

HUMAN EVOLUTION AND MIGRATION IN AND OUT OF INDIA

Veeranarayana Pandurangi¹

Head, Dept of Darshanas,
JR Rajasthan Samskrita
University, Jaipur

Introduction

Human evolution is a matter of high controversy, much debated by different faiths across the globe and different schools of western science as well.

This paper aims to present a picture according to Indian tradition and raise some questions on the validity of “Recent African Origin” (RAO) theory proposed by western evolutionists.

Indian tradition is very much clear of the human evolution in India. It comes to fore, when we think of human creation/evolution, that All the Indian scriptures speak unanimously of straight creation of perfect humans by Chaturmukha Brahman. Indian tradition also speaks of Dashaavataaras. Some modern thinkers have tried to relate these Avataaras with the possible human evolution from aquatics to perfect humans held by evolutionists. But this linkage theory need not be discussed here as it is apparently absurd. Even the earlier avataaras invariably include the perfect humans mostly as beneficiaries. For example the Matsya avatara includes the King Satyavrata who is perfect human. Kurma avatara includes the Devas and Daityas etc. Hence it is clear that this story does not endorse the western human evolution theory.

According to Indian tradition Chaturmukha created this universe along with all the creatures. Perfect humans are also created by him. This creation is an intentional process. This is the theme of this paper. Otherwise this creation can not be explained with satisfaction. **Modern evolution theory is helpless in finding some very basic questions** in more than one front. Let the evolutionists shoot us but they owe us an answer as to why this evolution happened? They can not simply escape from

¹ I thank Prof. Ananta Sharma, Dharmasamskriti piithaadhyaksha, JRRSU, for clearing many doubts and providing many books. I am particularly thankful to Dr. Vishvesha Guttal, Postdoctoral Research Associate, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, USA, for clearing many doubts, enlightening discussions and providing many links to scientific findings. This paper is primarily a result of a discussion held on BVP sometimes in April 2009. Consequently I held long discussion (whatever limited possible through emails) with Dr. Vishvesha Guttal. I can not claim that the views held here by me are final but is the result of our present day knowledge. Still we need to resolve many issues in Indian tradition as well as in western science. I can not also claim that I am a scholar of DNA vidyaa, it is simply is a result of human common sense with a little bit Nyaayasamskaara.

confounding questions by simply saying that they are agnostics. **They have to explain as to what is this universe? How did come to existence? How wide it is? How long it is? How old it is?**

We are not using the word “Universe” not in a sense that Universe is thing which comprises of 200 odd nations, but in a highly broader and wider sense i.e. “the infinite universe” which comprises of all the known and unknown planets, stars, galaxies and much more that we really do not know at present. This Universe is an infinite one. Infinity is a thing that can be known only logically and not otherwise. Nobody knows exactly, even in the logical sense, how infinite is this universe and what is happening in other infinite galaxies elsewhere. It seems, logically, that there must be similar creations elsewhere as things normally do happen in similar fashion. There must be men, women, elephants, giraffes, dinos so on and so forth elsewhere in infinite universe.

The all time biggest question is **where from all these male and female creatures come and where they go? What is their nature?** This is the question that our western colleagues should address in priority. We also need to find out a good answer to the following offshoot questions--

1. Do these creatures come from nowhere and go nowhere? Are they absolutely momentary as our Buddhist colleagues have held?
2. Do they come and go from and to somewhere? or
3. Are they permanent residents of this universe so that they may not need to come and go? or
4. (slightly modifying the no. 1) Are they like potsherds, computers and cars, to be completely manufactured by parents and to be flushed off after a specific shelf time?

We need to discuss these issues before we venture into discussing the human evolution itself. For example what is the need of the discussing the evolution if humans existed beginning-less **as held by Indian tradition?** In other words if these creatures existed beginning-less, albeit in the form of souls (with or without bodies), then they must have been getting these human bodies again and again in the infinite time frame. Then there ceases the question of evolution.

Off course it is possible that there was a time when no humans existed. For example, according to Indian tradition, the night of hundred years of last Chaturmukha is totally humanless and the whole first fifty years of the present Chaturmukha are humanless except for the Chaturmukha and Narayana. But if we consider the shorter time span of this Vaivasvata manvantara alone, consisting of 120,53,3110 years (4320000 x27+1728000+1296000 +864000+ 5110)², certainly it can not be humanless, **according to Indian tradition**, since of Vaivasvata manvantara³ was the beginning

² 4320000 [=one mahayuga]x27[=mahayugas]+1728000 [=28th kṛta]+1296000 [28th tretaa]+864000[28th dvaapara]+ 5110 [28th kali's past years].

³ in fact, the Vaivasvata manvantara itself is the beginning of modern civilization as described as follows

न हि पूर्वविसर्गे वै विषमे पृथिवीतले। संविभागः पुराणां वा ग्रामाणामभवत्तदा। न सस्यानि न गोरक्ष्यं न कृषिर्न वणिक्पथः। नैव सत्यानृतं चासीन्न लोभो न च मत्सरः। वैवस्वतेन्तरे तस्मिन्सांप्रतं समुपस्थिते। वैन्यात्प्रभृति वै विप्राः सर्वस्यैतस्य संभवः। यत्र यत्र समं त्वस्या भूमेरासीत्तदा द्विजाः। तत्र तत्र प्रजाः

the creation and it is continuously has through all these years. Atheists may cry foul for this, but it is the thing we have to believe until we get another good adoptable theory. Thus we have to keep these questions in mind while discussing the human evolution. No theory will be acceptable unless it answers these questions.

First we will see what is the western view and what are the problems to be found there and then go to Indian view on evolution. Afterwards we will discuss the issue of migration out of India.

Part One: Evolution

“Recent African Origin (RAO)” Theory of Evolutionists

Following is the Wikipedia article on the Human evolution according to Modern western science.

Early Homo sapiens

Archaic Homo sapiens originated in Africa about 250,000 years ago. The trend in [cranial expansion](#) and the [acheulean](#) elaboration of stone tool technologies which occurred between 400,000 years ago and the second interglacial period in the Middle [Pleistocene](#) (around 250,000 years ago) provide evidence for a transition from [H. erectus](#) to *H. sapiens*. In the RAO scenario, migration within and out of Africa eventually replaced the earlier dispersed *H. erectus*.

