GIAN GIUSEPPE FILIPPI

THE HOAX OF THE ARYAN INVASION

(What geographic feature stopped the “Aryans” from moving into China?)

The imaginary invasion

The purpose of this paper is to denounce a blatant falsification of history used for political, economic and ideological purposes. In the present case, we will deal with India, which has been and still is the “privileged” objective of a historical dissolvent criticism applied to archaeology and literary studies, because it represents the most ancient civilization in the world with the richest literature and the highest thought ever produced by humanity. For this reason, India is the most aristocratic tradition in the world. This is annoying, especially in this period of cultural flattening, intellectual mediocrity, social egalitarianism, all aimed at the realization of the second principle of thermodynamics adapted to the human species.

Our topic is the theory of the so-called “Aryan” Invasion. We will try to shed some light on this thesis and indicate the reasons and purposes for which it was invented. First of all, we must analyze the meaning of the term ārya. It is an adjective, often substantive, which derives from the verbal Sanskrit root ‘ṛ’ which means to stand high or to move high, to rise. In the śruti and smṛti, ārya means excellent in wisdom, dignity and behaviour. Being the summit of human society, ārya is identical to the archaic Greek ari (ἄρι), elevated, high, good, distinguished. In classical Greek, it remained only as a prefix (especially in its comparative form aristos-on, better) for names and adjectives, including aristocrat, aristocracy, and proper names such as Arion, Aristides, Aristeus, Aristogiton, Aristocles, Aristophanes and Aristotle, always with the sense of distinct, superior. Ārya can therefore be compared to the Latin nobilis, noble, eximious, egregious, eminent, illustrious, out of the ordinary.
Sanskrit Ārya vs “Aryan”

- **Ārya**: term identical to the Greek ἄρι (read ari, AarI), meaning “elevated”, “high”, “good”, “distinguished”
- **Ārya**: meaning comparable to Latin nobilis, “noble”, “eximious”, “egregious”, “eminent”, “illustrious”, “out of the ordinary”
- **“Aryan”**: academical deformation of Ārya suggesting false assonance with the Arian Christian heresy

Those who invented the theory of invasion avoid the Sanskrit term ārya preferring instead the use of the neologism “Aryan”. This word is borrowed from the name of an early Christian heresy, Arianism, an unorthodox doctrine preached by a priest called Arius (256-336 A.D.). This heresy spread mainly among the Germanic and Anglo-Saxon peoples. The choice of the “Aryan” term instead of the Sanskrit ārya is therefore not innocent. It is an appropriately adapted use of a term already familiar to Westerners. For the supporters of the invasion theory, the “Aryans” would have been a population, a race -if in the current climate of freedom, we are still allowed to use this word - with well-defined anthropological traits. In their fantasy, the “Aryans” were a nomadic people tall, robust, blond, light-skinned, with light-coloured eyes, similar to certain northern Anglo-Saxon or Scandinavian populations, of aggressive temperament and fine representatives of a barbaric and nomadic civilization. Certainly, they were barbaric, rough and violent, but curiously enough, they owned the technology of ironworking (ayas) and they had already tamed the horse too.

**Features of the so-called “Aryan” people of India**
- Nomadic
- Descended from North (Eurasia)
- Tall, robust, fair complexion, hair and eyes
- Aggressive, rough and warrior disposition
- Iron craftsmanship and horse taming

**Features of the so-called “non-Arian” Indian peoples**
- Sedentary
- Autochthonous
- Short, frail, dark complexion, hair and eyes
- Peaceful, agricultural and mercantile disposition
- Highly developed technology and social structure but still in the Bronze Age

All the opposite of the ethnic characteristics of the native populations, which with the same effort of fantasy, have been portrayed as tiny, frail, with dark skin and hair, with a peaceful nature and endowed with an advanced technologically sedentary civilization. Although more advanced, they were still at the technological stage of processing a pseudo-bronze, composed of copper and arsenic, from which their
supposed military inferiority. As evidence they pretend to distinguish two different human types of today’s inhabitants of the Subcontinent: the direct descendant of the “Aryans”; and the Dravidians, by some called “tribal” groups. In short: the trivial Marxist distinction between the oppressors and the oppressed.

