

Forbidden Archeology: A Three-Body Interaction Among Science, Hinduism, and Christianity

I presented this paper at The Sanskrit Tradition in the Modern World conference at the University of Newcastle, England, on May 19, 2000.

The interactions among science, Hinduism, and Christianity are as complex as those in the three-body problem of astrophysics. In practice, astrophysicists select a central body, say the Earth, with a second body, the Moon orbiting it, and then try to determine the perturbations induced in the motion of the Moon by the attraction of the third body, the Sun. There is no general solution for this problem. This means that independent of observations one cannot calculate very far in advance (or very far into the past) the exact position of the Moon relative to the other two bodies. The perturbations of the Moon's orbit, induced by the attractions of the Earth and Sun, are incalculably complex, as are the movements of Hinduism in relation to the twin influences of science and Christianity. The reactions provoked by my book *Forbidden Archeology*,¹ from scientists, scholars, and religionists,² provide useful data for examination of a three-body problem in the study of Hinduism, Christianity, and science.

I introduce myself as an American citizen, of Italian Catholic heritage and educated in secular schools, who converted to Gaudiya Vaishnavism in 1973, at age twenty-five. In 1976, His Divine Grace A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada, founder-*acharya* of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness (ISKCON), accepted me as his disciple. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada traced his lineage through nine generations of Gaudiya Vaishnava *gurus* to Chaitanya Mahaprabhu, who appeared in the latter part of the fifteenth century. Since 1973, I have strictly followed the ISKCON *bhakti* regimen, including rising before dawn, attending temple worship, hearing readings from *Bhagavata Purana*, practicing *japa* meditation for about two hours a day, and making occasional pilgrimages to sites sacred to Gaudiya Vaishnavas, such as Mayapur, West Bengal—the appearance place of Chaitanya Mahaprabhu—and Vrindavan, Uttar Pradesh—the appearance place of Krishna.

In 1984, I began working with the Bhaktivedanta Institute, the science studies branch of ISKCON. The Institute was founded in 1974 for the purpose of examining (and challenging) materialistic scientific ideas about the origin of life and the universe

from the standpoint of Vedic knowledge. I use the term Vedic in its broad Vaishnava sense to include the *Vedas*, *Puranas*, and *Itihasas*. The Bhaktivedanta Institute, following the teachings of Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada, generally favors a literal reading of the Vedic texts. In the realm of scientific discourse, this means using Vedic texts as sources of hypotheses, which can then be employed to explain evidence. My book *Forbidden Archeology*, which presents abundant scientifically reported evidence consistent with Puranic accounts of extreme human antiquity and documents social factors underlying the exclusion of this evidence from contemporary scientific discourse, was published by the Bhaktivedanta Institute in 1993.

As can be seen from this brief autobiographical sketch, I was pulled from the orbit of modern liberal Christianity and secular science into the orbit of traditional Hinduism. I thus have considerable empathy for the Indian intellectuals of the nineteenth century, the *bhadralok* who were pulled from the orbit of traditional Hinduism into the orbits of modern liberal Christianity and secular science.

As we explore the history of that time, we encounter (along with the Christian missionaries, the British Orientalists, the members of the Brahma Samaj and the Arya Samaj, and the Theosophists) such personalities as Krishna Mohan Banerjea (1813–1885), the Bengali convert and disciple of Scottish missionary Alexander Duff. Born a *brahmana*, Banerjea became a Christian and underwent a liberal education at Calcutta's Hindu College. Afterwards he flouted the rules of his caste, going so far as to get drunk with some friends and throw pieces of raw beef into the courtyard of a *brahmana's* house, causing considerable uproar in the neighborhood.³ In writing *Forbidden Archeology* and directing to it the attention of evolutionary scientists, I have performed an act roughly equivalent to throwing beef into a *brahmana's* courtyard. The book, anti-Darwinian as well as religiously inspired, has provoked considerable reaction in orthodox scientific circles.

