

**MOTION RE THE STATEMENT ON INDIA'S PARTICIPATION IN THE ISLAMIC CONFERENCE AT RABAT —contd.**

PROF. SHANTI KOTHARI (Rajasthan) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the House shares the anxiety and distress which the Government of India has expressed at the uncivilised behaviour of some members who participated in the Rabat Conference. In his concluding remarks Dr. Mahavir was relating to Israel and West Asia and related that to the Ramayan, "Baraat" and Rabat. I would like to draw his attention to the fact that it was not a "Baraat" or social function. It was not an invitation sought to a "Baraat" a social function. Swami Vivekananda, who would not have ever asked for or even accepted the special invitation, went out of way to seek invitation at the Chicago conference in the last century, for that gave him an opportunity to project India's image. The problem of unofficial or official or political nature of a delegation should be considered in the light of interest; it serves of the nation.

SHRI NIRAJAN VARMA (Madhya Pradesh) : This was a political conference.

PROF. SHANTI KOTHARI : I do not know what my hon. friend is saying. The last point raised by Mr. Chagla was whether we were officially invited or unofficially. I would like to remind him that national interests can be served either officially as I said earlier, or unofficially. I have to judge for myself whether your interests can be served and decide irrespective of the form and symbol. I was sorry that the former Foreign Minister, Mr. Chagla, could not elevate the debate from an invitation aspect to the foreign policy, interests I expected that, being a Foreign Minister at one time, he would have brought to bear on the foreign policy discussion the context and basis of our foreign policy. He questioned our secularism. Then, he questioned the Rabat decisions. Then he asked: "What sort of foreign policy is this that we had to go there even when Nasser did not himself attend but sent somebody else to represent the U.A.R. ? He also said that Nasser would have liked if we did not attend it. I would remind him that India's foreign policy was not conducted to please one or the other outsider. It is conducted so as to advance the national interests of this country.

I want to refer to the concept of secularism. They have said that it was an Islamic meet and, therefore, our secular interests were not served. They said that the declaration included the words "the best values of Islam". Does Indian secularism mean not to absorb the best traditions of Islam ? We have absorbed the best values of every religion, every faith and of everyone who is existing in this country. Secularism does not exclude the best values. It is the inclusion of the best values available in any sect, in any community, in any institution or in any individual. Our secularism is reel in the composition of the delegation as well. India, was represented by our Ambassador, Mr. Gurbachan Singh. He represented India on the opening day of the conference. I am sure he does not belong to the faith, which Dr. Mahavir has referred to—'Islamic'. He was the Indian leader on the opening day of the conference. Then, there was another scholar from Aligarh. Does not the very composition of our Indian delegation show our adherence to secularism ?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Does it not show

*(Interruptions)*

PROF. SHANTI KOTHARI : I am not yielding

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : I want to ask a clarification .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : You have had your say. Let him proceed.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : When he makes personal references, I can ask a clarification.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AK-BAR ALI KHAN) : He will lose his thread.

PROF. SHANTI KOTHARI : I want to tell him that Indian secularism is not a denominational secularism. It is an all-embracing cultural secularism. I am one of the best geniuses. I want to bring to your notice that everyone, including Mr. G'vignola, said that it was an Islamic conference. If countries are in-1 from an area where most people are of Islamic faith, what would you the conference ? Would you call it a non-Islamic conference ?

[Prof. Shanti Kothari]

Here I want to draw your attention to certain basic facts. India's foreign policy has been all along against military pacts. Dr. Mahavir's party all along had supported military pacts in the past. To-day, after a few years, wisdom has dawned on his party and they now say that our past policy was good. I am sure that after a few years he will say the same thing about this episode and see in the same light, as we do. He has quoted a very convenient part from the agenda. He has not said that the agenda included the discussion of the immediate political issues in West Asia, to which we have been a party and on which we have a policy in the United Nations. Our policy is determined by our geographical and geopolitical interests. He referred to Israel. He is obsessed with "Israel". Mr. Chagla said wherever there is any conference, wherever there is a religious approach, that should not be attended. I am afraid it is something I did not expect to hear from such a scholar and great man. He said religious approach, if personal approach can be anything, it can be religious, it can be psychological, sociological or it can even be lunatic, as we have seen in some of the speeches. So, it is left to them with what sort of approach or what sort of focus, they would look at the issues which confronted the concerned countries. There were many issues relating to West Asia. It was precisely also for this reason that we wanted to prevent the irrational, irrelevant elements and parochialism to triumph over rational, relevant and enlightened ones. We did not want to give our enemy—Pakistan—a free hand and a free field to propagate communal feelings and give a distorted picture. We did not there want to give them a free hand in the 26-nation conference. It was a big conference. As Mr. Parthasarathy said, India's foreign policy is based on the genius of Mr. Nehru. As he very rightly said, Mr. Nehru had laid down the basic things of India's foreign policy. Genius does what must be and, the talent does what can be. I do not know how Mr. Chagla said : "What a fall from Nehru's genius". It is the genius of India's foreign policy derived from Nehru's guidance in the past. Before independence Nehru had said on 22nd January, 1947 thus :

"When some petty matter divides us and we have difficulties and conflicts amongst ourselves over these small matters, let us remember not only this resolution (foreign policy), but this great responsibility of the freedom of

India, constituting a large part of the world, responsibility of being some kind of guide to vast numbers of people all over the world. It is a tremendous responsibility."

Not only this. I am quoting Nehru. He said this on 18th February, 1958 :

"India's policy is influenced not only by factors like history and tradition—religious or otherwise—but by geography."

Mr. Chagla has spoken of reciprocity. If the UAR did not attend, it does not mean that we should not adopt some other course. Foreign policy is not conducted at this level. It is conducted at a much more basic and higher level. Nehru went on:

"We naturally look first to the count tries around India, then farther afield because geography counts a great deal in such a matter."

In 1963 in the May issue of the Janata our most distinguished thinker and national public figure in this country—now on the other side—Mr. Asoka Mehtp said :

"The changed international situation provides us with fresh opportunities to alter the position before they harden." He referred and rightly so to "Continental Complex".

Then they have said that we were to sign declarations, we were to do this thing or that but there were no benefits. I think in diplomacy intangible benefits should not be overlooked despite many irritants. The intangible benefits here are that Pakistan once again stands exposed, and it has exposed Pakistan's design to divide the Islamic world against Indian interest. It has once again frustrated the evil designs of Pakistan, it has exposed its hollowness. Further, even those who mistakenly went into the trap of Pakistan's evil designs, they also expressed regret. And here if there is diplomatic illiteracy of any sort or if there is any failure on the part of some uncivilised participants, shall we also behave in the same manner, being a great nation? And shall we give up the basic interest of our foreign policy merely because of certain faulty diplomatic mechanism. I think my friends would not like it to be done.

I hope it is now realised that our participation in any conference is always

conditioned by you ; geographical and geo-political interest we participated in the conference at Rai at with our eye on the interests of India India which stretches in Asia is only undoing the triple conspiracy being hatched by a theocratic and dictatorial State like Pakistan and by the imperialist and erstwhile colonial powers like England and lastly by the misguided monarchs of the Middle East.

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, मैं यह चाहूंगा कि जब एक गम्भीर विषय पर चर्चा हो तो उसको जरा शान्ति से सुना जाय।

मैं छागला साहब को अपनी ओर से धन्यवाद दे देना चाहूंगा; क्योंकि आज उन्होंने जितनी बात कही है वे करीब हमारी सब बातें हैं। तो अब हम उनको दोहरायेंगे नहीं, जितना वह कह चुके हैं उसके आगे चलेंगे।

एक निवेदन मैं आपके जरिये विदेश मंत्री से पहले ही कर दूँ कि जनतंत्र की एक बुनियादी खूबी यह है कि जो बात जहाँ हो उसको वहाँ रख कर बहस हो और अगर बात वहाँ से हटाते चलेंगे, तो वह जनतंत्र सर जायगा, फिर उस बहस का मजा नहीं। जो बात सत्य है अगर मंत्री जी कहें कि वह हुई ही नहीं तो फिर बहस किस बात की हो। इसलिए जो फंडामेंटल डेमोक्रेसी का है, जो जनतंत्र का मौलिक गुण है वह है कि जो बात जैसी है, जो बात जिस स्थल पर है उस स्थल पर उस बात को रख कर बहस हो। इसलिए मैं अपनी बात एक एव करके रख रहा हूँ।

क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि शुरू शुरू में भारत की सरकार को स्वात सम्मेलन में जाने का न्योता नहीं था? क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि अगस्त के अन्तिम सप्ताह में संयुक्त अरब गणराज्य के राष्ट्रपति नासिर ने सऊदी अरब के शाह फ़ैजल से यह कहा था कि भारत को भी बुला लो तो कोई हर्ज नहीं है? क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि 17 सितम्बर को दिल्ली में यह खबर आई कि सम्मेलन की तैयारी समिति ने भारत को न्योता नहीं दिया? मैं तारीख इसलिए