Why is it wrong to treat the “Aryans” and the Dravidians as two ethnic groups? Because the first term refers to a social elite, the second to a linguistic division. These adjectives belong to two different domains not overlapping. It is like distinguishing the red colour from the salty taste. What we know is that the Dravidian language family is not related to any other language in Eurasia. As for the geographical origin of the people who speak Dravidian languages, there are two hypotheses not supported by any evidence. The first claims that they are indigenous, the second that they came from some area of present-day Iran and, always hypothetically, from a former African cradle.

---

1 To be fair, remains of minority human types akin to Iranian, proto-Australoid, and Mongoloid populations have also been found in Indo-Sarasvatī cemeteries. The Caucasian, Mediterranean, and Alpine designations are ‘anti-racist’ ideological designations, lacking serious anthropometric basis. In North America ‘Caucasian’ means the white race inclusive of the two Jewish ethnic groups, but excluding ‘Hispanics’ and Middle Easterners.
The ancient Bholan valley civilisation has now been recognised as the true source of the Indo-Sarasvati civilisation. Since the time of the Bholan civilization both the so-called “Aryans” and the so-called “Dravidians” already coexisted in a single civilization. Let us now return to the Indus-Sarasvati valley, the mixed composition of the population has also been confirmed by the skeletons unearthed at Mehrgarh in Baluchistan, dating from 5000-6000 BC. The rare cemeteries found south of the towns and villages of this vast area and covering a period from the 7th millennium to 1.500 BC confirm these anthropic data.

No Scandinavian or similar human types were present. What is disconcerting, however, is that in so many millennia there was never a mutation in the ethnic composition of the population of that area up to the present time. Therefore, there is no trace of foreign presence in North India until the Persian, Scythians and Part invasions1 (III century BC to the III century AD) At the same time, among the over 1200 Sites that have been excavated, no settlement of the Indus-Sarasvati civilization shows any traces of violent destruction, fire or massacre. For a long time, archaeologists have debated over the twenty-four skeletons found burnt and calcined on the surface of the outermost layer of Mohanjo Daḍo. Early British excavators speculated that they were the remains of a massacre carried out by the “Aryans” during the destruction of the city. This hypothesis has been refuted. First of all, the human remains were found above the ruins of the most superficial archaeological layer. Secondly, it was proved that they all bore the signs of a typhoid epidemic.

In the end, the most recent conclusion is as follows. The typhoid sick people had been expelled from the surrounding villages in a period dating back to the XV century BC; they had taken refuge among the ruins of the ancient city. Once dead, their bodies had been burnt to prevent contagion. No skeleton bore signs of stab or axe wounds. In other words, archaeology denies the arrival of any foreign population and any consequent war invasion. What was, then, the composition of the population of those big cities and river ports, such as Mohanjo Daḍo, Kalibhangan, Harappa, Surkotada, and the seaports of Dholavira and

1 Anyhow, as we will see later when we discuss the war of the ten Kings, these populations had archaic ethnic affinities with the inhabitants of the āryavarta, the Northern India.
Lothal, plus another thousands of towns and villages? Simply the same as today. All these human settlements have similar characteristics, barely changed over the centuries.

All these cities were planned with rational urbanisation. In them we can still today distinguish the housing estates, characterised by more wealthy residences, from those with buildings reserved to craftsmen and merchants and those with less wealthy but still functional and dignified houses. Just outside the city walls, a fortified citadel was built on an artificial hill, with public buildings, perhaps temples, an ablution kunda and some residential buildings. Only in some cases, the citadel was enclosed within the city walls. It is not difficult to recognize how the citadel, higher than the rest of the city, represented the religious and governmental centre. The urban structure, therefore, corresponds to the patterns of the more recent Hindu cities.

