

[श्रीमती पुष्पाबेन जनार्दनराय मेहता]

लाइन बढ़ाने के लिए प्राय रिटी दी जानी चाहिये। आपका ध्यान मैं केन्द्रित करना चाहती हूँ कि भुज ऊम्बह में एयरपोर्ट भी है और ट्रेन की सुविधा होने से वहाँ पर टूरिस्ट ट्रेफिक होने की भी अधिक संभावना है। मैंने इस प्लान के लिए पत्र व्यवहार भी किया था तो मुझे जवाब मिला कि चौथे प्लान में इसके लिए कोई स्थान नहीं है। चौथे प्लान में बोर्डर एरियाज के काम के लिए आपको प्रायरिटी देनी चाहिये और उस काम को जल्द से जल्द हाथ पर लेना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहती हूँ वह यह है कि जब मैं रेल में सफर करती हूँ तो जो दिलचस्पी रेलवे के कर्मचारियों को लेनी चाहिये वह देखने में नहीं मिलती है और खासकर के वेस्टर्न रेलवे में यह चीज देखने में नहीं आती है। इसका कारण यह है कि उनका जो दफ्तर है वह बम्बई में है जो कि उनके कार्यक्षेत्र से बहुत दूर है। अगर आप उनका आफिस बम्बई से किसी दूसरी जगह रखेंगे तब उनका काम अच्छी तरह से चलने वाला है। आजकल यह होता है कि छोटी मोटी बातों के लिए भी उन्हें बम्बई जाना पड़ता है और इस तरह से काम में बहुत डिले हो जाती है।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि जसहूण राजकोट की लाइन को चौथे प्लान में प्रायरिटी दी जानी चाहिये। यह लाइन 30 मील से अधिक नहीं है और कोटदे जरूटुण को राजकोट के साथ मिलाने से पैसंजर और गुड्स ट्राफिक को बड़ी आसानी हो जायेगी और इससे रेलवे की भी आमदनी बढ़ जायेगी। इसलिए मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि जिन लाइनों के बारे में मैंने निवेदन किया है उन्हें चौथे प्लान में प्रायरिटी देकर शामिल करें।

इतना कहकर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करती हूँ।

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 176 REGARDING THE SLOGAN OF INDIANISATION OF MUSLIMS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we have to start with the discussion on Indianisation of Muslims.

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर (मध्य प्रदेश): श्रीमन्, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि क्या कोई भी इस प्रकार से. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Just a minute. Will you please sit down? This is a very delicate question and I would like to appeal to hon. Members to be very careful in their observations and they should try to see that their observations will be such which would help to create the suitable atmosphere in the country for communal harmony. Also I would like to inform hon. Members that there are about 21 or 22 Members who would like to participate in this discussion. The normal time allotted under the Rules is two and a half hours. It is very difficult to accommodate all these Members and I do not think I can call all the Members. However, who ever may be called he should restrict his observations to eight to ten minutes so that I can try to accommodate the maximum number of speakers. If any hon. Member takes more time, then it will only mean that we debar some Members from participating in this important discussion. Therefore I would like to request hon. Members to restrict their observations; they should not take in any case more than seven or eight minutes.

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : श्रीमन्, क्या इस तरह के हाईपोथेटिकल इश्यू के लिए इस तरह का डिस्कशन रोज किया जा सकता है? "to raise a discussion on the slogan of Indianisation of Muslims raised in certain quarters"

श्री उपसभापति : आपका प्वाइन्ट हमारी समझ में आ गया है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह के प्वाइन्ट उठाकर सदन का समय नष्ट नहीं किया जाना चाहिये। मैं आपसे अनुरोध करूंगा कि इस समय व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना जरूरी नहीं है क्योंकि इस तरह का व्यवस्था का प्रश्न पहले ही उठाया जा चुका है और उसी के बाद यह फैसला हुआ कि इस बात

पर सदन में चर्चा होगी। जब यह फसला हो चुका तब ही चेयरमैन साहब ने इसको एलाऊ किया है। इसलिए मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आप इस समय व्यवस्था का प्रश्न न उठायें।

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : श्रीमन्, जो प्वाइन्ट हम रेज कर रहे हैं उस पर आप निर्णय दीजिये। मेरा कहना यह है कि जो विचार कहीं भी, किसी भी स्थान में, किसी भी व्यक्ति ने किये हैं कि मुसलमान का इंडिय-नाइजेशन किया जाय।

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN
(Nominated) : He is making a speech.

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : इस तरह की अकारण एक बात खड़ी करके लोगों में भ्रम पैदा करना और भारत में जो भिन्न-भिन्न धर्म के लोग हैं उनमें एक प्रकार से टेन्शन पैदा करना, इस तरह का जो प्रयास किया जा रहा है, वह उचित नहीं है। इसलिए मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि ऐसा किसी ने कहा ही नहीं है। जब तक आप पहले जानकारी न कर लें और सदन को जानकारी न हाँ जाय कि किस जगह, किसने कहा है केवल मुसलमान के लिए तब तक इस पर बहस करना उचित नहीं है। यह प्रश्न अलग है कि भारतीयकरण किसे कहते हैं इस पर चर्चा कर ली जाय।

श्री उपसभापति : शेजवलकर जी, आपने काफी कह दिया है। अगर किसी ने नहीं कहा हो तो ऐसा आप बाद में कह देना।

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह बात स्पष्ट हो जानी चाहिए।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) :
If he wants I can clarify.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to clarify at this juncture.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं आश्चर्य-चकित हूँ . . .

श्री ना० कृ० शेजवलकर : जब इन्दिरा जी के लिए . . .

(Interruption)

7—9 R. S./70

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। इतना अवश्य है कि जिस ढंग से इस समय यह प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया गया है उस ढंग से यह प्रस्ताव आना नहीं चाहिए। आपने कुछ इशारा किया कि इस पर चर्चा हो सकती है। तो मैं भी चेयरमैन साहब की खिदमत में हाजिर हुआ था अपने प्रस्ताव को लेकर। मेरा प्रस्ताव डेफिनिट था, निश्चित था और ठोस था—“श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी का भारतीयकरण होना चाहिए, यह सदन की निश्चित राय है”। मैं आज पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा यह प्रस्ताव क्यों नहीं लिया गया। चेयरमेन साहब के सामने यह चीज थी ‘जनसंघ द्वारा मुसलमानों के भारतीयकरण के नारे पर चर्चा’। जनसंघ के लोगों ने कहा कि जनसंघ मुसलमानों के भारतीयकरण की बात नहीं करता तो ‘जनसंघ’ शब्द निकाल दिया गया। वह क्यों निकाला गया? जनसंघ की बात मानी गई। . . .

(Interruption)

श्री उपसभापति : दस मिनट हो गए।

श्री राजनारायण : विषय वेग है। जब जनसंघ के लोगों ने कहा कि हम मुसलमानों के भारतीयकरण का नारा नहीं देते तो उसको मान कर निकाल दिया गया जनसंघ का नाम। फिर अब कतिपय लोगों द्वारा, यह वेग है, अनिश्चित हैं, अंधकार में है, कोई नहीं जानता कतिपय लोग कौन हैं जो कहते हैं कि मुसलमानों का भारतीयकरण हो। इसलिए इस ढंग से जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया है उसको मैं अनुचित समझता हूँ। सदन के समय का दुरुपयोग होना और अनिश्चित और व्यापक प्रस्ताव को इस तरह से ढाई घंटे के विवाद के लिए चर्चा का विषय रखना बिल्कुल अनुचित है। हाँ, अगर प्रस्ताव रखना है तो हमारा प्रस्ताव आना चाहिए था कि “Indira must be Indianised”.

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पंजाब) :
पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर।

श्री राजनारायण : क्या पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर?

श्री उपसभापति : आप अभी बैठ जाइये । मैं बोल रहा हूँ । आपने व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाया है ।

श्री राजनारायण : 'कतिपय' का भाष्य कीजिए ।

श्री उपसभापति : सुनिए । The discussion is on the slogan of Indianisation of Muslims raised in certain quarters and the implications thereof.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : What are those quarters?

श्री उपसभापति : किस तरह से इस विवाद पर चर्चा होनी चाहिए, इस बारे में चेम्बर में काफी देर तक चर्चा हुई ।

श्री राजनारायण : हम लोग जानते हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : सभी राजनीतिक दलों के विचार सुनने के बाद चेयरमैन ने अपनी राय दी है कि इस तरह के प्रस्ताव पर चर्चा होनी चाहिए ।

श्री ना० कृ० शंजवलकर : क्या वह हमारे लिए बाइडिंग है ?