दे रहा हूँ ताकि उसे ठीक से नोट कर लिया जाय; क्योंकि तारीख पर बहुत सी बातें बेस की जा रही हैं। क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि तैयारी समिति में ईरान, पाकिस्तान, सोमालिया, सऊदी अरब, मलेशिया, नाइजीरिया और मोरक्को, ये सात देश थे और इन सातों देशों ने सर्वसम्मति से यह फैसला किया कि भारत को न्योता न दिया जाय? इस बात को ठीक से समझ लें। क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि 18 सितम्बर को भारत की सरकार ने भारत को न्योता न देने का विरोध किया, बाकायदा उन सातों देशों के राजदूतों को सरकारी विरोध पत्र दिया गया, जिन्होंने भारत को न बुलाने का फैसला किया था। उधर मिश्र और मलेशिया ने भी भारत को न्योता न दिए जाने का विरोध किया था। फिर मलेशिया ने उसमें बैठ कर भी भारत को न्योता न देने का साथ दिया। ये दो स्थितियाँ आ गईं। अगर इसको ठीक से नहीं देखा जायगा तो मूल्यांकन जो अन्तिम नतीजे के रूप में आएगा वह ठीक नहीं आएगा। इसी के साथ हम कुछ और बातों को भी कह देना चाहते हैं। इसमें बहुत सी बातें आई हैं जैसे जो मुस्लिम राष्ट्र हैं, उनको न्योता दिया जाय या जहाँ मुस्लिम हैड हैं उनको न्योता दिया जाय या जिन राज्यों ने अपने को इसलामिक स्टेट घोषित कर दिया है, उनको न्योता दिया जाय। यही बात कुल नहीं है। यूगोस्लाविया ने न्योते को ठुकराया, नाइजीरिया ने इनकार किया, तनजानिया ने इनकार किया, अरेबिक स्टेट सीरिया और ईराक ने इनकार किया। वह कौन सी वस्तु हांसिल होनी थी या भारत को कौन हित या सम्मान मिलना था, जिसके लिए विस्तर बांधे हुए हमारे श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब बैठे हुए थे। ये बेचारे विस्तर बांधे बैठे थे और 17 घंटे में लुंडमुंड वहाँ पहुंच गए। जरा इसकी सफाई होनी चाहिए विदेश मंत्रालय की ओर से कि आखिर मामला क्या है।

**श्री ह्यातुल्ला अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** 'लुंडमुंड' का मतलब क्या है मैं समझा नहीं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** हम समझा दें।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :** नहीं, वक्त मत खराब करिए।

**श्री राजनारायण :** एक बात बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है, आज जो प्रगतिशीलता के हामी हैं और उनका बड़ा दम भरते हैं, वे बताएं कि क्या वे इस बात को सत्य नहीं मानेंगे कि इस सम्मेलन को बुलाने की अगुआई की कुवैत ने, इसे बुलाने की अगुआई की ईरान ने, बुलाने की अगुआई की सऊदी अरब ने? ये तीनों राज्य कैसे हैं? ये जनतंत्री हैं, समाजवादी हैं या एकतंत्री हैं? इसका जवाब सरकार दे। इनसे बढ़कर प्रतिक्रियावादी शायद ही और कोई होगा। जो आज एकतंत्रवाद को चला रहें हैं, उन्होंने अगुआई की ओर भारत की सरकार बंठी हुई थी इस उम्मीद में कि जो एकतंत्री देश सम्मिट कान्फ्रेंस के नाम से जल्सा करें, हम उसमें जाकर भारत का सम्मान हासिल करेंगे और उसमें जाकर भारत का हित साधेंगे, हमको इस सरकार के बौद्धिक दिवालियेपन पर तरस है।

मैं चागला साहब की उस बात को फिर कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर निमंत्रण हो तो उस निमंत्रण को टेबिल पर रखा जाय। श्री दिनेश सिंह खुद जानते हैं कि कभी कभी वे लोग बुलाते हैं हम लोगों को भी तो बेचारे एक कार्ड भेज देते हैं कि हमारे यहां खाने आएँ। मुझे कभी मौका नहीं मिला जाने का; क्योंकि हम उस दिन व्यस्त हो जाते हैं। सीधी बात है कि राजदूत को कहा गया कि अच्छा बुला लो। तो क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि श्री गुरुवचन सिंह वहां जाकर बैठे, जहां पर भारत सरकार के लिए जगह बनी थी। तो उसके लिए पूरी जगह बनी हुई थी। शाम को 7 बज कर 20 मिनट के लगभग भारत के प्रतिनिधि की हैसियत में सरदार गुरुवचन सिंह बोले। सम्मेलन में भारतीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल के बैठने की जगह थी और वह मंडप छोड़े की नाल की शकल का बनाया गया था और उस में श्री गुरुवचन सिंह जी बोले। अब यह बात भी कुछ अखबारों में विदेश में निकली है कि सरदार गुरुवचन सिंह का साफा और उनकी दाढ़ी देख कर भी वहां के प्रतिनिधि बहुत रंज हुए। मगर यह बात गलत है क्योंकि

अगर यह उनसे रंज हुए तो यह बात उनको बोलना चाहिए थी। वह रंज तो हुए जनाब फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब से जो वहां क्लीन श्रेव्ड गये, जो अपने चेहरे को खुशनुमा बना कर गये। तो हम को वस्तुस्थिति का मूल्यांकन करना चाहिए। सरकार को इस बात का उत्तर देना होगा। इस पर कोई मजाक न करे। हमारे मित्र नुरुल हसन साहब पता नहीं कहां चले गये। वह हमारे पुराने मित्र हैं स्टूडेंट फेडरेशन के। 1939-40 में यह बनारस कांफरेंस में गये थे। उस समय तीन आदमियों की कमेटी बनी थी—एक श्री गोपाल दास थे, दूसरे थे राजनारायण और तीसरे थे नुरुल हसन साहब। तो मैंने एक मसविदा बनाया जिसमें हम ने कहा कि यह व्यक्तिगत सत्याग्रह समाप्त हो, जन-क्रांति का बिगुल बजे। हमने कहा आप लोग इस पर एक प्रस्ताव बनाइये, हम विश्वविद्यालय जा रहें हैं, वहां से आयेंगे। हमने कहा कि हम गांधी जी के व्यक्तिगत सत्याग्रह से सहमत नहीं हैं। मास मूवमेंट चलाया जाय और यह उन को बता कर हम विश्वविद्यालय चले गये; क्योंकि वहां सम्मेलन ही रहा था। मैं जानता नहीं था कि यह कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के सदस्य हैं नुरुल हसन साहब।

**श्री एस० डी० मिश्र :** अब तो कांग्रेस में है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** उस समय कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में थे और गोपाल दास भी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में थे। मैं हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय की ओर से था। हमने कहा कि इस आशय का ड्राफ्ट तैयार कर दीजिये। उन्होंने ड्राफ्ट तैयार कर दिया और उस पर हमारे दस्तखत भी बना दिये और उसमें बताया गया कि महात्मा गांधी अंग्रेजों के दलाल हैं। यह व्यक्तिगत सत्याग्रह इसलिए छोड़ा गया है कि जन-क्रांति न हो। यह अंग्रेजों से मिल कर किया गया है। जब मैं वहां वापस आया, तो लोगों ने कहा कि तुम्हारी सब-कमेटी बनी थी, उसने यह क्या काम किया है?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : विषय पर बोलिये, अपनी कहानी मत कहिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : अगर 1942 और 1940 को नहीं समझोगे, तो रवात सम्मेलन को भी नहीं समझ सकोगे । इस बात को खूब समझ लो; क्योंकि आज रवात सम्मेलन पर हम को ऐसे लोग सुनने में आ रहे हैं, जिन्होंने 1942 की जनक्रांति की मुखालिफत की । हमने ज्यादातर उन्हीं को सुना है । आप उसमें शामिल ही नहीं हुए । तो भारत का हित कहां कैसे समझेंगे, इसको अब हम दिनेश सिंह से सुनेंगे । दिनेश सिंह का हित कहां से होगा इसको तो वह बता सकते हैं; मगर उसके लिए भी मैं कहूंगा कि उनको मैं ज्यादा अच्छा बतला सकूंगा कि उनका हित कहां ज्यादा हो सकेगा । इस समय हम दिनेश सिंह पर चोट नहीं करना चाहते; क्योंकि यह तो बचारा सुग्गा है । जैसे श्री जवाहरलाल ने कृष्ण मेनन को सुग्गा बनाया था वैसे ही यह सुग्गा है । यह भारतीय संस्कृति में है कि मालिक लोग घर में जब कोई रोग आने को होता है, तो वह एक सुग्गा पाल लेते हैं ताकि रोग के लक्षण पहले उस सुग्गे में ही आयें और अगर सुग्गा मर जाता है तो घर की सफाई कर देते हैं । तो नेहरू जी ने कृष्ण मेनन को मार दिया । दोष सारा नेहरू का था और उस समय हमारा भी रामलीला मैदान में भाषण हुआ था—बोले धरती और पताल, गद्दी छोड़ जवाहरलाल । हमने कहा कि जवाहरलाल इस्तीफा दें, कृष्ण मेनन के इस्तीफे से क्या होता है । उस समय हम मेनन के इस्तीफे के पक्ष में नहीं थे । आज भी जो लोग श्री दिनेश सिंह से इस्तीफे की मांग करते हैं, मैं उनकी वृद्धि पर तरस खाता हूँ कि भाई इस बेचारे का क्या दोष, यह तो मालिक के आदेश का पालन कर रहा है । बाप का सुग्गा कृष्ण मेनन, बेटी का सुग्गा दिनेश सिंह । हो सकता है कि यह बेचारा सुग्गा मर जाय; क्योंकि जनक्षोभ है और हम जनता की भावना को प्रतिबिम्बित कर रहे हैं कि अरब सम्मेलन में भारत सरकार ने सरकारी ढंग पर जो नापाक कोशिश की