In the year 2000, I directed the excavations of the city of Kāmpilya, locally known as “Drupad Kila”, discovered by my team near Farrukhabad, which in the Mahābhārata is mentioned as the capital of King Drupad’s kingdom of South Pañcāla. The plan of Kāmpilya, surprisingly, can be perfectly overlapped to Dholavira in shape, size and orientation¹.

¹ G.G. Filippi & B. Marcolongo (ed. by), Kāmpilya: Quest for a Mahābhārata City, New Delhi, DK Printworld, 1999; B. Marcolongo (ed. by), First International Symposium on Kāmpilya Project, Padova, CNR, 2001.
This proves that over the centuries the urban planning of the Vastu Śāstra had not changed. Let’s stay a little longer in archaeology. A whole current of Western philologists and Indian philologists of Marxist or Christian faith have tried to interpret the writings of the Indo-Sarasvatī civilization. They moved with the unanimous intention to prove that the language written using pictograms was a Dravidian language. In particular, it was the Soviet and Finnish philological schools that for decades focused their efforts in this direction, using increasingly sophisticated computer and multimedia tools to support their claim. Rivers of ink have been written to demonstrate with certainty this Dravidian origin to prove that Sanskrit, spoken by the hypothetical population of the oppressor “Aryans”, was a language foreign to India. All these efforts have been in vain: the writing of the Indo-Sarasvati Valley to date remains undeciphered.

Sanskrit indeed belongs to a linguistic family that has been called Indo-European, different from the stream of Dravidian languages. Until few decades ago prevailed the XIX century philology, which describes the development of languages from a primitive one, following the model of the Darwinian family tree. Now, however, the opinion of experts has changed and the languages are grouped into families. Three main Indo-European families have been recognised: the Sanskrit-Iranian; the languages today still prevalent in Europe and the Tocharian.

Allow me an observation: glottologists and philologists compare methodologically the Ṛgvedic Sanskrit to the Avestan Persian, not considering, in complete bad faith, that there is a gap of more than two thousand years between the Ṛg Veda and the Avesta. The Avesta, in fact, was written in the Persian language in use in the Sasanian era (III-VII century AD). The relations among the three mentioned linguistic families, are simply marked by affinities due to reciprocal influences and not proceeding from a single origin, as required by the philological application of the Darwinian theory. Therefore, the reconstruction of the so-called proto-Indo-European language is the result of an exercise of fantasy, not different from Esperanto language experiment.
Finally, since the writing of the Indo-Sarasvati civilization has never been deciphered, it is not possible to establish which language they spoke. It does seem that the writing could have been written from right to left, as one example of overlapping suggests. However, not even this observation leads to any definitive conclusion. Indeed, Sanskrit and Prakrit languages of the Brahmi and Kharoshthi inscriptions were written indifferently from right to left and vice versa. Today, even the outlandish hypothesis of a Semitic origin of these two alphabets has been denied¹. Therefore, the investigation of the Harappan graphic system does not bring any evidence about its language.

However, archaeology brings us some material evidence of great utility to reconstruct mostly the religious aspect of the civilization we are dealing with. For example, the presence of lingams is very telling in this respect. A famous glyph, moreover, shows an ascetic with a buffalo head, attacked by a tiger carrying a human figure on its back.

Around the ascetic are placed a human form, a buffalo, a rhino and an elephant. In all probability, it is the iconic representation of the myth of Mahiṣāsura and his duel with the goddess Durgā. As it is well known, Mahiṣa, during the battle narrated in the Devī Mahātmya, took the form of a man, a rhino, a buffalo, an elephant and a tiger. This second tiger is absent from the seal, which is mutilated. In Kālikā Purāṇa the myth is narrated in the same terms, but the conclusion is a bit different: in fact, from the corpse of the asura emerges Rudra, who is the real personality of Mahiṣa. And it is certainly no coincidence that two gazelles appear under the seat of the asura, recalling the Vedic myth of Rudra killing two gazelles, traditionally identified as Prajāpati and Uṣas.