श्री राजनारायण : जब प्रस्ताव सदन में आएगा तब व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठेगा ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please sit down. The Chairman has considered all the proposals and counter-proposals, all the arguments and counter-arguments and he has admitted this motion and that is how this motion has come before the House for consideration, I think the House should proceed with the discussion of the motion. There is no point of order and I would request the Members: let us not waste time; let us proceed with the discussion.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मुझे आश्चर्य है । जब एक संस्था के माननीय सदस्य लोग यह कहें कि हमने यह कहा नहीं तब यह विषय अनिश्चित हो गया । इतने से क्या संतोष नहीं है ? जनसंघ के लोग मुक्त कंठ से कह रहे हैं कि उनकी पार्टी मुसलमानों के भारतीयकरण की बात नहीं करती ।

श्री उपसभापति : पार्टी का नाम नहीं आया, राजनारायण जी ।

श्री राजनारायण : इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह "कतिपय साधन" क्या है, कौन दूसरे लोग हैं जो कहते हैं कि मुसलमानों का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिए ?

(Interruption)

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, आप बैठिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप चाहते हैं कि सदन का समय ऐसे ही खर्च हो, तो चलाइए, लेकिन हमारी प्रोटेस्ट लिख लीजिए कि जानबूझकर किसी ताकत ने इस विषय को रखा है, इसे भारतवर्ष में हिन्दू-मुसलमानों के सम्बन्धों में तनाव पैदा करने के लिए रखा है और श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के इशारे पर इस विषय को यहां पर चर्चा के लिए रखा गया है । मैं इसकी भर्त्सना करता हूँ और घोर भर्त्सना करता हूँ । सदन के समय का दुरुपयोग इस तरह से होगा प्रधान मंत्री के इशारे पर, चन्द गुर्गों के इशारे पर, तो हमारी प्रोटेस्ट होगी ।

श्री उपसभापति : आपने प्रोटेस्ट किया, ठीक है, अब बैठ जाइए ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप व्यवस्था दीजिए । हमारा प्रस्ताव कहाँ गया ? हमने सेक्रेटरी को स्लिप लिखी, वह सेक्रेटरी की पाकेट में होमी, हमने लिखा ...

(Interruption)

श्री उपसभापति : सुनिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : हमने अपने आदरणीय सचिव, राज्यसभा, को स्लिप भेजी कि जब आज इस विषय पर चर्चा है तो हमारा नाम गुम क्यों, तो सचिव ने कहा कि चूंकि आपने "इन्दिरा" को लिखा था, मुसलमान को नहीं लिखा था, इसलिए आपका नाम गोल है । तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सचिव हमारी बहुत सी चीजों को बदल देते हैं; भारतीयकरण की चर्चा हुई तो "इन्दिरा" उसमें से काट देते हैं, भारतीयकरण ले लेते, यही काफी था उस पर चर्चा हो जाती । इसलिए हमारा संशोधन है

कि मुसलमान शब्द नहीं लिखा जाय। [कतिपय लोगों द्वारा भागीयकरण के बारे के बारे में चर्चा होगी . . .

(Interruptions)

श्री उपसभापति : आपने 15 मिनट ले लिए, राजनारायण जी ।

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIKSHIT (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No point of order; please sit down. Hon. Members should resume their seats. If the House is of opinion that we should try and accommodate the large number of Members to express their views on this important matter I would request them not to enter into any further discussion or raise points of order.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat) : The motion has been brought forward in such a manner that there is so much of controversy.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, आप "मुस्लिम" शब्द निकाल दीजिए ।

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, आप बैठिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं समझता हूँ कि मुसलमान भारतीय है, जो मुसलमान के भारतीयकरण पर चर्चा करवाते हों वह अभारतीय हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठ जाइए ।

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Mysore) : Sir, I want to make a submission. I know this motion has been admitted by the Chairman but unfortunately the wording of the motion has created certain difficulty. I think it is not the intention of any Member of this House to raise communal passion in the country or here. You yourself rightly observed in the beginning that this should be considered in a very very dignified manner and we should not lose ourselves in passion or exhibit any emotion on this issue so that the atmosphere elsewhere may not be spoilt.

In view of your observations and also the reaction of certain colleagues here, I suggest that this motion be either reworded or better still we may withdraw it. I would appeal to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to

withdraw this motion once and for all. That will create a better atmosphere.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: When the motion has been admitted specifically and when it is in this House . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order order.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : But the wording has been distorted.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : What we say is that at that time it was really Indianisation of Muslims . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: By whom ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : We say Jan Sangh.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : That will be given in the speeches.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Jan Sangh Members are free to say whatever they like.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order please.

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह सांप्रदायिकता का द्योतक है । जिस प्रस्ताव से सांप्रदायिकता आये उस पर यहां डिस्कशन नहीं होना चाहिए ।

श्री उपसभापति : आर्डर, आर्डर ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं अपनी असमर्थता पर पश्चाताप कर रहा हूँ कि मैं इतनी शक्ति क्यों नहीं रख रहा हूँ कि एक साधु सुझाव को आप से मनवा सकूँ । यह मोशन है । यह इसी ढंग से जायेगा भले ही अपनी स्पीच में भूपेश गुप्त जी कुछ भी कहें या कृष्णकांत ही कुछ भी कहें । वह जो चाहे कह लें लेकिन इस मोशन से 'मुसलमान' शब्द निकाल दिया जाय । केवल यह मोशन रहे कि भारतीयकरण के बारे में चर्चा हो तो नुकसान क्या है ? मैं आप से यही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप इस पर सोच लें ।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है ।

श्री सी० डी० पांडे : इस में मुसलमान भी आ सकते हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : इस में कुछ भी बर्द्धिग हों, लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा कि जब यह एक बार एडमिट हो गया, एजेन्डा पर आ गया तो— it cannot be changed. Apart from that, what is the meaning of the actual motion or the actual words of the motion the Mover of the Motion will explain it. All the Members who want to participate in the discussion can express their own views. You can refer to a number of problems here, if hon. Members want. Therefore, I would request hon. Members not to waste any more time on preliminary points and now I would call Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to raise the discussion. He will kindly be brief, if he wishes to accommodate other Members.

श्री राजनारायण : हमारा यह प्रोटेस्ट भी साथ-साथ जोड़ दिया जाय ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As the Mover of the Motion I have some time. First of all I wish to make it clear that it is far from my intention to rouse passions on any side. On the contrary, I would like to speak on the motion in the spirit of communal harmony and unity, which indeed exists in our country. I am not one of those who think that our country does not believe in secularism or that the unity of communities in our country is a fiction. Our country stands traditionally and historically for a secular way of life and that is my starting point. Now, if the slogan of Indianisation of Muslims has come up, it has come up due to some people in some quarters and they constitute not a big section of the community at all. That is an aberration in our public life and that is why we want to pinpoint the slogan, its harmful consequences and dangerous implications, so that all of us, irrespective of political parties and faiths, who stand for national integration and secularism, can together fight to uphold the noble traditions of secularism and national unity.

Before I deal with the subject and come to the different aspects of it, may I invite your attention to the discussions and deliberations of the National Integration Council, where this question of national integration and the question of the slogan of Hindu Rashtra or Indianisation was taken up by no other person than Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan ? I am a member of the National Integration Council and of its Standing Committee. It was at the instance of Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan that the Committee decided to apply its

mind. The National Integration Council came to certain conclusions at its meeting of November 4. At an earlier meeting of the National Integration Council, in the middle of October, this question was discussed and a statement of the Standing Committee of the National Integration Council was issued. The statement said :

“We are firmly opposed to the denunciation of any minority community as being unpatriotic or an agency of any foreign power.”

Equally it condemned the idea that any minority community requires to be Indianised or else it should be forced to leave the country. I think people are found sometimes indulging in such irresponsible talks as the exchange of people with Pakistan being the solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem. This was followed up by a meeting of an all-party conference convened on November 4 at the instance of the National Integration Council, which was attended by our esteemed colleague here, Dr. Bhai Mahavir, and he was also a signatory to the declaration. The declaration said:

“This Conference is firmly opposed to the denunciation of any minority community as being unpatriotic or an agency of any foreign power. Equally do we condemn the idea that any minority community ...”