[Homo sapiens idaltu](#), found at site [Middle Awash](#) in Ethiopia, lived about 160,000 years ago^[9]. It is the oldest known anatomically modern human and classified as [extinct](#) subspecies^[clarification needed]. Fossils of modern humans were found in [Qafzeh](#) cave in [Israel](#) and have been dated to 100,000 years ago. However these humans seem to have either gone extinct or retreated back to Africa 70,000 to 80,000 years ago, possibly replaced by south bound Neanderthals escaping the colder regions of ice age Europe.^[citation needed] Hua Liu & al. analyzing autosomal microsatellite markers dates to 56,063±5,678 years ago [mtDNA](#) evidence. The [paleontological](#) fossil of early modern human from [Qafzeh cave](#) dated at 80,000–100,000 Liu interpret as isolated early offshoot that retracted back to Africa.^[10]

All other fossils of fully modern humans outside of Africa have been dated to more recent times(80,000–100,000 year ago). The next oldest fossil of modern humans outside of Africa are those of [Mungo Man](#) found in Australia and have been dated to about 42,000 years ago.^[11]

Exodus from Africa

Some 70 millennia ago, a part of the bearers of mitochondrial haplogroup [L3](#) migrated from [East Africa](#) into the [Near East](#).

Some scientists believe that only a few people left Africa in a single migration that went on to populate the rest of the world^[19]. It has been estimated that from a

सर्वा निवासं समरोचयन्। आहारः फलमूनानि प्रजानामभवत्तदा। कृच्छ्रेण महता युक्त इत्येवमनुशुश्रुम॥
ब्रह्मपुराण 2 अध्याये 91-95

population of 2,000 to 5,000 in Africa, only a small group of possibly 150 people crossed the Red Sea. This is because, of all the lineages present in Africa, only the daughters of one lineage, L3, are found outside Africa. Had there been several migrations one would expect more than one African lineage outside Africa. L3's daughters, the M and N lineages, are found in very low frequencies in Africa (although haplogroup M1 is very ancient and diversified in [North](#) and [Northeast Africa](#)) and appear to be recent arrivals. A possible explanation is that these mutations occurred in East Africa shortly before the exodus and by the [founder effect](#) became the dominant haplogroups after the exodus from Africa. Alternatively, the mutations may have arisen shortly after the exodus from Africa.

Other scientists have proposed a Multiple Dispersal Model, in which there were two migrations out of Africa, one across the Red Sea travelling along the coastal regions to [India](#) (the Coastal Route), which would be represented by Haplogroup M. Another group of migrants with Haplogroup N followed the Nile from East Africa, heading northwards and crossing into [Asia](#) through the [Sinai](#). This group then branched in several directions, some moving into Europe and others heading east into Asia. This hypothesis attempts to explain why Haplogroup N is predominant in Europe and why Haplogroup M is absent in Europe. Evidence of the coastal migration is hypothesized to have been destroyed by the rise in sea levels during the [Holocene](#) epoch.^{[20][21]} Alternatively, a small European founder population that initially expressed both Haplogroup M and N could have lost Haplogroup M through random genetic drift resulting from a [bottleneck](#) (i.e. a [founder effect](#)).

Today at the [Bab-el-Mandeb straits](#) the [Red Sea](#) is about 12 miles (20 kilometres) wide, but 50,000 years ago it was much narrower and sea levels were 70 meters lower. Though the straits were never completely closed, there may have been islands in between which could be reached using simple rafts. Shell [middens](#) 125,000 years old have been found in [Eritrea](#)^[citation needed] indicating the diet of early humans included seafood obtained by [beachcombing](#)

Few questions about this theory

1. Change of colors, features etc.

How RAO theory handles the problems of explaining the different facial and other features and colors of humans in Asians (+Europeans) and Africans, if all the people were to originate from same man? It is difficult to accept that Africans got white color and got rid of their earlier facial features immediately after they came to Europe or to India. In the last at least four thousand years (in India) or five thousand years (in Egypt etc.), there is no visible change in the man as we see IWC seals.

It is certainly possible that Humans living in Africa owe their body colour to the harshness of equatorial Sun. Thus color change can be explained. But then a question arises that equatorial sun should have caused the same color in humans living in other parts of equator-line such as north America, Sumatra and elsewhere. But that is not the case.

Western scientists hold that founder effect is the primary cause of these changes. Founder effect is best explained in Wikipedia as follows —

The founder effect is a special case of [genetic drift](#).^{[3] [4]} In addition to founder effects, the new population is often a very [small population](#) and so shows increased sensitivity to genetic drift, an increase in [inbreeding](#), and relatively low [genetic variation](#). This can be observed in the limited [gene pool](#) of [Easter Islanders](#) and those native to [Pitcairn Island](#). Another example is the legendarily high deaf population of [Martha's Vineyard](#) which resulted in the famous [Martha's Vineyard Sign Language](#).

Yes. Certainly founder effect is acceptable to us. But it is effective only in the cases of limited gene pool like that of Easter Islanders and those native to Pitcairn Island. Legendarily high deaf population of Martha's Vineyard also is a result of this founder effect. Hence founder effect applies to only small mass of regions such as small islands and other inaccessible regions where humans live isolated for a long time but not to the whole large continents of Asia and Europe, where people regularly get intermixed in the long time span of thousands of years.

Further it is a mere scientific imagination that only 150 or 70 people crossed Africa and then had color changes etc. as an offshoot of founder effect. It is not at all possible to think that only 150 or 70 people crossed Africa and founded population here. These 150 would have been caught alive and eaten piece by piece by all the wild animals if they alone crossed the redsea.

Why this can not be assumed that Africa was full of the population 70000 years ago. Then some people in that large populace were very much worried about their future and left for greener pastures. Anyhow scientists are not witness to the fact (neither anybody did see it) that how many have had crossed out of Africa, and where the actual DNA mutation started. Is there any decisive factor to show that first mutation started here Asia?

At present we do not know that DNA samples of how many people are taken and how the conclusions are arrived at. It is also difficult to get conclusions on random DNA checks. In fact I call for a critically very important study of the DNA of 100 Indian shrotriya Brahmanas in contrast with some other foreign tribe's DNA. That would show the real differences. That would also shed light on importance of Indian Gotrapravara system. Indian Gotrapravara system is very much based on the DNA only. The Rshis responsible for the creation of this system had studied the lineages in a very perfect manner and formulated Gotrapravara system. That is why it is practiced so vehemently even today by Followers of Sanaatana Dharma.