These and other details clearly allude to Tantric tradition. Many Indologists, especially Westerners, maintain that Tantrism was the ancient pre-Aryan religion, without however bringing any proof to this theory.\(^1\)

On the contrary, they maintain that it is impossible to find traces of Vedic tradition in the Indo-Sarasvatī civilization. But this is not true at all. Even Dr Asko Parpola, an ardent supporter of the Dravidian origin of this civilization, has written a book that proves the opposite of his belief.\(^2\) This book carefully analyses the sculptures representing Brahmanic priestly figures found in this vast area. In particular, it focusses on what is commonly known as the King-Priest. This proves beyond any doubt that the dress worn by the priests is a dhotī (Skr. dhautī) of exactly the same shape as that worn by brāhmaṇas even today. In

---

\(^1\) This does not take into account that the basis of the whole Tantric tradition is mainly found in Atharva Veda, as testified by Muktikā Upaniṣad.

particular, the dress worn by the King-Priest still bears traces of red and blue colours in the interstices of its pattern representing the starry sky. Dr Parpola brilliantly identified in this dhoti the tarpyā dress used by Vedic sacrificers for the most solemn rituals. In addition to ablution kunda surrounded by brick-pillars, Vedic fire altars were discovered in Kalibhangan and Lothal.

Another feature is the attention that the inhabitants of the area paid to bovine cattle. Seals, clay figures, vascular decorations reproduced all kinds of bull, buffalo, zebu, as well as other horned animals. There are hundreds of figures of a bovine considered by some to be a unicorn, but evidently it is a kind of bovine whose horns appear superimposed. Furthermore, Bovine horns were also affixed on the heads of human figures, either directly or grafted on a headgear. Even tigers and elephants were sometimes adorned with a pair of bovine horns. This suggests a special religious attention to the bull, which has survived to the present time in the Hindū respect for the cow, calf and bull, deified as Nandin.

Moreover, depictions of characters in yogic positions both in sculptures and engraved in glyphs are quite common.

It is also beyond doubt that burials were rather rare, while there are traces of cremation ashes collected in terracotta pots abound. At this point, we can draw some conclusions. The religious tradition of this
ancient Indian civilization has left clear traces of the coexistence of the Vedic sacrificial religion and Tantrism, exactly as can be verified in the present reality of the sanātana dharma.

We will now quickly consider the information contained in the world’s most archaic literary monument, the Rg Veda Samhitā. According to invasion theory, the Rg Veda would have been elaborated in a “primitive” Sanskrit, as the sacred text of a proto-Hinduism called ‘Vedism’ around 1200 BC, a date close to the supposed “Aryan” invasion of Northern India. Let us briefly consider these early statements. First consideration: Vedic Sanskrit, far from representing a primitive language, was more complex than the classical Sanskrit of Pānini and Patañjali: the noun has eight cases instead of seven the conjugation of the verbs included also the conjunctive mode, which disappeared in the classical language, and the optative tense has four tenses instead of only one. The Darwinian rule of evolution from “simple to complex” applied to linguistics here is completely contradicted.