Among the more emotional respondents to *Forbidden Archeology* was Jonathan Marks, who in his review, published in *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, called it “Hindu-oid creationist drivel” and “a veritable cornucopia of dreck.”⁴ Here we find a tonal echo of some of the reactions of early European scholars and missionaries to Hinduism. We may recall, for example, the words of William Hastie, leader of a Scottish missionary organization in Calcutta, who as late as 1882 denigrated India as “the most stupendous fortress and citadel of ancient error and idolatry” and condemned Hinduism as “senseless mummeries, licentiousness, falsehood, injustice, cruelty, robbery, [and] murder.”⁵

Not all reviewers were so dismissive of *Forbidden Archeology's* scholarly worth. In a lengthy review article in *Social Studies of Science* (provocatively titled “Vedic Creationism: A Further Twist to the Evolution Debate”), Jo Wodak and David Oldroyd asked, “So has *Forbidden Archeology* made any contribution at all to the literature on palaeo-anthropology?” They concluded, “Our answer is a guarded ‘yes,’ for two reasons.” First, “the historical material . . . has not been scrutinized in such detail before,” and, second, the book does “raise a central problematic regarding the lack of certainty in scientific ‘truth’ claims.”⁶

In *L'Anthropologie*, Marylène Pathou-Mathis wrote: “M. Cremona and R. Thompson

have willfully written a provocative work that raises the problem of the influence of the dominant ideas of a time period on scientific research. These ideas can compel the researchers to orient their analyses according to the conceptions that are permitted by the scientific community.” She concluded, “The documentary richness of this work, more historical and sociological than scientific, is not to be ignored.”⁷

And in *British Journal for the History of Science*, Tim Murray noted in his review of *Forbidden Archeology*: “I have no doubt that there will be some who will read this book and profit from it. Certainly it provides the historian of archaeology with a useful compendium of case studies in the history and sociology of scientific knowledge, which can be used to foster debate within archaeology about how to describe the epistemology of one’s discipline.”⁸

I will not dwell much further upon the academic integrity and utility of the archeological evidence presented in *Forbidden Archeology*. I want to focus instead on how the book fits into the larger history of interactions among science, Hinduism, and Christianity. Although these interactions defy simplistic explanation, it is possible to trace a broad pattern of development.

In the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century, some European scholars, such as John Playfair, were intrigued by the vast time scales of Vedic histories and attributed considerable antiquity to Hindu astronomical texts. Playfair, for example, put the composition of the *Surya-siddhanta* before the beginning of the *Kali-yuga*, or over 5,000 years ago.⁹ And that implied an even longer history of refined astronomical observation. But other European scholars, deeply influenced by Christian chronology, were unhappy with such assertions. John Bentley, for example, put his knowledge of astronomical science to work in discrediting the proposals of Playfair and others.

About one of his opponents, Bentley wrote:

By his attempt to uphold the antiquity of Hindu books against absolute facts [Bentley’s], he thereby supports all those horrid abuses and impositions found in them, under the pretended sanction of antiquity, viz. the burning of widows, the destroying of infants, and even the immolation of men. Nay, his aim goes still deeper; for by the same means he endeavours to overturn the Mosaic account, and sap the very foundations of our religion: for if we are to believe in the antiquity of Hindu books, as he would wish us, then the Mosaic account is all a fable, or a fiction.¹⁰

Bentley regarded the vast time periods of Hindu cosmology as a recent imposition by the *brahmanas*, who desired “to arrogate to themselves that they were the most ancient people on the face of the earth.”¹¹ Unable to tolerate a chronology that “threw back the creation [*in the current kalpa*] to the immense distance of 1,972,947,101 years before the Christian era,”¹² Bentley held that the Puranic histories should be compressed to fit within the few thousand years of the Mosaic account.¹³ Sir William Jones also brought the expansive Hindu chronology into line with the Biblical time scale.¹⁴

At the same time Bentley and Jones were using science and textual criticism to

dismantle the Hindu chronology, their contemporaries in Europe were using the same methods to dismantle the Biblical chronology. The process accelerated with the advent of Darwinism, leaving only a minority of Christian intellectuals committed to a divine creation of Adam and Eve about six thousand years ago. In India, many Hindu intellectuals, influenced by science and liberal Christianity, similarly gave up the historical accounts of the *Puranas*, which place humans on earth millions of years ago. Today, the Darwinian evolutionary account of human origins remains dominant among intellectuals in India and throughout the world, although the postmodern tendency toward relativism has somewhat weakened its hold.

This is the background against which *Forbidden Archeology* appeared. It has been quite interesting for me to monitor academic reactions to the book, especially the attempts of reviewers to grapple with its Hindu inspiration and relationship with Christian and Darwinian accounts of human origins and antiquity.