It has repeated what has been stated earlier.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) : I was not signatory to the declaration. I opposed it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You may have opposed it. Anyway, I accept it. All right. The Indian Constitution does provide suitable safeguards for the cultural and educational interests of the minorities. The majority community has a responsibility to make those safeguards a reality. Therefore, I am not dealing with that subject, which has been tackled in a partisan manner or has been dealt with in a sectarian or narrow partisan spirit. All of us sat together, discussed it and came to conclusions. I think it is consistent with the principles and the declaration of the Constitution itself.

Before I come to discuss the implications of it, I must point out the genesis of this slogan of Indianisation of Muslims and other similar slogans. I would invite your attention to a book published before the second world war ...

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : He may permit me to put this question. Could you point out where exactly and who exactly said "Indianisation of Muslims"?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let me proceed. As I said, I want to speak without rousing any passions. Let the discussion take place. I invite your attention to the book of Mr. Golwalkar published in 1939. The title of the book is "We, our Nationhood Defined". At page 52 of the book you will find: —

"Those only are nationalist patriots who with the aspiration to glorify the Hindu race and Nation next to their heart are prompted into activity and strive to achieve the goal. All others, posing to be patriots and wilfully indulging in a course of action detrimental to the Hindu Nation are traitors and enemies to the Nation cause or to take a more charitable view if unintentionally and unwillingly led into such a course, mere simpletons, misguided, ignorant fools."

The reference is to Congressmen, Communists, Socialists and many others who at that time were fighting the British and stood for national unity, national integration and communal harmony. It was the counterpart of the Muslim League. (Interruptions). I do not wish to be disturbed. Then, in this book again it is written :

"From this standpoint sanctioned by the experience of shrewd old nations the non-Hindu peoples in Hindusthan must either adopt the Hindu culture and language, must learn to respect and hold in reverence Hindu religion, must entertain no idea but those of glorification of the Hindu race and culture, i.e., they must not only give up their attitude of intolerance and ungratefulness towards this land and its age-long traditions, but must also cultivate the positive attitude of love and devotion instead in one word they must cease to be foreigners or may stay in the country wholly subordinated to the Hindu nation, claiming nothing, deserving no privileges, far less any preferential treatment not even citizen's rights".

This book was printed first in 1939 and again printed in 1947. You will remember, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that this was the time when Gandhi and the Congress Party leadership and the party were

preparing for waging a struggle against the British. This was the time when Mr. M. A. Jinnah came out with slogan of two-nation theory and propagated those ideas, and you found the Hindu counterpart, this book, was published with a view to dividing the anti-imperialist forces, with a view to waging an ideological war against Mahatma Gandhi and his teachings, with a view to creating confusion among the people, setting one community against another in order to help the British strategy of divide and rule. Mr. Deputy Chairman, that is the history behind it. Then later on we found these things being revived. My friend has raised the question as to who said it, who gave this slogan. I will just quote from various papers speeches uncontradicted, and it is for you to draw the conclusion :

"Anybody claiming himself or herself to be a secularist has to be a staunch Hindu".

RSS Guru Golwalkar said this in Delhi on February 22nd this year.

"Both Mrs. Gandhi and Chavan need to be Indianised more than the Muslims. Most of our troubles would not have been there had Mr. Nehru been Indianised, only Hindu state could guarantee secularism in the country".

This is by Shri Balraj Madhok on February 12th.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : This was contradicted by him and there has been a long controversy. He should not show only a part of it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Then,

"By Indianisation, it is meant that the Muslims should give due respect to the Hindu culture, Hindu scriptures, and try to participate in Hindu festivals".

This is by Shri K. Narendra, Editor, Paratap Daily. He has not denied it.

"Even the late Maulana Azad accepted that more than 95% of Indian Muslims are converts and not the progeny of foreign invaders. The talk of separate Muslim culture goes against the basic facts of history. Therefore when I suggest that they should shed the two nation theory and get fully Indianised I am not saying anything to which any nationalist Indian can take any objection".

[Bhupesh Gupta]

This was by Shri Balraj Madhok in a letter to Hindustan Times on February 16th. He cannot deny it. He wrote that letter.

"Riots will continue to rule till Islam is Indianised".

This was by Shri Balraj Madhok as reported in Hindustan Times of February 13th, to which he sent his correspondence.

"Indianisation of Muslims was not possible so long as the Aligarh University was allowed to function."

This was by Shri Balraj Madhok on February 13th. I hope my friend is getting some information.

"A recent meeting held at New Delhi under the Chairmanship of the P.M. decided to launch an all party campaign for communal peace and harmony. I suggest that this campaign be called 'India First and Foremost'".

Mr. Vajpayee is more subtle than the crude Mr. Balraj Madhok. This is from Mr. Vajpayee from Patna.

"All that we mean by 'Indianising Muslims' is that we may be spared the irrelevance of all Islamic impediments blocking our onward march. The Russian treatment of Muslims and the Indonesian treatment of Chinese can be good examples for us".

A wonderful example that is. That is in Organiser, "Moving figure writes", December 27th.

I think I have given enough to show from where the slogans come. Therefore, there is no dispute about it. I am not saying this but it is on record, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that this slogan is being given by some leaders of the Jan Sangh, and Mr. Madhok never denies that thing; he has his own explanation, he has his own argument, but he has not denied that he has ever given this slogan. Therefore, it is for us to take note of the slogan, and from Jan Sangh platform and other places the slogan is being raised. It is in newspapers. If my friends of the Jan Sangh give up this slogan, nobody would be happier than I. I am looking forward to them to give up this slogan. That is what we expect.

What does this slogan mean in the context of today. We are a free country today, Republic of India, wedded to a secular

way of life based on the principles and tenets and teachings of Mahatma Gandhi who became a martyr to the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity to the eternal glory of this nation. His teachings and principles are enshrined in the Constitution in one form or another. We are trying to build up our country. We are trying to overcome the dark legacies created by the Britishers when brothers were set against one another, when knife was given in the hand of one brother to stab another. I have seen this slogan, whether it be the two-nation theory, whether it be Indianisation of the Muslims or Pakistanisation of the Hindu of East Pakistan, this slogan leads to ruin and disaster. In fact this slogan leads to the forfeiture of the title of this country to be a civilised nation. That is why in the name of civilisation, in the spirit of the ancient culture and heritage of this land, I demand that this slogan be denounced by all who stand for our past, culture, who stand for a bright future who stand for the glories of this great and ancient land we have built up through the ages.

We have here today in free India 6 or 7 crores of Muslim brothers and sisters. They are as much citizens of India as I am. Some of them, I am proud to say, are perhaps better citizens of India than some claiming to belong to the majority community. Mr. Abdul Hamid was the man who met at the frontier the challenge of the invader in defence of our country. We honour his name by raising monuments, we put plaques in the streets, we gave him a posthumous award, but at the same time we have the melancholy spectacle, the grim spectacle of some of our countrymen calling upon the Muslim community to Indianise themselves. It is a shame, shame on us, shame on everybody. It is an insult to the genius and spirit of the great nation. Six crores of Muslims are patriotic to the fibre of their being, loyal to the country. They have their culture, they have their religion they have their way of life, certainly but in the larger context of a secular State, in our polity we are brothers and sisters; we stand before our nation as member of a polity, of a secular community trying to build a new India through our struggle, through our sacrifice, through our suffering, which Hindus and Muslims share in the fields and factories; workers and peasants, employees and others, everywhere they join hands in order to fight oppression and tyranny, oppression of the regime, tyranny of the regime, exploitation of the monopolist and plundering classes.

The blood of the Hindu mingles with the blood of the Muslim so that we together march forward with determination and resolve to make this nation worthy of the heritage of our past forbears and the heritage of Mahatma Gandhi. Today Mr. Deputy Chairman, they are asked to be Indianised. What else could be more disruptive? This is an ideologically perverse call at the top, and what happens at the bottom is that this slogan when translated into action becomes extermination of Muslims by some rabid communal Hindus. That is what it becomes. In Ahmedabad it happened. In Calcutta it happened. In other places it happened. In the name of Indianising Muslims, exterminate the Muslims. If they are not Indianised, exterminate them. If they are not Indianised, throw them across the border into Pakistan. If they do not go into Pakistan, put an end to their life, burn them alive, burn their hearths and homes, run amuck among them. Tear them to pieces, tear those people to pieces. That has become the pattern of Indianisation; it is utterly vulgar. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is a matter of satisfaction ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You should finish now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : ... that the overwhelming majority of the community and the people of this country, belonging to all communities, are fighting this menace, fighting this slogan, fighting this trend that will bring ruin to the life of the nation. Mr. Rajnarain has raised his point of order. But I am not questioning it. We may differ over many things; but not on this there should be any difference. With this slogan, I do not know how you are going to deal. I have got the freedom of speech. Anybody can say anything. But must we say such things? Must we say that the British should come back simply because we have got the freedom of speech? Must we say that Sati should be reintroduced simply because we have got the freedom of speech? It is a matter for our conscience. Let this be known. I do not bother about parliamentary legislation at the moment. I am not speaking in that spirit. Today I think it is in the heart of hearts; in our minds. We must enact a law that bans such a slogan. I would rather be dead than have such a slogan; I would rather be killed than hear such a slogan being uttered by the rabid communalists of the RSS or of the Jana Sangh or by any party or any section against the Muslim community. Mr. Balraj Madhok...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You must finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : ... is using his freedom of speech in a particular manner. Not only are the Muslims to be Indianised, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Do you know who others are to be Indianised? Do you know that the Harijans are also to be Indianised by them, that the Christians are to be Indianised, that everybody is to be Indianised whom the Jana Sangh does not like or whom the RSS does not like? My friend, Mr. Rajnarain, he does not want to Indianise anybody except Shrimati Indira Gandhi. I am not quarrelling with him. But we would like Shrimati Indira Gandhi to humanise Mr. Rajnarain. But he is all the same a secular man.