न्योता मंगाने की भारत की जनता पूर्ण रूपेण उसकी मुखालिफत करती है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि चीन ने तो हमको हमारे घर में घुसेड़ कर के पीटा, राष्ट्रीय सम्मान का मर्दन किया, मगर श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी की सरकार ने इस राष्ट्र की तौहीन की जा कर के रवात में । दूसरे के घर में जा कर के हमको कहा गया कि बुलाओ और उसके बाद हमको वहां जाने नहीं दिया गया । क्या यह सच नहीं है कि श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद का बयान अखबारों में आया हुआ है कि हमारी बड़ी बेइज्जती हुई और अब हम को अपनी विदेश नीति पर पुर्नविचार करना चाहिए ? क्या यह सच नहीं है ? झूठ नहीं होना चाहिए सदन में । क्या यह भी सच नहीं है कि श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब बहुत झूठ बोल रहे हैं । वह कहते हैं कि आखिरी दिन हम इसलिए नहीं गये कि हमको उस विषय का एजेडा ही नहीं दिया गया । अब यह उनकी सफाई आयी है, मगर विदेशी अखबारों में इसकी चर्चा है । हमारी जानकारी के अनुसार पहले तो उन्हें ले जाने से मोरक्को सरकार के ड्राइवर ने इन्कार किया । फिर भारतीय दूतावास की गाड़ी में बैठे कर यह लोग गये । यह गाड़ी कई जगहों पर रोकी गयी लेकिन ड्राइवर ने हिम्मत से पुलिस की नजर बचा कर गाड़ी को ठीक सम्मेलन के दरवाजे पर लगा दिया । वहां सम्मेलन भवन के फाटक पर उन्हें रोका गया । उनके पास, बिल्ले बर्गरह नहीं दिये गये और उन्हें कहा गया कि हमें अफसोस है कि भारतीय प्रतिनिधि मंडल को जाने देने की आज्ञा नहीं है । इसकी खबर विदेशी अखबारों में छपी है । श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब का बयान है कि वे इसलिए नहीं जा सके कि वहां का कार्यक्रम उन्हें नहीं मिला था । यह झूठ क्यों ? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इसका परपत्र क्या है ? मकसद क्या है ? अपनी जनता और अपने देश के प्रेस से जो सरकार विदेशी नीति के मूल तत्वों को छिपाती है वह सरकार क्या देश द्रोही नहीं है ? मैं आज यह कहता हूँ और

[श्री राजनारायण]

दावे के साथ कहता हूँ; क्योंकि देश से हमें मोहब्बत है। अंग्रेजों के चंगुल से इस देश को छुड़ाने में हमने कुछ काम किया है। इस देश की तौहीन हो इसको हम बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकते। एक मंत्री रहे या जाय, इन्दिरा जी रहें या जायें, मंत्री रहेंगे और जायेंगे, लेकिन यह देश हमारा है, इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों का है, 55 करोड़ जनता का है इसलिए उनको यह हक हासिल ही नहीं है कि वह इस देश की तौहीन करें।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :**  
राजनारायण जी, सिर्फ दो मिनट आपके बाकी हैं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** ऐसे कैसे होगा। श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मित्र भाई दिनेश सिंह जी इस बात को जरा ठीक से देखेंगे कि जो कुछ काम हुआ है यह विगडे रईसों, राजा-रजवाड़ों और जमींदारों के लड़के-लड़कियों की सरकार का ही काम हो सकता है, यह किसी जनतंत्री सरकार का काम हो ही न सकता।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक ही बात पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पहले जहाँ भारत सरकार के लिये मंडप लगा था, वहाँ बाद में वह हटा कर मुस्लिम प्रतिनिधि कर दिया गया, जो लिखा था पहले उसको हटा कर मुस्लिम प्रतिनिधि लिख दिया गया। किसी मुल्क ने जो वहाँ पर शामिल था इसका विरोध किया। किसी ने विरोध किया! कौन है हमारे साथ? कौन इस मुल्क के साथ है? नूरुल हसन साहब कहते हैं कि हमको पाकिस्तान को मात देना था, अगर भाई यही बात सही है, हम मान लें कि पाकिस्तान को ही मात देना था, तो पाकिस्तान को हमने मात दी कि हम मात खायें? यह सफाई के साथ कहना चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान ने मात दे दिया। तो जिस पाकिस्तान का हौल्ला खड़ा करके आज उस सम्मेलन में जाने की अनुचित राष्ट्रद्रोही, राष्ट्र पर कलंक लगाने वाली, कार्यवाही हुई, उसमें पाकिस्तान ने हमको मात दे दी। (Time bell rings) और

मैं बिलकुल जानकारी की बुनियाद पर कहना चाहता हूँ कि याहिया खाँ को इन लोगों से बड़ा भरोसा था . . .

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :**  
अब खत्म कीजिये। आपका टाइम हो गया।

**श्री राजनारायण :** जरा घबड़ाइये नहीं, जरा आप देख लीजिये, खयाल कर लीजिये कि शान्तिलाल कोठारी को जितना समय देते हैं उतना ही हमको देते हैं।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :**  
यह बात नहीं, आपकी पार्टी का पूरा समय आपको दे दिया।

**श्री राजनारायण :** पार्टी तो कांग्रेस पार्टी है, हम नहीं।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal):  
You may allow him, but not at our cost.

**श्री जेड० ए० अहमद (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**  
हमारे वक्त में से तो यह वक्त लेंगे, कहां से लेंगे।

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर सम्मेलन में किन बातों पर विचार होना था। सम्मेलन में पांच बातों पर विचार होना था। पहला विचार होना था अलस्का मस्जिद जलाना, दूसरा था फिलिस्तीन के अरब शरणार्थियों का सवाल, तीसरा था जेरुसलम का सवाल . . .

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :**  
यह आप पढ़ चुके हैं। अब खत्म कीजिये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** नहीं। . . . चौथा था इन प्रश्नों पर मुस्लिम देशों का र्वैया और पांचवा इन प्रश्नों की रोजनी में अरब और इजरायल प्रश्नों पर आम तौर पर विचार-विमर्श। ये पांच ही मुद्दे थे कि मुस्लिम राष्ट्रों का इन पांच मुद्दों पर क्या रख हो। यह वहाँ पर होने वाला था। हमें आज बताया जाय कि भारत के रख के बारे में किसमें सफाई नहीं है कि भारत का रख क्या है। हमने इस सदन में कहाँ है कि इजरायल का जो हमला था, उसमें 3 जून के

पहले की जो स्थिति है वहाँ वह चला जाय । हमने इसको इस सदन में कहा है । आप कहते हैं तो इसके आगे मैं नहीं पढ़ूँगा । फिर कौनसा मुद्दा है जो कि साफ नहीं है । हाँ, उसकी आड़ में यह कहें कि हम इजरायल को मान्यता नहीं देंगे, हम फलाँ को मान्यता देंगे, तो फिर यह गुट-निरपेक्ष की नीति नहीं है । चागल साहब और बातों को कह चुके कि ब्लाक में शामिल होने की हमारी नीति नहीं रही, हम एक सक्रिय, वृजनात्मक तटस्थ विदेश नीति चाहते हैं, बिना लगाव की विदेश नीति चाहते हैं । मगर एक छोटी सी बात हमारे मित्र दिनेश सिंह जी के दिमाग में आ गई ।

( Time bell rings )

मैं दो मिनट में खत्म किये देता हूँ । मैं अपने मुसलमान दोस्तों से कहना चाहता हूँ, अपने मित्रों से जो कि इस संसद् में बैठे हुये हैं, उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने को मुसलमानों का ठेकेदार मत बनावो ।

श्री जे० ए० अहमद : तुम देश के ठेकेदार मत बनो ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं हरिजनों से कहना चाहता हूँ, जगजीवन राम जी आप हरिजनों के ठेकेदार मत बनो ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप किसके ठेकेदार हैं ?