In his review of *Forbidden Archeology* for *Geoarchaeology*, Kenneth L. Feder wrote: “The book itself represents something perhaps not seen before; we can fairly call it ‘Krishna creationism’ with no disrespect intended.”¹⁵ After describing the contents of the book, Feder added, “While decidedly antievolutionary in perspective, this work is not the ordinary variety of antievolutionism in form, content, or style. In distinction to the usual brand of such writing, the authors use original sources and the book is well written. Further, the overall tone of the work is superior to that exhibited in ordinary [*i.e.*, *Christian*] creationist literature.”¹⁶

Comparisons between *Forbidden Archeology* and Christian creationist literature are common in the academic reviews of the book. Murray wrote in *British Journal for the History of Science*, “This is a piece of ‘Creation Science’ which, while not based on the need to promote a Christian alternative, manifests many of the same types of argument.”¹⁷ He further characterized *Forbidden Archeology* as a book that “joins others from creation science and New Age philosophy as a body of works which seek to address members of a public alienated from science, either because it has become so arcane or because it has ceased to suit some in search of meaning for their lives.”¹⁸

Some of the comparisons are less polite. Marks acrimoniously wrote in *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, “The best that can be said is that more reading [*of the scientific literature*] went into this Hindu-oid creationist drivel than seems to go into the Christian-oid creationist drivel.”¹⁹ Paleanthropologist Colin Groves wrote:

A book like this, simply because it is superficially scholarly and not outright trash like all the Christian creationist works I have read, might indeed make a useful deconstructionist exercise for an archaeology or palaeoanthropology class. So it’s not without value. You could do worse, too, than place it in front of a Gishite with the admonition “Look here: these guys show that human physical and cultural evolution doesn’t work. Therefore it follows that the Hindu scriptures are true, doesn’t it?”²⁰

Stripping away the armor of defensive ridicule in such statements, we find a mate-

rialistic science not yet totally secure in its ongoing global three-body interaction with unreconstructed Christianity and traditional Hinduism.

Wiktor Stoczkowski, reviewing *Forbidden Archeology* in *L'Homme*, accurately noted, "Historians of science repeat tirelessly that the Biblical version of origins was replaced in the nineteenth century by the evolution theory. In our imaginations, we substitute this simple story for the more complex reality that we are today confronted with a remarkable variety of origins accounts."²¹ Among those accounts Stoczkowski included that of the Biblical creationists. "*Forbidden Archeology*," he added, "gives us one more, dedicated to 'His Divine Grace A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada' and inspired by the Vedic philosophy that disciples study in the United States at the Bhaktivedanta Institute, a branch of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness."²²

The main text of *Forbidden Archeology* is solely dedicated to documentation and analysis of evidence consistent with Vedic accounts of extreme human antiquity. The religious affiliation of my coauthor and I, and our commitment to Vedic historical accounts, are briefly mentioned in the introduction. Reviewers have therefore taken upon themselves to expand upon these topics for the benefit of their readers. It is somewhat novel to find substantive discourse on *yugas* and *manvantaras*, the Bhaktivedanta Institute and ISKCON, in the pages of mainstream journals of archeology, anthropology, and science studies. Up to this time, such references have largely been confined to the pages of religious studies journals.

In the first few pages of their *Social Studies of Science* review article, Wodak and Oldroyd gave extensive background information on: ISKCON ("a modern variant of the Bhakti sects that have dominated Hindu religious life over the last one and a half millennia"); the teachings of the movement's founder ("for Prabhupada, science gives no adequate account of the origin of the universe or of life"); the Bhaktivedanta Institute (they comment on "the boldness of its intellectual programme"); and Vedic chronology ("partial dissolutions, called *pralaya*, supposedly take place every 4.32 billion years, bringing catastrophes in which whole groups of living forms can disappear"). One also encounters many references to the *Rg Veda*, *Vedanta*, the *Puranas*, the *atma*, *yoga*, and *karma*.²³

In common with other reviewers, Wodak and Oldroyd draw a connection between *Forbidden Archeology* and the work of Christian creationists. "As is well known," they note, "Creationists try to show that humans are of recent origin, and that empirical investigations accord with human history as recorded in the Old Testament. *Forbidden Archeology* (*FA*) offers a brand of Creationism based on something quite different, namely ancient Vedic beliefs. From this starting point, instead of claiming a human history of mere millennia, *FA* argues for the existence of *Homo sapiens* way back into the Tertiary, perhaps even earlier."²⁴