Second consideration: the dating of the Veda was proposed by Friedrich Max Müller, the Victorian court sanskritist, and is based on the following reasoning: Buddha lived about 500 BC. This was unilaterally established by the European indologists of the colonial era. Traditionally, however, the Buddhists dated it to about 1000 BC. Since several Upaniṣads, among which the Brhadāraṇyaka, Chāndogya and Taittirīya are evidently pre-Buddhist, they must have been written around 600 BC. The Upaniṣads are highly sophisticated and abstract literature. Therefore, evolutionistically speaking, they must represent an advanced stage of human civilization compared to the ritualistic technicalities of Brāhmaṇas and Arāṇyakas. Being, therefore, considered “less intellectually advanced”, these texts have been placed in a period between 800 and 600 BC. The Sāma and Yajus Saṃhitās, on which Brāhmaṇas and Arāṇyakas are based, would have been elaborated from 1000 to 800 BC. The Rg Veda, which presents the most archaic language, was consequently dated by Max Müller around 1200 BC, thus representing the young and spontaneous poetic work of the “Aryan” warriors during their invasion of Northern India.

One hundred and fifty years have passed since this completely unscientific and arbitrary dating was formulated, and to date, no indologist or sanskritist, not even any Indian ones, has dared to denounce its total senselessness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max Müller’s dating of the Rg Veda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a matter of fact, the dating of the Rg Veda, refers to more ancient times. Especially in this samhitā, the sacred river par excellence is not the Gangā, but the Sarasvatī, the most copious, impetuous, divine watercourse of the sapta sindhu rivers.
The Sarasvatī originated in the eastern Himalayas and ran from north-east to south-west almost parallel to the Indus, crossing the salt desert of the Rann in the Kach (Kutch) of Gujrat. Abundant with water for several millennia, fed by the remaining glaciers of the last ice age, the Sarasvatī lost its impetus over time, dividing itself into smaller watercourses. In the end, it disappeared, swallowed up by the Thar desert (of which the Rann is an offshoot), because its subsoil does not have an impermeable layer of clay. Extensive hydrogeological studies have shown that the Sarasvatī river disappeared completely between 2000 and 1900 BC, leaving only some sporadic emerging meanders such as the Gagghar, Hakra, Sutlej and other minor ones. This proves that the Vedas and Rg Veda, in particular, attest to a much greater antiquity than what is continually repeated not only in popularization books but also in university manuals. But there is another instrument of dating which the Vedas offer and which is not falsifiable, namely the mentions of celestial events: Rg Veda (V.40.5-9) describes a partial solar eclipse, which took place on the meridian of Kurukṣetra, the day after the summer solstice in the afternoon. This eclipse could only happen on 26 July 3928 BC. In 1894, Herman G. Jacobi, based on his study on precession of the equinoxes, placed the composition of Rg Veda around the fifth millennium BC. Yajurveda and Atharvaveda place the vernal equinox, which today is in Pisces, in Krttikā nakṣatra, the Pleiades, i.e., from the 26° 40’ of Aries to the 10° of Taurus; the same goes for the summer solstice, today in Cancer, which fell in Magha nakṣatra, from the 8° to the 13° 20’ of Leo. These two data correspond roughly to 2400 BC. In this way, the period of elaboration of the Vedas would be between 4000 and 2000 BC. It seems incredible that such relevant data are not taken into any consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 BC</td>
<td>Sarasvatī river’s disappearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3928 BC</td>
<td>Solar eclipse (Rg Veda V.40.5-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400 BC</td>
<td>Vernal equinox in Pleiades (Yajur Veda and Atharva Veda)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarkably, the dating obtained from the geo-archaeological data compared with the descriptions of the impetuous Sarasvatī and the comparison between astronomical calculations and literary astral descriptions coincide. The civilization described in the Vedas and Rg Veda, in particular, correspond to

---

1 The salt desert was formed precisely due to the sinking of the Sarasvatī. The river flowed into the Arabian Sea where the city of Dwarka stands today.
4 Koenraad Elst, Update on the Aryan Invasion Debate, New Delhi, Aditya Prakashan, 1999.
the mature phase of the Bholan civilization and its development in the seven rivers plain. The āryas appear there as a cultured and refined class, certainly not dedicated to nomadism, although colonization of new lands occurred. The famous term ayas, frequently translated as “iron”, actually means metal in general. This corresponds exactly to the results of archaeological excavations that have found no presence of iron artefacts except from 1300 BC onwards, that is when the Vedic civilization had moved to the Doab, the land between Ganges and Yamunā, due to the desertification of the Thar and the disappearance of the Sarasvatī. It is in that period of the Iron Age that the Ganges was first recognized as the main sacred river of India.

