

History of Ancient India: Distorted and Mutilated

The national history taught in schools has tended to encourage the most general and terrifying of existing evils, “human presumptions and particularly intellectual arrogance,” or in other words self righteousness. Wrong history is being taught in all countries, all the time, unavoidably; while we have great need of history, our first need is to *unlearn* most of what we have been taught.

[Customize Links](#) Historian Herbert Butterfield¹

HERBERT J. MULLER (1958: 28) writes that on a national scale, history becomes the kind of prejudice and conceit that led Paul Valery to call history the most dangerous product ever concocted by the chemistry of the brain. Muller says that Valery wrote:

“It (History) causes dreams, it makes nations drunk, it saddles them with false memories, it exaggerates their reflexes, it keeps their old sores running, it torments them when they are at rest, and it induces in them megalomania and the mania of persecution. It makes them bitter, arrogant, unbearable, and full of vanity.”

One will find history all of this – prejudice, conceit, false memories, exaggerations, absurdities, arrogance, vanity – when one reads what European historians have said about the age and authorship of the Vedas, Sanskrit, Swastika, Dravidians and their languages, origin of the Aryans, Hindu gods, etc. It becomes apparent that these historians have been successful in crafting confusion by distorting the dates of significant events related to the ancient history of Bharat, the West envied. It seems, European scholars have knowingly ignored what is written in Vedic scriptures, saying that they are mythological and not historically worth believing. They claim they know better than India’s native scholars and scriptures know. The East India Company brought in missionaries and introduced them as Sanskrit scholars to translate Vedic scriptures who with the help of bribed poor Pundits to translate our scriptures to fit in their hidden ethno-political agenda.

This has happened not only with India, but with several countries, colonized by the West, particularly by the Britain. Histories have been written by victors. Their pen had colonial power to write what they wanted to, with the purpose to infuse in the Indian psyche ethnic inferiority complex. They succeeded. Impressions, implanted by first histories, become too deep to get erased. Post-independence sixty years are not enough for a nation, particularly for India has been under bondage for over a millennium to wake up from colonial soothing anesthesia.

Thus history, particularly of ancient India, has been obscured and confused. This has been more adversely affected because of the attitude of indifference towards history on the part of ancient Hindu historians. Lieut. Col. F. Wilford, in the Asiatic Society of Bengal's research series, led by William Jones (1746-94), section: "*On the Ancient Geography of India*" (Vol. XIV, pp.374-376), says that some Puranas have information about the names of some mansions, geographical tracts, mountains, rivers, etc., but without any explanations about them. Wilford also describes his difficulties and frustrations in collecting relevant data, mainly because of lack of adequate cooperation from Pundits and Hindu historians.

If Wilford had received full cooperation and if historians, over the years, referred to the ancient names of the rivers and towns in addition to their respective modern names, we would have been able to get clearer picture of ancient India's geographical spread. The history of ancient India, therefore, has been erroneous and infected with several gaps.

Unfortunately, still there are many who believe that it is because of Britain India has a long network of railways, universities, drainage system, etc. They think India would have not uplifted herself if Britain were not there. They, being great angrez-raj-bhagta, refuse to realize what India – who has technologically achieved so much during sixty years of her independence – would have achieved if she had independence of more than a millennium. Bharat would have soared through the roof to touch the sky. We should know that the Britain did not allow India have industries except textile. Raw material was exported to Britain for importing back the products manufactured thereof.

In order to know what India would have been if she had independence long back, they should read books on the five thousand year old Indus Valley civilization to know that its two main cities, Mooanjodaro in Sindh and Harrapa in the Punjab, had parallel broad avenues, great drainage system, public swimming pool, brick houses with a well inside, etc. The people were literate and had know how about architecture and city planning. They knew technology of ship building and navigation because of which they had maritime links with Egypt, Mesopotamia (present Iraq), Asia Minor, Bahrain, etc. Bharat had Nalanda Vishwa Vidyalaya in her ancient times. Sanskrit dictionary had "Vishwa Vidyalaya" word for university.