Despite the considerable attention Wodak and Oldroyd devoted to *Forbidden Archeology*'s Vedic inspiration, the greater part of their review article focused on the book's substance, about which they commented:

It must be acknowledged that *Forbidden Archeology* brings to attention many interesting issues that have not received much consider-

ation from historians; and the authors' detailed examination of the early literature is certainly stimulating and raises questions of considerable interest, both historically and from the perspective of practitioners of SSK [sociology of scientific knowledge]. Indeed, they appear to have gone into some historical matters more deeply than any other writers of whom we have knowledge.²⁵

Another example of extensive references to ISKCON and Vedic concepts can be found in Feder's *Geoarchaeology* review of *Forbidden Archeology*:

The authors are open about their membership in the Bhaktivedanta Institute, which is a branch of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness, and the book is dedicated to their "spiritual master," the group's founder. They make a reasonable request regarding their affiliation with this organization: "That our theoretical outlook is derived from the Vedic literature should not disqualify it." (p. xxxvi). Fair enough, but what is their "theoretical outlook?"²⁶

Feder, citing Basham's *The Wonder That Was India*, goes on to give a succinct account of Hindu cosmology's *kalpas*, each of which lasts 4.32 billion years and "is divided into 14 *manvantaras*, each lasting 300,000,000 years." Feder then explains how "within each *manvantara* the world is created with human beings more or less fully formed, and then destroyed, only to be created once again in the next *manvantara*."²⁷

In the concluding paragraph of his review, Feder gives his own comments on our three-body problem:

We all know what happens when we mix a literal interpretation of the Judeo-Christian creation myth with human paleontology; we get scientific creationism. It seems we now know what happens when we mix a literal interpretation of the Hindu myth of creation with human paleontology; we get the antievolutionary Krishna creationism of *Forbidden Archeology*, where human beings do not evolve and where the fossil evidence for anatomically modern humans dates as far back as the beginning of the current *manvantara*.²⁸

A more favorable estimation of *Forbidden Archeology*'s Vedic roots was offered by Hillel Schwarz in *Journal of Unconventional History*, which, as the title suggests, is situated on the outer edges of respectable scholarship's domain. But it is at such edges that advances in understanding often occur. Schwarz observed: "*Forbidden Archeology* takes the current conventions of decoding to their extreme. The authors find modern *Homo sapiens* to be continuous contemporaries of the apelike creatures from whom evolutionary biologists usually trace human descent or bifurcation, thus confirming those Vedic sources that presume the nearly illimitable antiquity of the human race."²⁹

Schwarz was not put off by the authors' underlying motives for writing *Forbid-*

den Archeology. “Despite its unhidden religious partisanship,” said Schwarz, “the book deserves a reckoning in this review for its embrace of a global humanity permanently distinct from other primates.” He accurately detected the book’s implicit thesis, namely, that “humanity is no mere biochemical exfoliation but a work of the spirit, in touch with (and devoted to) the ancient, perfect, perfectly sufficient, unchanging wisdom of the Vedic masters.”³⁰

One might wonder what the Christian creationists think of Hindu-inspired *Forbidden Archeology*. Perhaps sensing an ally in their battle against Darwinism, they have reacted somewhat favorably. A reviewer of the abridged version of *Forbidden Archeology* stated in *Creation Research Society Quarterly*: “This book is a must reading for anyone interested in human origins.” After expressing his surprise over finding the book in a major U. S. chain store, the reviewer noted that its “theoretical outlook is derived from the Vedic literature in India, which supports the idea that the human race is of great antiquity.” The reviewer made clear that he did not share this view: “As a recent earth creationist, I would not accept the evolutionary time scale that the authors appear to accept. However,” he added, “the authors have shown that even if you accept the evolutionary view of a vast age for the earth, the theory of human evolution is not supported.”³¹