I am finishing. This one point I should like to say. The implications of this slogan ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Because you are interrupting, therefore my thoughts are lost when thoughts come. You can show your hand a little yourself. The trend is lost anyhow. Anyhow, I am very sorry for it.

Therefore, the slogan should not be there. It should be banned from our land. Now, it has been given by them. Why? Why today? Today there is a popular upsurge in the country just as in 1939 when Gandhiji was preparing for the movement. Today when there is a democratic upsurge in the country for progress, for a political break-through for making radical changes in the life of the nation, for united mass action by Hindus and Muslims and all communities, the slogan of Indianisation of Muslims has come up to start riots in the country, to divide the Hindus and the Muslims, to create political diversions. This slogan today has become a feature of the counter-offensive of the rightist reactionary forces including the communal forces in the same way as the Golwalkar slogan before the war in 1939 became the slogan of the aggressive forces of imperialism and their lackeys. Therefore, democratic and progressive forces, secular forces, must bear in mind that this is not just a sudden lapse on the part of Mr. Balraj Madhok. This is a part of the calculated counter-offensive of the rightist forces in order to stall the advance of the progressive and united popular forces. This is an attempt

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

to divide the Hindus and the Muslims—there was the riot in Ahmedabad—because it is by such political diversion that they want to kill the upsurge of the people. The Hindus and the Muslims are united. Mr. Deputy Chairman, the slogan should be viewed as a counter-offensive of reaction.

I do not wish to take much of your time ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have given almost more time to points of order.

I would like to appeal to the House—let the voice of the House be raised today at least in denouncing, in fervently denouncing, all such slogans. I would like the hon. Members to speak through indignation, through their heart, in denouncing this slogan. Let it be known to the Muslim community that we in this House can give them all protection, give them all their rights as the rights which I have got, belonging to the majority community. They are not second-class citizens; they are not third-class citizens. They are as much citizens as anybody else, and to deny them that right is to deny us all the right to call ourselves a civilised nation. That is why I would ask the House in all humility, in all earnestness, to raise its voice so that we can register a protest against it and find ways and means of silencing those people who issue such dangerous, disruptive, murderous, heinous slogans that bring in their wake the Ahmedabad riots, the Ranchi riots and the other riots and which cannot but spell ruin this great nation and its future.

Thank you.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : You should call party-wise, Sir.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): It should be name-wise.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit down? ज़रा बैठ रहिये। दूसरी बार क्यों पूछ रहे हैं; जब मैं बताने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। ऐसे डिसकशन में हमेशा पार्टी-वाइज़ डिसकशन चलता है। I would be calling one from every party. First is Mr. Krishan Kant.

SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA : Sir, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA : Why not? मुझे केवल आपसे यह पूछना है कि प्रारम्भ में आपने यह कहा था कि हर स्पीकर को दस-दस मिनट का समय मिलेगा।

श्री उपसभापति : देखिये, जिसने मोशन मूव किया उसको ज्यादा समय मिलेगा।

(Interruptions)

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : आप व्यवस्था कीजिए।

श्री उपसभापति : मैंने आपको बतलाया वह मूवर थे...

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : हम भी जानते हैं। लेकिन औरों को कितना समय मिलेगा?

श्री उपसभापति : मिस्टर वर्मा ज़रा सुन लीजिए। एक तो उन्होंने यह रिजोल्यूशन मूव किया है उनके लिये है... (Interruptions.) ज़रा सुनिये, वर्मा जी बैठ जाइये, आपकी जानकारी के लिये बतला रहा हूँ। मूवर साहब मूव कर चुके हैं, इसके बाद पार्टी-वाइज़ जिनके नाम हैं, वे बोलेंगे और बाद में जवाब के लिये मिनिस्टर साहब को थोड़ा ज्यादा समय देना पड़ेगा। इसके अलावा हमने यह भी सोचा है कि जिनको इस पूरी बहस का जवाब देना होगा, उस पार्टी को थोड़ा-सा ज्यादा समय देना पड़ेगा। बाकी के सब सदस्यों को पांच, सात मिनट में अपने विचार प्रगट करना है।

श्री पीताम्बर दास (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अपने साथी कुलकर्णी जी से ज़रा मैं निवेदन करने जा रहा था। कुलकर्णी जी का तो यह विचार था कि मारो और रोने मत दो। यानी उन्हीं लोगों को बुलाया जाये, जिनके नाम इस कागज़ पर हैं और जिनको गालियाँ दी जायें वे जवाब तक न दें; क्योंकि उनका नाम इसमें नहीं है।

अगर यह बहस इस स्प्रिट में चलानी है तो इससे कुछ लाभ नहीं होने वाला है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pitamber Das, I have already made the position clear.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Thank you very much, Sir.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu): With regard to your observation that the Minister will be called upon to reply to the debate, may I ask what is his competence on the subject? Does Indianisation fall within his competence? Is Indianisation the subject of the Government or the administration? Is it mentioned in any of the Schedules of the Constitution that the Minister should be called upon to reply to the debate?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): This is a very pertinent and valid point raised and the Chair or the Minister himself must say how this comes under the portfolio of the Minister... (Interruptions) You can hand over. I am not objecting to it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can raise the question later on.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: But here is a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member wants to raise that question, that can be raised later on.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Mr. Ruthnaswamy has raised a point of order...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He can raise the point of order later. I have called the hon. Member to speak.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: The point of order is already there and you cannot ask somebody else...

(Interruptions)

SHRI NEKI RAM (Haryana): It is ruled out of order....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I have said that he should raise that point afterwards when he is speaking. That is my observation on the point of order. He should not raise it now. He can raise it at the proper time.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: May I suggest that the Minister is here only as an observer on the part of the Government?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever it is you can raise that question later on.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was very glad when our friend, Shri Shejwalkar, raised the point whether the thing should be admitted or not because I wanted him to say that the Jan Sangh disowns the slogan of Indianisation. I will be glad if after the debate they say that it is not so. Here is the speech of Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee which he gave in Patna. He says:

"If the word Indianisation has been used more often in the context of the Muslim community, it is because of the peculiar historical background of Pakistan in which Muslims as a community had come under the influence of Jinnah's two-nation theory. In their case, therefore, an even more conscious effort is called for to wean them away from this emotional background."

Not only that, Mr. Balraj Madhok while replying to the debate says:—

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: What was wrong in what Mr. Vajpayee said?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: While referring to his speech on Indianisation, he says:—

"For your information I may add that these are not my personal views. These are the views of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh as a whole and are being accepted by other people also."

If in spite of that our friend says that they are not the views of the Jana Sangh, I will be very happy. If they disown Mr. Balraj Madhok and Mr. Vajpayee and what they have said, that will really be a new chapter written in our political history ...

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: We would not oblige you.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: because that would really take us to the real goal we want to achieve.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, the slogan which has been raised by the Jana Sangh today is not a new slogan. It has some historical background. It started long back when the R. S. S. was formed because the Jana Sangh is a product of R. S. S., and I do not think they will in any way dispute that. As Muslim communalism started here and as I consider

[Shri Kr'shan Kant.]

Jamait-i-Islami as much vicious and communal, similarly the R. S. S. is equally vicious and communal.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : वह आपका खयाल गलत है। आर०एस०एस० से जनसंघ की उत्पत्ति नहीं हुई है। आपका जो खयाल है वह बिल्कुल गलत है।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, may I quote from a book "Jana Sangh—Biography of an Indian Political Party" by Craig Baxter (U.S.) wherein he says:—

"The organisational and ideological ancestor of Jana Sangh is R. S. S."

