

Busting the Myth of the Arya–Dravidian Divide in India

Prof. Ravi Prakash Arya

Former UGC Chair Professor

President: Vedic Science Virtual Vishva-Vidyapeeth USA

Abstract

The Arya–Dravidian divide has long been presented as a foundational framework for understanding Indian history, linguistics, and population origins. This paper critically examines this construct and argues that it is not an indigenous civilizational reality but a colonial-era hypothesis shaped by missionary objectives, racial anthropology, and Eurocentric chronology. Drawing upon Vedic literature, Dharmasāstra, historical linguistics, archaeology, population genetics, and astronomy-based chronology, the study demonstrates that Ārya and Drāviḍa are civilizational, cultural, and ethical descriptors rather than racial or ethnic categories. Linguistic continuity across Sanskrit and South Indian languages, genetic gradients without demographic rupture, and textual evidence from the Vedas, Manusmṛti, and Itihāsa collectively invalidate the notion of a binary Aryan–Dravidian opposition. The paper concludes that Indian civilization represents a continuous, internally diversified cultural continuum and that the Arya–Dravidian divide is best understood as a colonial narrative rather than a historical fact.

Keywords

Arya–Dravidian divide, Sanskrit, Drāviḍa, Vedas, Manusmṛti, population genetics, colonial historiography, Indian chronology

Introduction

The Arya–Dravidian divide occupies a central position in modern academic discussions on Indian history and linguistics. According to this framework, Indo-Aryan-speaking populations are said to have entered the Indian subcontinent from Central Asia during the second millennium BCE, displacing or dominating earlier Dravidian-speaking populations. This narrative has shaped interpretations of language, genetics, archaeology, caste, and culture. However, the intellectual genealogy of this theory reveals deep entanglement with colonial ideology, missionary agendas, and nineteenth-century racial anthropology. This paper reassesses the Arya–Dravidian hypothesis through indigenous textual evidence and modern scientific findings, arguing for a unified civilizational model of India.

Colonial Origins of the Arya–Dravidian Theory

The classification of Indian languages into Indo-Aryan and Dravidian families was formalized in the nineteenth century by European scholars such as Max Müller and Robert Caldwell. Müller's linguistic model, developed within a Christian missionary milieu, extended language similarity into racial and civilizational categories. Caldwell's *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages* (1856) further entrenched the idea of a distinct Dravidian linguistic family separate from Sanskrit. These frameworks coincided with missionary objectives to weaken indigenous cultural unity and facilitate religious conversion. Müller's correspondence with the Duke of Origoil reveals his conviction that the intellectual dismantling of Vedic tradition was a

prerequisite for Christianization of India.

He writes to the Duke of Orgoil, who was the British secretary of state for India, Müller (Georgina Adelaide Müller, 1902: Chp. XVI, p.358) wrote on 16 December 1868:

'The ancient religion of India is totally doomed and if the Christianity doesn't step in whose fault will it be.'

In a letter addressed to his wife Georgina Adelaide Müller on December 9, 1867, Prof. Max Mueller wrote (Georgina Adelaide Müller, 1902: Chp. XV, p. 328):

'I still have a great work to do, and I often feel that I might have done a great deal more if I had kept the one object of my life more steadily in view. I sometimes wish you would help me more in doing that, and insist on my working harder at the 'Veda' and nothing else. I hope I shall finish that work and feel convinced that though I shall not live to see it, yet this edition of mine and translation of Vedas will hereafter tell to a great extent on the fate of India and the growth of millions of souls in this country.'

At the same place, he further observes:

'It is the root of their religion, and to show them what the root is, I feel sure, is the only way of uprooting all that has sprung from it during the last 3,000 years.

The text of his letter is self-explanatory to the fact that Max Müller pursued Indic studies with an ulterior motive and he was more or less successful in his efforts. His friend Dr. E.B Pusey who was an English churchman and for more than fifty years Regius Professor of Hebrew at Christ Church, Oxford, hurls praises on him for the good job done by him for which he was awarded the position of Sanskrit Chair. He also makes a mention of his support in his elevation to the Chair. He writes on June 2, 1860 (Georgina Adelaide Müller, 1902: Chp. XII, p. 237-38):

'My dear Professor, On the first election to the Sanskrit Chair, you will have heard that we were divided before two great names. Professor Wilson, whose first-rate Sanskrit knowledge was in the mouth of everyone, and Dr. Mill, who, many of us thought, might fulfil the object of the founder better by giving to the Professorship a direct missionary turn. The same thought would naturally recur to us now, and I have kept myself in suspense since our sudden loss of Professor Wilson. **My first impression, however, is my abiding conviction, that we should be best promoting the intentions of the founder by electing yourself, who have already done so much to make us fully acquainted with the religious systems of those whom we wish to win to the Gospel.** It is obvious that without this knowledge a missionary must be continually at fault, ignorant alike of the points of contact of which, after the manner of St. Paul, he may avail himself, or of those which present the chief obstacles to the reception of the Gospel in the minds of those whom he would win. I cannot but think then that your labors on the Vedas-while they attest your wonderful power in mastering this ancient Sanskrit (and of course of the more modern Sanskrit, through which you had access to the older), and while they evince, as I understand, **great philological talent, beyond the knowledge of Sanskrit itself-are the greatest gifts which have been bestowed on those who would win to Christianity the subtle and thoughtful minds of the cultivated Indians.** We owe you very much for the past, and we shall ourselves gain greatly by placing you in a position in which you can give your undivided attention to those labors by which we have already so much profited. You know that I have felt it my duty to confine myself to a different class of languages, those which bear directly upon Hebrew. I have written, therefore, on that upon which I am alone competent to write - not your great knowledge of Sanskrit, of which we have such eminent testimony, but of the great value of that special line of study to which you have devoted yourself. **Your work will form a new era in the**

efforts for the conversion of India, and Oxford will have reason to be thankful that, by giving you a home, it will have facilitated a work of such primary and lasting importance for the conversion of India, and which, by enabling us to compare that early false religion with the true, illustrates the more than blessedness of what we enjoy.