Up to this point, mainstream religious studies scholars have not, to my knowledge, published any reviews of *Forbidden Archeology* in their professional journals (although many did receive copies for review). But they have not been totally silent. Historian of religion Mikael Rothstein of the University of Copenhagen wrote in a review article published in the science section of *Politiken*, Denmark’s largest newspaper, that in the nineteenth century Darwinism challenged the creationist views of Christian religion. Today, he said, the roles have been reversed. Religion, not science, is the primary source of intellectual provocation. And *Forbidden Archeology* is “in principle just as provoking as *The Origin of Species*.” Rothstein informs his readers that the authors of *Forbidden Archeology* belong to the Bhaktivedanta Institute, the “academic center” for ISKCON, which he correctly characterized as “part of the Vaishnava religion from India.” Noting that the authors are Hindu “monks” as well as scholars, he stated, “Their otherwise thorough academic argumentation can thus find support in the Vaishnava mythology, which actually describes the history of man and the geological development of the earth in a way that is compatible with their results.” According to Rothstein, people who have grown up with the idea of Darwinian evolution can by reading *Forbidden Archeology* “get a glimpse of the feeling the people of the Church experienced when Darwin’s theory was presented.”³²

Gene Sager, a professor of religious studies at Palomar College in California, wrote about *Forbidden Archeology*:

As a scholar in the field of comparative religion, I have sometimes challenged scientists by offering a cyclical or spiral model for studying human history, based on the Vedic concept of the *kalpa*. Few Western scientists are open to the possibility of sorting out the data in terms of such a model. I am not proposing that the Vedic model is true. . . . However, the question remains, does the relatively short, linear model prove to be adequate? I believe *Forbidden Archeology* offers a well researched

challenge. If we are to meet this challenge, we need to practice open-mindedness and proceed in a cross-cultural, interdisciplinary fashion.³³

I have not yet seen any reviews of *Forbidden Archeology* in academic journals published in India. But I have gotten responses from Indian scholars in other arenas. When I presented a paper based on *Forbidden Archeology* at the World Archaeological Congress 3, held in New Delhi in 1994,³⁴ a number of Indian scholars approached me privately and expressed their appreciation of my efforts to uphold the Puranic chronology. My World Archaeological Congress paper also drew me an invitation to speak at a conference on Vedic history in the United States, organized by several Hindu organizations.³⁵ I earlier received an invitation, which I was not able to accept, from Kishor Ruperalia, general secretary for the Vishwa Hindu Parishad in the United Kingdom, to speak at a conference organized by the VHP. Ruperalia wrote about *Forbidden Archeology*, "Inspired by the Vedic writings and encouraged by His Divine Grace A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada, the scholarly authors have made a tremendous and painstaking effort . . . to make archeological scholars rethink the predominant paradigm on human origins and antiquity."³⁶

Where does all this leave us in terms of our three-body question? In astrophysics, there are some special cases of the three-body problem that do allow for reasonably accurate solutions. If one of the bodies (a manmade earth satellite, for example) can be assigned an infinitely small mass, this simplifies the matter somewhat. In terms of the global interactions among science, Christianity, and Hinduism, as related to any substantive discussion of human origins and antiquity, the three-body problem has been solved, in the minds of many modern intellectuals, by assigning traditional Hindu concepts of human origins and antiquity an infinitely small mass. The problem is then reduced to establishing the relative positions of the accounts of human origins and antiquity offered by modern Darwinian evolutionists and their Christian fundamentalist opponents. And the result is a somewhat stable and predictable system. We find a Christian fundamentalist body revolving in a fixed orbit of perpetual subordination to the central body of a Darwinian consensus negotiated between modern science and liberal Christianity (and liberal Hinduism). But the substantial and widespread reactions to *Forbidden Archeology* suggest that traditional Hindu views of human origins and antiquity have again acquired sufficient mass to cause real perturbations in scientific and religious minds, thus introducing new elements of complexity into the relationships among Hinduism, Christianity, and science.

What predictions might be made about future states of the three-body question I have posed?

We seem to be entering an era when the boundaries between religion and science will, as in times past, no longer be so clear cut. This is especially true in the metaphysical areas of science, i.e., those dealing with phenomena beyond the range of normal experimentation and observation, such as Darwinian evolution. Indeed, Karl Popper, the philosopher of science who established falsifiability as a criterion for the validity of a scientific theory, said: "I have concluded that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory, but a metaphysical research programme—a possible framework for testable

scientific theories.”³⁷ And there may be other such frameworks, perhaps even some derived from the Vedic texts.