श्री जे० ए० अहमद : यह देश के ठेकेदार हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : . . . देश की जनता के ठेकेदार बनो । देश की जनता के ठेकेदार बनो । मैं आज शपथ ले कर यहाँ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमारे सामने हमारे जिन्दा रहते किसी मुसलमान की जिन्दगी पर खतरा आये, तो पहले मैं मरूँगा और तब उसके बाद वह मरेंगे । कितने दंगों में हमने अपने को झोंका है और कितने मुसलमानों को बचाया है, जहाँ कि फ़खरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब भाग कर अलग हो जायेंगे । फ़खरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब अगर कहीं झगड़ा होगा, दंगा होगा तो भाग कर के ऐशो आराम करेंगे और हम अपनी जिन्दगी खपायेंगे ।

( Time bell rings ) मैं आज इस देश के, दुनिया के मुसलमान बन्धुओं से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपना शोषण न होने दो । जो कुछ ठेकेदार बने हैं, जो चाहते हैं कि हम मुसलमानों के नाम पर बोलें, दिनेश सिंह जी इन्हीं के धोके में पड़ गये । यह सोचते थे कि पहले चागल साहब विदेश मंत्री थे, एक मुसलमान थे, उन्होंने जो काम नहीं किया वह काम हम अपने हाथ से, एक राजपूतनी माँ का पूत कर दे, यह एक छोटी सी बात, श्रेय लेने वाली बात दिनेश सिंह जी के दिमाग में आई, जिसने कि इस देश के सम्मान को धूल-धूसरित कर दिया, मलियामेट कर दिया ।

श्रीमन्, हम पहले ही कह देना चाहते हैं कि हम मुसलमानों के दोस्त हैं, हम हिन्दुओं के भी दोस्त हैं, हम मनुष्य हैं, हम इंसान हैं, हम इंसानियत का बंटवारा करना बिल्कुल इंसानियत के विरुद्ध मानते हैं । अगर दिनेश सिंह यह कहे होते कि सर्वधर्म-सम्मेलन बुलाओ, इसमें हिन्दू भी आयें, मुसलमान भी आयें, सिख भी आयें, बौद्ध भी आयें, जैन भी आयें, ईसाई भी आयें, दुनिया के सारे धर्मों का सम्मेलन बैठे और बैठ कर के विचार करे कि अलस्का पर इस तरह का बुरा काम क्यों हुआ, अलस्का मस्जिद क्यों जलाई गई, तो हम उनके साथ हैं कि हम बैठ कर के सोचें कि कहीं किसी का मन्दिर न गिरे, कहीं किसी की मस्जिद न गिरे, किसी का गिर्जा न गिरे, किसी का गुरुद्वारा न गिरे । वह यह कहते कि सब लोग बैठ कर के इस पर सोचें मगर अलग से हिन्दू की बात करें यह ठीक नहीं, जैसा कि एक अनर्थ डा० कर्ण सिंह साहब ने किया कि हिन्दू विश्व धर्म सम्मेलन में पटना में गये, उन्होंने वहाँ भी तौहीन की थी । फिर नेपाल का राजा आ रहा था, नागपुर में नेपाल के राजा को आने नहीं दिया गया । तो हिन्दू और मुस्लिम इन शब्दों के प्रयोग से राजनीति का चलाना मैं आज जनतंत्र के विरुद्ध मानता हूँ, समाजवाद के विरुद्ध मानता हूँ । अगर चाहते हो जनतंत्र हो, चाहते हो समाजवाद हो, तो ईमानदारी के साथ कहो, तिकड़म और साजिश को छोड़ो और मानवता की बुनियाद

[ श्री राजनारायण ]

को सामने रखो और उसके लिये हमारा समर्थन है। मगर तिकड़म, साजिश, झूट, असत्य बोल कर कायरता और राजद्रोह को छिपाने की साजिश करना, इसको हम कतई वर्दाशत नहीं करेंगे।  
(Time bell rings)

भाई दिनेश सिंह जी हमारे पड़ोसी हैं, हम आपकी इज्जत करते हैं, आपकी मुसीबत को भी समझते हैं . . .

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :**  
हम आपकी इज्जत करते हैं, आप बैठ जाइये, अब आप बैठिये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** एक मिनट में बैठ रहा हूँ। हम दिनेश सिंह जी की इज्जत करते हैं, जो उनको कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी में नहीं लिया गया उसका हमें बहुत दुःख है।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :**  
राजनारायण जी, अब आपको बैठना है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** हम इनकी इतनी इज्जत करते हैं तो वह यह भी समझे कि मैं उनके खिलाफ यह बात किसी व्यक्तिगत राय-द्वेष के कारण नहीं कर रहा हूँ, बल्कि हम समझते हैं कि राष्ट्र के सम्मान पर, राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा पर, राष्ट्र की जनता के हित पर रबात सम्मेलन में जा कर इस सरकार ने पूरे तरीके से ठोकर मारी है और इसलिये रबात सम्मेलन में शामिल होने के हम घोर विरोधि हैं और मंत्री जी का यह कहना राष्ट्र के लिये चुनौती होगी जैसा कि मंत्री जी ने यह कहा है कि आगे भी जायेंगे, यह इनका बयान है कि आगे भी जायेंगे, हर्गिज नहीं, उसको वह वापिस लें और आगे चल कर देश का अपमान न करायें।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** माननीय वाइस-चेयरमैन महोदय, कानून विशारद चागला साहब तो चले गये और डा० भाई महावीर भी चले गये और यह भी भागने की तैयारी कर रहे हैं, मैं राजनारायण जी से कहूँगा कि आप बैठिये, मैं आपको सुनाऊँगा, आप मेहरबानी कर के बैठ जाइये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** दिनेश सिंह जी जब बोलेंगे तो हम सुनेंगे।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** वह अलग बात है अभी हमें मुनिये।

वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, अलस्का मस्जिद की बात आई जब कि वह चले गये और अभी हमारे साथी ने कहा कि लोग उछल कर रबात गये। वह तो चले गये लेकिन मैं इनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अलस्का मस्जिद जब जलाई गई, तो इस सदन में और उस सदन में भी जितने लोग थे वह उछल रहे थे, कूद रहे थे, उसकी तीव्र निन्दा कर रहे थे कि वह मस्जिद क्यों जलाई गई और रबात कांफ्रेंस के एजेंडा में प्रथम बात है, प्रथम विषय है, अलस्का मस्जिद का जलाना। अब राजनारायण जी ने कहा कि यदि कोई मस्जिद जलाई जाय, मन्दिर जलाया जाय, कुछ भी जलाया जाय, हम उसकी हिफाजत करेंगे, उसके लिये बोलेंगे और वह काफी बोलेंगे लेकिन आज क्या बजह है कि इसको एक राजनैतिक सवाल बना कर के रख दिया जब कि उनके एजेंडे में यह पहला विषय रखा गया है।

कहा जा रहा है कि इस्लामिक समिट कांफ्रेंस है। पूछता हूँ कि पाकिस्तान को छोड़ कर कौनसा देश है, जिसने कि अपने कांस्टीट्युशन में कहा कि यह इस्लामिक स्टेट है।

**डा० भाई महावीर :** सभी हैं।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** नहीं हैं। अरब है, मिश्र है, सब हैं, ये सब प्रिडामिनेटली मुस्लिम स्टेट हैं, वहाँ मुस्लिम पापुलेशन है, लेकिन जिस तरीके से पाकिस्तान ने अपने संविधान में लिखा है कि वह इस्लामिक स्टेट है और किसी ने कहीं नहीं लिखा हुआ है। वहाँ मुस्लिम ज्यादा से ज्यादा हैं, इसलिये उसका नाम इस्लामिक समिट कांफ्रेंस ही रखा गया। लेकिन उसमें जो नुमाइंदे गये, जो प्रतिनिधि गये वह इस्लामिक स्टेट के नहीं थे, सिर्फ भारत की ही बात नहीं है दूसरे देशों से भी लोग गये, इसलिये कि वहाँ एजेंडे में मस्जिद जलाने की बात थी तो यह पहली बात है। और यदि हमारे प्रतिनिधि, हमारे एम्बेसेडर, या हमारे मंत्री दिनेश सिंह जी नहीं जाते तो फिर

यहां राजनारायण जी छाती पीटते कि क्यों छः करोड़ मुसलमान भाइयों की उपेक्षा की गई, जरा इस कांग्रेस को देखो यह कैसी अवसरवादी है, कितने निकम्मे हैं कांग्रेसी लोग हैं। यह जनसंघी लोग जो हैं, उनमें कुछ साम्प्रदायिकता है, लेकिन वोट लेने के वक्त यह भी मुसलमानों के पास जाते हैं, ये भी उनी तरह से छाती पीटते। तो जितने विरोधी दल के लोग हैं, यह छः करोड़ मुसलमान भाइयों से कहते कि देखो आपका कोई नुमाइन्दा वहां नहीं और सब पार्लियामेन्ट में चिल्ला चिल्ला कर उछल उछल कर कूदते जैसे उन्होंने अल अकसा मस्जिद के बारे में किया था कि मस्जिद जला दी गई, वैसे ही यह कहते कि भारत सरकार का कोई प्रतिनिधि नहीं गया। तो बात क्या है? बात असली यह है कि राजनैतिक सवालों को लेकर जब बहुत कुछ बातें होने लगती हैं, तो विवेक भी चला जाता है, बुद्धि भी चली जाती है और सब कुछ खो जाता है और इसी में हमारे कानून विशारद भी बहक गये। डा० भाई महावीर को ले लीजिए डाक्टर आफ लेटर्स हैं, जानवरों के डाक्टर नहीं हैं, इन्सानों के डाक्टर नहीं हैं, डाक्टर आफ लेटर्स हैं, लेकिन जब वोट लेने का वक्त आता है, तो इन्सान को आगे नहीं रखते हैं, वान को आगे रखते हैं। लेकिन उनको समझ लेना चाहिये कि हमारी बलों की जोड़ी है। वह खूब समझते हैं कि जनता की नुमाइन्दगी कौन करता है। तो मैं कह रहा था कि हमारी सरकार ने इन्वीटेशन मांगा, वह इन्वीटेशन उनको भेजा गया, सबने पास करके भेजा और उसमें बड़ा मजाक हुआ कैसे इन्वीटेशन आया। जब हमारे एम्बेसेडर वहां जाकर के भाषण देते हैं, तो पाकिस्तान के नुमाइन्दे तालियां बजाते हैं, सब कुछ होता है। ठीक है, इसी बीच अहमदाबाद के रायट्स हुए, लेकिन जिस समय बातचीत चल रही थी, उस समय अहमदाबाद का कम्युनल रायट, साम्प्रदायिक दंगा हो गया और उसके बाद याह्या खां कहते हैं अब हम कांग्रेस टेबल पर नहीं बैठेंगे, नहीं जी हब रावलपिंडी वापस चले जायेंगे, क्योंकि अब हमारी खरियत नहीं, हमारी हड्डी हड्डी फूट जायेगी, ये पाकिस्तान के बंदे उनको

