people and their progress in power and greatness for all times".⁷

Unfortunately for us, Swami Vivekananda passed away from us before he could campaign against this false theory which cuts at the root of Hindu religion. His mantle fell on the worthy shoulders of Sri Aurobindo, another great sage from Bengal. A short history of his life may help the readers to understand him and appreciate his findings.

Sri Aurobindo was the son of an Anglicised Bengali Doctor. His student life began in a wholly European environment, not "contaminated" by any Indian influence. At the age of five he was sent to Loretto convent at Darjeeling where he was a boarder. At the age of seven Aurobindo was sent to England for a 'thorough English Education'. When he left England for India, he was twenty-one years old. Out of the twenty-one years of his life, he spent fourteen years in England, a few years in an English household, the rest in school and university hostels. Thus the most impressionable years of Aurobindo's life were spent entirely in English environment.

After coming to India he first studied his mother-tongue Bengali. The next language he mastered was

Sanskrit. One of his biographers writes: "He was equally at home with Kalidasa, Bhavabhuti, the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, as with the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Gita and the Manusmriti. His appreciation and defence of Indian cultural thought in its various manifestations was neither second-hand nor by proxy" (as in the case of many Indian Scholars.) It sprang from his direct knowledge. Later he studied Marathi and Gujarathi, and when he took refuge at Pondicherry, his acquaintance with poet Subramaniya Bharathi, who was also a fellow exile, gave him an opportunity to learn Tamil. Life at Pondicherry was the turning point in his life. The patriotic politician became a Hindu Sage. Now, let us hear the sage.

"Like the majority of educated Indians, I had passively accepted without examination, before myself reading the Veda, the conclusions of European scholarship both as to the religious and as to the historical and ethnical sense of the ancient hymns. In consequence, following again the ordinary line of modernised Hindu opinion, I regarded the Upanishads as the most ancient source of Indian thought and religion, the true Veda, the first book of knowledge. The Rig Veda in the modern translations which were all I knew of this profound Scripture, represented for me, an important document of national history, but seemed of small value or importance for the history of thought or for a living spiritual experience".

"It was my stay in South India, which first seriously turned my thoughts to the Veda. Two observations that were forced on my mind gave a serious shock to my second-hand belief in the racial division between Northern 'Aryans' and Southern 'Dravidians'. The distinction had always rested for me on a supposed difference between the physical types of 'Aryan' and 'Dravidian' and a more definite incompatibility between the Northern Sanskritic and Southern Non-Sanskritic tongues".

"I knew indeed of the later theories which suppose that a single homogeneous race 'Dravidian' or 'Indo—

Afghan' inhabits the Indian Peninsula, but hitherto I have not attached much importance to these speculations."

"I could not, however, be long in South India without being impressed by the general recurrence of Northern or 'Aryan' types in the Tamil race. Wherever I turned I seemed to recognise with a startling distinctness, not only among the Brahmins but in all castes and classes the old familiar faces, features, figures of my friends of Maharashtra, Gujerat, Hindustan, even though this similarity was less widely spread of my own province Bengal. The impression I received was as if an army of all the North had descended on the South and submerged any previous populations that might have occupied it".

"And in the end I could not but perceive that whatever admixture might have taken place, whatever regional differences might have been evolved, there remains behind all variations a unity of physical as well as cultural type throughout India".

"But what then of the sharp distinction between 'Aryan' and 'Dravidian' races created by philologists. It disappears. If at all an 'Aryan' invasion is admitted we have either to suppose that it flooded India and determined the physical type of the people with whatever modifications or that it was the incursion of small bands of a less civilized race who melted away into the original population".

"And there was always the difference of language to support the theory of a meeting of races. But here also my preconceived ideas were disturbed and confounded. For examining the vocables of the Tamil Language, in appearance so foreign to the Sanskritic form and character, I yet found myself continually guided by words or by families of words supposed to be pure Tamil, in establishing new relations between Sanskrit and its distant sister Latin and occasionally between the Greek and Sanskrit. Sometimes the Tamil vocables not only suggested the connection but proved the missing link in a family of connected words. *And it was through the*

“*Dravidian Language*” that I came first to perceive, what seems to be now, the true law, the origins, and as it were the embryology of the Aryan tongues.”

“If so, the sole remaining evidence of an Aryan invasion of Dravidian India would be the indications to be found in the Vedic hymns.”

“It was therefore, with a double interest that for the first time, I took up the Veda, in the original, though without any immediate intention of closer or serious study. It did not take long to see that the indications of a racial division between ‘Aryans’ and ‘Dasyus’ and the identification of the latter with the indigenous Indians were of a far flimsier character than I had supposed. “But the indications in the Veda on which theory of a recent Aryan invasion is built are very scanty in quantity and uncertain in their significance.”

“There is no actual mention of any such invasion.”⁸

Thus these great and learned men had exposed the falsity of this theory that cuts at the very roots of Hindu society. Notwithstanding the weighty opinions of these scholars, the theory spread very quickly in India, as it did in Europe. In High Schools, Colleges and Universities this ‘*monstrous*’ lie is being taught to school children as gospel truth. The authors who incorporated these racial theories in their books, never paused to think that these theories are mere opinions of people introduced to destroy the *esprit de corps* of the Hindu Society.

Truth remains always the same. It does not undergo any change. But falsehood takes different forms to suit different occasions. The ‘Aryan’ race theory is a Myth that has taken many forms to strengthen its hold in the minds of the people. We saw earlier how Max Muller’s theory of a highly civilized and civilizing race came to be later modified by modern scientific historians, as a barbarous race which carried destruction everywhere it went. In India too the ‘Aryan’ race theory underwent many modifications. They are:—

(1) That there was an 'Aryan' race and it did invade India, but the number was so small that it was absorbed into the original population. There are two exponents of this theory and what they have written is very interesting to read.

(a) J. C. Nesfield: "Such a theory as the above is not compatible with the modern doctrine which divides the people of India into 'Aryan' and aboriginal. It presupposes an unbroken continuity in the national life from one stage of culture to another, analogous to what has taken place in every country in the world whose inhabitants have emerged from the savage stage. It assumes, therefore as its necessary basis the unity of Indian race. While it does not deny that a race of white complexioned foreigners who called themselves by the name of 'Aryas' invaded the Indus Valley *via* Kabul and Kashmir some four thousand years ago and imposed their language and religion on the indigenous races by whom they found themselves surrounded, it nevertheless maintains that the blood imported by the foreign race became gradually absorbed into the indigenous, the less yielding to the greater so that almost all traces of the conquering races eventually disappeared just as the Lombard became absorbed into the Italian, the Frank into the Gaul, the Roman (of Rumania) into the Slav, the Greek into the Egyptian, the Norman into the Frenchman, the Moor of Spain into the Spaniard and as the Norwegians and Germans are at the day becoming Englishman in North America..... And the physiological resemblances observable between the various classes of the population from the highest to the lowest is an irrefutable proof that no clearly defined racial distinction has survived, *a kind of*

evidence which ought to carry greater weight than that of language on which so many fantastic theories of ethnology have been lately founded".⁹

- (b) Father Heras: "With the Indian branch of the great 'Indo-European' family a phenomenon took place similar to the phenomena that occurred like-wise in Greece, Italy and Spain. It is what happens to a tree transplanted from a cold country to a warm one. The tree thus planted to a country of brighter sky and warmer breeze has an extraordinary growth. In the course of one or two generations luxuriant leaves cover its branches, its flowers count more petals than in former days; its fruits are of a size never imagined in its pristine habitat. Yet after this unusual manifestation of luxuriant life, the tree cannot live any longer in this new climate. One day the leaves fade away, the stem bends its head, as if for the last time saluting the land that had given it that extraordinary growth and finally the whole plant collapses at the first kiss of the winter wind. Something like this happened to the 'Aryan race' in India".¹⁰

(II) The second modification of Max Muller's 'Aryan' race theory is just the opposite of what he preached. According to this theory the 'Aryans' were of Asiatic origin and were barbarians who were responsible for the destruction of all civilizations both in the East as well as in the West. "This movement of peoples, this sack of the ancient cities by the outer barbarians is something not confined to India in the centuries immediately after 2000 B. C."¹¹

"The barbarians imperceptibly assimilated the traditions of the civilization they had destroyed

yet prized, they had conquered only to be themselves conquered at last by its persuasive and subtle power”¹².