Not only that he said that it was helped to be formed by the Britishers at that time. That is why we say that the Jana Sangh and the R. S. S. are fascist parties. Why do we say that?

It was in 1920, after the First World War, that the Britishers started supporting the Nazi Party in Germany and at the same time, after the Hindu Seva Dal of Dr. Moonje, this Rashtriya Swayam-sevak Sangh came into being right about 1925 or so.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : वे गलत बात कह रहे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. आप जवाब दे देना।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: They can reply to it, Mr. Deputy Chairman. You can reply later on. Why are you taking my time?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right. No interruption, please.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: It shows how the R. S. S. was really playing into the hands of the anti-national forces.

They are talking now of Indianisation. But may I submit, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that most of their prominent Sangh Chalakas were Rai Bahadurs and Rai Sahibs? Even in the Punjab Rai Bahadur Badridas was their Sangh Chalak. In U. P. Rai Bahadur Madanjit Singh was their Sangh Chalak....

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: He was never a Rai Bahadur.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: The Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh was supported by the Gwalior State, the Alwar State, all feudal elements and communal elements.

श्री उपसभापति : श्री कृष्ण कांत आप क्वेश्चन के बारे में बोलिये और साइट इश्यू मत करिये।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Mr. Deputy Chairman, what I am saying is that the slogan of Indianisation has not come up in a vacuum. It has come up with a certain background because of the freedom fight that was continuing. Here is the "Bunch of Thoughts" by Shri Golwalkar. What does he say about our National Movement? It is rather interesting to see what he says about that movement. He says:—

"Anti-Britishism was equated with patriotism and nationalism. This reactionary view has had disastrous effects upon the entire course of the freedom movement, its leaders and the common people."

He says:

"This reactionary view has had disastrous effects upon the entire course of the freedom movement, its leaders and the common people."

श्री राजनारायण : आप क्या पढ़ रहे हैं ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: It is "Bunch of Thoughts" by Guru Golwalkar.

श्री राजनारायण : मैंने समझा कि आप कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की हिस्ट्री पढ़ रहे हैं।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Why are you so much afraid of that? Mr. Deputy Chairman, not only that. In 1939, when Hitler was creating havoc, what has Guru Golwalkar to say in his book, "We"? He says:—

"The way Hitler has built the German nation by awakening race pride is a great lesson for us in Hindustan."

He wanted too to have his racial struggle in this country, superior race and inferior race. Indianisation is the product of the historical background in which the R. S. S. functioned and the Jana Sangh is their product in 1939 when Hitler was.

challenging the world into war. How can Guru Golwalkar be ignorant of the evil consequences of communalism? He appreciated Hitler's Nazi party and has been trying to mould his activities on the pattern of the Nazis. The same way our friends are talking about Indianisation. If today they want to disown the slogan I will be very happy.

Not only that, Mr. Deputy Chairman. What did they do in 1942? When the Quit India struggle started, they gave instructions to the Shakhnas not to associate, earlier either with the Satyagraha or, later on, with the Quit India Movement. (*Time Bell rings.*) Their main concentration was on weaning away the youth from the national movement. You know, Sir, when we were fighting the Britishers, when Gandhiji started the Quit India Movement, they were asking the youth not to join this national movement. On the other hand, they were pleading with the youth to join the British Army. They had issued instructions to that effect.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: And what was the Communist Party doing?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: They were also doing the same thing. The C.P.I. at that time was playing an anti-national role.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, not only that, if Bhai Mahavir was in Lahore he must be knowing that there was a paper, Hindu, which was assisted by the Punjab Government—because I was there I know that—for its war effort. He also knows it, I think. What happened in the post-independence India when the bulk of the nation was going towards socialism? They say “No” because they do not want to fight poverty. They do not want poverty to go. They were trying to sidetrack the issue of poverty.

On the other hand, here is another book by Shri Golwalkar, “Not socialism, but Hindu Rashtra”. This is how they want to sidetrack the battle of the poor. They want to sidetrack the issue of social injustice to the poor. Hence, “Not socialism, but Hindu Rashtra”. This is what he has to say in the book:—

“... Now that we have attained freedom and are trying to wash off all stains of past slavery, why should they, who were subject to religious slavery, not shake off those shackles and join the original national stream. All these

Muslims or Christians, everybody should join the mainstream and be converted to Hinduism”.

This is how they want to Indianise.

Now, not only that, Mr. Deputy Chairman, here is another quotation from Mr. Golwalkar's “Bunch of Thoughts”.

He says :

“There are some people who declare that they have achieved unity of Hindus, Muslims, Christians and all others on the political and economic plane. But why limit the oneness only there? Why not make it more wide and more comprehensive so as to fuse them all in the Hindu way of life, in our *Dharma*, and take them back as lost brothers? For those who speak of unity on the political and economic plane, we say that we stand not only for political and economic unity, but also for cultural and religious unity.”

This is the way they want to Indianise the Muslims; this is the way they want to act. Not only with regard to these people, but also with regard to Harijans and the Scheduled Castes, they want to do it. Here is an extract from an interview given by Guru Golwalkar to a Marathi monthly called *Nawakal*. Here while referring to the system of the “*Chaturvarna*” he said: “It was true that it was in accordance with quality and action, but to interpret quality as “ability” and *karma* as “*karma* accepted by one's liking” is wrong. Quality means *sattva*, *raja* and *tama* and *karma* means “*karma* done in past life”.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : ये भारतीयकरण के बारे में बोल रहे हैं या हिन्दू धर्म के बारे में बोल रहे हैं ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Guru Golwalkar feels that it is the previous birth which makes *karma*. Thus they want to divide the society into different sections and have race relations. Now what do they say? Now, if 25 per cent of the minorities—Muslims, Sikhs and others—and 35 per cent of the Harijans are taken out of the mainstream, on the basis of birth, then only 40 per cent of the people are of the superior race which according to Guru Golwalkar, should be the ruling race, which should govern the country. That is why we are saying that this is a method

[Shri Krishan Kant]

of dividing the Indian polity. Is it not a fact that when awards or "Vir Chakras" were given for the sacrifices of the Keeler brothers and Abdul Hamid, at a reception by the Lucknow Corporation, Guru Golwalkar said that it was an act of appeasing the minorities? They say they want to Indianise these people. Are they Indians themselves? They do not want to recognise the sacrifices of these people because they belonged to the minority community. Is this the attitude with which we can build up the nation? Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is a very serious thing. I can only say that if they want to take it back, let them take it back. I know there are some very good people in the Jan Sangh.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Do not try to divide and rule, Mr. Krishan Kant?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: No, I am not dividing. The whole House knows that the R. S. S. and the Jan Sangh have been trying to divide the country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must conclude now.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: By saying that there are some good people in the Jan Sangh, and others are bad, do not try to divide them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right; there are no good people in the Jan Sangh. Are they united now?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, here is what Mr. Balraj Madhok says.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please resume your seat.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: He says Hindu politics became identified with the Bhartiya Jan Sangh. And then he says ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not read anything now. Please sit down.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: He says :

"Indian politics is and will always remain Hindu politics so long as India exists as a nation."

When their leaders have said like this may I know if we are not justified when we criticise the Jan Sangh? This slogan of Indianisation is anti-national, anti-unity, anti-fraternity, against the Constitution of India, against the traditions of India and we condemn it with all our strength. The minorities have equal rights. All people who were born and domiciled here shall be given full and equal opportunities.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while participating in this discussion, I want to make it clear that I do not agree with the main words of the motion. There is no question of Indianising the Muslims. The Muslims who have stayed in our country, 60 millions of them, are fully Indians. We have no grudge against them. We have got no suspicion against them. But this motion has a wider meaning. I am referring to the section of the people here who look beyond our borders for inspiration or whatever it may be. There are parties here—not on the basis of religion; there is absolute freedom of religion; there is absolute freedom of culture here—which import their political thinking from other countries.

SHRI B. V. ABDULLA KOYA (Kerala) : Which are the other countries?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Russia, China, and there are many. (*Interruptions*) What I want to say is that there is a large section of people in this country who really deserve to be Indianised, from the political angle, in their loyalties. I remember the days of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's political career when he was a student in London. He was not looking to the Indian welfare. His politics throughout for the last 30 years has centred on Russian policy. If there is a war by Russia, it becomes people's war. When Indian youths were in jail, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was fighting against us. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a matter of personal explanation. When my friend was happily married to the daughter of an illustrious man, I was in prison.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: If there is any section of people in this country which needs to be Indianised, it is Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's party and Mr. Niren Ghosh's party. It is a shame to our country that there are men who have got the picture of Mao Tse-tung in various parts of the country and they have got Chinese friends. They are not guided by Indian interests.