Yours very faithfully,

E.B. Pusey

The above letter by a Churchman to Müller reveals the hidden agenda of colonialists. By far, this was not the only case. There is another celebrated scholar called Monier Williams he writes (1879: 262):

'Christianity has many more points to their ancient faith than Islam has, and when the walls of the mighty fortress of Brahmanism are encircled, undermined and finally stormed by the soldiers of the cross, the victory of Christianity must be signal and complete.'

In his preface to his famous Sanskrit-English Dictionary (1899: p. ix) Monier William, as the Professor of Boden Chair, reveals the objective of founding the Chair for Sanskrit studies by Col. Boden as to convert the natives of India to Christianity. He writes thus:

In explanation I must draw attention to the fact that I am only the second occupant of the Boden Chair, and that its founder; Col. Boden, stated most explicitly in his will (dated Aug. 15, 1811) that special object of his munificent bequest was to promote the translation of the scriptures into Sanskrit; so as to enable his countrymen to proceed in the conversion of the natives of India to the Christian Religion.

The Book 'Eminent Orientalists: Indian, European and American' (p. 53) informs that Prof. H.H. Wilson, one of the occupants of Boden Chair, delivered two public lectures at Oxford before general audience on 'Religious and Philosophical Systems of the Hindus'. These lectures were written to help candidates for a prize of Pound 200 given by John Muir, a well-known old Haileybury man and great Sanskrit scholar, for the best refutation of the Hindu religious systems. The prize was obtained by one Mr. Mullions.

The above evidence shows that the whole exercise was done by Prof. Wilson for 200 Pounds to encourage students for the refutation of Hindu religion.

Cephalometry and the Politics of Scientific Legitimacy

Cephalometry, once widely employed in anthropology, was initially used to support theories of steppe and Iranian origins for Indian populations. When subsequent measurements failed to conform to these migrationist expectations, the method was dismissed as pseudoscientific.

This abrupt reversal reveals a deeper epistemological problem: methodologies are often deemed "scientific" or "unscientific" based not on internal consistency, but on ideological compatibility with prevailing theories. Such selective validation raises serious concerns regarding objectivity in anthropological research on India.

Linguistic Continuity Across India

From an internal linguistic perspective, Sanskrit exhibits deep structural continuity with all major Indian languages, including those classified as Dravidian. Phonetics, morphology, syntax, and semantic roots reveal extensive overlap. South Indian languages such as Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, and Malayalam retain large Sanskritic vocabularies, grammatical parallels, and shared conceptual categories. The differences between Sanskrit and Tamil are comparable to those between Sanskrit and modern Indo-Aryan languages such as Hindi or Bengali. Script evolution

further reinforces this continuity, as South Indian scripts are historically derived from Brāhmī, which itself encodes Sanskrit phonology. Linguistic borrowing alone cannot account for this depth of convergence, pointing instead to a shared civilizational linguistic ecosystem.

Ārya and Drāviḍa in Vedic and Dharmasāstric Texts

Dravida word in the sense of race or ethnicity is not directly used in the Vedas, as the Vedas are the books of knowledge of creation and its creator. Dravida word has evolved from the Vedic word द्रवदिड (dravadiḍa) occurred five times Sāmavedic Brāhmaṇas like Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa or Pañcviṃśa Brāhmaṇa (8.3.7; 10.11.1), Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (10.12.4) (associated with Jaiminiya recension of Sāmaveda.

In the context of the Vedic literature, the term “Dravadiḍa” is employed to refer to the “Sāmaveda.”

For instance, the hymn “इमं वाव देवा लोकं द्रवदिडेन (साम्ना) अभ्यजयन्” (Devas (enlightened people) win this loka (attain mokṣa) with the help of Sāmaveda) exemplifies the usage of “Dravadiḍa.”

Therefore, the term “Dravida” is exclusively associated with Vedic literature, and its etymology can be traced back to the Vedic word “द्रवदिड (dravadiḍa),” which was originally used to denote the “Sāmaveda.”

The regions of Karnataka, Kerala, and Tamil Nadu, where the Jaiminiya and Ranayaniya recensions of the Sāmaveda were prevalent, were collectively referred to as “Draviḍa.”[‡]

Ramayana did not use Draviḍa word

Kaladi, the birth place of Shankara was also situated in Draviḍa-deśa.

In Mahabharata, Draviḍa is a separate small place in south India (most probably Sāmavedic region

Bhīṣma Parva (9,67) mentions “पाण्ड्याश्चैव चोलाश्च द्राविडाः शूर्पराक्षकाः ।

Meaning: “The Pāṇḍyas, the Cholas, the Dravidas, and the Śūrparākas (people of the south).”

Sabhā Parva (31, 6) mentions, “चोलाः पाण्ड्या द्राविडाः केरलाश्चैव वीर्यवन्तः ।

Meaning: “The Cholas, Pandyas, Dravidas, and Keralas are all valiant peoples.” (Describing southern kings paying tribute to Yudhiṣṭhira’s Rājasūya sacrifice.)