Temple of History has been maligned

E. Pococke, in his "*India In Greece*" or "*Truth in Mythology*" (preface, p. vii), seems helplessly rebuking the European scholarship for destroying the temple of history:

"A gigantic mass of absurdities now lies exposed, for a sifting examination. It remains for the patient sagacity of European scholarship, working upon both Occidental and Oriental materials, to re-build, I trust, upon no unstable foundation, that Temple of History which national vanity has destroyed, and whose ruins national Bud'hism has obscured."

Pococke further writes (p. ix): "Our ignorance it is which has made a myth of history; and our ignorance is an Hellenic inheritance, much of it the result of Hellenic vanity." Why Pococke, it seems, has titled this book also as, "*Truth in Mythology*". European scholarship ignorance or rejection of the oriental history is the product of their belief – unconscious or deliberate – that oriental mythologies as contained in their respective traditional scriptures are sentimental and do not give history. Ironically, it reflects their double standards. They themselves consider their own Biblical mythologies as reliable history.

Should one be called a scholar who is shy of admitting his errors?

In light of recent research, including excavations, pointing to the previous inaccuracies, the example of Donald Foster comes to my mind. Foster admitted that his work to establish Shakespeare as the author of an obscure poem was incorrect. Foster candidly admitted his mistake, and gave a very important message of professional ethics to scholars, particularly historians: "No one who cannot rejoice in the discovery of his own mistakes deserves to be called a scholar."²

History and Identity:

Wrong and misinterpreted history has confused Hindus about their identity and about the antiquity of their heritage. They have questions about the origin of Aryans and about Aryan invasion. If you want to weaken a nation, distort its history. If you want to destroy a community, confuse its ethno-cultural identity and heritage. Western colonials have done this to the ancient Hindu nation in general, and to the history of Sind, in particular. Sind is the region of the Indus (Sindhu) Valley civilization, which is the core civilization of Hind (Hindustan), the Hindu Samaj. The word "*Hind*" has been derived from the word "*Sind*", "*Hindi*"

from “*Sindhi*”, and “*Hindu*” from “*Sindhu*”. History of Sind reflects lot about history of India. Henry Cousens, in his “*The Antiquities of Sind*” (1929, p. 13), describes the history of Sind as full of contradictions and confusion:

“Materials for the history of Sind, previous to the time of the Arab conquest in A.D. 711, are meager indeed, and what exist are contained almost solely in the accounts of a few Arab writers. The most lucid account, though very short, of the country immediately preceding the establishment of Arab rule in the province, is to be found in the *Chach Namah* which is a Persian translation of a work written by Ali, son of Muhammad Kufi, in A.D. 1216. Two later works on the history of Sind – the *Tarikh-i-Masumi* or *Tarikh-i-Sindh* and *Tuhfatu-l-Kiram* – were to a great extent based upon the *Chach Namah* in their accounts of the earlier periods.³ The history of Sind, as told by its own historians, with contradictions and various spellings of names, is very confusing; but this is as nothing to the hopeless tangle caused by the contradictory translations and commentaries of modern writers, each of whom is perfectly convinced in his own mind that he alone is right. ... Nor do Hiuen Tsiang’s brief and perplexing references help us much more. A long dark period of a thousand years in which we catch glimmers of the White Huns and other invaders, is as yet untraversed by any but the faintest rays of light.”

Cousens writes that *Chach Namah*, also known as the *Tarikh-i-Hind wa Sind*, was originally written in Arabic. He further writes that the history of Sind, as written by its own historians, is full of contradictions and confusion.

As a matter of fact, the history of Sind, as suggested by Cousens, was not written by Sind’s natives, Sindhi Hindus. Rather, it was written by Arabs in Arabic followed by faulty translations. This history – *Tarikh-i-Hind wa Sind* – does not illustrate what had happened to, or in Sind before the Arab invasions. The pre-711 AD history of Sind would have helped Sindhis to know their 5000 year long heritage. The Moanjudaro seals would have told more, if they were fully deciphered. How will the future Sindhi Hindu generations will know that their grand parents were born and raised in Sind when they read the book entitled as “*Five Thousand Years of Pakistan*”, published in 1950, when Pakistan was not even three year old? The name “Indus” for “Sindhu Nadi” may not convince many youngsters that it ran through Sind. The same way, how would the name “India” for “Aryavarta” or “Bharat” convince us that none, but Bharat (Aryavarta) is the original home of the Aryans and their language Sanskrit?