- (III) The third modification of the ‘Aryan’ theory of Max Muller is in respect of culture. “Ethnically what we today call ‘Dravidians’ and ‘Aryans’ are one, but their cultures due to peculiarities of environment are quite different, one standing for a ‘Dravidian culture’ and the other for ‘Sanskrit culture’. Both cultures met like the mighty rivers the Jumuna and the Ganges and coalesced into a confluence of unified culture and were responsible for the evolution of Hindu Culture which is a vitalising force living with us today.”¹²

Although Dhikshithar and a few others maintained the unity of race and believed in the existence of two cultures, the truth is there has been a unity of both race and culture, which is nothing other than Hindu culture which was created and maintained by the Hindus from time immemorial. The Indus Valley Culture is only one single scene in the whole panorama of Hindu Culture which prevailed throughout the length and breadth of India from the Indus Valley in the North to the valley of the Vaigai in the South. The culture of the Hindus today is not different from the culture of the Indus Valley people.

“For we may confidently and solemnly aver that Mohanja-Daro, Harappa and Chanchu Daro are still alive in India. The cities of Mohanjo-Daro, Harappa and Chanchu Daro and many others have perished, it is true, but the civilization that flourished in these cities survived their end.”

“India has not changed in the course of ages. The ancient civilizations of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria have been blotted out from the map of the world. But that of India, the first light of which have been discovered along the banks of the Indus is still alive”¹³.

“Considering all this, we have often led to affirm that Mohanjo-Daro Civilization was not a civilization restricted to the Indus-Valley; it is a civilization that extended all over India and eventually we should find relics of this civilization similar to those of Mohanjo-Daro all over the Indian sub-continent. My prediction began to be fulfilled in the year 1942 when the late Sir Aurel Stein explored the archaeological sites along the lost Sravasti River in Rajasthan. In a place called Soun-danawala situated in the state of Bahawalpur he found some sherds with incised characters which appear on incised seals from Mohanjo-Daro and Harappa.”¹⁴

REFERENCES

1. An Advanced History of India by. Drs. R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Raychoudhuri & Kalikinkar Datta.
2. Vide Report of the Fynnish Scientists Dr. Aske Parpola and others.
3. Speech by Prof. S. K. De M. A., D. Litt. in the Ramakrishna Institute of Culture, Calcutta. Reported in “Free India,” April. 3. 1955.
4. Speeches and Writings of Swami Vivekananda Vol. 5. pp. 436—437
5. Ibid. Vol. 3. page 293.
6. Rajaj's collected essays.
7. From Ardra—1938. a monthly magazine from Jaffna, Edited by Narayana Iyer.
8. ‘On the Veda’ by Sri Aurobindo—page 41. First Edition.
9. Tribes and Castes of North-Western Provinces and Oudh by W. Crooke of Bengal Civil Service. Preface cxi.
10. Studies in Proto-Mediterranean Cultures by Fr. Heras—Preface.
11. Pre-Historic India—Stuart Piggott—Pelican Edition—p. 239.
12. Pre-History of South India—by Ramachandra Dhikshither. 1st Ed. p. 174.
13. Fr. Heras.
14. A Survey of Ancient Sites along the lost Sravasti River—Geographical Journal xcix (1942) p. 180.

CHAPTER 3

THE DRAVIDIAN RACE THEORY

It is absolutely necessary that one must not fall into an error as vicious as the one that one is trying to avoid. The present day reaction in India is tending to be so. From an all-comprehensive 'Aryan' race theory, some Indian historians are swinging into another theory, the 'Dravidian race' theory, which is equally false and fantastic. At one time, the Indian historians believed that "All the better elements in Hindu religion and culture, its deeper philosophy; its finer literature, its more reasonable organisation—everything in fact which is great and good and noble in it—came from the 'Aryans' as a superior race; and whatever was dark and lowly and superstitious in Hindu religion and civilization represented only an expression of the suppressed 'non-Aryan' mentality".

A reaction set in, especially after the discovery of the Indus-Valley civilization. Now, most modern historians say that all that is great and good in Hinduism is non-Aryan—'Dravidian' "To give a brief resume, the idea of Karma and transmigration, the practice of Yoga, the religious and philosophical ideas centering round the conception of the divinity as Siva, Devi and Vishnu, the Hindu ritual of pooja as opposed to the Vedic ritual of Homa—all these and much more in Hindu religion and thought—would appear to be 'non-Aryan'; a great deal of puranic and epic myth, legend and semi-history is pre-Aryan; much of our social culture, social and other usages eg. the cultivation of our important plants, like rice, and fruits like the tamarind and the coconut, the use of the betel leaf in Hindu life and Hindu ritual, most of our popular religion, most of our folk-crafts, our distinctive Hindu dress—the dhoti and the saree—our marriage ritual in some parts of India with the use of the vermilion and tumeric—and many other things

could appear to be a legacy from our pre-Aryan ancestors." In this context, pre-Aryan ancestors can only mean the so called 'Dravidians'.

In the previous Chapter we saw how and why the 'Aryan race' theory was accepted in India, without any hesitation. The Hindus had become debased and demoralized by long foreign rule lasting over a thousand years. That they were debased and demoralized is the opinion of Sir William Jones (1786) who says: "Nor can we reasonably doubt, how degenerate and abased soever the Hindus now appear, that in some early age, they were splendid in arms, happy in Government, wise in legislation and eminent in various knowledge."²

At the beginning of the British rule, the Hindus were so ignorant of their ancient and glorious past that they wholly depended on Western Christian Scholars for interpreting their shastras. Probably the Hindus were not conscious of the fact that many of the orientalists were devout Christians who believed that 'the worship of the true God was limited to Christianity alone'³ and that the Hindus and Muslims were heathens and infidels. Besides, the Indologists and the Indian nationals who followed them, were influenced by Herbert Spenser's doctrine of social evolution and progress, according to which, the world was getting more and more perfect as time passed on. Hence things in the past were imperfect in proportion to their distance from the present age. Therefore many of the Indologists thought, the Vedic age, being extremely remote, must have been in an extremely crude stage of civilization and culture. For example H. Oldenburg, a famous orientalist, fearlessly declared that the Vedic Mantras were songs "sung by barbarian priests on barbarian gods". And Kaegi declared "The great majority of the songs are invocations and glorifications of the deities addressed at that time; their keynote is throughout a simple outpouring of the heart etc.". H. Brunhofer in one of his essays said, "The Veda is like a lark's morning trill, of humanity awakening to the consciousness of his greatness".⁴

“Moreover, there was a strength of conviction and a sense of certitude in the mind of the average Western orientalist which went unchallenged by native scholars, so that the Western oriental scholar had no mental reservation in anything and he spoke and wrote as he liked.”⁵

A case in point is the Varna-Ashrama Dharma. This institution which is the back-bone of Hindu religion, is purely a religious one. It has nothing to do with the present decadent and disintegrating caste system and the tyranny of untouchability connected with it. Varna classification was meant to help all the people, without any distinction, to evolve gradually to a spiritual height, the brahminhood, the ideal of humanity in India. It is prescribed only for those whose aim in life is the attainment of spiritual freedom. It is the only way open to all those who aspire after the Kingdom of God on earth.

There are many instances of the members of the fourth varna (Sudras) being elevated to brahminhood in one birth. In Vedic times the lines between the four varnas were not impassable. In the beginning there was only one varna, All were brāhmīns “Na Visesotivarnanam Sarvam Brahmanamidam jagat” A smṛiti text says:

Janmānā jāyate Sūdra
Samskārad dvija uchyate
Veda Pāthāt bhavet Viprah
Brahmajānati brāhmanah.