In July of 1996, I took part in a roundtable discussion, at the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. After I made a presentation about *Forbidden Archeology* and another work in progress (establishing the antiquity of the *Rg Veda* at five thousand years), Indologist Evgeniya Y. Vanina made these comments:

I think that the statement you have made, and your paper, are very important because they touch upon the cooperation of science and religion—not just science and religion but how to look at the texts of the classical tradition as sources of information. There is a tendency among scholars to say whatever the *Vedas*—and the *Puranas*, the *Ramayana*, and the *Mahabharata*—are saying, it is all myth and concoction, and there is no positive information in it . . . I think that such a negativist attitude toward the ancient and early medieval Indian texts as sources of information should definitely be discarded.³⁸

Of course, the most likely persons to search for items of positive information in such texts are those who believe in them. For the past century or so, there has not been much room in the academic enterprise for believers, either in religious studies or the sciences. But this may be changing.

G. William Barnard of the religious studies department at Southern Methodist University suggested that “this all too-frequently found notion, that scholars who have no religious inclinations are somehow more objective and therefore are better scholars of religion than those who are pursuing a spiritual life, is fundamentally flawed.”³⁹ Reflecting on the contribution that could be made by genuine spiritual traditions, Barnard advocated “a scholarship that is willing and able to affirm that the metaphysical models and normative visions of these different spiritual traditions are serious contenders for truth, a scholarship that realizes that these religious worlds are not dead corpses that we can dissect and analyze at a safe distance, but rather are living, vital bodies of knowledge and practice that have the potential to change our taken-for-granted notions.”⁴⁰

And in a perceptive article in *American Anthropologist*, Katherine P. Ewing observed: “While espousing cultural relativism, the anthropological community has maintained a firm barrier against belief.” But this fear against “going native” has a detrimental effect on the search for truth. “To rule out the possibility of belief in another’s reality,” said Ewing, “is to encapsulate that reality and, thus, to impose implicitly the hegemony of one’s own view of the world.”⁴¹ Ewing argued that belief may be a valid stance to take in fieldwork in cultural anthropology.

Even Jonathan Marks, one of *Forbidden Archeology*’s most strident critics, admitted that (in theory) “the rich and varied origins myths of all cultures are alternatives to contemporary evolution.”⁴² And Tim Murray wrote in his review that archeology is now in a state of flux, with practitioners debating “issues which go to the conceptual core of the discipline.” Murray then proposed, “Whether the *Vedas* have a role to play

in this is up to the individual scientists concerned.⁴³ This amounts to the smallest and most backhanded of concessions that the Vedas may have some utility in the conceptual reconstruction of modern scientific accounts of human origins and antiquity. But at this point in the three-body interaction among science, Hinduism, and Christianity it must nonetheless be regarded as significant.

Some scholars, particularly those who identify themselves as postmodern, have already recognized the utility of the approach taken in *Forbidden Archeology*. Sociologist Pierce J. Flynn found positive value in the authors' status as believers.

The authors admit to their own sense of place in a knowledge universe with contours derived from personal experience with Vedic philosophy, religious perception, and Indian cosmology. . . . In my view, it is just this openness of subjective positioning that makes *Forbidden Archeology* an original and important contribution to postmodern scholarly studies now being done in sociology, anthropology, archeology, and the history of science and ideas. The authors' unique perspective provides postmodern scholars with an invaluable parallax view of historical scientific praxis, debate, and development.⁴⁴

I first met Pierce when I was living near the ISKCON temple in the Pacific Beach neighborhood of San Diego, California. He would sometimes bring his classes on field trips to the ISKCON temple, which provided an example of an alternative religious community for his sociology of religion students. I had volunteered to be their guide. During a conversation after one of the field trips, I mentioned to Pierce that I was working on a book that examined the question of human origins and antiquity from the viewpoint of the Vedic histories. He immediately grasped its significance and assured me that the book would be of interest to many scholars. When the book was finished, I therefore asked him to contribute a foreword. Pierce Flynn's remarks, written before the publication of *Forbidden Archeology*, and, before the many reviews in academic and scientific journals corroborated his estimation of the book's potential impact, were quite prescient.

And speaking of prescience, I predict we are moving into a period in which the Vedic texts, and scholars openly professing intellectual commitment to the Vedic texts, are going to be playing a larger role in the three-body interaction among science, Hinduism and Christianity. Although we are not going to immediately see a major realignment of the bodies under consideration, careful observers will note some significant perturbations in their orbits, which may eventually propagate into large scale shifts of the kind that have occurred so often in the history of ideas.