They are guided by what is happening in China and Russia. If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is fighting Mr. Niren Ghosh, it is not because they have any enmity, but because China and Russia are fighting each other. And that conflict is reflected here. Therefore, is it not desirable that such sections of people, who are looking beyond the country for inspiration, for their loyalty, should be nationalised? What is wrong if I say that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should be nationalised?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I should be nationalised?

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am already in the public sector.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : You are not. You are in the Russian sector.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : He should be deposited in a nationalised bank.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : He is in the Russian sector and his loyalties are there. When he uses the words "preposterous", "sinister", and so on, in connection with this slogan of Indianisation, may I ask him whether his Russian friends have not Russianised the Muslims in Turkestan? Have not the Russians Russianised the entire Muslim population of Turkestan? There is not a single name in Central Russia which has not been Russianised. If a man was called Sultan, he became Sultanov. If somebody's name was Ahmed he became Ahmedov.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Pande will be Pondov.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Did they tell them "Don't play with the religion and culture of the Muslims in Central Asia"?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should become Bhupeshov.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : So, Sir, there is a large section of people in this country who need to be Indianised and it should be our effort to Indianise them. And if we cannot do it easily, a legislation should be brought that no person in this land should have any loyalty to another country, whether culturally or socially or otherwise. They should resist such temptation because it is very dangerous. I have no danger from Chagla or from Akbar Ali Khan. But I have every danger from Mr. Bhupesh

Gupta, from Mr. Niren Ghosh and from such others. Therefore, if there is any utility in this Resolution, it is with regard to this aspect. They should be Indianised. (Interruptions) Sir, one more sentence. As far as the Muslims are concerned, I remember the days of 1923-24 when Maulana Mohammed Ali used to say in public speeches, "I am an Indian first, I am an Indian next, I am an Indian last." I think the Indian Muslims of today are the same. Therefore, I have no complaint against the Muslims, but I have a complaint against those people who are carrying on a bogey of campaign, whoever it is. They are creating a suspicion and horror in the minds of the Muslims so that they may leave Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's party or Mrs. Indira Gandhi's party or somebody else's party. It is a political exploitation of the minorities. So I blame you, I charge you, for exploiting the Muslims creating a psychology of terror. You should desist from that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Thank you, Mr. Pande, for your cooperation. I hope other honourable Members also will emulate the example of Mr. Pande.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : Mr. Deputy Chairman, when in 1870 Italy became unified for the first time, the great Italian statesman, Mazzini, said to the first King of the United Italy, "Sir, we have made Italy. Now we must set about making Italians." That is the problem with which India has been faced ever since it acquired independence. When India was made, to the eternal tragedy of the country, large portions were knocked off. The land which had been intended by nature to be united, indivisible, was divided by the lust of politicians for power. But even so, India still stands united. But the people of India have to become Indians. Just as the Italians were divided into Lombardians, Northern Italians, Tuscanians, Neapolitans, Sicilians, etc., we have also been divided from one another by our caste, by our community, by our religion, and unfortunately recently by our culture. So the great problem before India is how the people of India can become Indians; not merely the Hindus, not merely the Muslims, not merely the Christians, all the people, how they can become Indians. That is the problem which faces every community. The Hindus have to be Indianised. The Muslims have to be Indianised. The Christians have to be Indianised. Every community, every caste, has to be Indianised because the dominant influence upon us has been

[Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.]

that of either our religion or our caste or our community or our language. So all these different communities have to become Indian, and that is the problem before every one of us, not merely before the Muslims, before the Hindus, before the Christians, before the Parsis, but before every one. And our duty lies in strengthening all those factors, all those influences, that make for Indian unity, that make for Indianisation, and keep in the background, suppress, all those factors that divide us from each other.

Among the factors that keep India united is the land of India. The land which was intended by nature to be one and undivided, that has never been divided. The land is never divided between the people of India. The mountains, the seas have definitely divided India and the Indians from every other country but not the Indian themselves. It is the people of India that are divided. And so I would suggest that in our schools, in our colleges, in our newspapers, emphasis should be laid upon the love of the land of India because, while the cultures, the languages, the castes divide us from one another, the land of India unites us. Let the love of the land of India be inculcated among our youth, among our people, among the young and old, so that this love of the mountains, the hills, the plains of India, the birds of India, the animals of India,—the love of the land of India—may be one unifying factor. That is the only unifying factor in our country.

This debate was utterly uncalled for, and it does not relate to the issues of Parliament. Indianisation is not one of the subjects of the Government. It is not the charge of any one Minister. Although this debate should not have been allowed, it has been allowed by the Chairman; but it has given us an opportunity to clear our minds of all those cobwebs, all those differences that keep us divided. Let us concentrate upon the factors that keep us together, that keep us united. If this debate can concentrate our attention upon the things that unite our people and unite our country, it will have served its purpose.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chagla.

श्री नेकीराम : मिस्टर डिप्टी चैयरमैन, प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर ।

श्री उपसभापति : क्या प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है ?

श्री नेकीराम : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि हमारे साथी रत्नस्वामी जी ने इटली की मिसाल दी, लेकिन जर्मनी ने जब हमला किया इटली वालों पर तो उन्होंने अपने आप को उन के हवाले क्यों कर दिया ?

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठ जाइये ।

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think everyone in this House agrees that we want in our country national unity and communal harmony. And from that point of view, I am sorry that this Resolution should have been worded in the manner in which it has been done. Now, I do not understand Indianisation. Every citizen of India is an Indian. He does not need Indianisation. He has all the rights under the Constitution. All the fundamental rights are guaranteed to him. We can proudly say we do not have two classes of citizenship. We have repudiated emphatically, unequivocally, the evil, vicious, theory of two nations. Therefore, whatever the community, whatever the caste, all the people who are the citizens of India are equal. I also regret that the expression 'Indianisation of Muslims' should have been used...

AN HON. MEMBER: By whom ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I am talking of the Resolution.

In my opinion one of the misfortunes of our country is, as somebody said, there are very few Indians in India. We think of our caste, we think of our community, we think of our language, we think of our religion, and the last, if at all, we think of our country. And what we need is that our first, foremost, paramount, loyalty should be to our country. In other words, we must develop an Indian outlook. And I say that applies not only to the Muslims, but to the Hindus, the Christians, and others. Therefore, as a universal proposition I accept it though I do not like this language. This is not a very happy language. We do need people in our country with a national outlook. But our trouble today is that our people postpone loyalty to the country to all other loyalties, minor loyalties, forgetting the major loyalty which is loyalty to India. And, therefore, I

wish my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, had worded this Resolution better. Now, it is my view, that in public affairs we should not permit our religion to intrude itself. Religion is a matter of one's individual conscience. I may believe in God or I may not believe in God. I may be an agnostic or an atheist or a Hindu or a Muslim. That is my concern. That is my relationship with my creator if I believe in one, or my way of life. But when it comes to public affairs we are all Indians and should think, behave and act as Indians.

The trouble with our country is, we do not do so. In this House although we represent different States, I say that we should all think and act as Indians. I will remind you of the famous answer the great British political thinker, Burke, gave to his constituency—I think it was Sheffield. His constituency wrote to him and said 'You are not taking sufficient interest in your constituency and you are not looking after the interests of your constituency'. The reply that Burke gave, the celebrated reply, was: "Although Sheffield has elected me, once I am elected, I represent not Sheffield but the whole of England". That should be our attitude. We come from different States. This is the Council of States. The Lok Sabha is different. Even though we come from different States, even though we may look after the interests of our respective States, that looking after the interests of the States should be from the point of view of India, of the interests of India and the national aspect. My quarrel with the Government is this—I have said so on the last occasion and I say it again and I know the Home Minister made some very cynical remarks about me, I am afraid he did not understand me, he did not appreciate what I said. What I say is, the Government policy should not be communal. If we are a Secular State, we must stick to a secular view of public affairs. Whether we are dealing with a domestic question or an international question, the only way to look at it is from an Indian national point of view and I am sorry to say, I am really sorry to say that there has not been one occasion but several where the Government has tried to look at a question from a communal point of view to satisfy one community or another. That is an entirely wrong approach, that is not an Indian approach. My definition of secularism is this. The British definition was to play one community against another, appoint people to a post because they represented certain communities, so that the members

of the majority community were indignant and angry that people of merit in their community were passed over. What real secularism means is that no one should be disqualified by reason of his caste or community. Appoint people on merits whether he is a Harijan or a Muslim or a Hindu or a Christian. Do not try and seek to help a community or please a community or cater to a community by making appointments or giving advantages to that community because it is a community. That is not secularism but communalism in another form. As I said in the debate on Ahmedabad riots, that is unfortunately what we did with results that are known to everybody in this House.