Bhīṣma Parva (10.40) mentions

“द्राविडाः प्रचलन्त्यन्ते...” (Refers to Dravidas as one among southern groups engaged in war preparations.)

Sanskrit poet Rājaśekhara (3rd century CE), who was the teacher of Pratiḥāra King

[‡] The Jaiminiya recension of the Samaveda is traditionally found in South India, specifically in the states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu

The *Rāṇāyanīya* in the Maharashtra, Karnataka, Gokarna (Uttara Kannada Distt. of Karnataka State), a few parts of Odisha, Andhra Pradesh. Here it may be noted that the *Kauthuma* recension is current in Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, Odisha, West Bengal, and for a few decades in Darbhanga, Bihar,

Mahendrapāla, divided Āryavarta into five parts:

1. Pūrvadeśa, 2. Dakṣiṇāpatha,
3. Paścāddeśa, 4. Uttarāpatha and 5. Madhyadeśa.

He did not read the word Draviḍa in Dakshinapatha

The region lying south of Māhiṣmatī city or Narmadā River is called Dakṣiṇāpatha. It consists of the janapadas of Maharashtra, Māhīṣaka, Aśmaka, Vidarbha, Kuntala, Krathakaiśika, Śūrpāraka, Kāñchi, Kerala, Kāvera, Murala, Vānavāsaka, Simhala, Chola, Dandaka, Pāndya, Pallava, Gānga, Nāsikya, Konkaṇa, Kollagiri and Vallāra, etc.

In Purāṇas also Draviḍa is a separate small region in south India in addition to Kerala, Andhra, Pandya, Chola, Gujrata, Surparaka (Sopara).

Bhāgavata Purāṇa (10.86.19) mentions “द्राविडः कर्नाटकश्चापि गुर्जरोऽप्यञ्च एव च ।”

Meaning: “The Draviḍa, the Karnāṭaka, the Gurjara, and the Andhra (regions) also [heard the glories of the Lord].”

Vāyu Purāṇa (Chapter 45, Verse 116–117) mentions “पाण्ड्याश्चोलाश्च केरलाः शूर्पारकाः च द्राविडाः ।”

Meaning: “The Pandyas, Cholas, Keralas, Śūrpārakas, and Dravidas — all southern peoples.”

Markandeya Purāṇa (Chapter 57, Verse 36) mentions “चोलाः पाण्ड्या द्राविडाः केरलाश्चैव वीर्यवन्तः ।” (Similar enumeration as in Mahābhārata — listing southern dynasties among Bhārata-varṣa peoples.)

In Purāṇas also Draviḍa is a separate small place in south India in addition to Kerala, Andhra, Pandya, Chola, Gujrata, Surparaka (Sopara).

According to Bhāgavata Purāṇa (10.86.19) “द्राविडः कर्नाटकश्चापि गुर्जरोऽप्यञ्च एव च ।”

Meaning: “The Draviḍa, the Karnāṭaka, the Gurjara, and the Andhra (regions) also [heard the glories of the Lord].”

Vāyu Purāṇa (Chapter 45, Verse 116–117) describes “पाण्ड्याश्चोलाश्च केरलाः शूर्पारकाः च द्राविडाः ।”

Meaning: “The Pandyas, Cholas, Keralas, Śūrpārakas, and Dravidas — all southern peoples.”

Markandeya Purāṇa (Chapter 57, Verse 36) says, “चोलाः पाण्ड्या द्राविडाः केरलाश्चैव वीर्यवन्तः ।” (Similar enumeration as in Mahābhārata — listing southern dynasties among Bhārata-varṣa peoples.)

Epigraphic and Inscriptional Reference

In epigraphic and inscriptional records, the term “Draviḍa” is also mentioned as a region.

According to the Aśokan Inscriptions (Rock Edicts II and XIII), Aśoka refers to the southern kingdoms as follows: “पाण्ड्ये च चोलके च केरलपुत्रे च सत्यपुत्रे च...”

Pallava Inscriptions (Kāñchī (Pallava) copperplates refer to: “द्रविडदेशाधिपः” (*Draviḍa-desādhīpaḥ* — Lord of Dravida country

Chalukya and Rashtrakuta Inscriptions of Pulakeśin II describe him as: “त्रिषष्ठद्राविडराज्यदण्डनायकः” (*Triṣaṣṭhi-Drāviḍa-rājya-daṇḍanāyakaḥ*)

Meaning: “Conqueror of the 63 Draviḍa kingdoms.” (Source: *Aihole Inscription of Pulakeśin II*, Rashtrakuta copperplates (Govinda III) mentions as “द्राविडविजयप्रसिद्धः” — “Renowned for his conquest of Dravida.”

The Chola emperors use Draviḍa self-referentially: “द्राविडाधिपति राजेन्द्रः” (*Draviḍādhipati Rājendraḥ*)

Meaning: “Rajendra, Lord of Dravida.” (Found in *Tiruvāṅga Plates* of Rajendra I, c. 1020 CE)

Another frequent title:

“द्राविडराज्यशेखरः” (*Draviḍa-rājya-śekharaḥ*)— Crest-jewel of Dravida kingdom.

Nava and Pancha Dravidas and Pancha Gaudas

Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta (4th century CE) lists nine or new dravidas defeated by him, including:

“कोशलकर्नाटकनवद्राविडा...” Interpreted as: “Kosala, Karnāṭaka, and the Nine Dravida kingdoms.” (Exact reading debated, but “Navadravida” = Nine Dravida regions.)

