INSTITUTE FOR REWRITING INDIAN HISTORY N-128 Greater Kailas-1, New Delhi-110048 (India)

President: P.N.Oak, M.A., LL.B.

October 17, 1977

judgment.

SYNOPSIS OF THE LECTURE DELIVERED

THE SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES, LONDON

P. N. Oak

THE NEED FOR DRASTIC REVISION

Chance discoveries sometimes necessitate drastic revision and extensive readjustments in a given discipline. Such a stage has arrived in history. This brief address stretching over a number of topics is intended only to outline a vast new field of historical research. Detailed evidence on specific topics could be laid through separate lectures if desired.

Since my approach and conclusions are likely to sound very unfamiliar a few notes of caution seem necessary, viz.: 1. Please reserve the matter for cooler reflection instead of jumping to instantaneous

2. Current socio-political predilections shouldn't colour or cloud your thinking.

3. The prospect of a thorough overhaul of history shouldn't terrify you into shirking action.

WHAT OCCASIONED MY DISCOVERIES?

In Delhi one is shown tombs of Humayun, the Lodis, Abdur Rahim Khan Khana,

Like the falling fruit suggesting gravity to Newton my discoveries flowed from my absorbing, 35 year long meticulous study of and musing over historic buildings and cities.

Some questions which arose in my mind were: -1. If most historic buildings In India and West Asian countries were built by invaders from Afghanistan to Abyssinia, as is currently believed, did not earlier indigenous rulers build any cities or raise any

buildings? 2. If that were so where did those pre-Saracenic august monarchs and their generals and courtiers live?

3. How is It that even the very Saracens credited with such colossal building activity, raised mostly only tombs and mosques? Numerous such questions tormenting my mind impelled me to read mediaeval chronicles in a frantic search for peace of mind through plausible answers. On reading them I only found my doubts

reinforced. Particularly staggering was the uncanny observation in the preface to the 8-volume Elliot and Dowson collection of mediaeval chronicles that the history of the Saracenic era "Is an Impudent and Interested fraud." Unfortunately Sir H.M. Elliot unable to fathom the depth of that "fraud" allowed himself to be inveigled by it in as much as he failed to discover that the buildings and cities being ascribed to conquering Saracens all over the world, like the so-called St. Sophia's Mosque In Istanbul and the Taj Mahal and Fatehpur Sikri In India were never built by them.

Similar is the case with cities. It is most easily assumed that Ahmad Shah built Ahmedabad and Tughlaq Shah raised Tughlaqabad. If that were true Allahabad should have been founded by Allah himself, and Delhi's Rashtrapati Bhawan by some Rashtrapati.

General Cunningham who organised the Archaeological Survey of India under the then British administration did not prove cunning enough to see through that deception. He and his two assistants Beglar and Carlleyle assumed that a building introduced to them by some hangers on as a tomb or a mosque or cities masquerading as Ferozabad or Shahjahanabad were raised by Saracens. At times when a Beglar ventured to suggest that the so-called Kutb Minar looked a

non-Saracenic tower Gen. Cunningham asked him to shut up. QUICK SAMPLE SURVEY Just to indicate the voluminous evidence that is available let us make a guick sample survey of a cross section of historic townships and buildings that have been unquestioningly ascribed by gullible

historians and archaeologists to saracenic invaders and rulers.

shelter while he or she is alive?

Fatehpur Sikri Is said to have been built by Akbar to make it his capital but the Victoria and Albert Museum in London has a Mogul painting which shows Akbar's father Humayun in his capital city Fatehpur Sikri. That Indicates that Fatehpur Sikri existed even one generation before Akbar. Humayun's sister Gulbadan Begum has stated in her chronicle that her father Babur wrote a few chapters of the Babar-nama In Fatehpur Sikri. That proves that Sikri existed even two generations before Akbar. Tracing the history of that town-ship backward we ultimately find from Col. Tod's "Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan" that Fatehpur Sikri is a very ancient city originating as the capital of Sikarwal Rajputs.

been the case if they have been of Saracenic origin. There the Nishat, Shalimar and Verinag gardens and ruins are ascribed to the Mogul days of pedestrian transport. What Mogul ruler ruling 600 miles away In Delhi and Agra would lay out such expensive gardens so far away to spend a few cool hours in at a place which he could visit perhaps only once, if at all, in a life time? Added to that would he also give them Sanskrit names and give them temple portals?