उड़ा देंगे। इसलिये वह नहीं बैठेंगे। तो वह लोग कभी हमारे देश के जो प्रतिनिधि थे, उनको समझाते थे और कभी पाकिस्तान के प्रेसीडेंट को समझाते थे कि मत जाइये, झगडा नहीं हो। लेकिन मैं अपने सदस्यों से और खास कर चागला साहब से कहूंगा कि चागला साहब की आवाज महज एक परस्टेशन की आवाज थी, जिस तरह से वह बातें कर रहे थे। कानूनी विशारद हैं, पंडित आदमी हैं, मैं उनकी बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ, लेकिन आज जिस तरह की बात कर रहे थे, मुझे बड़ी मायूसी हो रही थी। ठीक है और लोग राजनीति के प्रवाह में बहते चले जाते हैं, लेकिन चागला साहब को कहीं से शिकायत नहीं होनी चाहिये थी, वह अपने आपसे हमारे बीच से चले गये, किसी ने उनको भगाया नहीं, लेकिन उनकी आवाज में फस्ट्रेशन है। इसीलिये मैं कहता हूँ उस कापरेन्स में इन्डिया के रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव्ह गये और यदि उनकी कोई बेइज्जती हुई, तो उसका सब लोगों को अफसोस है। लेकिन क्या पाकिस्तान का चेहरा अच्छा हो गया, जहां जहां मुस्लिम कन्ट्रीज हैं वहां हुआ है। वहां दूसरे देशों के गैर-मुसलमान भी गये और जो इसलामी स्टेट नहीं उनके भी लोग गये। लेकिन अगर हमारे वहां जाने में राजनैतिक उद्देश्य है, तो इस चिल्लपों मचाने की आवश्यकत नहीं थी। इस तरह से एक राजनैतिक इश्यू बना कर बातें करने की जरूरत नहीं थी। यह हकीकत है कि अहमदाबाद में रायट्स हुए और मैं अभी तो नहीं कहता कि पाकिस्तान ने रायट कराने में हिस्सा लिया, हो सकता है जो कमीशन बनेगा वह इसकी भी जांच करेगा। किसी पोलिटिकल पार्टी को मैं इसके लिये इलजाम नहीं देता हूँ लेकिन हकीकत है कि वह दंगा रूबरात कान्फरेन्स के समय हुआ, जिससे वहां की फिजां खराब हुई, और यही नहीं दुनिया की फिजां खराब हुई.

**श्री कृष्ण कान्त :** लेकिन भाई महावीर की समझ में नहीं आया।

**श्री शीलमद्र याजी :** जब उनकी उम्र हो जायेगी वह समझ जायेंगे, अभी नीजवान है,

[श्री श्रीलभद्र याजी]

जोश में कभी बेहोश हो जाते हैं लेकिन वह भी समझते हैं कि अकल्लियतों के साथ मिलकर हमारा फायदा है, उनके लिये भी जनसंघ ने दर्वाजा खोला है यह कह कर कि जनसंघ में मुसलिम संप्रदाय को भी आना चाहिये। जनसंघ नाम सुनने में तो अच्छा है, पीपुल्स लीग, लेकिन अभी उनका दिमाग संकुचित है, कभी कभी नैरो माइन्ड होकर बोल देते हैं, लेकिन धीरे धीरे उनको सुधारना होगा। मैं तो किसान आदमी हूँ, सीधा डंडा लगाता हूँ, सीधी बात कह रहा हूँ। यदि हम कान्फरेन्स में नहीं जाते तो ये विरोधी पक्ष के लोग उस पर भी घड़ियाल के आंमू बहाते, छाती पिटते, मुसलमानों के पास जा कर क्या क्या नहीं बोलते। इसलिये उनको बड़ी तकलिफ हुई कि उनको मसाला मिला नहीं आगे के लिए इसलिये चिल्लापों मचा रहे हैं। मजहब की बात नहीं है क्योंकि हम बुद्धिष्ट समारोह में जाते हैं, इन्टरनेशनल कोर्ट में पैरवी के लिए जाते हैं, जाना ही चाहिये। क्या सेक्युलर स्टेट का मतलब यह है कि सबको ला मजहब बनायेंगे? मजहब इनसान के लिये है। इसलिये छः करोड़ मुसलमानों की भावना को ध्यान में रखकर रद्दवात कान्फरेन्स में जाना ही था जैसे कि अल अकसा मसजिद जलाई गई तो हमने देखा उस सदन में किस तरह से उछल कुद और चिल्लापों मची। मैं नहीं समझता कि वहाँ जाने से हमारा किसी तरह से अपमान हुआ। राजनीति में अपमान भी हुआ करते हैं लेकिन विदेश नीति में हमको श्रीकृष्ण और चाणक्य की नीति अपनानी होगी। जय हिंद।

SHRI A. K. A. ABDUL SAMAD (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, after fulfilling my duties as a member of the Indian Parliamentary Delegation to Yugoslavia a few months back, I visited some of the Islamic countries including Morocco. I mention this here because during this visit I was happy to see a great deal of goodwill for India in all these countries, a fact of which every Indian should be proud.

When I went to Morocco again in September to attend the Islamic Universities Conference at Fez at the invitation of

the Morocco Government extended to Dr. Aleem and me through the External Affairs Ministry of the Government of India, I had another opportunity to witness the enormous depth of goodwill and friendship towards India prevailing in these Islamic countries. Even though the Fez Conference was designated as Islamic Universities Conference, the fact that Dr. Aleem was nominated as one of the Vice-Presidents of the Conference is a great tribute to the place of honour which secular India occupies in the Afro-Arab Islamic regions. In fact, from what I saw and heard in these Afro-Arab Islamic countries, a feeling has grown in me that it is the desire of these Afro-Arab countries that India should take up the effective leadership of the Afro-Asian region.

It is in this background that I would like to examine the Rabat issue.

India's decision to participate in the Rabat Conference has been mainly opposed on the ground that India, as a secular State, has no business to participate in a conference which was wholly religious in character. I can only say that by raising such an objection, the critics of the Government of India are, quite unconsciously, playing into the hands of Pakistan, which has never been tired of depicting India as an anti-Muslim country. The invitation to India to participate in the Rabat Conference is, in fact, a great vindication of the secular character of India. And its acceptance by our Government is a greater vindication of the truth that secular India is not opposed to any religion, much less to Islam whose eighty million ardent followers are the full-fledged citizens of India. India, by accepting the invitation, gave a great blow to the unceasing Pakistan efforts to put obstacles in the way of India's participation. The intensity of Pakistan's fear about India's decision to participate in the Rabat Conference can be very easily gauged from the fact that no less a paper than the semi-official "Dawn" of Karachi, wrote that India was thereby trying, in the words of the "Dawn", "to strengthen its efforts to penetrate the Muslim world economically and politically and to win over new allies in its bid for leadership of the Third World." It is clear from this that India's decision to participate in the Rabat Conference was to the advantage of India and as such it was most vehemently resented and opposed by Pakistan. If some people are not able to appreciate this simple fact,

they show ver poor\* statesmanship, I am sorry to say that.

How is it the » that India, after having been invited, wa not given the opportunity to participate in the Conference ? As one who was there at the time of this unfortunate incident, I think I am competent to say a few words at least to enlighten those who are interested in knowing the facts.

To know tht reason for this change, we need not g > on an investigation to Morocco. The reason is not far to seek. It is here—in Ahmedabad.

Hon. Membe-s can easily imagine in what an unha] py position India found herself when the shocking news of the communal riots at Ahmedabad and the looting of the property >f the minority and of the burning of not (ess than forty-eight mosques reached R ibat which was the venue of the Conference convened to register the indignant protest of the world against the barbaric Jev ish act of burning a single mosque at Al Aqsa. Though none of the local Arab c or French newspapers published any i ;port about the Ahmedabad riots beca ise they did not perhaps want to create a hostile atmosphere for India's admission to the Conference, the atmosphere wa surcharged with emotion because of he periodical BBC broadcasts and the French broadcasts from Paris, detailing the innumerable loss of life and propei ty to the minority community. When the dastardly act of an innocent child b !iog killed by its legs being torn asunder, i lu n the inhuman act of people being r jilled out of a taxi and mercilessly kill 'd, when the devilish scene of sacred mosques being burnt, when all such cruel i cts of communalists were clearly placed right before the eyes of the people on the British and French Television, one :an imagine what a horrified picture of ;ecular India these things would have err ited in the minds of the people who were participating in the Rabat Conference. I can say without any exaggeration that the importance of Al Aqsa receced and Ahmedabad projected itself in it-place.