You have imposed a time-limit and I will not exceed it. What we need to-day more than anything else is to put down everything that leads to separation and encourage everything that leads to national integration. I do not want to be misunderstood when I appeal to the Muslim community and other minority communities also to join the national stream. There is the national stream. They are part of this nation, as much part of the nation as the Hindus. I resent anybody telling me that I am not as good an Indian as any other Indian. The traditions of the country are mine as much as of the Hindus. The culture and civilisation which have come down for centuries and thousands of years belongs to me as it belongs to others. What we want is that all of us, the Hindus, Muslims and Christians should share in this heritage, should be proud of this heritage, should feel and think as Indians and should not get into separate compartments and start thinking as different communities, different castes or religions. That is the only way we can have national unity and national integration in this country.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : I agree with every word that Prof. Ruthnaswamy said and may I also add, I agree with almost every word that Mr. Chagla has said but they were dealing with general issues. The issue raised by Mr. Gupta is not an issue which he has raised. He has called our attention to an issue raised by somebody. The Jan Sangh is one of the leading political parties of this country. I have some admiration for Atal Behari Vajpayee, between whom and myself, I take it, there has been long friendship. We have met often and even discussed matters. Here is Dr. Mahavir whom I

[Shri G. Ramachandran.]

consider as one of the coming men of this generation but the other day, when he entered into polemics with Mr. Gupta, he leaned forward and said: 'I want to Indianise even Bhupesh Gupta'. Now this is nothing but an insult to a man like Mr. Gupta. He is as much an Indian as Dr. Mahavir. He is as much an Indian as G. Ramachandran. To sit here and point your hands at each other and say: "I want to Indianise you and you" is to indulge in political insanity. What did Mr. Gupta do? He said: 'Here is a leading political party. They have asked for the Indianisation of the Muslims'. He gave quotation and my friend, Shri Krishan Kant, gave quotations which are unassailable to prove that those the Jan Sangh had in mind were the Muslims. Now there has been such a furor against this that the Jan Sangh is taking shelter under varying definitions and explanations. I think it is a very healthy thing that they are now denying the statement and saying: 'We did not have the Muslims only in our mind' but the quotations that have been given from their top-most leaders make it absolutely clear whom they had in mind. Let me go to a step further. What did they mean by Indianisation? I want Mr. Chagla to deny this and I want Prof. Ruthnaswamy to deny this that what they had in mind were Muslims. They had nothing else in mind than the Hinduisation of the Muslims. I will tell you why. When some time ago I raised the question of the composite culture of India, it was Dr. Mahavir or somebody from that eminent party who said: "There is no such thing as a composite culture of India. There is only Hindu culture". To the Jan Sangh, rightly or wrongly, according to them rightly and according to me totally wrongly, India is a Hindu country. The culture of India is Hindu culture. This is ingrained in their outlook and philosophy and if they were more courageous than they appear to be, they should ask as Mr. Golwalkar has asked or as Mr. Madhok has asked, for the Hinduisation of the minorities of this country. My very valued friend Prof. Ruthnaswamy who indulged in beautiful generalisations must recognise what is the significance of this attitude of the Party which is putting forward this proposal and Mr. Chagla, with his wonderful liberality of mind, must not run away from looking at the Party which has put forward this proposal and the manner in which it has been put forward. What they have in mind is Hinduisation. There can be no more pernicious doctrine for the

whole of this country, to-day, in 1970, for this Republic of India, than for a Party to arrogate to itself the right to judge who should be Hinduised or Indianised. What are the tests and who will give the tests? The whole thing is a piece of political insanity and nothing less.

They are indulging in it and yet now a number of them are trying to cover this up and explain this away. Now take the Opposition. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is in the opposition and he spoke in the manner in which he did. I think my friends of the Congress (Opposition), in their hearts, even if they do not want to give up their loyalty to a fellow party in the Opposition, know that what has been expounded is a pernicious doctrine. I want them to have the courage to disown this kind of a doctrine even from their friends of the Jan Sangh. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : I want to make a point of clarification.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: I am not yielding, Sir.

Now take a friend like Mr. Rajnarain. I hold him to be a true revolutionary in this country. But there is in him only one passion; to demolish the Government of Shrimati Indira Gandhi! He will join hands with anybody, work with anybody, do anything, if that can be accomplished. Otherwise he would be on my side. He would be on the side of those who oppose this pernicious doctrine of Hinduisation. But he too is caught up in the circle of his own pet prejudices. If Members of the Opposition will talk frankly to each other, they will realise that the party which has put up this proposal is a fanatic Hindu communal party, that they rely for their strength on the RSS, which has vitiated the politics of this country like no other group in this country. Taking help from them, drawing sustenance from them, this Party is now producing the theory that Muslims should be Indianised. But, if today . . . *(Interruptions)*

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN (Tamil Nadu): In the days of the British we demanded Indianisation. What does that mean? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : If today they will all stand up and say that "we have no such intention as Hinduising the Muslims, I shall be most happy ..."

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : Please listen to me, Sir. If the leaders and the spokesmen of this party will stand up today and say, "we did not mean the Hinduisation of the Muslims, of the minorities; we were talking of Indianisation in the broad and magnificent manner in which Mr. Chagla explained it, and in the broad and magnificent manner in which Professor Ruthnaswamy put it", I will have no quarrel with them. But the truth of the matter is this—and I am now closing—that they indulged in political indiscretion of the highest order. They have now realised that they have raised a hornet's nest in this country, and they are somehow trying to wriggle out. May they wriggle out fully, and my best wishes to them as they wriggle out. (Interruptions).

SHRI C. D. PANDE: One word. I want to explain. The hon. speaker just now had spoken that some Members of the Congress (Opposition) have said this. My complaint is that nothing of the sort has been said, and they have disowned it. (Interruptions) What has been done is that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, to exploit the Muslim minority has brought this thing. That is my grievance. Otherwise, this does not exist. The mere fact is that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, by bringing this up, has done a great disservice to the country. This is what I wanted to say.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did not raise the issue at all, he only referred to an issue raised by the Jana Sangh.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : This is a most pernicious thing.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से यह पहले ही निवेदन करूंगा कि जब एक ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषय पर चर्चा हो तो ज़रा धीरज और शांति के साथ सुना जाये; क्योंकि अगर एक हल्के तरीके से केवल शब्दों पर हम लड़ाई करें और भावों पर न जायें, तथ्यों पर न जायें, तो यह बहुत ही ख़तरनाक

स्थिति होगी। मैं आपके द्वारा अकबर अली साहब से भी रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि जब कोई बोलने लगे तो उसको ज़रा सुने। यह विषय मामूली नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, मैं पहले ही कह दूँ कि मैं अपने को विश्व का नागरिक मानता हूँ। हमने गांव सभा और गांव पंचायतों में प्रस्ताव पास कराया कि हम विश्व के अंग हैं, हम विश्व के नागरिक हैं, हम प्रतिज्ञाबद्ध हैं कि हम विश्व के नागरिक हैं। यह सन् 1946 में हमने किया। वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्, विश्व में, वसुधा में, हम एक कुटुम्ब हैं, उसके एक सदस्य हैं। मैं पहले ही साफ कर दूँ कि जो मुसलमानों के भारतीयकरण की बात करते हैं मैं उनको देश का शत्रु मानता हूँ, देश का शत्रु। जो हिन्दू और मुसलमान में खाई बढ़ाने की कोशिश करते हैं, नफ़रत बढ़ाते हैं, उनको भी मैं राष्ट्र का शत्रु मानता हूँ, समाज का शत्रु मानता हूँ। उसी के साथ साथ मैं चाहता हूँ कि जब यह बात साफ हो गई। इस समय छागला साहब चले गये उनको रहना चाहिये था। हम यहां लेकचर दे दें और फिर चले जायें और व्यवहार क्या हो रहा है, बाहर उसकी चर्चा न हो, तो यह वस्तुस्थिति ज्यों की त्यों रह जायेगी। मैं चाहूंगा कि इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इससे इन्कार न करें कि अनावश्यक ढंग पर, ग़लत बुनियाद पर, हिन्दू और मुसलमानों में नफ़रत बढ़ाई जा रही है। कौन बढ़ा रहा है यह विषय अलग है।