Now for a review of important historic gardens and buildings let us start from Kashmir. That Is a Sanskrit word and so is its capital Srinagar. All historic sites in Kashmir are in ruins. That should not have

Knowing that successors couldn't have cared less to give their hated predecessors a decent burial historians persuaded themselves to believe that all Saracenic elite solicitously built their own palatial mausoleums in nostalgic anticipation of their own death without bothering to have any mansions over their heads while alive.

Najaf Khan, Ghiasuddin Tughlak, NizamuddIn Safdarjang, Roshanara, Jahanara, Amir Khusro etc but none of their mansions. Will a person need a palatial building to house his corpse or to give him

The Interlocked triangles symbolizing the Hindu goddess Bhavani, embossed in marble on the facades of buildings known as the mausoleums of Humayun and Khan Khana have all along been ignored.

boar figures carved on it. Historians and archaeologists baffled by such features in what they believed to be Saracenic mosques and tombs comforted themselves with the explanation that those edifices were built from temple debris or that Hindu workmen were free to build what they liked. These are Illogical explanations.

The so-called Sultan Ghari in Delhi, mistaken for a tomb is an ancient temple because it has an octagonal sanctorum, a Sanskrit inscription had been found in it, and because all its beams had cow and

Firstly, no Hindu Is ever mentioned as the designer of a Saracenic building. Secondly, if Sultans demolished temples because they detested their heathenish carving would they be so Idiotic as to raise the same stones once again at their own expense just for the satisfaction of calling it a mosque?

Thirdly, workmen never have any Ideas of their own nor are they allowed to dabble in the owner's plan. Fourthly, even the British rulers of India had their churches built by Hindu labour; how is it that their churches were not given the temple twist by Hindu labour?

rendering the Saracenic idiom. They should have made it clear that destroying a temple and building a mosque means capturing the temple and using it as a mosque. Graves have also been similarly

The Mirat-e-Ahmade clearly states that destroying a temple means simply capturing a temple, desecrating it and using it as a mosque. Translators of mediaeval chronicles have therefore erred in

misunderstanding that has resulted in historians and archaeologists going into raptures over the fancied sepulchral and mosque architecture. The Kutub Minar ascribed to Kutubuddin Aibak is not claimed to have been built by him. It is worth noting that not a single monument ascribed to various Individuals is claimed even by themselves. Kutubuddin reigned just for four years which was too short a period to conceive, plan and build a 258 ft. high tower. The falling stone pitching has revealed that the Saracenic captors of the tower turned

planted in captured Indian buildings. Historians have erred in mistaking the mansion for the grave. The tomb is not the building but the grave inside it. If this is clearly understood it will reveal the colossal

the stones Inside out to hide Indian carving end to Inscribe Arabic letters on the new exterior. Delhi's so-called Jama Masjid usually ascribed to Shahjahan has been alluded to 230 years before him by his own ancestor Tamirlane as a temple.

According to a document found by Gen. Cunningham Delhi's massive wall and the Red Fort were built by Raja Anangpal In 1052 A.D. Yet being under the impression that the Red Fort was built by Shahjahan, Cunningham resorted to queer logic. He argues: "If the site of the Red Fort may be fixed by the position of the Anang Tal as well as by that of the Iron Pillar then the grand old fort which now

upper floor there is only a single cenotaph. Actually however Safdarjang died and was buried hundred of miles away at Paparghat in U.P.

surrounds the Qutb Minar is in all probability the very Lalkot that was built by Anangpal." This is tantamount to saying that if the location of the British Isles were to be fixed on the map somewhere between Japan and Singapore then probably the land called the Philippines must be the British Isles. Since that queer finding got the official stamp, all degree-holders who teach history or man archaeological posts and have authored books have perpetuated that erroneous belief. That is the tragedy with history in many other similar blundersome findings too. The palatial mansion In Delhi believed to be Safdarjang's tomb contains two basket-load heaps of brick powder which has to be often replenished to keep up the pretence of burial mounds while on the

Lahore fort to Akbar. If I go home and write in my diary that I lectured in that School of Oriental and African Studies in London which was built by my father will my claim be accepted?

On his way from Agra to quell a revolt in Kabul Jahangir records in his chronicle that he encamped in that fort of Lahore which was built by his father. From that modern historians ascribe the origin of

Akbar has been buried in a seven storied captured palace. To hide that fact the Jahangir-nama records that Jahangir commissioned the mausoleum and left on tour. On returning he found that the building had been completed with all heathenish motifs depicted on it. He doesn't say who had the temerity to do it, how were they punished and what their motive was.

and inscribing Arabic or Persian lettering outside is no evidence of commissioning a building. If that were not so anybody daubing other people's buildings with election slogans or advertisements could claim ownership of those edifices.