Herbert J. Muller⁴ tells that Herbert Butterfield, himself a historian, feels that the national history taught in schools has encouraged the most general and terrifying of existing evils, human presumptions and intellectual arrogance. He concludes:

"While we have great need of history, our first need is to *unlearn* most of what has been taught. A superficial, confused and distorted notion of history is far more dangerous than ignorance of it."

We have blindly endorsed most of the ethno-socio-cultural theories, particularly – "*Aryan Invasion of India*", "*Aryans and Dravidians*", and "*Indo-European Family of Languages*" – which have been expounded by Western scholars with their missionary agenda to confuse our heritage. Our own politicians have remained apathetic, silent, indifferent, and unconcerned. It seems, they have been resisting getting history of ancient India corrected, apparently because of political reasons, fear of losing minority votes.

The historian Graham Hancock, in '*Underworld: The Mysterious Origins of Civilization*' (2002, p.116), remarks: "Almost every thing that was ever written about this (Indus) civilization before five years ago is wrong." Mr. Hancock concludes that during most of the twentieth century, the archaeological record refused to reveal evidence of the Indus civilization's long period of development. This created a vacuum, a dark hole in history, European scholars took advantage of. Hancock remarks: "European scholars felt free to conclude that the Indus Valley civilization might, in its origin, have been alien to India." We know that the socio-cultural and religious landscape, before the advent of Muslims in the region, was very much similar, if not identical, to that in the rest of Bharat.

Hancock (2002:169) explains how the culture of the ancient India has been scholarly misinterpreted:

"The Indus-Sarasvati civilization was a literate culture, but the archaeological interpretation of it has been strictly limited to excavated material remains and has never been able to draw upon the civilization's own texts. This is because all attempts to decipher the enigmatic 'Harappan' script have failed, and because (at least until very recently) the Sanskrit Vedas were regarded as the work of another, later culture and were assumed to have had nothing to do with the Indus-Sarasvati civilization. Well into the twentieth century, this approach simply meant that there was no Indus-Sarasvati civilization. It was not part of the archaeological picture of India's past and was never even contemplated. It was, in other words, as 'lost' as Plato's Atlantis until the material evidence that proved its existence began to surface when excavations were started at Harappa and Mohenjo-daro in 1920s."

Even now, for some or even larger section of the world society – the Eastern (particularly Indian) as well as the Western – the Sindhu (Indus) Valley civilization has remained lost as Plato's Atlantis, because of the reasons:

- The first-written-history has strong impact, because it gets implanted in the reader's mind too deep and too hard to disbelieve it. Old is considered wisdom and truth. Wrong history has gone down to so many generations.
- All do not read new developments.
- There are few Donald Fosters who have scholarly grace and integrity to admit their wrongs. Most of the post-1920s scholars do not admit that whatever was written earlier was not right. Some even twist things around to reinterpret them as facts.
- Some Indian scholars have attempted to modify the history by reinterpreting the events in light of new historic developments. The general tendency is to discard them as sentimental and communal. Unfortunately, nationalism is being politically branded as communalism and fundamentalism. Such sort of contra-nationalistic thinking is being considered as a progressive fad, and nationalistic persons are criticized as conservative and backward. Previously, colonial ethnic politics was out to distort the ancient history of India, now our own domestic politics has been a strong obstacle against correction of the historic distortions.

The illiteracy among the massive rural segment of the society has prevented many from reading such a wrong and ethnically injurious history.