Fortunately for us Morocco and other friendly countries . . f lthe area know that such inhuman acts v/ere the work of a small fraction of the maliciously militant and extremely fana ical bigots. But then, as the well wi hers of India, it was the concern of M< rocco, Saudi Arabia, the U.A.R. and ot] ers to save India from the embarrassing si uation of attending the

Rabat Conference and finding herself facing the Ahmedabad issue rather than discussing the issue arising out of the burning of Al Aqsa. Ahmedabad and not Al Aqsa would have been the subject-matter of heated discussion in Rabat if India had actually participated in the Conference, and our Moroccan and other friends only wanted to save our country from such a situation, and hence the persuasion to our country's delegation not to attend the Conference. Under such circumstances it was a blessing in disguise that India did not participate in the Conference.

I must frankly confess here that when the news of the brutal massacre at Ahmedabad reached me with all the details of its horror, I was very much moved and I wondered what had happened to my motherland. However, when questions were put to me about such repeated communal riots in India, I explained that it was the work of a few fanatics and that the Government of India was solidly behind the minority community in protecting their rights. But when they asked me, "How is it that in spite of such periodical outbreak of violence not a single culprit has been hanged ?" I had to evade the issue sornehny, as I had no answer to it. Therefore instead of accusing and blaming the Government of Morocco or Jordan or any other country or individual for the so-called humiliation suffered at Rabat, we had better focus our attention on the fanatical elements responsible for this massacre of innocent Muslims at Ahmedabad which has very badly tarnished the secular image of India abroad and has thereby done incalculable harm to our national prestige, national honour and Rational interest.

There is much talk about India not having been treated with respect in Rabat. It is significant to note that though our official delegation was not able to participate in the Rabat Conference to which it was invited, it was received with the normal official respect given to such delegations. Our national flag was hoisted along with the flags of other participating countries. Our official delegation under the leadership of our hon. Minister, Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, was given a respectable send-off with a guard of honour.

To those who cry hoarse at India's acceptance of the invitation to attend the Rabat Conference, I would like to put a few questions.

[Shri A. K. A. Abdul Samad.]

Masjid Al Aqsa is dear to the heart of the Afro-Arab Islamic countries. Are these critics going to antagonise those countries by censuring the Government of India for its decision to participate in the Rabat Conference on invitation? Have they ever thought of the political and economic implications of their contention that India should have nothing to do with any Islamic Conference? Are they not aware of the fact that in Saudi Arabia and other Afro-Arab Islamic countries whom they dub as reactionary a very large number of Indian citizens are leading a happy and prosperous life which is to the great advantage of India which is already overburdened with the ticklish problem of repatriates from Burma, Ceylon, Kenya, etc.?

And what about the trade balance worth several hundred millions of rupees with these Afro-Arab Islamic countries? Are these critics to be told that our trade balance with Saudi Arabia alone is worth one hundred million rupees? Surely the critics of the Government in this Rabat affair are guided by motives other than

national dignity, national honour and national interest.

Finally I would like to make a request to the Government of India. We have recalled our Ambassador from Morocco. But how has Morocco reciprocated our action? It has observed Gandhi Centenary celebrations within its territory. It has brought out a special commemorative stamp on Gandhiji and it has not recalled its Ambassador, Sir, from New Delhi. Such friendly acts even after we have recalled our Ambassador go to prove the sincerity of Moroccan friendship for India. Let us reciprocate it by sending a proper person as our Ambassador to Morocco.

In the light of these facts, the invitation extended to India to attend the Rabat Conference is undoubtedly a vindication of the secular character of India, and its acceptance by our Government is quite in order, reflecting the legitimate aspirations of the 80 million Muslim citizens of India. The circumstances under which our official delegation was denied admission to the Conference after the invitation is most unfortunate, and the Govern-

ment of India have already done the needful to record our rightful indignation at such treatment meted out to our Dele-

tion.

Let us treat the whole episode as a bitter lesson to guide us for bestowing adequate attention on the proper composition of any delegation to be sent abroad on such occasions.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : Sir, he referred to the Ahmedabad riots. I come from Gujarat. I want to clarify one thing here. The Plenary Session of the Islamic Conference decided against India's participation on September 16 and, Sir, the riot in Ahmedabad broke out on September 18—in the evening. So how is he blaming Ahmedabad riots? The riots were brought under control on the 23rd of September and India's participation in this conference was welcomed by all the twenty-five countries including Pakistan. Then why is he blaming Ahmedabad riots?

SHRI A. K. A. ABDUL SAMAD : For his information I may say this. According to him the riots started on the 18th or a little whereas the conference began only on the 22nd, and naturally they discussed this matter also there.

(Interruptions)

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : उपसभ्याध्यक्ष जी, मैं इस बहस में कुछ मोटे मोटे मुद्दे उठाना चाहता हूँ। रवात पर अगर बहस होती तो एक और बात थी, इत्मीनान से बैठकर बातचीत की जाती, हमारा मूल्यांकन सही था, गलत था, कोई गलती हुई, नहीं हुई, लेकिन आज रवात पर बहस नहीं हो रही, यह बिलकुल साफ है। रवात को तो बहाना बना लिया गया है, एक हथियार बना लिया गया है।

थोड़े दिन पहले यहाँ एक प्रदर्शन हुआ था जनसंघ का तो वहाँ रवात में क्या हुआ, देश का अपमान हुआ, इंदिरा गांधी गवर्नमेंट को हटाओ, फलां को हटाओ, उलट दो-पलट दो लोग चिल्ला रहे थे। मैंने पूछा एक आदमी से 'रवात है कहाँ'। उसने कहा 'कहीं मद्रास के पास'। क्या बात है रवात-रवात? आसमान टूट पड़ा, जमीन फट गई। 30 साल से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति के क्षेत्र में हम काम कर रहे हैं। ऐसे-ऐसे धक्के लगे कि दिन के बक्त तारे दिखाई दे गए। काश्मीर का मुवाल उठा तो धक्का

दिया अमरीकन्स ने, ब्रिटिश ने, जितने साम्राज्य-वादी थे सब ने घेरघारकर...

**डा० भाई महावीर :** देखिए...

**श्री जेड० ए० अहमद :** आप खामोश रहिए । मैं कभी किसी के खिलाफ कुछ नहीं बोलता । जब राजनारायण बोलते हैं तो मेरी तबियत घबड़ा जाती है, अब बहुत नजदीक आ गए हैं मेरे, फिर भी मैं कभी नहीं बोलता । (Interruptions) राजनिति में ठुकाई भी की जाती है, ठोके भी जाते हैं, दोनों बातें होती हैं, चमड़ी आपकी मजबूत होनी चाहिए । आप थोड़े में तिलमिला न जायं (Interruptions) आप सीखिए, हम बहुत सीख चुके हैं ।

सदर साहब, ऐसे ऐसे धक्के लगे, काश्मीर के सवाल पर क्या नहीं हुआ, गोआ के सवाल पर क्या नहीं हुआ । वियतनाम के बारे में हमने सवाल उठाए तो हमारी गर्दन दवाने की कोशिश की गई । जी० डी० आर० की रिकागनीशन के बारे में कभी कभी हम सोचते हैं, हमारे नेता सोचते हैं तो कौन धमकियां देते हैं, यह भी हम जानते हैं । इतने जो अपमान हुए हैं इन वर्षों से उनके बारे में कभी कोई सवाल नहीं उठाया गया, चुप बैठे हैं । हज़ारों लाखों आदमी, बच्चे, औरतें कल्ल किए जा रहे हैं, धून की नदियां बह गईं, कभी इन्होंने आवाज उठाई ?

SHRI MULCA GOVINDA REDDY: The other day i was raised.

**श्री जेड० ए० अहमद :** फार्मल हर चीज उठाई जाती है । आज जो तिलमिला रहे हैं रवात-रवात मालूम होता है कि इनके घर में कोई चोरी कर गया । क्या हो गया ? देशका अपमान हो गया ? किसका अपमान हो गया ? किसकी निगाह में हम गिर गए ? क्या हम अपने अरब दोस्तों की निगाह में गिर गए, क्या दुनिया के जो प्रगतिशील जनवादी देश हैं, साम्राज्यवाद-विरोधी देश हैं उनकी निगाह में गिर गए ? कौन सा अपमान हुआ ?

**एक भाननीष सदस्य :** अपमान नहीं, इज्जत अफजाई हुई ।

**श्री जेड० ए० अहमद :** इसलिए यह तमाशा है, यह एक हथियार है जो अनस्क्रूपुलस तरीके से इस्तेमाल किया जा रहा है सरकार की, राष्ट्र की विदेश नीति के खिलाफ । कौन है वे लोग जो आवाज उठा रहे हैं ? ये लोग सिर्फ रवात के सवाल पर ही नहीं, जब भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समस्याओं पर जबान खोलते हैं तो देश की जो बुनियादी नीति है नान-एलाइनमेंट की उसके खिलाफ आवाज उठाते हैं, हमको साम्राज्यवादियों की गोद में बिठाना चाहते हैं, जो हिन्दुस्थान की कदर है दोनों ब्लाक्स में उसको मिटाना चाहते हैं और हमको गुलाम बना कर साम्राज्यवादियों की दुम में बांध देना चाहते हैं । मैं साफ कहता हूँ कि हम नहीं बंधेंगे, आप रवात का ढोल पीट लीजिए, हिन्दुस्तान अपनी नीतियों को नहीं बदलेगा, हिन्दुस्तान ने अपनी नीतियों की मजबूत नींव डाली है । आज हिन्दुस्तान की दुनिया में क्रूर है, आज हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया की एक एक महफिल में सीना तानकर बोल सकता है क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान ने ईमानदारी के साथ नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी पर अमल किया है ।