Western scientists opine that An African and a European may look so different, but genetically any two humans are extremely similar 99% or more. In fact humans and chimpanzees share up to 97% common generic features. So the difference that has happened in evolution in 6 million years starting from chimpanzees is very small from a genetic perspective, but the results are large from a phenotypic point of view (i.e, observable features). So we need not worry about the changes in observable features.

Our answer is as follows-- Yes. Africans and Europeans may be 99% similar. But even this 1% is does matter very much, since human genome is several billion letters long. Therefore even this 1% change is of very high value. Similarly Humans and

chimpanzees may share up to 97% common generic features, but then there is a high change in brain. Hence this 99% similarity does not matter.

It takes much more than founder effect to get changes in the features that are apparent. In the last two thousand years there is no much difference in observable features even considering the Greek and Roman sculptures (which are very modern compared to IWC or Egyptian ones). If no significant change has happened there then on what basis we can suppose that the founder effect is possible for this change. We do not know how much time it may take to happen.

It is also possible a very powerful incident may cause this change. This change seems more intentional than incidental. **In fact the whole worldly activities are intentional rather than simply incidental.** Scientists may disagree on the purpose of life, but the whole Indian tradition is, was, and will be, for this achieving this purpose. This is the theme of Indian tradition that this body is not for something worldly pleasures but for achieving something more fruitful thing. Indian sciences like Saamkhya-Yoga, Nyaaya- Vaisheshika, Miimaamsaa-Vedaanta, Tantra etc. do explore the same thing. The whole Vedic literature does the same. Off course there is much more literature than this mokshashastra in India, but it is all auxiliary knowledge and not the main thing. This is the basic difference between Indian and other traditions. That is why hoards of people, generation after generation, thronged India to get the glimpse of this a-worldly knowledge. These people came to India without any allurements of worldly gifts. Even today thousands of people seeking spiritual solace come to India. Hence nobody can dismiss this a-worldly purpose without showing enough evidence. Thus we can conclude that this whole process of creation is intentional and thus different colors features in different regions etc. have their origin in an intentional creation process controlled by intelligent power.

It is also very important to note that, in creation, each species has its own identity that is available from time beginning-less. It does not change. For example if it is elephant it is always elephant. It can not be giraffe at one stage of creation and become elephant at a later stage. Similarly a Giraffe can not become an elephant at a later stage of evolution. Elephant will remain elephant for ever and Giraffe will remain Giraffe. They may cease to exist only if something endangering their very existence happens. But they will not become something other. Yes, they may produce some hybrid species, if interbred, but then who were there to be interbred with humans. Some fossils of very different formation of elephants might be found somewhere but that may belong to another species and not that of Elephant. May be some creatures might have had shorter or longer trunk, tusk or blower mouth but those are different kinds of elephants. If all elephants can become giraffe then there can not be elephants at all. It is the way that all the big creatures like dinosaurs etc. existed and produced their offshoots of similar nature and at a certain time became extinct without reproducing something of different forms. Similarly Chimpanzees and Gorillas can not become humans at a later stage in the creation. They will continue to be Chimpanzees and Gorillas as long as there is no threat to their very existence like mass massacre or something like that. Why did all the chimpanzees not become humans? How did they continue to be chimpanzees? Hence this evolution theory seems defies general laws.

2. Spread of Samskrit-based-languages in central Asia and Europe

How RAO theory handles the spread of Samskrit-based-languages (or so called Indo-European group of languages)? India, Central Asia and Europe share a language family (family Samskrit-based-languages). It will be difficult had the European group separated from one that was bound to travel to south Asia 30000 years ago.

Western scientists opine that there were two migrations to India. First one was around 40,000 years back. Second one was a split from Central Asia. One branch came to India and other went to Europe. The timing is estimated to be between 30,000 to 10,000 years back. These numbers have large error bars and are not accurate. Moreover genetics can not always tell precisely about languages. Take for example that of spread of English in India. Imagine that we had no history textbooks. Currently we see that English is prevalent in Europe and also in some parts of India. Did English originate in India and went to Europe or did it originate in Europe and come to India? Or did they appear separately? Can genetics answer this question in the absence of any history? The answer is No. We can only tell that from history and historical linguistics. There are principles of linguistics that can suggest the most likely origin of a language. History can make the task easier if its clearly written and does not contradict with the linguistics.

This is our answer- It is difficult to explain spread of Samskrit-based-languages in the absence of colonial power and Machiavellian tactics employed by Sons of Mecauley to usher the spread of English in India.

Moreover If second immigration into India accepted to happened estimated 30 to 10 thousand years back then there should have been DNA variation among the groups North Indian (second and later migration group) and south Indian (first migration group). But that seems not the case.

Wikipedia says

Recent studies of the distribution of alleles on the Y chromosome,[13] microsatellite DNA,[14] and mitochondrial DNA [15] in India have cast overwhelmingly strong doubt for a biological Dravidian "race" distinct from non-Dravidians in the Indian subcontinent. The only distinct ethnic groups present in South Asia, according to genetic analysis, are the Naga, Bodo, Tripura, Balochi, Brahui, Burusho, Hazara, Kalash and Pathan peoples, all of which are found in the northwest and northeastern extremes of south Asia respectively .[16]

Moreover the Haplogroup M, (a human mitochondrial DNA [mtDNA] haplogroup) is found common among the people of India including Kerala, Karnataka etc.who are supposed to be first wave immigrants. How it is possible had if they have different DNA than north Indian population.

The claim that the 30000 old language, spread among two continents, spoken by millions, is same now after all these years is also well steeped in deep imagination. Imagine the transformation English has got in last one thousand years. But neither Samskrita or Tamil have undergone such variations in last five millennia. Similarly the base language of these immigrants should have gone turnovers many times. but it is not the case.

Indian traditional view

Hence before going to the Indian evolution theory we can conclude the review of western theory by saying that we need to look up at the evolution through the comprehensive view point rather than simply looking at DNA samples and making some conjectural conclusions.