Arya is a Sanskrit word. It appears numerous times in the Rig Veda, which was composed at least two thousand years prior to the Indus civilization. The Indus civilization was established more than a millennium before 1500 B.C., the time the Aryans allegedly invaded India. How, then, can one talk about the 'Aryan invasion of India'?

.

Sind after Arabs conquered it in 711 A.D.?

Henry Cousens (p. 1) writes:

"Sind is a land of sepulchers and dust, of "holy" shams and "holy" humbugs. When the good old times under Hindu rule gave way to Muhammadan domination, the principal concern of its rulers seems to have been for the selfish pleasures of the living and the glorification of their dead. It has been a country very fruitful in the production of *pirs* or holy men; and, though some of these have, no doubt, been earnest

disciples of the Prophet, many more have made it a cover for base and selfish motives.”

The cultural face of Sindh was systematically transformed from ‘Hindu’ to ‘Muslim’. The names of most of the towns, cities, lakes, rivers, canals, and various public places were changed to erase its *Vedic* (Hindu) identity. The same was done to the history of the countries with their names suffixing in ‘istan’ to the extent that their original historical identity has been buried too deep for even historians to know. Post-1947 Sindh continues to suffer from this quiet cultural agenda. *Ram Baugh* in Karachi is renamed as ‘*Aaraam Baugh*’, and a book titled: “*Five Thousand Years of Pakistan: An Archaeological Outline*” was published in 1950, when Pakistan was only three years old. In its Preface, Fazlur Rahman, the then Minister of Commerce and Education in Pakistan remarks:

“This book has been compiled for the purpose of presenting both to Pakistan and to the outside world a brief sketch of the imposing material heritage of Pakistan in the form of ancient buildings, sites and cultures prior to the death of the emperor Aurangzeb in A.D. 1707. In quantity, in range and in quality, this heritage is one of which the new Dominion may be justly proud.”

Mr. Rahman, consciously or unconsciously, seems to have avoided the use of word – Hindu or Vedic – although there is a reference to Buddhist art. Most of the book is crowded with descriptions of tiled mosques, Moghul fortresses and tombs. Rightly, he seems to call it as “material heritage of Pakistan”, not cultural nor spiritual. Mr. Rahman states Pakistan’s history-related agenda:

“The story of these things is worth the telling and re-telling, in every school and university of the land. The heritage of Pakistan must be kept alive if the future is to grow strongly and healthily out of it. It will be no good to tie new leaves on to a dead tree.”

In other words, Rahman does not want Pakistan be connected with ancient culture whom he seems to brand as “a dead tree”. Then, how does he brag about the five thousand year old heritage of Pakistan? The book tells how history can be distorted and mutilated.

Technically, it is right that the heritage of the natives (mainstream Muslims) of Pakistan is five thousand years long and even longer. But for Rahman, the pre-711 A.D. religio-cultural tree of Sind should be considered “dead”.

Cousens (p.1) has cited Elliot's⁵ description of the squandering of public funds by Talpurs:

“It notoriously swarms with sanctified beggars and imposters, and contains, according to the current saying, no less than 100,000 tombs of saints and martyrs, besides ecclesiastical establishments, which, under the Talpurs, absorbed one-third of the entire revenue of the state.”

I recall that in my boyhood days in Sindh, a person, who squandered his money, was taunted as a Talpur. But, I think Talpurs knew that swarm of tombs would give Sind new religio-cultural face to Sind.

Traditional name of a country reflects its identity

Ceylon, immediately after getting independence, regained its ancient name ‘Sri Lanka’. Sri Lankans feel sentimentally associated and emotionally connected with it. The foreign-given name ‘Ceylon’ would not accurately convey to Sri Lankans their cultural history. India has not yet regained its traditional name and it seems is not going to. Its constitutional name “Bharat” is no more than a paper name. It has not been known to the international community at the United Nations, excepting a few neighboring countries, such as Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, etc. None of India’s post-independence governments has shown effective interest to give India its original name.