By birth one is a Sudra, by samskāra (Upanayana etc.) a dvija (twice-born); by the study of the Veda one attains the state of a Vipra; and that he who has knowledge of the Brahman is a brahmana.⁶

“The basis of Varnadharma is that every human being must try to fulfil the law of his development. We must discipline our life in conformity with the pattern of our being, instead of wasting our energies in following those which we lack.”⁷

In special cases individuals and groups changed their Varnas. Viśvāmitra, Ajāmīdha and Purāmīdha became brahmanas and even composed Vedic hymns. Yaska, in

his Nirukta, tells us of two brothers Santānu and Devāpi ; one became a Kshatriya king and the other a brahmin priest. Kavasa, the son of the slave girl Ilusa, was ordained as a brahmin priest at a sacrifice.⁸ The Vyasakta Brahmins of Bengal are reputed to be the descendants of a Sudra who was made a brahmin by the Rishi Vyasa himself.⁹

The concept of Varna was misinterpreted and confused with castes which are purely social institutions based probably upon occupations. No one has said the last word on caste on which subject there are more than hundred books by both foreigners and Indians.⁹

It is true that Varna Ashrama Dharma had died out long before the advent of the Britishers. There are bachelors but they are not Brahmacharins, in the true sense of the word. There are mendicants but they are not sanyāsīs who are in duty bound to protect the Dharma. Of the four Varnas, Kshatriya and Vaisias of the shastras had almost disappeared. The brahmana Varna has degenerated into a social caste with numerous taboos built around it. The brahmins, while frantically preserving their privileges, have failed miserably in their six-fold duties. Like the kings of Medieval Europe who believed in the Divine Right of Kings, the brahmins of today have come to believe that they have a birth-right and a divine right to become priests without the requisite character, education and training. While it was the purpose of the institution to develop the requisite spirit and tradition in the members of the various classes by the proper employment of the forces of heredity and education, it became, with the passage of time, a fossilized caste-system with thorny thickets of taboos and superstitions built around it. In this miserable environment arose the pernicious racial theories, 'Aryan' and 'Dravidian' to disrupt the Hindu society.

We have seen how Max Muller was responsible for the growth and spread of the 'Aryan' race theory both in Europe and in India. The counterpart of the 'Aryan' race theory is the 'Dravidian' race theory enunciated by

Bishop Caldwell. Max Muller was an Anglicised German, while, the Bishop was a European Christian Priest attached to the Thirunelvely Parish in South India. For a long time, he tried his best to spread the Christian religion among the caste Hindus in Thirunelvely District, Tamil Nadu, but his attempts became a failure. He then tried to spread the religion among the Schedule Castes. In this, to some extent he was successful. The caste Hindus, among whom there were a large number of brahmins, interfered and obstructed him. When he found his attempt at proselytization were severely checked by the counteraction of the high caste Hindus, he started a vilification campaign against the caste Hindus particularly against the brahmins. He continued his vilification campaign both by speech and writing which culminated in his book "A Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages"¹⁰. It is worthy of note that this grammar book was first published by 'The Office of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel', 79, Pall Mall, London, June 2, 1856. In his long introduction to this book, he had written many things, which are irrelevant to the subject, very obnoxious to the Tamils and destructive to the Hindu Religion. He was the first to speak of a family of 'Dravidian Languages' and of a 'Dravidian race'.

Before we proceed to examine the origin and growth of the 'Dravidian race' theory let us trace the romantic history of the word 'Dravida' which came in handy to the Bishop to exploit an explosive situation for his benefit.

The word 'Dravida' is not found in any ancient Tamil classic, secular or religious. But this word occurs in ancient Sanskrit works. Manu Smriti refers to 'Dravidas' as a tribe of degraded Kshatrias¹¹. The Mahabharata also gives two lists of degraded Kshatrias in which the name 'Dravidas' occurs. "It is interesting to note in this connection that in the arbitrary scheme of Indian society found in the Manu Smriti and other works on law, the Andhras are assigned to an exceptionally low rank, while their neighbours the 'Drāvidas (by which word the writer means the Tamil speaking people) are regarded as degraded Kshatrias'¹². Thus we find that the word Dravida was applied to

a group of people belonging to the Kshatriya Varna which forms the main body of, and in no way different from, the so called 'Aryan' people. "Dravida does not mean a race. Originally the term was used to mean a clan. Like the Pāñchālas, Kurus, and Pandavas Dravidas also was a clan in the great 'Aryan' family".¹³ This view is supported by two verses from Vālmiki Rāmāyana.¹⁴ The Sage Valmiki says that Emperor Dasaratha used to exercise his sovereignty over the kingdoms of India by collecting tributes from them. In the list of his tributary kingdoms 'Dravida' is one. Some of the other kingdoms mentioned are Sindhu, Sauvira, Saurāshtras, Anga, Vanga, Magadha etc.

At a later time this word came to denote, as a general term, only brahmanas belonging to five South Indian tribes. They are called 'Pancha Dravidas' viz. Dravida, Karnada, Gurchara, Maharashtra and Tailinga.¹⁵ It is worthy of note that Ādisankaracharya Swamigal refers to Saint Thirugnānasambandar, a high class brahmin child of Tamil Nadu as "Dravidasisu (child) in his beautiful hymns Saundarya Lahari."¹⁶

It is worth repeating that ancient writers, Tamil or Sanskrit do not make any pointed reference to the Tamils as 'Dravidas'. The first writer who used the word 'Dravida' to denote the Tamils was Bishop Caldwell. He first used the word to denote Tamil and other languages cognate with it. He then extended the use of the word to denote the peoples speaking these languages. Viz. Tamils, Telugus, Canarese, and Malayalees. Thus he created a 'Dravidian race' distinct from the so called 'Aryan race' from a mistaken notion that language is an indication of race. The Bishop went a step further and said that even the word Tamil is derived from Dravida. "I have come to the conclusion" writes the Bishop "that the words Tamil and Dravida, though they seem to differ a great deal are identical in origin. Supposing them to be one and the same word it will be found much easier to derive Tamil from Dravida than Dravida from Tamil".

That Bishop Caldwell is the creator of the 'Dravidian race' theory is supported by Rev. Fr. Gnanaprakasara, O. M. I.

a linguist of very high repute and a scholar held in high respect by such an eminent scholar as Rev. Fr. Heras. The learned Father writes: "Since the time of Bishop Caldwell who published the first edition of his scholarly 'Comparative Grammar Of Dravidian Languages' in 1856, the people who have spoken Tamil, Kanarese, Telugu, Malayalam, Tulu and other less cultivated South Indian languages from Pre-historic times are known as 'Dravidians'.¹⁷

The wrong view that language is an indication of race, which was held by the Bishop, was generally accepted by philologists of the nineteenth century but now completely discarded by modern scientists. Prof. M. Nesturkh of the Academy of Sciences. U. S. S. R. writes: "People speaking the same language are not racially homogeneous and as a rule consist of representatives of a number of anthropological types. Six such types are to be found in Germany for example".

"In Africa the Negroid peoples speak their own languages, in North America they speak English and in South America Spanish. Thus groups of one race that enter into the composition of various peoples and nations, speak different languages".

"All this goes to show that language is independent of race and disproves the unscientific theory that language is the offspring of a mysterious 'race spirit' in some way biologically inherent in a race. Language depends entirely on the development of society; it emerges, lives and dies as people develop; it has no causal relation with the race as a biological group."

It takes time to eradicate the errors born of enthusiasm; therefore, there is a great danger in affixing labels without due scrutiny and intelligent discrimination. Caldwell was too hasty in his conclusion, viz. fixing the label 'Dravidian' on both the languages and the people of South India.