We also find a mention in Kalhana’s *Rajतरंगिणी* of Pancha Dravidas in respect to southern Brahmins and Pancha Gaudas in respect of northern Brahmins.

कर्णाटकाश्च तैलङ्गा द्राविडा महाराष्ट्रकाः,
गुर्जराश्चेति पञ्चैव द्राविडा विन्ध्यदक्षिणे ॥
सारस्वताः कान्यकुब्जा गौडा उत्कलमैथिलाः,
पञ्चगौडा इति ख्याता विन्ध्योत्तरवासिनः ॥

Here it may be known Gauḍa is also a particular region in Northeast of India (Bengal and Bihar) as Draviḍa in the south. The word Brāhmaṇa is equally associated with both Gauḍas and Draviḍas. This proves that both Gauḍas and Draviḍas are Vedic people.

Śaṅkara Digvijaya (Biography of Ādi Śaṅkara, Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya version) says:

“द्राविडदेशे जन्म” — “Born in the land of Dravida.” (Refers to Śaṅkara’s birth in *Kaladi*, Kerala.)

Here also Draviḍa is mentioned as a region.

Arya & Dāsa, Dasyu in Vedas

The word Arya has occurred 80 times in the Vedic Samhitas; 14 times in Brāhmaṇa texts. The word दास occurred 80 times in the Vedic Samhitas and 13 times in the Brāhmaṇa Texts.

The word Dasyu occurred 122 times in the Vedic Samhitas and 5 times in Brāhmaṇa texts.

Meaning of Vedic “Ārya”

The term “Ārya” is employed in the Vedas to refer to a civilized individual and a person who believes in the existence of God. Vedic seers were tasked with the responsibility of civilizing the entire world, as people were living in a state of savagery. Consequently, it is explicitly stated in the Vedas: “कृण्वन्तो विश्वमार्यम्.”

The term “Ārya” is derived from the root “ऋ,” which signifies “to go.” Aryas are likened to spokes of a wheel, each contributing to the overall structure and functioning of the wheel. They embody a culture of cooperation and teamwork, similar to the spokes of a wheel.

According to the Yaska, the term “arya” (अर्य) in the Vedas is used to denote “ईश्वर” (Nighaṇṭu), while “Ārya” (आर्य) is used to signify “Believer in God.” (Nirukta)

Vedic allegorical references to Devāsura Saṅgrāma were later interpreted as a conflict between Aryas and Dravidians. If there had been a genuine war between Aryas and Dravidians, the Vedas would have explicitly mentioned the term “Dravida.”

The Vedas categorize humanity into two groups: Arya and Anarya, also known as Dasa or Dasyu, which translates to “non-believers.”

Another classification is made between Arya vācha (Sanskrit speakers) and Mlecchavacha (Vernacular speakers), as Sanskrit served as the standardized language.

Vedas do not mention the name of a country

The Vedas, which are knowledge of creation in Brahman, do not mention any country or nation. The only place mentioned is Bharat. The Vedas primarily focus on the concept of converting the Earth into a nation or forming nations on the Earth.

Furthermore, the Vedas do not discuss the division of humanity along the lines of caste, creed, race, religion, or region.

The only place mentioned in the Vedas is Bharat.

Bharata Agni: The word Bharata is derived from the root √Bhṛ ‘bharāṇe,’ meaning ‘to sustain,’ and ‘Agni,’ meaning ‘energy.’ Thus, Bharata and Agni collectively signify ‘the energy of the landmass capable of sustaining humanity.’

जनस्य गोपा अजनिष्ट जागृविरग्निः सुदक्षः सुविताय नव्यसे ।

घृतप्रतीको बृहता दिविस्पृशा द्युमद्वि भाति भरतेभ्यः शुचिः ।।

[Meaning] (jāgrviḥ) The vigilant, (sudakṣaḥ) the powerful (agniḥ) energy of Bharatiya land mass is the (janasya gopaḥ) the protector of human beings (ajaniṣṭa) born here. It provides (navyase) for rejuvenation (suvitāya) and prosperity of these human beings. (ghṛtapratikaḥ) Irrigated by water, and (dyumat) blazing with (bṛhatā) great sunshine (divispr̥śā) reaching to the sky, (śuciḥ) this holy land (bhāti) shines by sustaining Bharatas.

So, this place and its people got a new extension of the name, from Bharata to Bhārata. This fact has also been alluded to excellently in the *Rgveda* (6.16.45

उदग्ने भारत द्युमदजस्रेण दविद्युतत । शोचा वि भाह्यजर ।।

*udagne bhārata dyumadajasreṇa davidyutata
śochā vi bhāhyajara.*

O (Ajara Agne Bhārata) undecaying, knowledgeable first-born human beings known as Bhāratas! (dvidyutat) keep blazing forth with knowledge, (dyumat ajasreṇa) keep shining in the world continuously, (ut śochā) keep yourself enlightened and (vi bhāhi) enlighten others.

Bharat was not named after Bharat, the son of Shankuntala and Dushyanta as is misunderstood

From the above references it is crystal clear that Vedic literature and post Vedic Sanskrit literature do not describe Ārya and Drāviḍa as racial or ethnic antagonists. The term Ārya denotes ethical refinement, cultural participation, and adherence to ṛta (cosmic order). Drāviḍa appears in later Sanskrit literature as a geographical and cultural designation, never as an adversarial racial category. Manusmṛti (10.4) explicitly defines varṇa in terms of saṃskāra, guṇa, and karma, not birth. Even where groups such as Drāviḍas are described as Vratya Kṣatriyas (Manusmṛti 10.22), the reference denotes loss of initiation or education, not ethnic origin. Such passages indicate cultural fluctuation within a shared Vedic framework rather than civilizational rupture. Some innocent persons raise a doubt that Manu Dharma Shastra calls the Dravidas as Vratya Kshatriyas.