Thus, we can, neither accept this human evolution/creation is 6000+2000 year old as held by Christian clergymen, (which is apparently false even going by the available evidence of different civilizations around the world and hence does not deserve discussion) nor we can accept that it as 100000 old as held by evolutionists. **This human creation is eternal and endless since the souls are eternal.** These souls take journey again and again in this universe to achieve their goals. In the process they will take one or other bodies. These bodies are counted in Indian tradition as 8400000. Each living being in this universe, including even trees etc., has one soul. These souls will be rotating in this creation forever. **Thus this whole process of creation including human evolution is beginningless and endless.** This is the essence of Indian tradition. One will have to turn a blind eye to reject the evidences that prove the eternity of souls. Innumerable instances, across the globe, reporting past life remembrance can not be summarily rejected without any reason. Edgar Casey too confirms this theory through his numerous past life readings which were proved to be difficult to be rejected by contemporary scientists and atheists. Hence the human creation/evolution must be seen from this angle only.

Long process of creation

Though Vedas speak of direct creation of Braahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Suudra vaguely as found in famous Purushasukta--

ब्राह्मणोस्य मुखमासीत् बाहू राजन्यः कृतः।

ऊरु तदस्य यद्वैश्यः पद्भ्यां शूद्रो अजायत॥ (RV 10.90.12)

it does not necessarily mean that Chaturmukha or Parabrahman straight away created these four classes and all other creatures simultaneously. Puranas give a detailed account of gradual creation. There is a very long process to go. However this description of Purushasukta may indicate the creation of these four varnas by Vaamdeva at a later stage as described in Matsyapuraana⁴. It may also indicate the creation of humans by Aryamaa since Aryamaa the son of Aditi is credited with the creation of ordinary humans⁵. But still we have think more over about these descriptions⁶.

The process/chronology more or less agreed upon in all Puraanas is given below. **According to Indian tradition all the humans are the off springs of the same lineage. Not only the Humans but all the living creatures came into existence**

⁴ वामदेवस्तु भगवानसृजन्मुखतो द्विजान्। राजन्यानसृजद्बाहवोर्विद्वान्शूद्रान् रूपादयोः॥ मत्स्य 3.28.

⁵ अर्यम्णो मातृका पत्नी तयोश्चर्षणयः सुताः। यत्र वै मानुषी जातिर्ब्रह्मणा चोपकल्पिता॥(भाग.6.6.42)

⁶ This untraced quotation also speaks of straight creation of four varanas by Chaturmukha ब्रह्मणः

सृजतः पूर्वं सत्याभिधायिनस्तथा। मिथुनानां सहस्रं तु मुखात्सोथासृजन्मुने। सहस्रमन्यद्वक्षस्तो

मिथुनानां ससर्ज ह। ससर्जन्यत्सहस्रं तु द्वन्द्वानामूरुतः पुनः। पद्भ्यां सहस्रमन्यच्च मिथुनानां ससर्ज

ह॥ (possibly Vishnupuraana?)

only in this process. Below given are the Svaayambhuva manu lineages where there are actually two branches of creation as listed below--- 1. Suuryavamsha 2. Chandravamsha.

Chaturmukha also created ten Rshis named Mariichi, Atri, Angiraah, Pulastya, Pulaha, Krtu, Prachetas, Vasishtha, Bhrgu and Naarada from his mind. He also created Daksha, Dharma, Kaama, Krodha, Lobha, Moha, Mada, Pramoda, Bharata and one daughter out of the various parts of his body. Again **Vaamadeva and Sanatkumaara** are born by Shataruupaa (Gaayatrii) of Chaturmukha. These Rshis are very important component of creation⁷.

1. Suuryavamsha

Narayana>Chaturmukha>Svaayambhuvamanu>**Uttaanpaada**>Dhruva>Vatsara>Pushparna>Vyushti>Chakshu>Manu>Ulmuka>Anga>**Vena**>Prthu>Antardhaan(Vijit aashva)>Havirdhaanna>Barhishmat or Barhishat (Praachiinbarhish)>Prachetasah (ten) >**Daksha** (Prajaapati of Chakshusha manvantara)> [through his sixty daughters]

Ten wives of Dharma

Bhanu> Devarshabha,> Indrasena
Lambaa> Vidyota >Stanayitnu,
Kakubh> Sankata,
Jaami> Bhuvo Durgaani> Svarga nandi
Vishvaa> Vishvedevas,
Saadhyaa>Sadhyas,> Athathasiddhi
Marutvatii> Marutvaan and Jayanta (Upendra),
Muhuurtaa>Mauhuurtikas,
Sankalpaa>Sankalpa,
Vasu> Eight Vasus> their sons>grandsons etc.

**Saruupaa (wife of Bhuuta) > Rudras (crores of them), Bhuuta, Vinaayaka
Svadhhaa (wife of Angiras)> Pitrs, Atharvaangiras, Veda
Archish (wife of Krshaashva) > Dhuumrakesha
Dhishanaa (wife of Vedashirah)> Devala, Vayuna, Manu**

Four wives of Tarkshya

Vinataa (Suparnaa)> Garuda and Aruna
Patangii> **Patangas**
Yaaminii> **Shalabhas**
Kadruu> **Naagas**

⁷ मरीचिरभवत्पूर्वं ततोत्रिर्भगवानृषिः। अङ्गिराश्चाभावत्पश्चात्पुलस्त्यस्तदनन्तरम्। ततः पुलहनामा वै ततः क्रतुरजायत। प्रचेताश्च ततः पुत्रो वशिष्ठाश्चभवत्पुनः॥ पुत्रो भृगुरभूत्तद्वन्नारदोप्यचिरादभूत्। दशमान्मानसान्ब्रह्मा मुनीन्पुत्रानजीजनत्॥ शारीरानथ वक्ष्यामि मातृहीनान्प्रजापतेः। अङ्गुष्ठाद्दक्षिणाद्दक्षः प्रजापतिरजायत। धर्मः स्तनान्तादभवत् हृदयात्कुसुमायुधः। भ्रूमध्यादभवत्क्रोधो लोभश्चाधरसंभवः॥ बुद्धेर्मोहः समभवदहंकारादभून्मदः। प्रमोदश्चाभवत्कण्ठान्मृत्युर्लोचनतो नृप॥ भरतः करमध्यात् ब्रह्मसूनुरभूत्ततः। एते नव सुता राजन्कन्या च दशमी पुनः॥ अङ्गजा इति विख्याता दशमी ब्रह्मणः सुताः। मत्स्य 3.2-12

Thirteen wives of Kashyapa⁸

Diti>Hirayaaksha, Hiranyakashipu, Maruts

Danu> Dvimuurdhaa etc.Daanavas (61 sons)

Kaashthaa> **Dvishaphetara (creatures other than twohoofed)**Arishtaa>**Gandharvas, Kinnara**Surasaa> **Yaatudhaanas**

Ilaa> Bhuuruha (Trees), Trna, lataa, Gulma etc.