The name, especially of a nation, speaks immeasurably of its history and culture. The name of a nation is a stepping-stone to define the identity of its original people and the antiquity of their society. India – because of its politics and the traditional indifference of its people to its history and national identity⁶ – has been sleeping over the issue. Its metropolis cities – Bombay, Madras and Calcutta – have regained their respective traditional names – Mumbai, Chennai, and Kolkata.

Original names reflect history

Distortion or mutilation of history is done by burring them too deep to see the sunshine. Victors, invaders, colonialists, or occupiers, in general, do not want the world, particularly the people of present India, know about the glories of the ancient India. They change the name of the country or region they occupy, and also the names of its towns, rivers, mountains, streets, gardens, etc. to insure that the future generations would not know who were its original masters. This has happened to so many countries in the Middle East comprising of Asia Minor, Iran, Egypt, Mesopotamia, Bahrain, etc.; and also several countries in Central Asia

including Balochistan, Afghanistan, Tadjhistan (Tajikistan), Turkmenistan, Turkistan or Turkestan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan. Countries with their names suffixing with 'istan' or 'stan'. could be part of Greater India in its ancient times. '*Sthan/stan*' is a Sanskrit word, meaning 'place'. According to *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, by Vaman Shivram Apte (1992:1007), '*sthanam*' means "A state, place, spot, site, locality, station, position, etc." Some say that "istan" is a Persian/Iranian word. It is possible. Both Sanskrit and Avestan have the same or similar word for land. It is known that ancient Sanskrit and ancient Avestan languages were linguistically very close to each other.

History of a country should be its true story right from its birth to the present time. Unfortunately, histories of most colonized countries have been distorted and mutilated to the extent that their respective natives do not know, even unable to know so many important things related to their mother, including her original name, language, age of her scriptures, etc. This is true about India. Even history students of India do not know. How can they know when their professors are ignorant? Most post-independence governments of India, because of their political concerns, do not want historians to reconstruct the history of ancient Bharat.

Pococke (p.1) has observed:

"An illustrious geographer has well observed that the names which geography, particularly physical geography, has consecrated, may be considered the most important documents of primitive history, or of history anterior to chronology. ... Had that geographical nomenclature been preserved pure and entire, a map of the world might have been obtained, more valuable by far than the Universal Histories."

Pococke (pp.6,7) seems to lament that Greeks have inherited a mass of disfigured documents. This has been made more difficult by the superscriptions of new tales over the old parchment. He seems to believe that fortunately, since no erasures have been made, the text of the old history needs to be restored. But he laments:

"Our way seems effectually barred by the dictum of those theorist who virtually define 'ancient history' as 'invention'. I deeply regret this spirit of theorising; it has been gaining ground of late years in Germany; and, but

recently, its most able exponent in this country has carried this principle into the regions of hypercriticism.”⁷

Pococke (pp.6-7) talks about an “able writer” in the Edinburgh Review, who says:

“The real question at issue is not so much whether there was a basis of his historical truth for the poetical legend; whether any such events as the siege of Thebes, or the expedition against Troy, actually occurred; as whether we are now able to extricate this kernel of truth from the mass of fable with which it is overgrown, and to exhibit the naked skeleton of historical fact, stripped of all its coverings of poetical embellishment.”

Pococke further writes (pp.7-8): “When we find the same nation (reference seems to be to India) who were the colonists of Greece, composing not only history but also mathematical treatises in a poetic form, this poetical form will produce, in our minds, no solid objection against the statements contained therein. ... What we read as poetry, and legend, was once accredited history, and the only genuine history which the first Greeks could conceive or relish of their past time. Curtain conceals nothing behind, and cannot by any ingenuity be withdrawn.”⁸

Pococke (p.8) explains that “the curtain is the picture”, the picture is Indian and the curtain is now withdrawn.

British East India Company & Distortion of History

Dr. K. M. Munshi, the founder of the *Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan*, in his foreword to Majumdar’s “*History and Culture of the Indian People*” (1988:8-9), points out to the damage, several British scholars have intentionally inflicted on the history of the Indian culture:

"The attempts of British scholars, with the exception of Tod, wherever they have taken these ‘*histories*’ as reliable source-books, have hindered rather than helped the study of Indian history. Unfortunately for us, during the last two hundred years, we have not only to study such histories but unconsciously to mould our whole outlook on life upon them."

