Response to Suvrat Kher

Suvrat Kher in his letter admits that he is the author of those sentences that generated misunderstanding between Giosan et al. and myself. If Kher had such strong feelings about my writing on the Saraswati as expressed in the sentences he has put on his blog post, he could have communicated directly with me, for he has advised me to revise my works. I must confess that I do not have the ability and inclination to read the material posted on blogs. I am aware that quite a few geologists hold views different from mine. When I used the words ‘we’ and ‘ours’, I understandably meant those who subscribe to the view that once the Saraswati flowed through Haryana, Rajasthan and Sind. Having ploughed a lonely furrow all my life, I cannot have the immodesty and temerity of assuming ‘responsibility for all Indian geologists’.

Kher accuses me of misinterpreting the deduction of Saini et al., who clearly state that the sedimentary succession of the area between Tohana and Sirsa which is ‘considered as a part of the area’ through which the ‘lost’ Saraswati flowed (p. 1634), contains grey sandy facies with ‘grey sediments similar to the modern day sediments of the mountain-fed rivers’, ‘like Ganga and Yamuna’ (p. 1637) and ‘The mineralogical characters, extent and style of the grey micaceous sand suggests that it was a Himalayan mountain-fed multi-channel fluvial system.’ Taking in conjunction with the findings of Courty, I concluded that this fluvial system belonged to the Saraswati.

Logical deduction cannot be construed as ‘misrepresentation’.

I know that Saini et al. alluded to the river coming from the Siwalik. But the Siwalik is the Outer Himalaya. Moreover, in all my writings I have stated that the Himalaya-born Saraswati flowed through the Siwalik terrain between east of Paota Sahab and KalaAm.

I have correctly interpreted what Giosan et al. have written in their article. The only error I committed was the wrong placement of quotation mark. I am sorry for this inadvertent mistake. But the meaning conveyed is the same as what Giosan et al. intended.

I have not indulged in any misinterpretation or misrepresentation.

Response to L. Giosan et al.

Giosan et al. rightly protest the attributions I made in my article. I sincerely apologize for the misattribution which was the result of a genuine error. Giosan et al. state that their ‘admiration for the Indian culture’ and their ‘interest for the history of the subcontinent is long-lived’, and that ‘they have the utmost respect for the Indian civilization and its achievements’.

The irony is that they have not found ‘reliable enough’ works to be cited—even seminal works—of Indian authors who spent their lifetime on constructing the history of the Saraswati and the Harappan Civilization. Out of the 60 references in their list, only three Indian archaeologists figure, one of them being a co-author of the Giosan paper. Only one paper on geology is cited, and the contributions of many authors in an edited volume are not mentioned, let alone discussed, even to contend their conclusions.

K. S. Valdiya

Jawaharlal Nehru Centre for Advanced Scientific Research, Bangalore 560 064, India

e-mail: valdiya@jncasr.ac.in

References

3. http://www.suvrat.blogspot.in/search/label/saraswati

Suvrat Kher

e-mail: suvrat_k@yahoo.com

CURRENT SCIENCE, VOL. 104, NO. 8, 25 APRIL 2013

997