मैं खास तौर से एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ । यह कहा जाता है कौन सी कान्फेंस, इस्लामिक कान्फेंस ? 'इस्लामिक' के ऊपर बड़ा जोर है । मुसलमान कान्फेंस में चले गए । मैंने वहां भी बहुत सुना, यहां भी सुना, 'इस्लामिक कान्फेंस' इसी लफ्ज के ऊपर बहुत जोर दिया जाता है । इसके पीछे भी एक भावना है । वह समझते हैं कि इस्लामिक-इस्लामिक कह कर हिन्दुस्तान की जनता में जो साम्प्रदायिक, फिरकेवाराना रूझनात हैं उनको उठाएंगे । वे यह समझ कर चलते हैं, देश के अन्दर आसानी से रायट करवा देते हैं, दंगे करवा देते हैं और बड़ा आसान है, मुसलमानों के घर में घूस गए, मुसलमानों ने ठोकर मारी, कह दिया गजब हो गया । जैसा कि कहा गया, पूरी रवात की बहस में कम्युनल ओवरटोन्स पैदा की जा रही है और जानबूझकर पैदा की जा रही है । वे इसलिए पैदा की जा रही है ताकि असलियत

[श्री जेड० ए० अहमद]

सामने न आए, राजनीति न आए, फिरकेवाराना जज्वात उभर आए और सबको उसी में उलझा कर अपना उल्लू सीधा किया जाय। यह आज साजिश है।

पता नहीं, किमने कहां मजहब और राजनीति वहां मिल जाती है, यह नहीं होना चाहिए। बड़ा लेक्चर देने लगे डा० महावीर साहब कि मजहब अलग रहे, राजनीति अलग रहे। अंग्रेजी में क्या कहते हैं—मैं कहना तो नहीं चाहता—'डेविल कोटिंग दि स्क्रिपचर्स'। आपने राजनीति को मजहब बनाया।

डा० भाई महावीर : आप कहते हैं।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : हिन्दुस्तान में जिस पार्टी ने सबसे ज्यादा मजहब की आड़ लेकर राजनीति का पतन कर दिया है वह जनसंघ है और आज खड़े होकर ये हमें लेक्चर देते हैं कि मजहब अलग रहे और राजनीति अलग रहे।

डा० भाई महावीर : यह आप रवात की चर्चा कर रहे हैं ?

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : आपने कहा रवात की चर्चा करते हुए कि मजहब को अलग रखना चाहिए।

डा० भाई महावीर : आप समझते होंगे जिन्होंने पाकिस्तान बनवाया।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : आप तिलमिलाइए नहीं, चुप रहिए। बात चुभ रही है इसलिए तिलमिला रहे हैं, लेकिन हम आपको चुभायेंगे।

श्री कृष्ण कान्त : इनको बता दीजिए कि जिन्होंने पाकिस्तान बनवाया।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : हां, ऐसे लोगों ने, ऐसी ही जहनियत के लोगों ने पाकिस्तान बनवाया।

डा० भाई महावीर : मल्लापुरम भी हमने बनवाया ?

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : हम मरे इस देश की आजादी के लिए।

डा० भाई महावीर : कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ?

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : आप नहीं कह सकते।

डा० भाई महावीर : फिर आप गलत जानकारी मत दीजिए।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : चाहे मुस्लिम लीग की जहनियत वाले हों, मुस्लिम लीग की जहनियत वाले और हिन्दू राष्ट्र की जहनियत वाले लोगों ने मिलकर हिन्दुस्तान का बंटवारा करवाया, हिन्दुस्तान के टुकड़े करवाए। इस हकीकत को हम साफ तौर पर कहेंगे, एक बार नहीं हजार बार कहेंगे। इस जहनियत के खिलाफ हमें ईमानदारी से लड़ना पड़ेगा। आज ये लोग रवात की आड़ लेकर अपनी राजनीति बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। उनकी राजनीति खोखली है, उनकी राजनीति गन्दी है, उनकी राजनीति झूठी है, यह राजनीति नहीं चलेगी। रवात का ढोल पीट लो। हम जानते हैं कि आप किसकी नुमाइन्दगी करते हैं, हम जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े बड़े लुटेरों की आप नुमाइन्दगी करते हैं, हम जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के घना सेठों की आप नुमाइन्दगी करते हैं, हम जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के साम्राज्यवादी तत्वों के साथ आप हैं। रवात का खिलौना ज्यादा दिन आपके हाथ में नहीं रहेगा। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम काफी पेचीदा दुनिया में रहते हैं। और वेस्ट एशिया का जो काइसिस है, जो उस की पेचीदगियां हैं उन में हम जान बूझ कर दखल देते हैं और क्यों न दें। वे हमारे पड़ोसी देश हैं। आप जानते हैं कि वहां प्रति-क्रियावादी शक्तियां एक तरफ हैं जिन को साम्राज्यवादी शक्तियां पाल रही हैं और दूसरी तरफ जनवादी शक्तियां हैं, अरब नेशनलिज्म की शक्तियां हैं। उन के दरम्यान टक्कर है। और यह टक्कर हर चीज में जाहिर होती है। वहां बादशाह भी हैं और अमीर भी हैं। नासिर भी हैं और जनवादी तत्व भी हैं। उन के दरम्यान यह संघर्ष चलता है। वहां पैन-इस्लामिज्म की एक रुझान अरब नेशनलिज्म की है। एक

साम्राज्यवादी रूझान है और एक साम्राज्य के साथ दोस्ती की रूझान है। उधर इजराइल को अंदर डाल कर उन्होंने पेचीदगियां पैदा कर रखी हैं। इस सब में हम हिन्दुस्तान, इतना बड़ा मुल्क जरूर इस सब में दखल देगा और हर कांफ्रेंस में दखल देगा वहां का एजेंडा पोलिटिकल एजेंडा होगा चाहे उस को इस्लामिक कहा जाय या कोई और नाम दिया जाय। वह पोलिटिकल कांफ्रेंस थी, उस के अंदर पोलिटिकल एजेंडा था। उस को इस्लामिक कांफ्रेंस कहने से क्या होता है। क्या वे वहां पर नमाज पढ़ने जा रहे थे या रोजा रखने जा रहे थे या क्या वे वहां पर हज की तैयारियां करने जा रहे थे? किस लिए वे वहां जा रहे थे। वह एक राजनीतिक कांफ्रेंस थी और उस का एजेंडा पोलिटिकल एजेंडा था। यह हमारा फर्ज था कि हम उस में जाते... (Interruption.) वहां नमाजें नहीं पढ़ी जा रही थीं, वहां रोजे नहीं रखे जा रहे थे, वहां राजनीति पर चर्चा होने वाली थी, वहां टक्कर थी उन प्रतिक्रियावादी रजत-पसंद ताकतों की, वहां साम्राज्य अपना खेल खेलना चाहता था और हम इस लिए वहां गये और हम को वहां जाना चाहिए था। यह अच्छी चीज थी अगर हम वहां जाते और कोई गलत बात न होने देते। क्योंकि जो कुछ वहां होता उस का असर हम पर पड़ता और जो कुछ यहां होता है उसका असर उन पर पड़ता है। हमारे वेस्ट एशिया से ऐतिहासिक ताल्लुकात हैं, हमारे उन से तिजारत के रिश्ते हैं, हमारे उनके साथ बौद्धिक रिश्ते हैं, हम दुनिया के नक्शे में, एक दायरे में बंधे हुए हैं। अगर हम मुंह मोड़ कर बैठ जायें तो पेचीदगियां बढ़ती ही जायेंगी। जो देश हिम्मत वाला नहीं है जो सरकार हिम्मत वाली नहीं है वही ऐसा कर सकती है। आज हम अपनी नीतियों के लिए मजबूती के साथ लड़ें यह आवश्यक है। कभी कभी रिपेक्शनरी तबके अपने दांव पेंच चलाते हैं, कभी कभी वे हमारे लिए पेचीदगियां पैदा कर देते हैं, लेकिन उस से घबरा कर हम हट जायें ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। आज दुनिया के अंदर एक राजनीतिक

कांफ्रेंस हो कि जहां साम्राज्य विरोधी और साम्राज्य के पक्ष की ताकतों का टकराव हो अगर हमारा उस से संबंध है, हम उस के नजदीक हैं तो हम उस में जायेंगे और उस में दखल देंगे। यह हमारी राजनीतिक कमजोरी नहीं है। क्या क्या कहें अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक साहब कहने लगे की रबात में जाने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान का सेकुलरिज्म ही खत्म हो गया। सारे हिन्दुस्तान के रिपब्लिक का करेक्टर खत्म हो गया। अब वह सेकुलर रिपब्लिक नहीं रहा। कमाल की बात है कि सारा सेकुलरिज्म हिन्दुस्तान का इस से खत्म हो गया। मैंने कहा कि हजारों मासूम मारे जायें, खून की नदियां बहें, गले काटे जायें, सांप्रदायिक दंगे हों कभी रांची में, कभी अहमदाबाद में, कभी इलाहाबाद में और कभी जबलपुर में, तब तो सेकुलरिज्म खतरे में नहीं आता, लेकिन अगर दो चार आठमी रबात में जा कर बैठ जायें तो हिन्दुस्तान के रिपब्लिक का करेक्टर बदल गया। अब यह सेकुलर रिपब्लिक नहीं रहा। यह क्या राजनीति है? यह सब ढकोसले हैं। अनस्कूपुलस तरीके हैं जिन का विरोध डट कर हम लोगों को करना पड़ेगा।