As for the Taj Mahal that term itself doesn't exist in any court papers or chronicles of Shahjahan. That monarch's fancied infatuation for Mumtaz too is nowhere mentioned in history. That is why no bookshop sells Shahjahan Mumtaz love stories though other popular romances like Romeo and Juliet or Laila Majnu could be purchased by the hundreds. The date of Mumtaz's burial in the Taj is

In Agra Itimad Uddaula, Chini-ka-Rauza and the Taj Mahal are all believed to be mausoleums. What historians have forgotten is that tomb means a grave and not the building. Planting a grave inside

nowhere mentioned. Half a dozen names are bandied about as the builders of the Taj. Its expense is fancied to be anything between four and 91.million rupees. The Taj ending In a 'J' Is supposed to derive Its name from Mumtaz ending in a 'Z' ShahJahan's court chronicle the Badshahnama itself candidly admits on page 403, vol.1 that Mumtaz was buried In a mansion of unique splendour covered with a dome (Imarat-e-alishan wa Gumbaze) obtained from the Jaipur Maharaja. Prince Aurangzeb mentions having repaired that ancient building complex in 1652 A.D. while the archaeological plaque outside the Taj put up by modern historians, confidently asserts that the Taj Mahal was completed brand new In 1655. Should Aurangzeb know better or today's historians?

Tavernier notes that Shahjahan purposely buried Mumtaz near the Taj Ganj and that the cost of the scaffolding was more than that of the entire work. This could happen only if a person gets a colossal building of the Taj dimensions free and then has to employ casual labour to inscribe the Koran at various heights. The pinnacle on the dome is a trident. On the top of the gateway is inlaid a line of pairs of hood-raised cobras and a temple-bell bunting. Even carbon14 dating has proved the Taj to be pre-ShahJahan.

building be Saracenic when it has no dome? This is like 'heads I win and tails you lose.' Gen.CunnIngham was wrong in assuming that a building in use as a mosque or a tomb today was built for that

The so-called Atala Devi mosque in Jaunpur is an erstwhile temple of the goddess of inexorable fate as its name implies. If the Taj Is a Saracenic building because it has 3 dome how can the Atala

Rs. 600.000/- around the grave within a couple of years of Mumtaz's death. Had the Taj been under construction for 22 years, as is commonly believed, would that costly gold railing be there so soon?

specific purpose. In Saracenic language Atala means Junk; could there be a Junk mosque? Moreover it is a five-storied structure. Do Muslims pray in tiers on top of the guibla. The so-called Indo-SaracenIc architecture theory based on such fanciful assumptions is all wrong both in surmising the characteristics of such buildings and their dates. To date a building according to the date on which somebody planted a grave inside Is queer archaeology. If we are going to concede such claims anyone could hire buildings In London, raise graves inside them In the name of Tamerlain or Mohammad Ghori and compute their dates as well as describe their architecture as being of the Tartar or Afghan style. The World of Islam Festival held In London In 1975 got away with exhibiting such captured buildings as Islamic creations. In lands from Afghanistan to Abyssinia too practically no historic building is Saracenic. Like the so-called St. Sophia's mosque in Istanbul they are all captured buildings being used as tombs and mosques. Students and scholars of history and architecture should critically examine the antecedents of those buildings. The notion that the dome is a saracenic creation is untenable until it can be proved that the dome was born simultaneously when Islam was born. It may be remembered that the Kaba Itself has no dome. Therefore the Saracenic architecture theory itself needs to be scrapped from history and from archaeological and architectural books. Shershah, burnt to death while laying siege to Kalanjar fort is supposed to be buried hundreds of miles away in a lake palace in Sasaram. Had his army lifted siege to carry his body away it would have

describe its architecture as Afghan as Percy Brown and Fergusson have done is wrong. In Ahmedabad when a merchant demolished his old shop and raised a huge mansion the trustees of the neighbouring, so called Jama Masjid filed a suit against him demanding that he be ordered to demolish his mansion which rose taller and obstructed the so-called mosque's view. When with my guidance the merchant filed his reply to the plaint claiming that the plaintiffs had no right to sue

because the building they occupy is not a mosque but the Bhadrakali temple, the trustees withdrew the suit. This proves how when cornered those who have been using historic buildings as mosques

been pursued and slaughtered by the enemy. So what is believed to be Shershah's mausoleum is an ancient Hindu palace. Moreover dating it at 1545 because Shershah was killed in that year, and to

and tombs, quickly realise that they are there only through conquest. In several cases buildings were plastered over to camouflage their origins. For instance, when the plaster in the so-called Kamal Maula mosque in Dhar (central India) fell off the building was discovered to have been a library of stone panels with classical Sanskrit literature carved on it.