झल्लो मल्लश्च राजन्याद्वात्याल्लिच्छविरेव च । नटश्च करणश्चैव खसो द्रविड एव च ॥ १०.२२ ॥

According to them, it refers to people of a specific tribe/jati?

First, it is essential to understand that the Manusmṛti primarily discusses Varna, not Jāti. As Manu himself proclaims in Manusmṛti 10.4, the Varna system is fundamentally based on Samskāras — that is, guṇa (qualities), karma (actions), and svabhāva (innate disposition) — rather than on birth. Manu clearly distinguishes two broad social categories: the Dvijas (the educated or initiated) and the Śūdras (the uneducated or non-initiated):

ब्राह्मणः क्षत्रियो वैश्यस्त्रयो वर्णा द्विजातयः । चतुर्थ एकजातिस्तु शूद्रो नास्ति तु पञ्चमः ॥ (10.4)

This makes it clear that the four Varnas are classified by education and initiation, not heredity. According to Manu, there is no fifth varna or class. Consequently, the later verses from Manusmṛti 10.5–10.44 appear inconsistent and possibly interpolated, as they contradict the foundational Varna definition given earlier.

Even if one insists on accepting these verses as authentic, it is crucial to interpret the term Vratya correctly, as defined by Manu himself:

द्विजातयः सर्वाणामु जनयन्त्यव्रतांस्तु यान् । तान् सावित्रीपरिभ्रष्टान् व्रात्यानिति विनिर्दिशेत् ॥ (10.20)

Here, Vratya refers to “Patita Sāvitrīkaḥ” — those who have not undergone the Upanayana Samskāra, the sacred initiation marking the beginning of education. In other words, a Vratya is an uneducated or non-initiated person. Logically, one who has never received initiation cannot be considered a Dvija (“twice-born”), which makes such statements internally contradictory and therefore suggestive of interpolation.

Even accepting the text as it stands, the verse cited —

इल्लो मल्लश्च राजन्याद्वात्याल्लिच्छविरेव च । नटश्च करणश्चैव खसो द्रविड एव च ॥ (10.22)

— states that groups such as the Jhalla, Malla, Licchavi, Naṭa, Karaṇa, Khasa, and Draviḍa originated from Vratya (non-initiated) Kṣatriyas. This, however, must be understood in the sense of educational and cultural decline, not racial or ethnic derivation.

It must also be emphasized that the Varna system is entirely Vedic. Even the Śūdras (uneducated people) are part of the Vedic social order, as the term “Vedic” or “Ārya” in its original sense denotes a cultured, civilized, and God-believing person, not a race. Therefore, according to the very verse quoted above, even the Draviḍas are Vedic people, belonging within the same civilizational and spiritual continuum. When Veda says Krinvanto Vishvam Aryam, the seer shows Vedic people’s burden to civilize other people on the globe. Similarly, Manu points out that the people of entire globe got education and learnt lessons on morality and education from the people of this country, who were born first on the earth.

एतद् देशप्रसूतस्य सकाशादग्रजन्मनः । स्वं स्वं चरित्रं शिक्षेरन् पृथिव्यां सर्वमानवाः ॥ 20 ॥

From the inhabitants of this country who were first born human beings on the globe, people from all parts of the globe learn the lessons on education and morality.

India has consistently been a cradle of civilization, knowledge, and philosophy. However, Westerners often struggle to comprehend its entirety and disseminate inaccurate information. India holds numerous firsts in its history.

For interpolation free Manusmṛiti, my English translation of Manusmṛiti into two parts is available on amazon.

The Avestan Parallel and the Deva–Asura Question

The Avestan religion refers to Daivas as supernatural beings in conflict with Ahuras. But, to the Avestan religion, the Ahuras are benevolent while the Daivas are not. They refer to

themselves as Aryas. This is taken by many scholars as a point of divergence at some point between these Aryans and Dravidas groups?

So far as the *Avesta* is concerned, it must be remembered that the *Gāthās* of the *Avesta* are, in essence, a **corrupted or transformed form of the ancient Vedic mantras**. The terms *Deva* and *Asura* of the Vedas correspond to the *Deva* and *Ahura* of the *Avesta*.

In the **Vedic context**, however, *Devas* and *Asuras* do not refer to human beings or ethnic groups. They represent **cosmic and natural forces**—for example, light and darkness, or the directions such as east and west. *Devas* symbolize the **spiritual and luminous aspects of nature**, while *Asuras* denote the **material, dynamic, and vital forces of existence**.

Philosophically, the *Devas* correspond to the **indriyas** (senses or perceptive faculties), while the *Asura* embodies the **life force (prāṇa)** that drives them. The *mind (manas)* may be viewed as *Asura*, the motive energy behind the senses. In a broader scientific analogy, *Devas* may be likened to **particles**, and *Asuras* to **antiparticles**—two complementary forces maintaining the balance of the cosmos. Even in nature, the **cloud** is termed *Asura*, as it conceals the light (*Deva*).

Thus, in the Vedas, there is **no moral dichotomy of good and evil** between *Devas* and *Asuras*; both are integral components of the cosmic order. The later interpretation of *Devas* as divine and *Asuras* as demonic was a **later theological and colonial distortion**, often promoted by **Western scholars** to create artificial divisions within Indian thought—such as the so-called **Aryan-Dravidian divide**.