श्री सी० डी० पांडे : सामने देख रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : बढ़ाया जा रहा है तो मैं चाहूंगा कि हिन्दू और मुसलमान में नफ़रत बढ़ाने की जितनी जड़ें हैं उन सभी जड़ों को काट दिया जाये। हरिजन में, शूद्र में, क्षत्रिय में, ब्राह्मण में जो नफ़रत बढ़ाने की दीवालें हैं, उन्हें ढहा दिया जाये। मैं अपने को चमार मानता हूँ, हरिजन, भंगी समझ लीजिए और मैं यह साफ बता दूँ कि जो इस देश में अपने को हरिजनों से श्रेष्ठ मानता है, मैं उसे नीच कहता हूँ। हमारे जीवन में यह निजी व्यवहार है, चाहे घर पर रहूँ, चाहे कहीं जाऊँ। अगर यह हमारा आचरण है और हमारे सामने अगर कोई हरिजन या मुसलमान को

[श्री राजनारायण]

अछूत कह दे तो उस समय कभी कभी हमको गुस्सा आ जाता है। 1942 के पहले तो एक कांग्रेस अच्छे के नेता को रेल से ढकेल दिया।

श्री महेश्वर नाथ कौल (नाम-निर्देशित) : चोट लगी कुछ।

श्री राजनारायण : लगी हो। हमारे साथ एक गजाधर प्रसाद एम० एल० ए० हरिजन बैठे थे और वह ब्राह्मण थे, वह बिगड़ गये, चिल्ला पड़े कि राजनारायण को जो मैं कहता हूँ तो तुम क्यों बिगड़ते हो। तो हमने यह समझा, यह हमको समझता है हम भी ब्राह्मण परिवार में हैं, इसलिये इसको हक है और गजाधर प्रसाद को नहीं है। केवल इतनी भावना पर हमने उनको वह लताड़ दी कि चेन खींची और कहा ट्रेन से बाहर जाओ।

श्री ना० कृ० शंजवलकर : अच्छा, चेन खींची।

श्री राजनारायण : इसलिये मैं समय समय पर इस सदन में कह चुका हूँ मनुष्य 'समान प्रसवः जातिः' है।

श्री उपसभापति : सदन में कई बार आप यह कह चुके हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : समान प्रसवः जातिः गौतम सूत्र के इस श्लोक के मुताबिक समाज का गठन करना चाहता हूँ। चाहे हरिजन हो, चाहे ब्राह्मण हो, चाहे मुसलमान हो, चाहे हिन्दू हो, मर्द हो औरत हो, शादी होगी, सम्भोग होगा, गर्भ रहेगा तो बच्चा होगा ...

श्री नेकीराम : लेकिन बड़ा खतरनाक होगा।

श्री राजनारायण : यह बेवकूफ आदमी कुछ समझता नहीं है।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): This is a wrong remark. To call an hon. Member "बेवकूफ" is not the proper thing to do. This must be expunged off the record.

श्री उपसभापति : आप ज़रा सभ्यता की लैंगुएज इस्तेमाल कीजिए।

श्री राजनारायण : हाँ, मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप ज़रा सदन को शांत रखें।

SHRI OM MEHTA (Jammu and Kashmir) : The word 'bewgoof' should be expunged.

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, हम भी कुछ जानते हैं। I know my responsibility.

श्री उपसभापति : वापस ले लीजिये जो आपने कहा है।

SHRI OM MEHTA: He must withdraw that word.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं इनको बेवकूफ मानता हूँ, मगर उनको बेवकूफ नहीं मानता।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I would request the hon. Member that he will use better and civilised language.

श्री ओम् मेहता : यह बहुत बड़ा बेवकूफ है, हम भी कह सकते हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : हाँ हाँ, आप कहिये। श्रीमन्,...

श्री उपसभापति : अनपार्लियामेंटरी है या नहीं, लेकिन हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि वह शब्द सिविलाइज़्ड है और यही चीज़ ज़्यादा महत्वपूर्ण है। इसलिए मैं आपसे अनुरोध करूँगा कि इस तरह की बातें कहने से सदन की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ेगी नहीं और आपको अच्छी तरह से शब्दों का इस्तेमाल करना चाहिये।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैंने पहले ही कह दिया है कि इस विषय को गम्भीरता के साथ लिया जाना चाहिये। यहां पर अनावश्यक ढंग से चापलूसी करके पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी बनने के लिए भाषण नहीं देना चाहिये। हम इस चीज़ को बहुत जानते हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप विषय पर बोलिये।

श्री राजनारायण : जो बेवकूफी करेगा मैं उसको बेवकूफ कहूँगा। श्रीमन्, मैं आपके द्वारा श्री भूपेश गुप्ता से निवेदन करूँगा कि चूकि

उन्होंने 1939 निकाला था और इसलिए मैंने 1943 निकाल लिया है। मैं आपके सामने इसको पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ और चाहूँगा कि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस बात को ठीक से सुनें।

Communist Party of India

FIRST CONGRESS RESOLUTION ON RIGHT OF SECESSION OF NATIONALITIES.

Bombay, 31st May, 1943.

Every section of Indian people which has a contiguous territory as its homeland, common historical tradition, common language, culture, psychological make-up and common economic life would be recognised as a distinct nationality with the right to exist as an autonomous State within the free Indian Union or Federation and will have the right to secede from it, if it may so desire.

यह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने अपने प्रस्ताव में कहा है कि भारतवर्ष के अन्दर जितनी नेशनलिटीज हूँ उनको एक स्टेट की शक्ल दी जाये। वे सिर्फ इंडिया में रहें, फ़ेडरेशन में रहें या फिर यूनियन में रहें या फिर चाहें तो उससे अलग होकर स्टेट में रहें।

अब मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्ता के प्रस्ताव पर आ रहा हूँ और जो टू नेशन थ्योरी का मज़ाक किया है उसमें आ रहा हूँ :

“Thus the free India of tomorrow would be a federation or union of autonomous States of the various nationalities such as Pathans, Western Punjabis dominantly Muslims, Sikhs, Sindhis, Hindusthanis, Rajasthanis, Gujaratis, Bengalis, Assamese, Biharis, Oriyas, Andhras, Tamils, Maharashtrians, the people of Kerala, etc. etc.”.

ये नेशनल इंटीग्रेशन का नारा लगाने वाले आज कह रहे हैं कि ऐ बिहारियो !

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend is reading something which was written in the context of the fight against the British. It does not mean that even today we do not stand for unity. It is quite possible to concede that right and see that by persuasion and by the shaping of a social order nobody secedes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The Soviet Constitution even now concedes the right to secede to its units.

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : मेरे समय में यह नहीं जोड़ा जाना चाहिये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय पर पूरी रोशनी पड़े।

आगे देखा जाये। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से कि क्या बिहारियों की कोई नेशनलिटी है ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes; Bihari is a nationality. You see your Jana Gana Mana composed by Rabindranath Tagore. What does it say ? पंजाब, सिंधु, गुजरात, मराठा, द्राविड़, उत्कल, बंगा — what does this mean ? The concept is unity in diversity. That is our view. Nation and nationality should not be confused.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं आपको पढ़ कर बतलाना चाहता हूँ।

श्री उपसभापति : जो जरूरी है, वही पढ़ें।

श्री राजनारायण : हम ज्यादा नहीं पढ़ रहे हैं। (Interruptions.) श्रीमन्, हम यह निवेदन करना चाहते हैं कि इस तरह के विषय के साथ यहां पर मज़ाक नहीं किया जाना चाहिये। आखिर श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने जो प्वाइंट अपने दिमाग से कहा है उसी दिमाग से यह प्रस्ताव निकला है और हम उसकी तह में जाना चाहते हैं।

देखिये, उन्होंने नेशनलिटीज को नेशन माना है। उन्होंने कहा है कि राजस्थान को एक अलग स्टेट बना दिया जाये, बिहार को एक अलग राष्ट्र बना दिया जाये और मुसलमानों का एक अलग राज्य बना दिया जाये।

अब मैं चलता हूँ, उस दिन जब दो-राष्ट्र के सिद्धान्त के संबंध में हमारे दोस्तों ने मज़ाक किया था। उसके बारे में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम लड़ाई लड़ रहे थे दो राष्ट्र बनाने के बारे में, तो इन्होंने बना दिया :

“In the case of Muslims of eastern and northern districts of Bengal where they form an overwhelming majority they