Having created the 'Dravidian race' the Bishop imported it into India from Central Asia the very same area from where Max Muller imported his 'Aryan' race. He writes "From the discovery of those analogies we are able

to conclude that the 'Dravidian race' though resident in India, for a long period, long prior to the commencement of history, originated in the central tracts of Asia—the seed-pot of nations; and that from thence after parting company with Ugro-Turanian hordes and leaving a colony at Baluchistan, they entered India by way of the Indus.”¹⁹

It does not sound reasonable to believe that the so-called two races 'Aryan' and 'Dravidian'—which had a common home in Central Asia, in remote pre-historic times could have been two distinct races, each speaking its own language belonging to two different families. It is also worthy of note, here that the Bishop's view that the 'Aryans' and 'Dravidians' lived peacefully in India, is contrary to the generally accepted views of other writers, who hold that these two races lived in a state of perpetual enmity. The Bishop quotes Prof. Max Muller in support of his view.

The Bishop writes: “By whomsoever the Dravidians were expelled from North India, and through what-causes-so-ever they were induced to migrate southward, I feel persuaded that it was not by the 'Aryans' that they were expelled... Looking at the question from a purely 'Dravidian' point of view I am convinced that the 'Dravidians' had any relation with the primitive 'Aryas' but those of a peaceful and friendly character”..... “I find a similar opinion respecting the relationship that subsisted between the Aryas and the early Dravidians as has been expressed by Prof. Max Muller.”²⁰

Both the Bishop and the Professor had their own reasons for holding such a view. They were in responsible positions during the British Raj and the British Government would have taken them to task for sowing seeds of discord between what the rulers considered to be, two major communities in India. Besides, the Bishop had a special reason. He was to enunciate a theory for which a peaceful relationship between 'Aryans' and Dravidians' was an indispensable need. An enmity between these two communities would jeopardize his theory.

If Prof. Max Muller had created a civilized and civilizing 'Aryan race', the Bishop created a barbarian and uncivilized

‘Dravidian race’ about which he records such opinions as are derogatory and disgraceful to the Tamils. The following quotations from his long introduction to his book, will prove this statement.

“From the evidence of the words in use among the early Tamilians we learn the following items of information:

- (i) They were without books and probably ignorant of written alphabetical characters.
- (ii) They were without hereditary priest and idols and appear to have had no idea of heaven or hell, or soul or sin.
- (iii) The chief, if not the actual worship, which they appear to have practised was that of devils which they worshipped systematically by giving to the devil ie offering blood sacrifices, and by the performance of frantic devil dances.
- (iv) They had ‘medicines’ but no medical science etc.
- (v) Their uncultivated intellectual condition is specially apparant in words that relate to the operations of the mind etc.

Basing upon the above false and wrong ideas, the Bishop enunciates a venomous theory which has brought in its wake great harm to the Hindu religion. The priest writes: “This brief illustration, from the primitive Tamil vocabulary of the social conditions of the Dravidians, prior to the arrival of the brahmins, will suffice to prove that only elements of civilization already existed amongst them (Tamils). They had not acquired much more than the elements; and in many things centuries behind the brahmins whom they revered as ‘instructors’ and obeyed as ‘overseers’.

“The mental culture and higher civilization which they derived from the brahmins have, I fear, been more than counter-balanced by the fozzilizing caste-rules, the unpractical pantheistic philosophy and the cumbersome routine of inane ceremonies which were introduced among them by the ‘guides of their new social state.’”²¹

Thus the Bishop stealthily and surreptitiously introduced the proposition that Hinduism and its scriptures were foreign

to the Tamils and was introduced by 'Aryan' brahmins who were foreign to the Tamil Nadu. The proposition was purposely introduced by the Bishop to prepare the way for the spread of Christian faith, as is evident from the following statements from his long introduction to a grammar book.

"A virgin soil is now for the first time being ploughed, turned up to the air and sown with the seed of life; and in process of time we may reasonably expect to reap a crop of intellectual and moral results."

If the national mind and heart were stirred to so great a degree a thousand years ago by the diffusion of Jainism and some centuries later by the dissemination of Saiva and Vaishnava doctrines, it is reasonable to expect still more important results from the propagation of the grand and soul-stirring truth of Christianity."²²

These erroneous and malicious ideal that the brahmins are foreigners, that Sanskrit, a language foreign to the Tamils and that Hinduism, an imported religion have had disastrous consequences on the Tamil-speaking people. There were good and faithful Hindus, who were brought up in the best Hindu tradition and to whom these were a shock. Two important consequences flowed from this pernicious theory of the Bishop (1) The caste-Hindus of Tamil Nadu, reacted in an indirect way, which was a way of escapism, by starting a Puristic movement in language and religion. They eschewed all Sanskrit words from their Tamil vocabulary and started publishing books and pamphlets, contemptuously treating the Vedic literature and the Sanskrit language as outlandish. At one time, the leaders of this movement were two outstanding scholars, Viz. Swamy Vedachalam and Mr. Subramaniapillai M. A. M. L. The Swamy went to the extent of changing his name to 'Marai Malai Adikal' for the words 'Swamy' 'Veda' and 'Achalam' are Sanskritic. Mr. Subramaniapillai M. A. M. L., a renowned Tamil scholar and Tagore Professor of Law at the University of Calcutta, went to the extent of writing a pamphlet bearing the title "Thiru Nān Marai Villakam" (an exposition on the four Vedas) in which he asserts that

the original Vedas existed in the Tamil Language and that the four Vedas so often mentioned in the Saiva religious hymns and Sangam Literature are not the Rig, Yajur, Sama and Atharva of Sanskrit. This view was severely criticised by eminent Saiva Tamil Scholars of Tamil Nadu and of Sri Lanka. Mr. S. Sivapadasundarampillai, the then Principal of Victoria College, Jaffna, Sri Lanka, and Sri Swaminatha Pandithar and Sri Ambalavana Navalar, both of whom are well known as eminent scholars in both Sanskrit and Tamil, published, as Co-Authors, an effective rejoinder to Mr. Subramaniapillai's pamphlet. This rejoinder quickly underwent three editions but is now out of stock and out of print.

The second consequence from this pernicious theory is the socio-political movement in Tamil Nadu under the name of "Dravidia Kazhakam" led by Mr. Ramasamy Nayakkar of Canarese origin, and his famous disciple Mr. C. N. Annadurai who later fell out with his 'guru' and started the social reform movement called 'Dravida Munnetra Kazhakam' (Dravida Progressive Society) popularly known as D. M. K. This body in later fifties became a powerful political party. To compare great things with small Mr. C. N. Annadurai easily sailed to power by exploiting the 'Dravidian race' theory as did Hitler in Nazi Germany by exploiting the 'Aryan' race theory. The racial theories both in South India and Germany reared their ugly heads under a pseudo-scientific garb to deceive the people. The D. K. and its branch, the D. M. K. directly attacked the Hindu religion from various angles, through the mass media of the press and cinema. That Hinduism survived their powerfully organised onslaughts is a miracle.

Encouraged by the enormous support of the masses Mr. C. N. Annadurai and his followers aspired to create a Dravidistan—probably following the foot steps of Mr. Mohammad Ally Jinnah on the model of Pakistan. But Mr. Jinnah was fortunate in having to bargain with the Britishers who were keen on dividing India before they quit. But Anna's case was quite different for two reasons:

- (1) The leaders of the so-called Dravidian states Andra, Kannada and Kerala rebuffed Mr. Annadurai and refused to fall in line with him.
- (2) He had to bargain with a newly created National Central Government which looked upon the division of India as high treason. So the agitation for 'Dravidastan' as a separate state had been officially given up.