The British East India Company employed a well planned three-pronged – missionary, history and education – assault on Hindu culture. Friedrich Max Muller (Bharti, 1992:64-71), basically a missionary, was presented to India as a Sanskrit scholar. He was hired at the age of 25 years in 1847 to translate the *Vedas* into English. If they were really interested in translations, they could have hired an indigenous scholar with proficiency in *Sanskrit* and English, authentic historic perspectives on the *Vedas* and with a genuine feel of the *Vedic* religion. Max Muller had none of the three. Neither English nor Sanskrit was his mother tongue. From the British point of view, his qualification was his firm commitment to his Christian mission. He very tactfully, as said by Bharti⁹, hired a couple of impoverished *Sanskrit Pundits* (who could have been easily bribed), got *Vedas* misinterpreted to humiliate and discredit the Hindu religion and culture. For example, the mantras praising the Indo-Aryan (Hindu) heroes were attributed to the invading Aryans. The ages of the four *Vedas* and the two epics (the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*) have been shortened, so as to validate the ill-founded theory of ‘Aryan invasion of India’. The native Aryans were deprived of the credit for having such a great culture and composing the *Vedas*. Many exponents of the theory wrote that prior to the advent of the light-skinned *Aryans* from Asia Minor, the natives of India were dark-skinned uncivilized *Dravidians* who were allegedly pushed down to the South by the invading Aryans. This sowed the seeds of difference and division between the North and the South. The world is aware of the age-old British doctrine, ‘Divide and rule.’

Adam Hochschild, reviewing (NY Times, July 24, 2005) the book “*Dancing with Strangers: Europeans and Australians at First Contact*” by historian Inga Clendinnen, writes that the author Inga Clendinnen feels that the British colonizers in Africa and Asia employed the same “divide and rule” tactics. She further remarks that European conquerors did not always meet heroic resistance; in much of Africa, India and Latin America. They succeeded because they could make indigenous groups fight with each other, not against strangers. She remarks:

“History is always written by the victors – at least at first. ... Since then, of course, the end of colonialism in Africa and Asia and the civil rights movement in the United States have forced us to start writing history differently. ... Yet history remains a messy and complicated business.”

The earlier versions of history undoubtedly have a more lasting impact than its later corrected version. The “first history” has typically been written by government-decorated scholars. In such history books, undesired truths are set aside to bring forth a pre-defined agenda. Such government-sponsored books receive extensive readership because of their recognition by schools and colleges as text books. They are given much more shelf space in libraries, particularly in public libraries.

Wolpert’s (1993:37) account of “invading barbaric hordes” and their more civilized pre-Aryan ‘slaves’” clearly suggests that native *Aryans* were more civilized than

the invading *Aryans*. He has characterized the *Aryan* conquest of India as their gradual “institutional assimilation and socio-cultural integration”, not as their “overwhelming linguistic, religious and cultural influence” over the native *Aryan* society.

Max Muller worked enthusiastically to project Hinduism in unfavorable colors. His design is well reflected in his letter to Chevalier Bunsen (The Life and Letters of Max Muller, Vol.1:17):

“Your Excellency, ... I have no doubt whatever, that something can be written about the *Veda* which would reach even the dullest ears. Nevertheless I, of course, shall be glad if the *Rig Veda* is dealt with in the *Edinburgh Review*, and if Wilson would write from the standpoint of a missionary, and would show how the knowledge and bringing into light of the *Veda* would upset the whole existing system of Indian theology. It might become of real interest. ... The Christianity of 19th century will hardly be the Christianity of India. But the ancient religion of India is doomed ... and if Christianity does not step in, whose fault it would be?”