Muni> **Apsaras, Munis**Krodhavashaa> **Dandashuuka etc. Sarpas (Creatures of Mouse family)**Taamraa⁹> **Shyena, Grdhra (Eagles, Vultures)**Surabhi> **Mahisha and Go (Buffalos and Cows)**Saramaa> **Shvaapada (Dogs etc.)**Timi> **Yaadogana (aquatic creatures)****Aditi**> Puushaa, Tvashtaa, Savitaa, Bhaga, Dhaataa, Vidhaataa, Varuna, Mitra, Shakra, Urukrama,**Vivasvaan**>Vaivasvata Manu>Ilaa>Budha (this leads to chandravamsha)
Yama, Yamii,**Aryamaa(w.Maatrkaa)> all the manushya Jaati¹⁰****Two daughters of Vaishvaanara (wives of Kashyapa)**

Pulomaa> Paulomas

Kaalakaa> Kaalakeyas (Both totalling 60000)

2. Chandravamsha

Narayana>Chaturmukha>Atri> Soma (Chandra)>Budha> **Puruuravas**> ¹¹ Aayu> Nahusha>Yayaati>Puuru>Janamejaya>Prachinvaan>Praviira>Namasyu>Chaarupada >Sudyu>Bahugava>Samyaati>Ahamyati>Raudraashva>Rteyu(Rantibhaara)>Sumati >Raibhya>Dushyanta>Bharata>Vitatha>Manyu>Brahatkshatra>Hastii>Ajamiidha>R ksha>Samvarana>Kuru>Jahnu>Suratha>Viduuratha>Saarvabhauma>Jayasena>Raadhika>Ayuta>Krodhana>Devaatithi>Rshya>Diliipa>Pratiipa>Shantanu>Vichitraviirya >Paandu>Yudhishtira>

⁸ तिमेर्यादोगणा आसन् श्वापदाः सरमासुताः। सुरभर्महिषा गावो ये चान्ये द्विशफा नृप। ताम्रायाः श्येनगृध्राद्याः मुनेरप्सरसां गणाः। दन्दशूकादयः सर्पा राजन् क्रोधवशात्मजाः। इलाया भूरुहाः सर्वे यातुधानाश्च सौरसाः। अरिष्टायाश्च गन्धर्वाः काष्ठाया द्विशफेतराः। (भाग. 6.7.26-29)

⁹ षट्कन्या जनयामास ताम्रा मारीचबीजतः। शुकी श्येनी च भासी च सुग्रीवी गृध्रिका शुचिः। शुकी शुकानुलूकांश्च जनयामास धर्मतः। श्येनी श्येनांस्तथा भासी कुरानप्यजीजनत्। गृध्री गृध्रकपोतांश्च पारावतविहङ्गमान्। हंससारसक्रौञ्चांश्च प्लवांच्छुचिरजीजनत्। अजाश्वमेषोष्ट्रखरान् सुग्रीवीचाप्यजीजनत्। (मत्स्य 7.30-32)

¹⁰ अर्यम्णो मातृका पत्नी तयोश्चर्षणयः सुताः। यत्र वै मानुषी जातिर्ब्रह्मणा चोपकल्पिता।।(भाग.6.6.42)

¹¹ Following is one more branch of the same lineage Vijaya>Bhiima>Kaanchana> Hotraka>Jahnu>Puuru>Balaaka>Ajaka>Kusha Kushaambu Gaadhi>Satyavatii(W/O Rchiika)>Jamadagni>Raama (Parashuraama)

Thus it is clear that this human evolution depicted in Indian texts is a gradual and long procedure to follow and not a thing that is manufactured in few hours as Semitics held for long. It depicts the creation of all the living creatures including birds aquatic creatures etc. Moreover this process is balanced one and more logical than other procedures in question. **It is also intentional as described earlier.** According to it whatever changes have occurred they are intentionally caused by an intelligent controller. **It confirms to very much important theory of “Eternal Continuity of wisdom/Knowledge”.** This theory is the central theme of Indian tradition. According to it, knowledge did not start merely six thousand years ago or some time. It is beginningless and endless. Knowledge is continuous. Humans did possess knowledge always. Knowledge itself is the civilization. Hence though not everybody lived as a Maharshi, but they did not live like Chimpanzees and Gorillas. They were civilized forever at least in some regions. All the Indian textual tradition is witness to this continuous flow of knowledge and civilization. Puraanas speak of the endless numbers of Kings, Sages and even some laymen from different spectrums only to end in saying that it is endless and can not be finished.¹² This creation comprises of all the above said creatures like bhuuta, Rudra, Gandharva, Apsaras etc. Thus the comprehensive creation can be explained only by Indian tradition. **This is shown in the earlier part of this paper.** It takes care of all the problems that are raised. Atheists and scientists may not accept this theory but they will have to find real solutions for the questions raised above if they do not accept this theory.

Part two: Migration

It is commonly held view that Aryans came to India from central Asia. This is proposed by so-called Indologists starting from Maxmuller and present day Michel Wetzell etc. But this theory is somehow lacks Indian literary support and purely based on imagination of Aryan migration theory and Proto Indo European Language theory. There should have been some quite literary mention had these people migrated from Central Asia. But no reference to that migration is available in Indian texts. Quite contrarily all our old texts like Puranas, Mahabharata, Ramayana etc. equivocally

¹² श्रूयतां मानवो वंशः प्राचुर्येण परंतप। न शक्यते विस्तरतो वक्तुं वर्षशतैरपि॥ भाग.9.1.7

नामधेयान्यमूषां च सापत्यानां च मे शृणु। यासां प्रसूतिप्रसवैर्लोका आपूरितास्त्रयः॥ भाग.6.6.3