To continue, Bishop Caldwell's theory of a 'Dravidian family' of languages different from the so-called 'Aryan' family of languages and linking them with the Scythian language group, was severely criticised by eminent scholars both European and Indian. The great historian and scholar C. E. Gower says "The learned doctor gives an appendix containing a considerable number of 'Dravidian' words which he asserts to be Scythian as the most efficient witness to prove the Turanian origin of the languages. It is now known that every word in the list is distinctly 'Aryan' (Sanskritic) although some of them have representatives in the Finnish group of Turanian languages—the group which has been most constantly exposed to 'Aryan' influences".²³ Another eminent scholar Jules Vinsen says "Dr. Caldwell's opinion that the 'Dravidian' may be related to a pretended Scythian group is equally unfounded".²⁴

R. Swaminatha Iyer, Reader in History, University of Calcutta, has pointed out that the sixty words which Caldwell mentioned as pure Tamil could in reality be traced to Vedic Sanskrit, which should be distinguished from classical Sanskrit. This scholar further points out the mistake committed by Dr. Caldwell. He thinks Caldwell had only compared his so-called pure Tamil words with words of classical Sanskrit instead of with those of Vedic Sanskrit; and that if he had compared the words in his list with those of Vedic Sanskrit, he would not have arrived at the determined conclusion that the Dravidian family was entirely different from the Indo-Aryan.²⁵

Philologists of Dr. Caldwell's time accepted his theory of a 'Dravidian race' but widely differed from him with regard to its original habitat, its civilization and culture.

There is a queer parallel in attempting to fix the original habitat of the 'Dravidian race' as in the case of 'Aryan race'. The theorists varied widely in the fixing of its original habitat. Also there is a strange contrast in describing the nature of these two races. At the beginning, the 'Aryan race' was considered to be a 'Civilized and civilizing race' and it came to be considered by later historians, a barbarous race and a destroyer of civilizations. At the start, the 'Dravidian race' theorists held that the 'Dravidian race' was a barbarous one having only elements of civilization, later theorists considered it to be a highly civilized race.

We will now deal with the various theories with regard to the racial concepts and original habitat of the Tamil-speaking people—the so-called 'Dravidian race'.

- (1) Many theorists held that the 'Dravidians' are of Semitic origin. They think that the people of South India may conveniently be called 'Dravidians', so that they may be distinguished from the people of North India, who are 'Aryans', and that by race, the people of South India are of Semitic origin. In proof of this the theorists quote the institution of 'Marumakkal Thāyam'—the Law of Inheritance through the mother—which prevailed in Arabia, Egypt and Asia Minor and in Pre-historic Greece.
- (2) Col. Holdich and others held that the 'Dravidians' had come from Mesopotamia to the Indian borderland in the 'illimitable past' through the Makran coast.
- (3) Another theory which has the support of a few ethnologists, is that the 'Dravidians' belong to the same race as the ancient Egyptians. Prof. Elliot Smith F. R. S. and Perry support this view.
- (4) Mr. F. J. Richards disagrees with Prof. Elliot Smith and brings forward his own theory that the 'Dravidians' are identical with the Mediter-

anean race which forms the ethnical basis of the major portion of the civilized Europe. He observes "the resemblances between 'Dravidian India' and the Mediterranean area are too numerous and essential to be ignored". Dr. Slater supports this view.

- (5) Another theory was propounded by Rev. Fr. Heras. According to him the 'Dravidians' of India formed the original nucleus of Hamitic race settled in the land that spreads between the Indus and the Ganges. There they found a race of Negritoes, a sub-group of the black race, with whom they freely mixed and the issues of the union were the Dasor or Dasyus of RigVeda. But the learned Father had abandoned this theory in the light of new ideas arising from Archaeological finds in the Indus Valley.²⁶
- (6) Sri Suniti Kumar Chatterji holds that the 'Dravidians' may be identified with the Lycians of Asia Minor who were a section of the Cretan people and who styled themselves 'Tremmilai'. He would trace even the words 'Dravidians' and Tamilians to the Cretan 'Tremmilai' and also sees many resemblances between Lycian and Tamil words.
- (7) Prof. K. A. Nilakanda Sastri holds that 'Dravidian' culture and civilization must have come into India from West Asian tablelands, such as Anatolia, Armenia and Iran.
- (8) Sir William Crooke of the Bengal Civil Service gives expression to the view that the 'Dravidians' represent an emigration from the African continent and discounted the theory that the 'Aryans' drove the aboriginal inhabitants into the jungles with the suggestion that the 'Aryan' invasion was more social than racial.
- (9) Rai Bahadur Charat Chandra Roy supports the view of F. J. Richards and Dr. Slater, but places the

arrival of the Mediterraneans to a later date than the Negritoes and Proto-Australoids. He writes "The earliest inhabitants were in all probability, a small black curly-haired Negrito race allied to the Semangs of Malaya and the Minicopis of Andamans. Then there came a long-headed race called Pre-Dravidian and sometimes Proto-Austroloid, who might have entered from the North-West or from the submerged Lemurian Continent. Wherever the Pre-Dravidian might have originated, the racial type of the Indian Proto-Australoid would appear to have been ultimately fixed in India under the influence of the Indian climatic conditions and he is the aboriginal of India. The next important wave of immigration into India appears to have been an early branch of the Mediterranean race who brought with them a rudimentary knowledge of agriculture, the practice of Urn-burial, the erection of rude stone-memorials for the dead, Neolithic implements, the art of navigation and a new speech. The main body of the race occupied Peninsular India, which was then sparsely inhabited by the Pre-Dravidians and by some remnants of the original Negritoes. The sections of the early Mediterranean immigrants who stayed on in Northern India were in time mostly absorbed in the dominant Pre-Dravidian population of the North. Most of the new immigrants in southern India whom we may call the Proto-Dravidians and their descendants too, gradually received varying degrees of infusion of Proto-Austroloid blood and in time worked out a civilization, now known as the 'Dravidian' culture".²⁷

- (10) The majority of opinion among a number of anthropologists is that the 'Dravidians' are a Mediterranean race.
- (11) After the discovery of the Indus Valley civilization, also known as Harappan culture, some Archaeologists hold that the 'Dravidians' are Indus

Valley people, driven out of their homeland by an invading race, which according to R. E. M. Wheeler, might have been 'Aryan', but later on he recanted this theory.

- (12) The theory of Von Furer Haimendorf is as follows:—
The Dravidians entered South India either from the N. W. of India along the West coast or possibly by sea from the west coast of the Peninsula in comparatively recent times (500 B. C.). It is certain that the iron using civilization in South India is an intrusion.

"The racial map of India still reflects this process. There are two great areas of progressive Mediterranean populations. One covers the whole of Northern India, while the other extends over Western India and parts of the Deccan. In between these two areas there is a broad belt of more primitive populations in whose racial make up a Vedoid element predominates.²⁸

Many more theories may be added to the list given above. It is of no use to any one. One fact emerges clearly from the long list of theories with reference to 'Aryan' and 'Dravidian' races that they are creations of people without any objective validity. Therefore, what Prof. Juan Comas wrote with regard to the original habitat of the 'Aryan' race is applicable equally to the original home and nature of the 'Dravidians'. I am quoting the passage replacing the word 'Aryan' with the word 'Dravidian'.

"The examples quoted demonstrate the variety of opinions held on the subject—opinions which in many cases flatly contradict each other. This must bring us to the conviction that the existence of the so-called 'Dravidian' people or race is a mere myth since we find purely subjective criteria employed in the attempt to determine its home, without the slightest factual and scientific foundation."²⁹

If the 'Dravidians' and 'Aryans' were not the original inhabitants of India, then there must be some others who

were the natives, unless it was an uninhabited country, which India could not have been because of its numerous natural resources.

Professors Sylvian Levi and Jean Przdzlowski and others have created a third family of languages called 'Austrie' and a group of people speaking these languages. Among the principal members of this family are Semang, Khasi, Mon Khmer, Munda etc. "It should therefore be admitted that the domain of Munda and Mon-Khmer and other connected languages was much more considerable than it is at present. It is only in the later times that the domain has been reduced and cut to pieces by 'Aryan' and 'Dravidian'.³⁰

A new and most important line of investigation has been inaugurated by Dr. Jean Przdzlowski in his researches into the philology of Austrie element in our Indian 'Aryan' speeches beginning from Sanskrit downwards. The presence in 'Indo-Aryan' speeches of a considerable number of Austrie words is of very great significance in the study of the origins of Hindu people and Hindu culture of North India. These words demonstrated a borrowing from Austrie dialects at a time when they were spoken by masses of people evidently on the Gangetic plains. The people who spoke this Austrie dialects have now merged into the Hindu or Mohammedan masses of Northern India. They have been transformed into the present day 'Aryan' speaking castes and groups of the country.³¹

All these theories, relating to both 'Aryan' and 'Dravidian' so far dealt with may be brought under a common name. "The Immigration Theories" according to which the people of India are the descendants of immigrants from foreign countries. Views contrary to this are held by a group of ethnologists, anthropologists, and philologists, according to whom the people of India are native to the soil. About the so-called 'Aryans' Dr. A. C. Das says "All these evidences unmistakably point to the vast antiquity of the Rig Veda and Sapta Sindhu and go to prove that the 'Aryans' were autochthonous and did not settle there as colonists from another country".