Therefore, there is no trace of any indigenous populations, more civilised but weaker, to be subjugated. But the imagination of the supporters of the “Aryan” invasion found a way to fill this gap. And so, the mythological struggles between devas and asuras, between ādityas and daityas or dasyu, have been interpreted as wars for the conquest of territories of the original inhabitants (ādivāsi') waged by the “Aryan” invaders. Unfortunately, the Vedas tell that ādityas and daityas were half-brothers, children of the same father, Kaśyapa and two sisters: Aditi and Diti. The relationship between devas and asuras is also similar: in many passages, the asuras are defined as ancestors of the devas, just as in Greco-Roman mythology the Titans represent the parents of the gods. The passage from Gods of the night to solar Gods takes place with the passage through dawn, Uṣas; and it is a fact that Varuṇa, the God of the celestial vault, appears alternately as an asura and a deva. Furthermore, both Gods and asuras are divided into four castes: for example, Brāhmapati is the Brahmanic caste God. Similarly, Vṛtra is a brāhmaṇ among the asuras. In the Vedic myth, after killing Vṛtra, Indra had to undergo long penances because he, a kṣatriya, had dared to kill a brāhmaṇa. The theory according to which in the Vedas the Gods are the counterfigures of the Aryans and the asuras or dasyus (or dāsa, meaning servant) of the native population enslaved by the invaders is definitively proved to be pure ideology.

**INTERPRETATION OF Rg Vedic Myths According to the Invasion Theory**

- Rivalry between Āditya and Daitya. (Āditya = “Aryan”, Daitya or Dāsa, servant = Dravidian)
- Fight between Deva and Asura, mythical memory of the “Aryan” invasion. Deva = “Aryans”, Asura = Dravidians

**True Vedic Evidence**

- Ādityas and Daityas were half-siblings
- Asuras were progenitors of the Deva
- Varuṇa, god of the sky, in night-time is Asura and in daytime is Deva

One of the strongest arguments in favour of the “Aryan” invasion theory was for a long time the absence of images of horses from the excavations of the Indo-Sarasvatī civilization. A couple of terracotta figurines, perhaps toys, and a single seal depicting a horse had been found; but the doubt remained

---

1 Gandhian “politically correct” term transmitting the idea that these peoples are the original inhabitants of India, thus suggesting the idea of the “Aryan invasion”. In reality, most of these peoples living in the forests, deserts and mountains immigrated in medieval times from Indochina, Pamir and Transhimalaya highlands if not even from southern China.
whether they were horses, donkeys or onagers, then as now numerous in the Gujrat. Indeed, the *Vedas* often refer to the importance of this domestic animal, which dragged the battle chariots of the ārya warriors. It was the preferred victim of the *aśvamedha*, the solemn sacrifice that, within a year, consecrated a king (*adhipā, rājanya*) to the universal rank of emperor (*samrāt, cakravartin*). Also known in Vedic mythology are Dadhikri, the horse of King Trasadasyu; Dadhiaṅc, the horse-headed sage; the divine twins Aśvini, the horse-headed physicians of the gods with their steed Paidva; Etaṅa, the horse of the sun; and many others.

Finally, however, six horse skeletons dated between 2200 and 1700 BC were found in Surkotada. So even this wrong assumption was eventually overcome. The most interesting thing is that these skeletons have 34 ribs, like the Arab horses, and not 36 like the Central Asian horses; this confirms that they were not imported by invaders from the North. The unresolved problem remains as to why the horse just once appears in the glyphs, perhaps due to some religious prohibition. On the other hand, not even the Indian lion is ever depicted, even though the region of the seven rivers is the natural habitat of this great feline.