ऐलं चैक्ष्वाकुवंशं च प्रकृतिं परिचक्षते। राजानः श्रेणिबद्धाश्च तथान्ये क्षत्रिया भुवि। ऐलवंशास्तु भूयांसो न तथैक्ष्वाकवो नृपाः। एषामेकशतं पूर्णं कुलानामभिरोचते। तादवदेव तु भोजानां विस्ताराद्विगुणं स्मृतम्। भोजानां द्विगुणं क्षत्रं चतुर्द्धा तद्यथातथम्। ते ह्यतीताः सनामानो ब्रुवतस्तान्निबोध मे। शतं वै प्रतिविन्ध्यानां शतं नागाः शतं हयाः। शतमेकं धार्तराष्ट्रा ह्यशीतिर्जनमेजयाः। शतं वै ब्रह्मदत्तानां वीराणां कुरवः शतम्। ततः शतं च पाञ्चालाः शतं काशिकुशादयः। तथापरे सहस्रे द्वे ये नीपाः शशबिन्दवः। इष्टवन्तश्च ते सर्वे सर्वे नियुतदक्षिणाः। एवं राजर्षयोतीताः शतशोथ सहस्रशः। मनोर्वैवस्वतस्यासन्वर्तमानेन्तरे विभोः। तेषां तु निधनोत्पत्तौ लोकसंस्थितयः स्थिताः। न शक्यो विस्तरस्तेषां सन्तानस्य परस्परम्। तत्पूर्वापरयोगेन वक्तुं वर्षशतैरपि। अष्टाविंशत्समाख्याता गता वैवस्वतेन्तरे। एते देवगणैः सार्धं शिष्टा ये तान्निबोधत। चत्वारिंशत्त्रयश्चैव भविष्यास्ते महात्मानः। अवशिष्टा युगाख्यास्ते ततो वैवस्वतो ह्ययम्। एतद्वः कीर्तितं सम्यक् समासव्यासयोगतः। पुनर्वक्तुं बहुत्वात् न शक्यं विस्तरेण तु। मत्स्यपुराणे 273.67-78.

support reverse human migration from India to these central Asian regions and beyond them.

Let us see some references listed below.

The Ramayana speaks of creation of many kshatriya tribes from Nandini when Vishvaamitra tries to take the cow forcibly from Vashistha.

तस्या हुम्भारवोत्सृष्टा पहलवाश्शतशो नृप। भूय एवासृजद्घोरान् शकान् यवनमिश्रितान्।
तैरासीत्संवृता भूमिः शकैर्यवनमिश्रितैः। प्रभवद्भिर्महावीर्यैः हेमकिञ्जल्कसंनिभैः।
तस्या हुंकारतो जाताः काम्बोजा रविसंनिभाः। ऊधसश्चाथ संभूताः बर्बराः शस्त्रपाणयः।
योनिदेशाच्च यवनाः शकृद्देशाच्छकाः स्मृताः। रोमकूपेषु म्लेच्छाश्च हारीताः सकिरातकाः।
(रामा. बा.का.54-55)

[Pahlavas were created by Humbha noice. She again created shakas along with Yavanas. Earth was full of these tribes of golden-pink color. Kambojas were again born of this nandini had sun color. Barbaras born of mammal glands. Yavanas were born out of Yoni and Shakas were born out of Shakrddesha (scrothum?)

From hair wells the Mlecchas came out alongwith Haritas and Kiratas.]

Matsya speaks of creation of Mlecchas and all types of creatures by Daksha prajaapati.

सोमांशस्य तु तस्यापि दक्षस्याशीतिकोटयः। तासां तु विस्तरं वक्ष्ये लोके यः संप्रतिष्ठितः।
द्विपदश्चाभवन्केचित् केचिद्बहुपदाः नराः। वलीमुखाः शङ्कुकर्णाः कर्णप्रवरणास्तथा।
अश्वरुक्षमुखाः केचित् केचित्सिंहाननास्तथा। श्वसूकरमुखाः केचित् केचिदुष्ट्रमुखास्तथा।
धर्मात्मा जनयामास म्लेच्छान्सर्वाननेकशः। स दृष्ट्वा मनसा दक्षः स्त्रियः पश्चादजीजनत्॥
ददौ स दश धर्माय कश्यपाय त्रयोदश। सप्तविंशति सोमाय ददौ नक्षत्रसंज्ञिताः।
देवासुरमनुष्यादि ताभ्यः सर्वमभूज्जगत्। (मत्स्य 4.51-55)

Matsya also speaks of creation of African Mlecchas by churning the body of Vena King.

तत्कायान्मथ्यमानात् बभूवुर्म्लेच्छजातयः। शरीरे मातुरंशेन कृष्णाञ्जनसमप्रभाः॥ (मत्स्य 10. 7 cd 8 ab)

This story appears in other Puranas also. Brhmapuranana says

तस्मिन्निर्मथ्यमाने वै राज ऊरौ तु जज्ञिवान्। ह्रस्वोतिमात्रः पुरुषः कृष्णश्चातिबभूव ह।
स भीतः प्राञ्जलिर्भत्वा तस्थिवान्द्विजसत्तमाः। तमत्रिर्विह्वलं दृष्ट्वा निषीदेत्यब्रवीत्तदा।
निषादवंशकर्तासौ बभूव वदतां वराः॥ धीवरानसृजच्चापि वेनकल्मषसंभवान्।
ये चान्ये विन्ध्यनिलयास्तुषारास्तुन्दुरास्तथा॥ अधर्मरुचयो विप्रास्ते तु वै वेनकल्मषाः॥
(ब्रह्मपु 2.44-47)

Bhavishyapurana speaks of Africans as follows--

रथक्रान्ते नराः कृष्णाः प्रायशो विकृताननाः। आममांसभुजः सर्वे शूराः कुञ्चितमूर्धजाः॥
(भविष्यपुराण)

Matsya Puraana speaks of succession (utpatti) of Yavanas in the family of Turvasu and Mlecchas in the family of Anu due to the curse of Yayaati.

यदोस्तु यादवा जाताः तुर्वसोर्यवनाः स्मृताः। द्रुहयोः सुतास्तु वै भोजा अनोस्तु म्लेच्छजातयः॥
(मत्स्य 34.30)¹³

Aitareya Brahamana speaks of creation of northern Andhra, Pundra, Shabara, Pulinda, Muutiva when he cursed his sons for non-obedience.