Dr. K. M. Munshi and many others hold the same opinion. This view is confirmed by the eminent Sanskrit scholar Prof. Muir who says "I must however begin with a candid admission that so far as I know, none of the Sanskrit books, not even the most ancient, contain any distinct reference or allusion to the foreign origin of the Indians".

With regard to the 'Dravidian' race theories Prof. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar says "several writers of Indian history seem to hold it as a necessary axiom that the fertile lands of India with her wonderful wealth of minerals underground and her infinitely various flora and fauna overground and with her climate, insular in some parts and continental in others, pre-eminently fitted to nurture man especially in early stages of their evolution, should yet depend upon importations from the arid countries beyond her borders for the human inhabitants and for the various cultures that adorn the pages of her history. Some writers conduct the ancient Dravidians with the self confidence of a Cook's guide through the North-Western or North-Eastern mountain-passes of India and drop them with a ready-made foreign culture on the banks of Cauvery or Vaigai... No single fact has yet been adduced that compels us to believe that the ancient people of India were not autochthonous.³²

The theories relating to the two hypothetical races viz. 'Aryan' and 'Dravidian' were given unscientific racist colouring by self-seeking and power-hungry politicians in Germany and India. Racism involves the assertion that inequality is absolute and unconditional that is to say a race is inherently and by its very nature superior or inferior to others quite independently of the physical conditions of its habitat and of social factors.

"As scientific discoveries and technological progress have largely destroyed the effectiveness of myths pure and simple among the masses, contemporary racism is accordingly forced to adopt a scientific disguise. Hence the racist myths of the twentieth century must seem to be based on science, although, according to Prenant it may be, at the price of the most shameless falsifications and contradictions."³³

The culture or way of life of a human group is also independent of race and language. The causes of different cultures may be attributed to the physical environment, the contact with the surrounding peoples, to the inventions and discoveries of individuals in any human group, the problems which face their lives and the solutions they make and last but not least the religion they follow.”³⁴

Psychologists by means of various tests have shown that culture is independent of race and language. “As a final example may be mentioned the application of the Rorschach technique to Chinese living in America... In this particular study.. it was possible to compare Chinese born in China with those who had lived their whole life in the United States. There were some important differences but the most striking conclusions that are drawn from the study is that the American-born Chinese showed marked alterations in personality pattern as compared with those born in China. In the words of the authors, T. M. Abel and F. L. K. Hsu, they were in the process of merging into the American way of life. Once again we see how two groups of different racial origin become more alike as they are exposed to similar social and cultural environment.”³⁵

People differ of course, but not because of their race As John Stuart Mill, the great English philosopher and economist expressed it. “Of all the vulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the effect of social and moral influences upon the human mind, the most vulgar is that of attributing the diversities of conduct and character to inherent natural differences” by which he means racial.³⁶

REFERENCES

1. By Sun'ti Kumar Chatterji. “Vedic Age”
2. “On the Hindus” By Sir William Joens. Vide Third Anniversary Discourse to the ‘Royal Asiatic Society’ 2nd Feb. 1786. Vol. 3. p. 32. First Edition.
3. “East & West in Religion by Dr. Radhakrishnan.
4. These quotes were taken from an article.
5. Vide. “Call of the Vedas” by Dr. A. C. Bose. Introduction. pages 13—16
6. Vide “Introduction to Tantra Shastra” by Sir John Woodroffe. (Second Edition, page 31.

7. Vide. "Religion and Society" by Dr S Radhakrishnan (Hindu Dharma) page 131 Second Edition).
8. Vide. Ibid page 131.
9. "Caste in India" by Dr J. H. Hatton C. B. E., M. A., D. Sc. Third Edition (Page 46) & Bibliography.
10. "The Original Scriptures of Saiva Religion" by Narayana Iyer. B. A., B. L., L. T. page 3 (A Native of Thirunelvely, Tamil Nadu). Jaffna Saiva Paripalana Sabai. Publication 41.
11. Manu Smriti Ch. X Verses 43 & 44. Prof. Jha's translation.
12. Vide: "Age of Imperial Unity" Bhuvan's Historical series. 1st Edition. p. 197 note 2 by Dr D. C. Sircar M. A., Ph. D.
13. "Rig Vedic Culture of the Pre-historic Indus" by Swami Sankarananda.
14. Vide: Ayodhya Kanda X 37 & 38. Valmiki Ramayana.
15. Apte's Sanskrit Dictionary.
16. Soundarya Lahari Verse 75.
17. Tamil Culture Vol. II. No. 1. 1953. His article "Linguistic Evidence for the Common Origin of the Dravidians & Indo-Europeans"
18. "Races of Mankind" by Prof. Nesturkh; Moscow.
19. Comparative Grammar Of Dravidian Languages Introduction p. 45 (1st Edition).
20. Ibid Introduction page 75 & note 2.
21. Ibid Introduction page 79.
22. Ibid Introduction pages 89—90.
23. C. E. Gower
24. Jules Vinsin.
25. Vide: Proceedings of the 1st and 3rd Oriental Conference. Also vide. C. Narayana Rao "Basis of Dravidian Tongues in Prakrit."
26. Vide: Studies in Proto-Mediterranean Culture also "New Review" Sept. 1941.
27. Journal of Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Vol. XXIV. pp. 37 & 38 (1938).
28. Tamil Culture Vol. II No. 2, April 1953.
29. Racial Myths A UNESCO Pamphlet.
30. "Sanskrit and Dravidian" by Jules Block Translated from the French by P. C. Baggot of the University of Calcutta.
31. Ibid.
32. "Ancient India" by Prof. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar.
33. Racial Myths. A UNESCO Pamphlet P. 47.
34. Race and History by Claude Levi-Strauss A UNESCO Pamphlet
35. Ibid
36. Ibid

THE RACIAL QUESTION IN INDIA

“The term race is a mental product, a concept having no objective existence, apart from man’s mind. Only individuals are real.” Topinard.

“After all races” says Spillar “show but skin-deep differences. Differences of language, of manners, and customs are nothing but accidental modalities, attendant on the respective historical evolution in the past, in no way powerful to efface the sub-stratum common to all humanity and in no way tending to hinder any co-operative effort in the fulfilment of the mission common to mankind in general.”

A great Tamil Sangam poet sang centuries ago “All the world is one and all mankind is kin; good and evil are of one’s own making and not caused by others”, a fact which politicians may refuse to concede.

There are a lot of misconceptions about ‘race’ which have existed in the minds of men since the dawn of history. These misconceptions have caused a lot of misery to mankind.

“In its anthropological sense the word ‘race’ should be reserved for groups of mankind possessing well-developed and primarily heritable physical differences from other groups.”¹ This definition too has been, of late, subject to criticism by scientists. Therefore, difficulties occur in any discussion on ‘race’ or ‘race’-relations. But one fact is obvious viz. strong prejudices, discriminations and inter-group rivalries are present and urgent evils and tension and friction have mounted menacingly in our own generation on account of these wrong conceptions about ‘race’. Here are a few:—

(i) Such phrases in common use as ‘the Tamil race’ the ‘Sinhalese race’, ‘the Malayali race’, ‘the Hindi race’ etc. have no warrant at all. Even ‘the Jewish race’ has been declared a myth.² “Today, however, anti-semitism has resorted to the myth of a ‘Jewish race’ in an attempt to justify itself and to provide a pseudo-scientific cloak for its political and economic motives”.³

“National, religious, geographical, linguistic and cultural groups do not necessarily coincide with racial groups; and the cultural traits of such groups have no demonstrated connection with racial traits”.