There is, however, an important episode narrated in the *Rg Veda* (VII.18 and LXXXIII.4-8) that academic studies do not keep sufficiently in consideration. It is the tale of the Ten Kings War. In summary, it is about the conflict between Sudāsa, King of the Eastern Purus, his allied tribes of Trtṣu and of Bharata on one side, and a rival alliance of ten tribes on the other. Before the conflict, all participants on both sides were āryas. We refrain from narrating the whole episode. Suffice to say that Sudāsa eventually prevailed, pushing the enemy to the edge of the ārya homeland, the āryāvarta. Some of them were declared *anārya*, ignoble, and disappeared from the area of the Subcontinent. The ten tribes were:

- **Alina**: a tribe of Iranian type declared *anārya*; it occupied present-day Nuristan;
- **Anu**: ārya tribe that remained in India;
- **Brghu**: ārya tribe that remained in India;
- **Bhalana**: a tribe of Iranian type declared *anārya*; it moved to the Bholan valley in Baluchistan;
- **Dāsa**: in Persian language Daha, a tribe of Iranian type declared *anārya*; it moved to present-day Turkmenistan;
- **Druhyu**: ārya tribe that settled in Gāndhāra;

---

2 The King’s name contains the term *dāsa*, servant. However, he was not of servile caste nor was he a dasyu (or a Dravidian, according to the Invasion Theory). On the contrary, he was the champion hero of the āryas.
Matsya: this tribe was divided into two groups: the first, ārya, moved to the right bank of the Yamunā south of the Pañcāla; the second, become anārya, called Madhya in Iranian language, the Medes, moved to Persia;

Parśu: the Persians, a tribe of Iranian type declared anārya;

Puru or Prthu were also divided into two groups: the first, ārya, moved to northern Pañcāla. The Kurus descended from it; the second became the anārya tribe of the Parthians and moved to what is now Persia;

Pani or Parni: a tribe of Iranian type declared anārya, known as Scythians or Śāka, migrated to Transoxiana.

Speaking of this war, there is an important episode¹ that tells of a battle near the city of Hariyūpiyāh, where the Purus were defeated. We can speculate that Hariyūpiyāh is the present day the village of Harappa; it is well known that geographical names rarely change. Many toponyms are of truly prehistoric origin.

With this, it seems to me that the theory of the “Aryan” invasion has no real foundation and that it was produced in colonial times for precise purposes, which we will now examine.

Prejudicial motivations:

1. Religious bias. For Christians, especially Protestants who are more attentive to the Old Testament of the Bible, the idea that there may be a religion older than the Jewish religion of Abraham and Moses is little tolerated. The religion expressed in the Bible must in every way be at the origin of man’s spiritual history. Therefore, the civilizations that appeared before the Hebrew-Semitic one had to be post-dated to fit the Bible. And Max Müller was always a fervent Lutheran.

2. Cultural bias. The most developed historical civilisation is represented by the Greek one, which spread in the ancient world through the Roman imperial expansion. That is to say, Western civilisation. Everything different from western civilisation must be considered barbaric, corrupt, vicious, despotic. In one word: “oriental”.

3. Religious-cultural prejudice. It is the mixture of the first two prejudices: The sublime Greek-Roman civilization was perfected by the revelation of the God of the Bible. This represents the absolute superiority of Western civilization over the entire world.

4. Social prejudice. Slavery, i.e., where a human being is the property of another human being, was maintained until 1833 in England; but in India, the indenture system or debt bondage system slavery was maintained by the British until 1920. Slavery was abolished only in 1848 in France and 1865 in the United States, and so on. Despite this, Europeans keep criticizing the caste system as inhuman, which is made up of free men even if hierarchical. This led to a moralistic assessment that was unfavourable to India and its entire history.