तस्य ह विश्वामित्रस्यैकशतं पुत्रा आसुः। पञ्चाशदेव ज्यायांसो मधुच्छन्दसः।
पञ्चाशत्कनीयांसस्तत्। ये ज्यायांसो न ते कुशलं मेनिरे। ताननु व्याजहार तान्वः प्रजा
भक्षीष्टेति। त एते अन्धाः पुण्ड्राः शबराः पुलिन्दाः मुतिवा इत्युदन्त्या बहवो भवन्ति।
विश्वामित्रा दस्यूनां भूयिष्ठाः (ऐ.ब्रा.7.4.18)

Transformation of Kshatriyas into Vrshalas

All the old Indian texts speak of kshatriyas becoming nonkshatriyas due to kriyalopa and non availability of Brahmanas in the other regions where these Kshatriya Tribes migrated. This non availability may have been caused by various reasons not clearly known.

It is also very important that These Shakas etc. tribes waged constant wars with Indian Kings only because they had Indian origin at one stage. It is like USA trying to dislodge England in every aspect. Always the duplicate wants to replace the original. And Vishnuparana etc. speak of some kind of penalty imposed by Sagara on these tribes. These tribes were forced to observe certain hairstyles that were considered to be inferior by (Original) Aaryas.

Mahabharata speaks of transformation of the following Kshatriya tribes into non-kshatriya = vrshala tribes.

अमार्गेण प्रवृत्तानां प्रत्यक्षादुपलभ्यते। चातुर्वर्ण्यव्यपेतानां जातिमूर्तिपरिग्रहः।
तथा ते हि शकाश्चीनाः काम्बोजाः पारदास्तथा। शबराः पहलवाश्चैव तुषारयवनास्तथा।
दार्वाश्च दरदाश्चैव उज्जिहानास्तथेतराः। वेणाश्च कङ्कणाश्चैव सिंहला मद्रकास्तथा।
किष्किन्धकाः पुलिन्दाश्च कहवाश्चान्ध्रास्सनीरगाः। गन्धिका द्रमिडाश्चैव बर्बराश्चूचुकास्तथा।
किराताः पार्वतेयाश्च कोलाश्चोलाः सखाशकाः। आरूकाश्चैव दोहाश्च याश्चान्या म्लेच्छजातयः।
विकृता विकृताचारा दृश्यन्ते क्रूरबुद्धयः। अमार्गेणाश्रिता धर्मं ततो जात्यन्तरं गताः।
अमार्गोपचितस्यैतत्तपसो विदितं फलम्।.....व्युच्छेदात्तस्य धर्मस्य निरयायोपपद्यते।

ततो म्लेच्छा भवन्त्येते निर्धृताः धर्मवर्जिताः॥ (महा. अनु. 146 कुं.पु.)

[Shaka, China, Kamboja, Parada, Shabara, Pahlava, Tushaarayavana, Darva, Darada, **Ujjihana vena**, Konkana, Simhala, Madraka, Kishkindhaka, Pulinda, karva, Andhra, Niraga, Gandamita, Dramila, Barbara, Chuluka, Kirata, Parvateya, Kala, Chola,

¹³ A quotation untraced but quoted by Raghunandana Sharma in Vaidikasampatti says that The Dravida country was inhabited by the mlecchas who were created out of mammal glands of Nandini

नन्दिन्या गोस्तनात्पूर्वं जातैर्म्लेच्छैर्विनिर्मितः। द्रविडाख्यो महादेशः

Shakhaka, All these Kshatriya tribes became non-kshatriya = vrshala tribes because of nonperformance of Vedic sacrifices etc.]

It further says that Dravida, kaling, Pulinda, Ushinara, Kolisarpa, Maahishaka, Mekala, Dravida, Laata, Paundraka, Kaanvashira, etc. became non kshatriya due to non availability of brahmanas.

शका यवनकाम्भोजाः तास्ताः क्षत्रियजातयः। वृषलत्वं परिगता ब्राह्मणानामदर्शनात्।
द्रविडाश्च कलिङ्गाश्च पुलिन्दाश्चाप्युशीनराः। कोलिसर्पाः माहिषकास्तास्ताः क्षत्रियजातयः।
वृषलत्वं परिगता ब्राह्मणानामदर्शनात्।। (महा.अनु.33.21-22)
मेकला द्रविडा लाटा पौण्ड्राः काण्वशिरास्तथा। शौण्डिकाः दरदाः दार्वाश्चैरा शर्बरबर्बराः।
किरातयवनाश्चैव तास्ताः क्षत्रियजातयः। वृषलत्वमनुप्राप्ता ब्राह्मणानामदर्शनात्।
(महा.अनु.35.17-18)

Manusmrti says it clearly--

शनकैस्तु क्रियालोपात् इमाः क्षत्रियजातयः। वृषलत्वं गता लोके ब्राह्मणादर्शनेन च।
पौण्ड्रकाश्चौद्रविडाः कम्बोजा यवनाः शकाः। पारदाः पहलवाश्चीनाः किराताः दरदाः खशाः
(मनुस्मृतिः 10.43-44)

[All these kshatriyas like poundrakas, odras, dravidas, kambojas, yavanas, shakas, paradas, pahlavas, cheenas, kiratas, daradas, and khashas became vrshalas gradually because inaction (kriyalopa) and of lack of brahmins there (in these countries).

This means even the Reza shah Pahlavi, last king of Iran (may be remembered for his grand coronation sometimes in 1960s) belonged to the same race.]

Refereces of these Kshatriya tribes and their transformation into nonkshatriya are abundant in ancient Indian literature like Mahabharata, Puranas, Ramayana etc.

अर्धं शकानां शिरसो मुण्डयित्वा व्यसर्जयत्। यवनानां शिरः सर्वे काम्बोजानां तथैव च। पारदाः
मुक्तकेशाश्च पहलवाश्मश्रुधारिणः। निःस्वाध्यायवषट्काराः कृतास्तेन महात्मना।। (वायुपुराणे
88.140-141)

शकाः यवनकाम्बोजाः पारदाः पहलवास्तथा। कौलिसर्पाः समहिषा दार्वाश्चोलाः सकेरलाः। सर्वे ते
क्षत्रियास्तात धर्मस्तेषां निराकृतः। वशिष्ठवचनाद्वाजन् सगरेण महात्मना।। (हरि 1.14, महा
9.8.)