“Americans are not a race, nor are Frenchmen, nor Germans; nor ipso facto is any other national group. Muslims and Jews are no more races than are Roman Catholics and Protestants. nor are people who live in Iceland or Britain or India or who speak English or any other language (whether Tamil or Sinhalese) or who are culturally Turkish or Chinese and the like, thereby describable as races.”⁴

An Englishman travelling in the U. S. A. finds that he is commonly recognised as English and the American in Europe is also recognised as such but that does not mean that there is an ‘English race’ or an ‘American race’, style of dress, type of gesture, habits of hygiene, turns of speech—all these things dependent on social environment and not on biological heredity—combine to facilitate recognition.

A Tamil from South India or Sri Lanka travelling in North India may be easily recognised as a Tamil, in spite of the fact that the *Tamil-speaking group has a cultural and religious tradition common to all the linguistic groups in India*. This does not mean that there is ‘a Tamil race’ or ‘a Dravidian race’. The ‘Dravidian race’ is an utter swindle a pseudo-scientific cloak for political and economic exploitation

“Unfortunately, however, when most people use the term ‘race’ they do not do so in the sense above defined. To most people, a ‘race’ is a group of people whom they choose to describe as a ‘race’. Thus many national, religious, geographical linguistic or cultural groups have, in such loose usage, been called ‘race’. The biological fact of race and the myth of ‘race’ should be distinguished. For all practical social purposes ‘race’ is not so much a biological phenomenon as a social myth. The myth ‘race’ has created an enormous amount of human and social damage”.⁵

“A racial type is but an artificial concept, though long continued geographical isolation does tend to produce a general uniformity of appearance.”⁶ Frederick Müller put it more bluntly when he declared “Race is an empty phrase, an utter swindle.”⁷

Israel Zangwell was no less emphatic when he pointed out that “the Italians are a medley of all races whose slaves poured into Rome between 100 B. C. and A. D. 300. Turn Time’s kinematograph back far enough, and the Germans are found to be French and the French Germans indeed, Bismark looking at their bodies on a battle-field, confessed that there was little difference even now.”⁷

Little wonder that the German writer, Count KoudenhavneKalergi, should say:— “As soon as one takes up the race question, the division of races or the enrolment of a people in this or that group, endeavouring to discover principles based on anatomy, language or religion, one encounters more and more trouble, confusion, and riddles without answer. One meets nothing but *dissolving views and empty phantoms.*”⁷

“*Racial philosophy with its race pride and race prejudice rots up the human personality far more effectively than all the drugs, drink and obscenity in the world.*”⁸

(ii) Another wrong conception about ‘race’ is due to the blood theory of heredity; which is as false as the old racist theory. “Of one blood” ‘Of my own blood’ ‘mixed blood’, ‘half blood’, ‘blue blood’, ‘brahman blood’, ‘plebeian blood’ are phrases which have no meaning at all scientifically, but these terms are very effective means of duping the ignorant people. ‘Blood’ is also used to mean nationality or linguistic groups as ‘German blood’, ‘French blood’, ‘Tamil blood’, ‘Sinhalese blood’ etc. etc.

“People who still think in this way are quite incapable of understanding the inwardness of hereditary phenomena or of social phenomena in which heredity plays a part. The truth is that many people are ignorant of the fact not only that the blood has nothing whatever to do with the genetic process, but that it has also been proved that the mother does not

supply blood to the foetus which develops its own blood from the beginning, this indeed, explains why a child may be of different blood group from its mother.”⁹

Evidence brought to light in blood transfusion shows that the skin colour of the giver and the receiver are entirely irrelevant. This is a new and striking proof that the ‘myth of blood’ lacks the slightest biological foundation. Since a ‘pink’ man could be pumped full of the blood of a ‘black’ or ‘yellow’ man of the proper blood group and vice versa, with no harmful effect, any physical differences between the human ethnic groups are of less importance than the differences between individuals within a group or even a family. Similarly, in the context of overwhelming similarity, between all humans, skin colour, hair texture, nasal shapes etc. are of very little significance. The division of humans into ‘races’ on the basis of these characteristics is now given up as unscientific. “The notion of humanity as being divided into completely separate racial compartments is inaccurate. It is based on false premises, and more particularly on the “blood” theory of heredity which is as false as the old racist theory.”^{9a}

Once it was thought possible to divide human beings into short-headed and long-headed (brachy—and dolicho—cephalic. Now most of them are what is called by ethnologists “Mesati-Cephalic” neither one thing nor the other. Since neolithic period (later stone age) races and nations have intermingled freely.”

(iii) The idea of “innate racial character” is also a false theory. It is a dangerous deception. It is an idea which has been uncritically accepted as a fact, though it is as much a fiction as the supposed flatness of the earth or the supposed travelling of the sun around the earth. In all populations, there are bright and dull, good and evil, miserly and generous, jovial and morose, mad and sane, kind and cruel men. To condemn the brahmins of India to be avaricious, ambitious, cunning, wily, double-tongued, servile, insinuating, fraudulent, dishonest, oppressive and intriguing is utter nonsense. It only shows the moral turpitude of the writer. It may also be considered as

a projection of one's own disgruntled personality on others a psychological complex. Jean Antoine Dubois was a French, Roman Catholic Missionary in India from 1792 to 1823. Despite his strong efforts in South India his mission of conversion failed. He returned to Paris in 1823 convinced that the conversion of the Hindus could not be accomplished. His best known work was his description of the character manners and customs of the people of India which was bought and printed by the East India Company in 1816. It is no wonder that the brahmins appeared to him in the manner described by him above. Sir James Frazer has said that every great figure in history is "a harlequin whose particoloured costume differs, according as you look at him from the front or the back from the right or the left. His friends and his foes behold him from opposite sides, and they naturally see only that particular hue of his coat which happens to be turned towards them." It is a pity that Dubois looked only at the back of the brahmins with his jaundiced eye.

The thought and emotions of a people can certainly be altered by education, by the newspaper Press, by having new doctrines dinned into their ears. Such alteration may be accomplished in a short time. The Germans were proud of Einstein in 1932; in 1933 they burned his books and drove him out of Germany. Nations can be induced to drop one trait and exhibit another with ease and rapidity. Examples are not wanting of changes in national sentiment brought about in a very short time by the efforts of politicians and Press. "Up to 1904 most of the English had regarded the French with suspicion, with self-righteous disdain, as immoral, flighty, frivolous. France had been their enemy throughout the centuries; and as for its morals—well, look at Paris! The English had also up to that date considered Germans almost as honest, as serious, as home-loving as themselves. This was what they were taught."

"Suddenly they were told to reverse their opinions. The French, they learned, were a noble folk, sadly misunderstood! As for the Germans, they were trying to steal Britain's trade; they aimed at building a navy to rival the British; they were a danger, must be carefully watched."

Almost overnight the English obediently took up these new attitudes—hostility to Germans, friendliness with the French.”

Incitements to hatred, spreading lies calculated to excite loathing and anger are easily circulated and finds easy lodgement and a welcome in the least developed minds which are everywhere in the majority.¹²

“For humanity in the mass is unhappily always at the mercy of glib tongues, voices with a thrill in them, wild and whirling words.” “Nations (or groups) are reeds shaken by winds from this or that quarter—and not ‘thinking reeds’ as Pascal suggested. They appear to give their support to any individual or any group that demands it with sufficient vehemence. They take the line of least resistance.”¹³

Now let us consider the question of ‘races’ in India, before the arrival of the Britisher. There was no racial problem in India. The fundamental unity of India is emphasised by the name Bharata-Varsha or land of Bharata, given to the whole country in the Epics and the Purānas, and the designation Bhāratī Santati or the descendants of Bharata applied to the whole people. Vishṇu Purāna II-3-1 says “The country that lies north of the ocean and south of the snowy mountains is called Bharata; there dwell descendants of Bharata.”