The so-called Tamerlain mausoleum in Samarkand displays a leaping tiger and a rising sun. That emblem is known as Sur-Sadul. That Is the Sanskrit term Surya-Shardul indicating that that building is the palace of ancient Sanskrit speaking monarchs. Samarkand itself is a Sanskrit name like Rohilkhand and Bundelkhand in India. Moreover how could a dead Tamerlain have a palatial mausoleum if a

Even the notion that the Pyramids of Egypt originated as tombs will have to be re-examined. It could be that they were built for some other purpose. Historians should learn to dissociate the graves inside from the buildings.

2. At all historic sites structures that still stand are all pre-saracenic. That is to say the construction is all pre-Sarscenic and destruction all Saracenic. What we currently teach is all topsy-turvy.

From the above review of so-called Saracenic buildings I draw two corollaries that: --

Peter MUNDY a British visitor saw a gold railing stuffed with gems, valued at

OTHER DISCOVERIES

SULTANS AND FAKIRS

ANTIQUITY OF HISTORY

living Tamerlain had no palace?

1. Destroyers have been called builders, and

In mediaeval history there are two more blunders namely regarding Sultans and Fakirs. Though most of them were very cruel and tyrannical they have all been described as great and noble. That record needs to be put straight through hundreds of new publications.

Having stumbled across that truth I felt impelled to review all history. The errors discovered there too were staggering.

Currently history is believed to span only about 5,000 years. But Indian scriptures backed up by Indian astronomical computation, trail a history of almost 20 million years. Indian Puranas even attempt a chronology of monarchs and other eminent personages over the long period. If the Bible is often quoted for historical evidence, there is no reason why Indian scriptures should be ignored. The frontiers

of history therefore need to be thrown back from 5,000 to 20 million years. WHO WERE THE ARYANS? Just as mediaeval history is being taught upside down by describing destroyers as builders ancient history has turned the Aryan issue topsy-turvy. Arya is no race. Arya means a Hindu. The Dravids

being staunch Hindus are the very hard core of Aryan culture. Yet they are being misrepresented as antagonists of Aryans. Had Aryans been a race Indians, Europeans and Iranians should have had a common complexion and other physical characteristics. In that case the Rigvedic guideline "Make the Whole World Arya" would have been meaningless. That slogan also proves that Aryans colonised the world starting from India, not vice-versa.

Judo, Karate and Jujutsu are all Sanskrit words.

SANSKRIT A WORLD LANGUAGE The digvijay, Sarvabhaum, Ashwamedh Yajna and Chakravartl traditions of ancient Indians also corroborate the conclusion that they colonized the world. It was precisely in that gap between 5000 and 20 Million years that Hindu culture, education, administration and the Indian medics system-- the Ayurved held sway over the world. Their language being Sanskrit it was Sanskrit which was spoken all

Japan's Shintoism derives from the word Sindhu i.e. the Indus. Japan has thousands of temples of Indian deities. In the Kshatrlya tradition the Japanese sovereign claims descent from the sun. Japan's

over the world for that long period. Therefore most languages of the world are derived from Sanskrit. That Is why all important countries feel compelled study Indology. A rapid review of that world-

China has throughout history been getting its scholars and administrators from India. That is why it is a Buddhist country.

Looking at the map of India, historians should have pondered over the fact that If Indians could spread their empire across a 2000 mile sea from Singapore to Japan couldn't Indian expeditionary forces go north Into Russia and west upto Spain and Egypt?

under the ancient Indian system a student had to be a bachelor until he completed his studies.

The museums of all countries from Borneo to Afghanistan are full of Hindu Idols and Inscriptions only.

spread of ancient Indian culture will prove interesting and enlightening. Let us start from Japan.

Europe's weights, measures, currencies and educational terms are all Sanskrit. Examples of these are:- ounce (ansh), foot (charan), thermometer (gharmametra), barometer (bharmatra), sterling, penny and cents; gerontology, dentistry, geometry, trigonometry all In Sanskrit terms. Even the bachelor degree is of Indian origin because while bachelorhood has no relevance to Western education,

From the 60 second, 60 minutes calculation to the March 25 New Year Day the ancient world has been keeping Hindu time. Making all this new knowledge available to the world will involve a gigantic research and publication programme. I hope you will all join in undertaking and underwriting this task without despairing that it is too late in the day or that it is too colossal. If things have gone wrong one has to begin some time to set them right; then why not now?