Thomas Babington Macaulay, another missionary poised behind the mask of an educationist, told his father in 1836 (Bharti 1992:66) that if his plans of education were followed up, there will be no high caste Hindu left in Bengal after 30 years. Both Max Muller and Macaulay worked hard to disfigure and distort *Vedic* culture with an objective to induce, in Hindus, a cultural inferiority complex. Muller and Macaulay did not succeed that much as they had desired because in those days very few Indians had knowledge of English; and very few among those few did read the books, Muller and Macaulay wrote. Moreover, Indians, in general, were getting correct perspectives on their religion and culture from oral traditions by way of *satsangs* in temples and traditional plays from town to town, such as Ram Leelas, Krishna Leelas, Sindhi Bhagats, etc. It seems, Max Muller had changed in his later period of his stay in India. He started talking positive about Hindu culture.

European scholars did the same to the literature on Zoroastrian culture:

“In the area of doctrine, problems arose in the 19th century, when European scholars began to translate and interpret Zoroastrian texts, challenging the traditional view of them. As a result, various reform movements were founded in Bombay, and still remain at variance with one another.”

Peter B. Clarke (1993:123)

Dr. K. M. Munshi (in Majumdar, 1951:9) has drawn our attention to the harm several European scholars have intentionally done to Hindu culture: He laments how the failures of Hindus have been highlighted and how their successes have been consistently ignored:

“It (history) does not give us the real India. ... During our school or college career, generation after generation were told about the successive foreign invasions of the country, but little about how we resisted them and less about our victories. We were taught to decry the Hindu social systems; but we have never been told how this system came into existence as a synthesis of political, social, economic and cultural forces; and how it developed in the people the tenacity to survive catastrophic changes.”

We can find consolation in Munshi’s (in Majumdar, 1951:9) assuring note:

“History, as I see it, is being consciously lived by Indians. History is a witness to the fact that politically motivated recorded history of India has been disappointed by the history given down to us orally by our *Vedas* and *Upanishads*.”

Illiteracy: A Blessing In Disguise

Paradoxically, illiteracy in the villages has been a blessing in disguise. It has saved the “*Jahil*” villagers of India from reading the undesirable material written in history books against Hindus and their culture. The illiteracy has provided them with cultural immunity. They, unlike the educated elite, have remained ignorant of misrepresentations and distortions of the history and have been correctly informed about their culture and heritage through the oral transmission of Vedic knowledge from generation to generation. It has been better explained by Dr. Alan Roland, an eminent American psycho-analyst, in his “*In Search of Self in India and Japan*” (1988, p.18):

“British administrative, educational, and missionary attitudes all conveyed intense attitudes of British superiority and Indian inferiority in numerous shades and ways over the two centuries of their colonial presence. This had enormous psychological impact, particularly on the Western-educated elite who were more closely associated with the Raj.

Since the men were more exposed to British attitudes than women, they were much more affected by colonial denigration.”

Dr. Alan Roland

In fact, the “educated” elite of India, in order to become learned in a real sense, need to unlearn lot. We Indians have been suffering from an ethno-cultural inferiority complex. It would be beneficial for India and Indians if politicians and academics take active interest in uncovering the truth with respect to the theory of the Aryan invasion of India. Dr. K. M. Munshi (Majumdar, 1951:8) has remarked:

“To be a history in the true sense of the word, the work must be the story of the people inhabiting a country. ... The central purpose of a history must, therefore, be to investigate and unfold the values which age after age have inspired the inhabitants of a country to develop their collective will and to express it through the manifold activities of their life. Such a history of India is still to be written”.

Dr. K. M. Munshi

In conclusion, I would like to say that Hindus indifference to our own history has been invitation to foreigners to write our history. Matlock, in his *India Once Ruled the Americas* (p.170), explains this: “The one and only reason why we don’t know about India’s true role in human history is our self-imposed ignorance of Indian mythology, history, and traditions!”

References

Apte, Vaman Shivram. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass

Publishers, 1992.

Asiatic Researches. New Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 1979.

Bharti, Brahm Datt. *Max Muller: A Lifelong Masquerade*. New Delhi: Erabooks, 1992.

Bibby, Geoffrey. *Looking for Dilmun*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.