With the advent of the Britisher, the concept of ‘race’ became very popular in India. Probably the first view about Indian racial position was by Sir Herbert Risley in the census report of 1901. According to this report the population of India was divided into seven groups as follows:—

1. Mongoloid 2. Indo-Aryan 3. Dravidian
4. Mongolo-Dravidian 5. Aryo-Dravidian
6. Scytho-Dravidian and 7. Turko-Iranian.

This was superseded by Dr. J. H. Hutton’s division of the people of India in 1933. It is an improvement on Risley’s division but it has one peculiar view—that all the peoples

of India had come from outside India. No man originated on the Indian soil. Their names are given in an approximate order of their arrival

- (i) Negritos (ii) Proto-Australoids
- (iii) Early Mediterranean (iv) Civilized Mediterranean
- (v) Armenoids (vi) Alpines (vii) Vedic Aryans
- (viii) Mongoloids.

A more recent view has been put forward by Dr B. S. Guha, Director of Anthropological Survey of India. He divides the people of India into six main races with nine sub-divisions. Dr. Guha's division is as follows:—

- (i) Negritos (ii) Proto-Australoids
- (iii) Mongoloids (iv) Mediterraneans, with three sub-divisions
- (v) The Western Brachycephals with three sub-divisions and (vi) The Nordics.

Dr. B. S. Guha has summed up the racial distribution for India as a whole, as follows:— ‘It must be clearly understood that no rigid separation is possible as there is considerable overlapping of types. From a broad point of view, however, a Nordic territory in North-Western India mixed with Mediterraneans and Orientals, can be distinguished from a territory in Peninsular India containing the older Palaeo-Mediterranean elements. On both the sides of these are the domains of Alpo-Dinarics mixed no doubt with other types. The primitive darker elements have come in everywhere and, with blood from other strains chiefly Palaeo-Mediterranean they constitute the lower stratum of the population. The Mongoloids occupy the sub-montane regions of the north and the east, but various thrusts from them have gone deeply into the composition of the people.’¹⁴

Prof S K Chatterji, quoting Dr Guha's division of the population of India and commenting extensively upon each element in the division sums up the position thus:—

“So, too, for India as a whole, a more or less a common type of economic life based on agriculture and taking shape within the limits of India forming a single geographical unit, combined with a large-scale commingling of different races building up a common history (through

a common Hindu Culture) has been responsible for the gradual modification of what doubtless existed in most ancient times as distinct racial types and distinctive language-cultures, and has led to the evolution, as result of conscious movement, *of a common Indian type and a common Indian culture.* In this culture of India, after at least two and a half millennia of close interaction, the original genetic differences in the four language-families obtaining in India from prehistoric times have largely converged towards the evolution of a number of common traits.”¹⁵

In the same article Prof. S. K. Chatterji holds that there are strong evidences both direct and indirect, that in the whole of India, at the remote past, a language called ‘Dravidian’, so-named by Bishop Caldwell, but in truth, some old form of Tamil was spoken by the majority of the people and that a race called ‘Dravidian’ (also a creation of Bishop Caldwell) was mainly occupying the whole of India. That Tamil or some old form of it was spoken throughout India is evident from Valmiki Ramayana where we find Sita conversing with Hanuman in a language different from Sanskrit, the language of the twice-born, in which Ravana spoke; and Sri Rama and his brother were conversing freely with Sugreeva and Vali. But the most surprising fact is that, according to Valmiki, Hanuman was a great Vedic scholar, well-versed in Vyakarana and in Sama Veda, an opinion expressed by Sri Rama also. These facts evidently show that throughout India, there were people who could freely speak both Sanskrit and Tamil, and that Vedas were studied throughout India by all communities from the remote past.

The theory that the whole of India has been populated by one ‘race’ which according to earlier philologists is ‘Dravidian’ is held by Western scholars too, besides Prof. S. K. Chatterji.

Dr. Hall of the British Museum in his book “Ancient History of The Near East” says:— “Among the modern Indians as among modern Greeks or Italians the ancient pre-Aryan type of the land has survived while that of the Aryan conqueror died out long ago.”¹⁶

Prof. Berriedale Keith, the great Sanskrit scholar says "the generally accepted view that the population of India is predominantly Dravidian or at least non-Indo-European in origin."¹⁷

An eminent writer says that the great Italian anthropologist Sergi "was extraordinary startled when realising the absence of the so-called Aryan type from the actual population of India, and not daring to affirm that the Aryan invaders had been absorbed by the former inhabitants of the country astonishingly concludes that the 'Aryans of India' were anthropologically different from the 'Aryans of Europe', who are brachycephalic."¹⁸

The above statements by various scholars show clearly that the sub-continent of India has been populated mainly by one 'race' which according to,

- (i) Philologists; 'Dravidian'.
- (ii) Earlier anthropologists; Mediterranean.
- (iii) Modern anthropologists and ethnologists: Caucasoid.

In support of this last view two eminent authorities say:

(i) "In the first place, the Caucasoid peoples cover not only most of Europe but also great areas of North Africa, the near East and India. In the second place, these peoples are not white: their skin colour ranges from pale pink to a deep ruddy hue, from a pale olive colour to a definite brown."¹⁹

(ii) "The population of the sub-continent is distinct enough to be named Hindu or Indic by some authors forming a racial sub-classification. *More modern opinion tends to classify the dark-skinned Pacific islands' people as Mongoloid despite their colour, and the most recent authorities such as Alfred Kroeber show no hesitation in placing all sections of the Indian sub-continent squarely within the Caucasoid or white race.*"²⁰

REFERENCES

1. 'Race Concept'. Result of an inquiry—a UNESCO Pamphlet page 37.
2. Vide. "Racial myths" by Prof. Juan Comas. A UNESCO Pamphlet pages 27—32.

3. Racial Myths. page 27.
4. Vide. The Pamphlet "Race Concept"—pages 40, 41, 42.
5. Ibid. page 90.
6. Prof. A. C. Haddon F. R. S. Races of Man. Passage taken from "Illusion of National Character" by Hamilton Fyfe. Thinkers Library. page 47 and follows.
7. From: "Illusion of National Character" Hamilton Fyfe. Thinker's Library. page 47.
8. Ibid. page 34 by John Longdon-Davies in a "A Short History of the Future.
9. Vide—Racial myths—Chapter II—The myth of blood'.
- 9a. Vide—Racial myths—Chapter II—The myth of blood'.
10. Racial myths. page 16.
11. Vide. Illusion of National Character. page 19.
12. Vide. Ibid. page 8.
13. „ „ pages 36 & 37.
14. Racial Elements in the Population. Oxford Pamphlets on Indian Affairs. No. 22. Oxford University Press, Bombay. 1944.
15. Prof. S. K. Chatterji—Race movements and Pre-historic Culture—History and Culture. of the Indian People. "Vedic page."
16. Ancient History Of The Near East—by Dr. Hall. page 173.
17. Religion and Philosophy of the Vedas and Upanishads. p. 629.
18. —
19. Race Prejudice & Education P: 12, By Dr. Cyril Bibby.
20. Encyclopaedia Americana Vol. 15. page 11.
21. Dr. Kroeber, President Anthropological Association U. S. A. and has to his credit 500 books and monographs.

To be Published

1. PERRENNIAL HINDU CULTURE

and

THE TWIN MYTHS

PART II

2. A TAMIL VERSION OF THE BOOK

3. GURULINGASANGAMAM

PRIEST, TEMPLE AND SANNIYASAM

in

HINDU RELIGION

THE HINDU SCRIPTURE

THE HINDU SCRIPTURE

PART I

A TAMIL VERSION OF THE HINDU

SCRIPTURE

THE HINDU SCRIPTURE

HINDU SCRIPTURE



Rs. 10/-