It is also important to recall that, in ancient times, the **geographical and cultural expanse of India (Bhārata)** extended far beyond its present borders—encompassing regions such as **Iran, Afghanistan, Turkmenistan, Pakistan, and Burma**. The *Mahābhārata* itself records participation from peoples of Iran, Iraq, China, and Afghanistan, showing that the Indian civilization historically represented a vast, interconnected cultural sphere rather than a narrowly defined territory.

Genetics and the Question of Migration

Contemporary population genetics identifies three broad ancestral components within South Asia: ancient hunter-gatherers (AASI), Iranian-related agriculturalists, and steppe pastoralists. However, these findings do not establish migration directionality or demographic replacement. Indian populations display greater genetic diversity than Central Asian or European populations, a hallmark of source rather than recipient regions. Y-chromosomal haplogroups such as R1a1a show highest diversity and continuity within India, contradicting simplistic invasion models. Genetic gradients reflect long-term diffusion, mutation, and internal demographic expansion rather than abrupt external imposition.

The observed genetic affinities between certain South Indian populations and populations inhabiting parts of Africa and other coastal regions can be plausibly interpreted in the context of ancient maritime mobility rather than large-scale inward migration into India. Archaeological, textual, and genetic evidence collectively indicate that the Indian subcontinent—particularly its southern and western coastal regions—possessed advanced seafaring traditions from very early periods. The Indian Ocean littoral was an active zone of human movement, trade, and cultural exchange long before the Classical or medieval eras.

Generally it is argued that the 3 main founder populations of India are Neolithic hunter gatherers, who are said to have entered Indian subcontinent between 40,000 and 60,000 years ago, Iranian farmers who entered the sub continent between 10,000 and 8,000 years ago and the steppe clade, who entered between 5500 - 4000 years ago. The contention is that the last wave

carried the Indo-Aryan languages into India from the Early to Late Harappan period. According to the Wikipedia summarizing “Peopling of India”, the ASI (which includes substantial hunter-gatherer ancestry) are inferred to have about ~75% native South Asian hunter-gatherer genes and ~25% Iranian-related genes. The genome study notes steppe-related genes in present-day Indian populations ranges from 0 % up to ~45 % in some groups

Here it may be pointed out that the conclusions of these genetic studies are based on a relatively limited dataset. Given India’s vast and genetically diverse population of over 1.4 billion individuals, such a small sample size cannot be considered fully representative of the entire subcontinent’s genetic diversity.

Generally, the continental average of various three populations can be summarized as follows:

Continent	Average Hunter-Gatherer Ancestry
Africa	50–70% overall (highest diversity, deepest ancestry)
Europe	15–25%
Asia (overall)	20–40%
South Asia (India, Pakistan):	40%
Oceania	90–100%
Americas	100% (descendants of Paleolithic Siberian foragers)

Continent	Average Iranian Farmer Ancestry
West Asia (core region)	60–100%
South Asia	35–55%
South Asia (India, Pakistan)	30–60%
Europe	10–20%
Central Asia	20–40%
East Asia	0–10%
Africa	5–15% (North Africa only)
Oceania / Americas	0%

Continent	Average Steppe-Clade Contribution
Europe	35–55 % (central–north), 10–30 % (south)
Central Asia	35–55 %
South Asia	15–25 %
South Asia (India, Pakistan, Nepal):	10–30 % overall; higher in North-West, lower in South
West Asia / Near East	5–10 %
East Asia	5–15 % (localized)
Africa	0–5 %
Oceania / Americas	0 %

When viewed independently of percentage-based proportions, the demographic scale and diversity of these populations within India appear significantly greater than those observed

elsewhere. This pattern may imply that the Indian subcontinent functioned as an early demographic and cultural nexus, potentially contributing to outward migrations into neighboring regions. The shared cultural and genetic traits across Asia and beyond may thus reflect complex genetic mutations rather than unidirectional gene flow into India.

The majority of such genetic and archaeological studies appear to be influenced by interpretive bias and, at times, conducted with predetermined assumptions. As highlighted by the American researcher Michael A. Cremonesi in his work *Forbidden Archeology*, there has been a historical tendency to suppress or overlook archaeological evidence pointing to the greater antiquity of Indian civilization. Consequently, these studies cannot always be regarded as fully reliable and, in many cases, reflect methodological or ideological limitations.

Moreover, the available genetic datasets primarily describe the **genetic composition** of populations, not the **direction of gene flow**. The inference of migration or diffusion patterns from such data is therefore speculative and heavily dependent on the parameters and assumptions adopted by the researchers.

In population genetics, **gene flow directionality** can be meaningfully assessed only by considering **population size, demographic expansion, and settlement continuity**, rather than by comparing allele percentages alone. In general, the **source population** of any migration exhibits a higher rate of population growth and genetic diversification, whereas **derivative or branch populations** show reduced diversity and slower demographic expansion. Hence, an analysis that ignores this demographic dimension may lead to misleading conclusions about the origin and spread of ancient populations.

South Indian communities, especially those residing along the eastern and western coasts, are known from archaeological remains, classical Greco-Roman accounts, Tamil Sangam literature, and later inscriptions to have engaged extensively in maritime trade and overseas settlement. Such sustained seaborne interactions would have naturally facilitated gene flow from South India to coastal populations of East Africa, Arabia, Southeast Asia, and other Indian Ocean regions. Over long time scales, even limited but continuous maritime contact can produce detectable genetic affinities without requiring mass population replacement.