एते च मयैव त्वत्प्रतिज्ञापरिपालनाय निजधर्मद्विजसंगपरित्यागं कारिताः ॥ 45 ॥

तथेति तद्गुरुवचनभिन्द्य तेषां वेषान्यत्वमकारयत् ॥ 46 ॥

यवनान्मुंडितशिरसोर्धमुंडिताञ्छकान् प्रलंबकेशान् पारदान् पप्लवाञ् शमश्रुधरान्
निस्स्वाध्यायवषट्कारानेतानन्यांश्च क्षत्रियांश्चकार ॥ 47 ॥

एते चात्मधर्मपरित्यागाद्बाह्यगैः परित्यक्ता म्लेच्छतां ययुः ॥ 48 ॥ (विष्णुपुराणे
4.3.45-48.)

Bhaagavata purana speaks with reference to Bharata's expedition as follows-

किरातहूणान्यवनानन्धान्कङ्कान् खशान्शकान्। अब्रह्मण्यान्नुपांश्चक्रे म्लेच्छान्
दिग्विजयेखिलान् (भाग.9.20.30)

Bhavishyapurana speaks of Kanva's voyage to Egypt.

सरस्वत्याज्ञया कण्वो मिश्रदेशमुपाययौ। म्लेच्छान् चाभाष्यतदा दशसहस्रकान्।
सपत्नीकांश्च तान् म्लेच्छान् शूद्रवर्णाय चाकरोत्। द्विसहस्रास्तदा तेषां मध्ये वैश्या बभूवुरे।
तेषां चकार राजानं राजपुत्रं पुरन्दरम्॥ (भविष्य प्रतिखं 4.21) (5.1.15?)

Matsya Purana speaks of 100 sons of Prachetas in the lineage of Gandhara, being the kings of northern regions (regions north of Gaandhara in Central Asian and possibly their successors being kings of other western regions)

पाण्ड्यश्च केरलश्चैव चौलः कथंस्तथैव च। तेषां जनपदास्स्फीताः पाण्ड्याश्चोलास्सकेरलाः।
द्रुह्योस्तु तनयौ शूरौ सेतुः केतुस्तथैव च। सेतुपुत्रः शरद्वांस्तु गन्धारस्तस्य चात्मजः।
ख्यायते यस्य नाम्नासौ गन्धारविषयो महान्। आरट्टदेशजास्तस्य तुरगा वाजिनां वराः।
गन्धारपुत्रो धर्मस्तु धृतस्तस्यात्मजोभवत्। धृताच्च विदुषो जज्ञे प्रचेतास्तस्य चात्मजः।
प्रचेतसः पुत्रशतं राजानः सर्व एव ते। म्लेच्छराष्ट्राधिपास्सर्वे उदीचीं दिशमाश्रिताः॥ (मत्स्य
48.4-9)

Bhaagavata purana corresponds to above cited fact.

आरब्धस्तस्य गन्धारः तस्य धर्मस्ततो धृतः। धृतस्य दुर्मनास्तस्मात्प्रचेताः प्राचेतसं शतम्।
म्लेच्छाधिपतयोभूवन्नुदीचीं दिशमाश्रिताः। (भाग.9.23.15-16)

Samvarana who is tenth in the ancestors line of Pandu lived on the Banks of Sindhu.

राजा संवरणस्तस्मात् पलायत महाभयात्।

सिन्धोर्नदस्य महतो निकुञ्जे न्यवसत्तदा॥

नदीविषयपर्यन्ते पर्वतस्य समीपतः।

तत्रावसन्बहून्कालान् भारता दुर्गमाश्रिताः।

तेषां निवसतां तत्र सहस्रं परिवत्सरान्।

अथाभ्यगच्छद्भरतान् वसिष्ठो भगवानृषिः॥ म.भा. आदिपर्वणि 89 अध्याये

संवरणः पाण्डोः पूर्वं दशमः

Some other reasons to be considered

1. If one does not accept migration of these tribes from India to different central and west Asian regions then it is difficult to explain the fire worship of Parsis, great similarity between Vedas and Avesta. Parsi fire worship is clearly original Vedic act. Though many other tribes lost their tradition by not preserving the Vedic rituals, Persians or, to speak exactly, the Pahlavas preserved it. Perhaps they were very well determined to preserve it even at the cost of migration to motherland. Other tribes were not so fortunate. In the aftermath of invasion of Iran by Islamists, Pahlavas or at least some of them came to India in order to preserve their Vedic heritage. Why they did not go to England or Germany if there was no connection between old India and Persia.

2. It is well known that Samskrita language is the mother of all these central Asian and European languages. Even the so-called Indologists accept it at least as elder sister. How is this similarity possible without Samskrita's migration out of India? It is not possible to accept that Sanskrit was imported by invading Aryans. It defies the self-accepted language rules if accepted so. This language of central Asian origin (if accepted so) should have become more and more simple as it moved forward and not clearly more and more sophisticated and highly inflected. Even today the languages vogue in the central Asian region are simple as other languages and not highly inflected like Samskrita. Dr. N.R. Joshi exclaimed once (on BVP, May 21, 2009)

According to the Principle of Least Efforts, the natural tendency of language speakers is to change the complex inflections to simple non-inflections. **Then who created highly inflected Vedic (or Sanskrit) and for what purpose?** Today we use English language without many inflections to write scientific papers. What was the need of cattle grazing pastoral Aryans to use highly inflected language? Or could it be that language was simple first but somebody purposely made it highly inflected? It seems unlikely for somebody or group of ancient scholars to invent all details of Vedic language artificially?

3. It is clear that there is high similarity between Samskrita and European words. Such as matr = mother, pitr = father, svasaa = sister, dve = two, tri = three, september, october, november, December etc. How is it possible to make more similar words without the patronage of Samskrita? One may make one thousand rules to justify what he has said or want to achieve, but the obvious modification of words from the time of Rgveda etc. (if it is timed) strikes at sight.

4. Even Mahaabhaashya of Patanjali says शक्तिर्गतिकर्मा कम्बोजेषु पठ्यते. What if Samskrita language is not used in Kamboja as held by AIT. It is clear that this same language Samskrita was the language of these countries wherever these kshatriyas lived.

Hence we can conclude that Aryan invasion theory is defected.

(See Kazanas RV is pre-harappan ABORI LXXXVIII 2007 p. 31) Genetic outflow see Sahoo et al 2006, Oppenheimer 2003; M Danino Puratattva 2006,

Australian professor rejects Darwin theory because it failed in the case of evolution from man to another species.