5. Darwinian prejudice. Over the millennia men progressed by natural selection and adaptation to new circumstances. A civilization that has remained intact for centuries and millennia must be the product of an unevolved human race. Therefore, the white race, and in particular the Anglo-Saxon, is the most

¹ Rg Veda, VI.27.4-8.
evolved and is destined for leading the other less fortunate races. Darwin himself theorized the principles of biological racism in his *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*.

6. Progressive prejudice. According to the previous point, an unevolved race does not progress technologically, sociologically, politically.

**Ideological motivations:**

In this context, the same false data on the invasion are used in two different and only apparently opposed ways. The first one looks favourably on the “Aryan” invasion:

1. **Colonialist ideology.** Darwinianly, the fittest must survive and dominate. The “Aryans” were a young people, full of energy; they invaded the weak and decadent indigenous people, the so-called Dravidians. Subsequently, there were other waves of “Aryans” who came to India, subduing the previous waves: the Parthians, the Scythians, the Sasanids. Each of these waves was entitled to subdue the previous by right of strength, as this is both a biological and historical rule. This is how humanity progresses, which legitimizes the right of invasion. The last legitimate “Aryan” invasion would be the British one. This was affirmed several times in Parliament by Winston Churchill when he was Secretary of State for the Colonies (1921-1922).¹

   The second ideology considers the invasion negatively:

2. **Christian missionary ideology,** the “ Aryans” invaded India to impose their dominion by violence over the peaceful native populations. The occupation was then maintained with the imposition of the caste system. The invaders established themselves as the three dominant castes, so the natives, the true inhabitants of India were forced to become servants of the “Aryans”. Therefore, through conversion and baptism, the caste of the servants could regain a new, more dignified social status. Being the British Protestant Christians, the “ādivāsī” could aspire to right of social improvement, if not of equality. In practice, this led to a great deal of conversions, especially among the so-called tribals. In the tribal environment, Catholic missionaries were particularly active, adding a revolutionary element against the high castes considered descendants of the invaders, the “Aryans”. From India’s independence onwards, the aberrant “liberation theology” has gained ground, with the consequent support for terrorism from Catholic missionaries, especially the Naxalite tribal one. However, this action of support to insurgent groups often turned against its own propagators. The Buddhization of the Dalit movement² has greatly limited Christian missionary success.

3. **Marxist ideology of various tendencies:** the preaching of the different Marxist, Marxist-Leninist, Maoist movements has been in many ways similar to that of the Catholic missionaries, if not in collusion. Here too the aim was to convert the lower strata of the population to the various communist “Churches”. The aim was to unleash a social and political revolution against

¹ Obviously, this theory did not take into account the invasions of the Arabs and the Turkish-Mongolians who aren’t “Arians”.

² “The oppressed”, a modern, ideologized term to define the *caṇḍāla*, the untouchables made impure by their occupation, such as necrophors, butchers, leather tanners, etc. Dalits, attracted by the possibility of a social advancement, in the past converted to Islam and Christianity (especially Catholicism). In the XX century they preferred to switch to a “reformed Buddhism”, created just for them, considering Buddhism indigenous and not a foreign religion.
the racist, capitalist and exploitative ruling classes, in the pay of the imperialist and ex-colonialist powers, to make India a vassal of the Soviet Union or China.

4. Practice of *Divide et impera* (divide and rule): very different powerful actors are involved in this practice aiming to weaken the Indian Union or even to break it apart, continuing the work begun with the Partition. It is a question of sowing the seeds of hatred between the southern Dravidians and the northern “Aryans” and preaching the secession. First of all, there is China with its policy of hegemony over all Asia, assisted by Pakistan and to some extent by Nepal and Bangladesh; secondly, certain North American multinationals, Banks and financial speculators. The latter groups mostly rely on Protestant sects and Israeli interests, often at odds with those of their governments. Finally, the Catholic Church and its mass conversion plan to leverage the poorer classes.
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