Notes:

1. Michael A. Cremo and Richard L. Thompson, *Forbidden Archeology: The Hidden History of the Human Race*, San Diego: Bhaktivedanta Institute, 1993.

2. Scholarly reviews and notices of *Forbidden Archeology*, in addition to the ones cited in this article, appear in *Journal of Field Archeology* 19: 112; *Antiquity* 67: 904; *Ethology, Ecology, and Evolution* 6: 461; *Creation/Evolution* 14(1): 13–25; and *Journal of Geological Education* 43: 193. *Forbidden Archeology*, and its abridged popular edition *The Hidden History of the Human Race*, have also attracted considerable attention in New Age and alternative science circles. Furthermore, I have appeared on about one hundred radio and television programs, including an NBC television special *The Mysterious Origins of Man* (originally broadcast in February 1996). A collection of academic and popular reviews, along with my academic papers and publications related to *Forbidden Archeology*, selected correspondence, and selected transcripts of radio and television interviews, came out in 1998 under the title *Forbidden Archeology's Impact*.
3. Martin Maw, *Visions of India: Fulfillment Theology, the Aryan Race Theory, and the Work of British Protestant Missionaries in Victorian India*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1990, p. 45.
4. Jonathan Marks, *Forbidden Archeology* (book review), *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, vol. 93(1), 1994, p. 141. Marks's statements were printed along with other favorable and unfavorable review excerpts just inside the cover of the abridged popular edition of *Forbidden Archeology*, helping to draw media attention to the book.
5. William Hastie, *Hindu Idolatry and English Enlightenment*, 1882. Quoted in Martin Maw, *Visions of India*, p. 8.
6. Jo Wodak and David Oldroyd, Vedic creationism: a further twist to the evolution debate, *Social Studies of Science*, vol. 26, 1996, p. 207. I regard this 22-page review article to be the most significant scholarly response to *Forbidden Archeology*.
7. Marylène Pathou-Mathis, *Forbidden Archeology* (book review), *L'Anthropologie*, vol. 99(1), 1995, p. 159. The cited passage is translated from the French original.
8. Tim Murray, *Forbidden Archeology* (book review), *British Journal for the History of Science*, vol. 28, 1995, p. 379.
9. John Playfair, Remarks on the astronomy of the Brahmins, *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, vol. II, pt. 1, 1790, pp. 135–192.
10. John Bentley, *A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy*, London: Smith, Elder, and Company, 1825, p. xxvii.
11. John Bentley, *A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy*, p. 84.
12. John Bentley, *A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy*, p. 84.
13. John Bentley, *A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy*, p. 84. Bentley preferred a date of 4225 B.C. for the start of the first *manvantara*.
14. Sir William Jones, *The Works of Sir William Jones*, Vol. I, London: Robinson and Evans, 1799, p. 313. In a table, Jones places the beginning of the first *manvantara* at 4006 B.C. and makes the first Manu a contemporary of Adam.
15. Kenneth L. Feder, *Forbidden Archeology* (book review), *Geoarchaeology*, vol. 9(4), 1994, p. 337. Feder's review contains inaccurate statements about the factual material presented in *Forbidden Archeology*. For example, he says (p. 339) that the authors "do not address the issue of use-wear on any of these unexpectedly an-

cient ‘tools.’” But *Forbidden Archeology* cites S. Laing’s 1894 report on the Thenay, France, implements: “The inference [that an object is cultural] is strengthened . . . if the microscope discloses parallel striae and other signs of use on the chipped edge, such as would be made by scraping bones or skins, while nothing of the sort is seen on the other natural edges” (*F. A.* p. 235). L. Bourgeois, the discoverer of the Thenay implements, reported such signs of use on them (*F. A.* p. 227). Max Verworn also gives quite detailed attention to wear pattern analysis in connection with the Aurillac implements (*F. A.* p. 252). A detailed response to Feder is included in my book, *Forbidden Archeology’s Impact*.