Childe, V.Gordon. *The Aryans: A Study of Indo-European Origins*. New York: Knopf, 1926.

_____. ***New Light on the Most Ancient East*. New York : Frederick A. Praeger, 1953.**

_____. ***The Dawn of European Civilization*. London,1950**

_____. ***Piecing Together the Past***

_____. ***What Happened in History*, Pelican Books,1943**

Coedes, G. *The Indianized States of Southern Asia*. Honolulu: An East-West Center Book, The

University University Press of Hawaii, 1964.

Cunningham, A. *Ancient Geography of India*. London: Trubner 1871.

Durant,Will. *Our Oriental Heritage*. New York: MJF Books,1935.

Goyal, Shankar. *History Writing of Early India: New Discoveries and Approaches*. Jodhpur (India): Kusumanjali Prakashan, 1996.

Hancock, Graham. *Underworld: The Mysterious of Civilization*. New York: Crown Publishers,

2002.

Jones, Sir William. *The Fourth Anniversary Discourse: On the Arabs* (delivered on 15th

Feb.,1787). In *Asiatic Researches*.(Vol.2,Ch.I, pp5-17).New Delhi: Cosmo Publications, 1979.

Langer, William L (ed.). *The New Illustrated Encyclopedia of World History* (Vol. 1 & 2). New York:Harry N. Abrams, Inc.,1968.

McCrindle, J.W. *Ancient India. Vol. IV*, Bombay,1885.

_____. ***Ancient India as described by Ptolemy*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2000.**

_____. *Ancient India as Described by Classical Literature*. New Delhi: Munshiram

Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1979.

_____. *Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arian*. New Delhi: Munshiram

Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

Majmudar, R.C.(ed). *History and Culture of the Indian People. 1st vol. Bombay: Bharatiya*

Vidya Bhavan, 1951.

Matlock, Gene D. *India Once Ruled the Americas*. New York: Writer's Showcase, 2000.

_____. *The Last Atlantis Book*. Tempe, Arizona: A Dandelion Books Publication, 2001.

_____. *From Khyber (Kheeber) Pass to Gran Quivira (Kheevira)*. New York: Authors

Choice Press,2002.

Muller, F. Max. *Science of Language (Vol.I)*.New York:Charles Scribner=s Sons, 1891.

_____ . *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*.

_____ . *The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*. Calcutta: Susil Gupte (India) Ltd.,

1952.

_____ . *India: What Can It Teach Us?* London: New York, Longmans, Funk &

Wagnalls Company, 1999.

_____ . *History of Sanskrit Literature (2nd edition)*. London, 1960.

Muller, Herbert J. *The Loom of History*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Nadiem, Ihsan H. *Moenjodaro: Heritage Of Mankind.(2nd. revised edition)* Lahore:

Sang-e-Meel-Publications, 1995.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. *The Discovery of India*. Calcutta; The Signet Press, 1946

Pococke, E. *India In Greece*. London and Glasgow: Richard Griffin and Company, 1856.

Possehl, G.L. *Ancient Cities of the Indus*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 1979.

Wheeler, Mortimer. *The Indus Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

1960.

Wheeler, R. E. M. *Five Thousand Years of Pakistan*. London: Royal India & Pakistan

Society, 1950.

1 Taken from Herbert J. Muller, "*The Loom of History*" New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958, p. 28.

2 Quotation of the Day, NY Times, June 20, 2002.

3 In this account, I have chiefly followed the translation by Mirza Kalichbeg Fredunbeg of Sind Civil Service. The *Chach Namah*, also as the *Tarikh-i-Hind wa Sindh*, was originally written in Arabic.

4 Herbert J. Muller, op. cit. p.28.

5 Elliot's Appendix to the Arabs in Sind, p.63.

6 Malte Brun, Geog. Univ.

7 See "The History of Greece," by G. Grote, Esq., London, 1849.

8 History of Greece, vol. I, Preface, p. xiii.

9 Bharti, Brahm Dat. *Max Muller: A Lifelong Masquerade*. New Delhi: Era Books, 1992.