In contrast, populations of northern India historically occupied major overland corridors connecting South Asia with Central Asia, West Asia, and eventually Europe. These land routes—later conceptualized as parts of the Silk Road network—enabled gradual demographic diffusion, cultural exchange, and gene flow through contiguous territories. Consequently, genetic similarities observed between North Indian populations and certain Eurasian and European populations may be more coherently explained by long-term overland migrations from India to West Asia, and eventually Europe rather than migrations into India as is falsely concluded.

Importantly, modern population genetics demonstrates that genetic similarity alone does not establish the direction of migration. Such similarity may arise from outward movement. When demographic scale, internal genetic diversity, and settlement continuity are taken into account, the Indian subcontinent exhibits characteristics more consistent with a long-term population reservoir rather than a recently assembled population through external influxes.

Thus, the differing genetic affinities observed between South Indian populations and coastal regions on the one hand, and North Indian populations and inland Eurasian regions on the other, may reflect distinct modes of ancient mobility—maritime dispersal from southern coastal India and overland diffusion from northern India—operating within a single, continuous Indian civilizational framework. This interpretation aligns more closely with archaeological continuity, indigenous historical records, and the known patterns of ancient trade and navigation than with

simplistic invasion or replacement models.

Genetic Differences

Here one point may be clarified that genetic differences within any population arise primarily through mutations — natural changes in DNA sequences that occur randomly during cell division or in response to environmental factors such as radiation or chemical exposure. These mutations introduce new genetic variations into populations over time. A classic example is the sickle-cell mutation found in certain African populations, which provides resistance to malaria — illustrating how genetic changes can be both adaptive and population-specific. Moreover, if we believe Darwin's evolution all living beings right from Amoeba to modern day humans are the result of internal genetic mutations based on several regional, environmental and other factors on the earth, instead of outside gene flow from some other planets.

Y-chromosomal haplogroup analyses

Y-chromosomal analysis shows trends towards higher steppe male ancestry as we go further north in geography and across caste hierarchy. This shows that ancient populations from the Indian subcontinent migrated outward toward the Eurasian steppes, rather than the other way around.

The distribution pattern of certain haplogroups, such as R1a1a (M17/M198), shows a gradual diminishing frequency from northwestern India toward Central Asia and Europe. Within India, the marker occurs most frequently among North Indian upper-caste groups, but it is not absent in lower or south Indian populations.

This pattern suggests that in pre-modern societies, large-scale long-distance migration was rarely a mass phenomenon involving entire populations. Historical, archaeological, and sociological evidence consistently indicates that mobility was largely restricted to specific social groups—namely rulers, warrior elites, priestly specialists, administrators, and long-distance traders. These groups possessed the necessary resources, education, political authority, and institutional support to undertake and sustain migration across vast geographical regions. Artisans, agricultural laborers, and service populations, by contrast, were generally sedentary and remained locally rooted, except when accompanying elite groups as retainers or dependents.

This asymmetry in mobility has important implications for interpreting genetic data. Genetic markers associated with Eurasian steppe or West Eurasian populations—particularly certain Y-chromosomal haplogroups—are found at higher frequencies among socially and economically dominant groups in North India, while appearing at lower frequencies among more localized or traditionally sedentary populations. Such a pattern is more consistent with limited elite-mediated gene flow rather than large-scale population replacement.

In population genetics, this phenomenon is well documented as elite dominance diffusion or sex-biased gene flow, wherein small but influential migrating groups—often male—introduce specific genetic markers into recipient populations without substantially altering the overall genetic structure. This explains why certain paternal lineages show social stratification, while autosomal DNA reflects broad continuity across populations. The relative genetic homogeneity of lower-status or occupationally fixed communities suggests long-term regional stability rather than exclusion from an ancestral population.

Importantly, this pattern does not imply inherent biological differences between social groups, nor does it support rigid or birth-based caste interpretations. Rather, it reflects historical constraints on mobility and social organization. Social stratification influenced who moved, who intermarried across regions, and whose lineages expanded demographically. Over time, these

processes created frequency differences in certain genetic markers without implying distinct racial origins.

Furthermore, the presence of shared genetic markers across Indian, Central Asian, and European populations—particularly concentrated among historically mobile elite groups—can be plausibly interpreted as evidence of outward diffusion from India through land-based networks, rather than unilateral inward migration. If large external populations had entered India en masse, one would expect more uniform genetic distribution across all social strata, which is not observed.

Thus, when interpreted within a realistic historical and demographic framework, genetic stratification by social group supports a model of selective mobility and elite-mediated transmission operating within a fundamentally continuous Indian population. This perspective cautions against simplistic invasion models and underscores the necessity of integrating genetics with social history, archaeology, and textual evidence.

Furthermore, this pattern aligns with the linguistic and cultural evidence. All Indo-Aryan languages—and indeed, the entire Indo-European linguistic family—derive fundamental phonetic, grammatical, and semantic features from Sanskrit, which itself exhibits a highly developed and internally consistent linguistic system. This indicates that Sanskrit was not a derivative language, but a source language from which later linguistic branches evolved.

The term “Aryan languages” was coined by Max Müller, based on linguistic similarities across Europe and Asia. The widespread diffusion of Sanskritic linguistic and cultural elements can be more logically explained by migration and interaction of Sanskrit-speaking groups from India toward surrounding regions, consistent with both genetic gradients and archaeological continuity.

Thus, the combined evidence from Y-chromosomal data, linguistics, and archaeology supports a model of India as an early center of human and cultural radiation, rather than a mere recipient of migrations from the steppe or elsewhere.