16. Kenneth L. Feder, *Forbidden Archeology*, p. 338.
17. Tim Murray, *Forbidden Archeology*, p. 378.
18. Tim Murray, *Forbidden Archeology*, p. 379.
19. Jonathan Marks, *Forbidden Archeology*, p. 141.
20. Colin Groves, Creationism: the Hindu view. A review of *Forbidden Archeology*, *The Skeptic* (Australia), vol. 14(3), pp. 43–45. This review was forwarded to me electronically by a friend who saw it posted on an Internet discussion group. After *Forbidden Archeology* and its authors were featured on the NBC television special *The Mysterious Origins of Man* in February 1996, hundreds of messages about *Forbidden Archeology*, and its “Krishna creationism,” were posted, as part of heated discussions, to Usenet groups such as sci.archeology, sci.anthropology, and alt.origins.
21. Wiktor Stoczkowski, *Forbidden Archeology* (book review), *L’Homme*, vol. 35, 1995, p. 173. Quoted passages are translated from the French original.
22. Wiktor Stoczkowski, *Forbidden Archeology* (book review), p. 173.
23. Jo Wodak and David Oldroyd, Vedic creationism, pp. 192–195.
24. Jo Wodak and David Oldroyd, Vedic creationism, p. 192.
25. Jo Wodak and David Oldroyd, Vedic creationism, p. 198.
26. Kenneth L. Feder, *Forbidden Archeology*, pp. 339–340.
27. Kenneth L. Feder, *Forbidden Archeology*, p. 340.
28. Kenneth L. Feder, *Forbidden Archeology*, p. 340. Of course, one might also propose that we know what happens when we mix the Darwinian myth of transforming species with human paleontology. We get the modern account of human evolution, with ancient apes transforming into anatomically modern *Homo sapiens* in the most recent geological times. The real question, in the game of science played fairly, is which “myth,” or theory, best fits all of the relevant evidence.
29. Hillel Schwarz, Earth born, sky driven (collective book review), *Journal of Unconventional History*, vol. 6(1), 1994, p. 75.
30. Hillel Schwarz, Earth born, sky driven, p. 76.
31. Peter Line, *The Hidden History of the Human Race* (book review), *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, vol. 32, 1995, p. 46.
32. Mikael Rothstein, Forbudt arkaeologi, *Politiken*, 31 January, 1994, Section 3, p. 1. Quoted passages are translated from the original Danish.
33. The quoted passage is an excerpt from an unpublished review of *Forbidden Archeology* by Dr. Sager. Another passage from the review is printed with other endorsements in the abridged version of *Forbidden Archeology*.

34. Michael A. Cremona, Puranic time and the archeological record, in: *Theme Papers: Concepts of Time*. D. P. Agarwal, M. P. Leone, and T. Murray, (eds.), New Delhi, Academic Committee of the World Archaeological Congress 3, 1994, pp. 23–35. This is a volume of machine-copied original drafts of papers intended for precirculation to conference participants. It is, however, available in some libraries. The official conference proceedings are to be published by Routledge.
35. International Conference on Revisiting Indus-Sarasvati Age and Ancient India, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A., October 4–6, 1996.
36. The quoted passage is from a faxed letter to the editors of *Back to Godhead*, dated August 3, 1993. Ruperalia was writing in response to an article about *Forbidden Archeology* that appeared in the May/June 1993 issue of *Back to Godhead*, the bimonthly magazine of the International Society for Krishna Consciousness.
37. Karl Popper, Darwinism as a metaphysical research programme, *Methodology and Science*, vol. 9, 1976, p. 104. The emphasis is Popper's. The article is taken from Karl Popper's *An Intellectual Biography: Unended Quest*.
38. Dr. Vanina is the Chief of the Department of History and Culture of the Center of Indian Studies of the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Her quoted remarks are transcribed from a tape recording, made with the consent of the participants in the roundtable discussion.
39. G. William Barnard, Transformations and transformers: spirituality and the academic study of mysticism, *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 1(2), 1994, p. 256.
40. G. William Barnard, Transformations and transformers, pp. 257–258.
41. Katherine P. Ewing, Dreams from a saint: anthropological atheism and the temptation to believe, *American Anthropologist*, vol. 96(3), 1994, p. 572.
42. Jonathan Marks, *Forbidden Archeology*, p. 140.
43. Tim Murray, *Forbidden Archeology*, p. 379.
44. Pierce J. Flynn, Foreword to *Forbidden Archeology*, pp. xix-xx. Jonathan Marks, in his review of *Forbidden Archeology*, labeled Flynn a "curious personage." Concerning Flynn's opinion of *Forbidden Archeology*, Marks stated: "Dr. Pierce J. Flynn . . . places this work within postmodern scholarship. I'd like to think postmodern scholars would distance themselves from it; even in the postmodern era, there has to be a difference between scholarship and non-scholarship."