Carriers of Indo Aryan or Indo European languages

It may further be clarified that multiple waves of outward migration from the Indian subcontinent, occurring over extended prehistoric and early historic periods, plausibly carried what are conventionally termed Indo-Aryan linguistic features from India into Western and Central Asia and, subsequently, into parts of Europe. Linguistic, archaeological, and genetic evidence together support such outward diffusion.

From a linguistic standpoint, Sanskrit occupies a uniquely central and structurally complete position among Indo-European languages. Its highly systematic grammar, preserved in the Vedic corpus and formalized in Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, exhibits features that appear more archaic and internally consistent than those of later European and Iranian languages. Many Indo-European languages display simplified or reduced forms of grammatical structures that are fully developed in Sanskrit, a pattern that is more consistent with linguistic branching outward from a mature source language than with Sanskrit being a late derivative.

Archaeologically, the Indian subcontinent demonstrates long-term cultural continuity, urban planning, technological sophistication, and symbolic systems extending from the Vedic through post-Vedic periods into Harappan phase, without evidence of large-scale demographic disruption. In contrast, Central Asian and European regions show later and more fragmented developments of comparable linguistic and cultural features, suggesting diffusion rather than origination.

Genetically, Eurasian populations share gradients of ancestry rather than sharp discontinuities, and South Asia exhibits greater internal genetic diversity than many of the regions to its west. In population genetics, such diversity is generally indicative of long-term habitation and source populations, whereas regions with lower diversity often represent recipient or branch populations. The presence of shared Y-chromosomal and autosomal markers across South Asia, Central Asia, and Europe is therefore compatible with gradual outward dispersal through both land routes (via the northwestern corridors) and maritime routes, rather than sudden inward migration.

Moreover, historical trade networks—both overland and maritime—provide well-established mechanisms for sustained linguistic and cultural transmission. Language spread does not necessarily require mass population replacement; elite transmission, scholarly mobility, ritual specialists, traders, and interregional cultural prestige can effectively disseminate linguistic systems across vast territories. The widespread adoption of Sanskritic phonology, morphology, and conceptual vocabulary across Eurasia may thus reflect long-term civilizational influence emanating from the Indian subcontinent.

Taken together, these linguistic hierarchies, archaeological continuities, genetic gradients, and historical transmission mechanisms allow for a coherent model in which India functioned as an early and enduring center of linguistic and cultural radiation. In this model, so-called Indo-Aryan or Indo European languages are not intrusive imports into India, but regional expressions of a broader Vedic linguistic tradition that expanded outward over millennia into Western and Central Asia and Europe.

Chronology and the Dating of the Ṛgveda

The conventional dating of the Ṛgveda (1500–1800 BCE) emerged under the constraints of Biblical chronology dominant in nineteenth-century Europe. Indian textual traditions employ astronomical markers—eclipses, solstices, nakṣatra alignments—that allow precise dating independent of Biblical frameworks. Purāṇic genealogies, the Rājatarangiṇī, and astronomical references collectively indicate a much greater antiquity for Vedic civilization. Modern computational astronomy increasingly corroborates these indigenous chronological systems, undermining artificially compressed colonial timelines.

Are Indo-Aryan and Dravidian two separate language families?

Sanskrit represents one of the oldest and most structurally sophisticated languages known to humanity. All European, Iranian, and Indian languages share a significant number of lexical and grammatical features with Sanskrit, indicating a deep linguistic connection. This relationship can be described metaphorically as a “mother–daughter” relationship, though the conventional naming of language families (such as “Indo-European”) may not fully capture the centrality of the Vedic linguistic tradition. From this perspective, these languages could more appropriately be viewed as branches of a broader *Vedic family of languages*. We cannot accept Indo Arya or Indo Dravidian theory as two separate language families. For detail, one can go through books of present author: “Vedic Theory of Origin of Language” and “Sanskrit the Original Source of European languages”, available on Amazon.

Discussion: India as a Civilizational Continuum

Archaeological continuity from the Vedic period to Harappan phase through later historical periods, combined with linguistic, genetic, and textual evidence, supports a model of India as an internally diverse yet civilizational unified space. Cultural differentiation occurred through region, profession, and pedagogy, not through racial displacement. The Arya–Dravidian divide, therefore, functions primarily as a colonial explanatory myth rather than an empirically grounded

historical reality.

Why couldn't we get rid of these conspiracies

Sri Aurobindo reflects upon it:

That....Indian scholars have not been able to form themselves into a great and independent school of learning is due to two causes, the miserable scantiness of the mastery in Sanskrit provided by our universities.....and our lack of sturdy independence which makes us ever-ready to deter to European Opinion.

Conclusion

The Arya–Dravidian divide dissolves under critical scrutiny. Neither indigenous texts nor modern scientific data support a binary racial or linguistic schism within India. Instead, the evidence points to a continuous Vedic civilization characterized by internal diversity, cultural exchange, and long-term demographic stability. Reclaiming this integrated perspective is essential not only for historical accuracy but also for intellectual decolonization of Indian studies.

References

Arya, R. P. (2005). *The Ṛgveda*, Parimal Publications.

Arya, R.P. (2025). *Manusmṛti: The First Constitution of Humanity on the Globe*. Indian Foundation for Vedic Science.

Caldwell, R. (1856). *A comparative grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian family of languages*. Harrison.

Cremona, M. A., & Thompson, R. L. (1993). *Forbidden archaeology*. Bhaktivedanta Institute.

Müller, F. M. (1883). *India: What can it teach us?* Longmans, Green, and Co.