अब, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आखिर में यह कहना चाहता हूं कि रबात के सवाल के ऊपर हम कह सकते हैं कि कुछ दांव पेंच ज्यादा होशियारी से खेले जा सकते थे। कुछ हम ऐसा कदम उठाते कि जिस के कारण रिपेक्शनरी ताकतों को ज्यादा मौका नहीं मिलता, लेकिन बुनियादी तौर पर इस सम्मेलन में जाना गलत नहीं था। इस सम्मेलन में जा कर, उस में हस्तक्षेप कर के उस की राजनीति में दखल देना ठीक था और इस लिए बुनियादी तौर पर नहीं कहा जा सकता कि हम ऐसे सम्मेलनों में आगे से नहीं जायेंगे।

मैं और ज्यादा कहना नहीं चाहता। मैं यह समझता हूं कि आज जो हमारे दोस्त इस की मुखालिफत कर रहे हैं वह मुखालिफत सही और सच्ची मुखालिफत नहीं है।

[डा० जेड० ए० अहमद]

वह इस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर इस सवाल को उठाना चाहते हैं अपने दूसरे अल्टीरिअर मोटिव को पुरा करने के लिए। हम इस बात को समझते हैं और हम उन तत्वों को इस देश में सफल होने का मौका नहीं देंगे। हम हिन्दुस्तान की नान-एलाइनमेंट की नीति को मजबूती में पकड़े हुए हैं, हम हमेशा साम्राज्य-विरोधी रहेंगे और हम जा कर किसी ब्लाक के साथ नहीं बैठेंगे...

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : सिवाय इस के।

श्री जेड० ए० अहमद : आप इस की बात क्या करते हैं। कल वहां बैठे थे, आज यहां बैठे हैं। आज मालूम हो गया, पूरा परदा फाग हो गया, आप की नीतियां साफ हो गयीं। हम हमेशा ईमानदारी से डट कर मुकाबला करेंगे और सेकुलरिज्म की नीति पर हम चलेंगे और हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर ऐसे साम्राज्यवादी, फिरकापरस्त तबके, जो इन चीजों को ले कर फिरकापरस्ती फैलाना चाहते हैं, लोगों के अंदर फिरकापरस्ती फैलाना चाहते हैं, हम उन का डट कर मुकाबला करेंगे चाहे हम को खून और पसीना ही क्यों न बहाना पड़े। यह मामूली बात नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान का नया नक्शा हमें बनाना है और उस नकश में ऐसी पार्टियों की कोई गुंजायश नहीं है। यह जायेंगे, जमाना उन को मिटा देगा। हम हिन्दुस्तान के तरक्की-पसंद, हिन्दुस्तान के देशभक्तों को मिल कर एक नये हिन्दुस्तान की बुनियाद डालना है जो समाजवादी हिन्दुस्तान होगा, जिसमें इंसान इंसान रहेगा, न हिन्दू, न मुसलमान, न सिख, न इसाई, जहां सब समान होंगे और हर एक दूसरे को भाई समझेगा। ऐसे हिन्दुस्तान के लिए हम एक दूसरे का हाथ पकड़ कर इन रजत-पसंद, पिछड़े हुए, पुराने, दक्खिनीय साध्या-ज्यवादी दोस्तों का डट कर मुकाबला करेंगे यही आज हमें इस से सबक लेना है।

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : The Government must thank the CPI for having put up one good speaker for them.

SHRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, ever since I entered this august House I have been supporting the cause of the Government in all its policies and purposes, but, Sir, on this occasion, I feel rather embarrassed to have to take up a different position and posture. Strange are the compulsions of duty and the directions of destiny. Is there an Indian with soul so dead Who to himself has not said that this iconoclastic vandalism of burning the Al Aqsa mosque should be deeply resented and strongly condemned ? We on this side of the House take this opportunity of expressing our profound grief and deep resentment at this abominable act. We stand by our Muslim brethren, here and elsewhere, in their strong condemnation of this diabolic desecration. Our hon. Minister for External Affairs chose to make a statement in both Houses of Parliament expressing the grief of the people and the resentment of the Government and I thought it was fully relevant, justified and sufficient. But, Sir, it was rather strange, if not silly and stupid, to have decided to go to Rabat. I wonder, Sir, whether the Government has had the advantage of knowing the deep design behind this Rabat summit. I have a feeling that the Government acted in fear, fear that Pakistan might overreach us, fear that Arab nations might mis\*understand our attitude towards Israel and fear because of domestic compulsions. No nation acts in fear. I am sure that the Government will agree when I say that the public resentment at the treatment is greatly justified. This unfortunate Rabat incident has generated much deep involvement in some of the rather sensitive aspects of our foreign policy, that no section of our external relations has generated such deep resentment, not even our nebulous attitude on Tibet, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, as this unfortunate incident. This incident has touched some deeper chords of involvement of public mind so closely interwoven with some of our domestic delicacies. The great gravity of the resentment of public opinion makes it all the more relevant that the real issue behind this Rabat debacle is not unfortunately affected either by sycophantic approbation or antagonistic reprobation. I am sure that we cannot delude ourselves with the fact that what has happened has been due to certain magnifying political prejudices or inter-party antagonisms, nor can we take solace in the fact that what has happened in Rabat is going to make Pakistan exposed to diplomatic misfor-

tune and not ours. I again wonder whether the Government has taken some pains to understand the developments that take place in this most vulnerable and explosive region of the world. Firstly there is the rise, growth and development of Arab nationalism on a republican scale with urges to emancipate from the orthodoxy and communalism, with resurgence, to fight against domination, old or new, and Western imperialism. Secondly, We have the lingering monarchies, presumably exemplified by Saudi Arabia and Morocco with feudal taste and traditions and inwardly struggling to get to the shores of safety and survival against the Arab nationalism. Thirdly, there is the emergence of the new nation, Israel, whose paternity was doubtful and whose maternity was deputed and, therefore, it was abandoned on the doorsteps of the United Nations Organisation. These are the three forces and factors that act and react in this most vulnerable region of the world. I wonder again whether the Government has thought it fit to examine the development of the balance of forces in this region. Some of us who have been close students of international affairs were convinced that there has been a very sedulous attempt on the part of the regional monarchs of that place to try to find a separate religious summit for their singular sunshine. For example King Feisal was trying to find a singular sunshine for himself and His Majesty knows that if it was purely for political purposes, His Majesty would have been either completely overshadowed or totally eclipsed. For comparable reasons King Hussein of Morocco also wanted a singular sunshine of exclusiveness. Some of us knew that this political pattern that was developing in that region did not visibly attract the Arab attention in spite of the great Islamic appeal that it had generated. For example, Iraq was cold, Syria was indifferent. Egypt was cynical. Yet the only ambition of having a religious summit exclusively for the survival of the Arab monarchs at that place looked as though it would have to be abandoned. It has been a slavering survival of its dream on account of the Al Aqsa incident. May I once again very respectfully ask the Government whether they have understood the deep design behind this Islamic conference that was arranged at Rabat? If it was purely for the purpose of having the Al Aqsa incident as a rallying point for this summit, I am sure that it had no visible attraction to the Arab countries. It was, therefore, lately and unwillingly that

political issue of Israel was added. I want my comrades who spoke in support of the justification of our attendance or attempted attendance at Rabat very recently to clearly understand that even when this political issue of Israel was added, what was the reaction of those countries which were vitally affected not only by the Islamic appeal and the Al Aqsa incident, but also by the political issues of Israel? The Arab countries, particularly Iraq and Syria, could see through the Rabat purdha and the most prestigious President of Egypt excused himself by absencing either for cold reasons or for reasons of cold and yet our Government could not even have some "Stray thoughts" to use a very modern phrase in ministerial circles. Why did not Iraq and Syria attend?

[Interruptions]

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY :  
Mr. Vice-Chairman, on a point of order. The Minister of External Affairs should not be disturbed now and then. He should not have confabulations here. He should listen to the debate. Serious should be taken. This is the second time.

SHRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN : I was attempting to emphasise that Iraq and Syria ; which were vitally affected in two ways, did not care to attend the Rabat Summit. If it is the appeal of the Islamic incident of Al Aqsa, Iraq and Syria were much more vitally and closely interested than ourselves. They did not attend. If it was for the political purpose of Israel, their territorial nexus to the danger of an Israeli conflict must have been more compelling than what it should have been in our case. May I again ask the government whether they have understood the meaning of Iran's participation in the Rabat conference? I want to pose two aspects for the very kind consideration of this House, not so much for the Government, because I am anxious that this House must understand this great tragedy that has been enacted. Iran, which has successfully flouted the Arab version of the Halstein doctrine, and also recognised Israel and even has diplomatic exchange with Israel, wanted to attend. Has this Government analysed why Iran participated in this summit? It is not merely to show the Tenah's diplomatic strength in that summit, but essentially and, if I may say, exclusively for the religious appeal that the Islamic summit would offer. Am I to give further evidence to demonstrate

[Shri T, Chengalvaroyan]

before this House and also before the whispering galleries of this world ? What is the essential and fundamental nature and bedrock of this Rabat summit ? If our hon. Members could just gather the agenda and the deliberations of the preparatory committee, they would easily be convinced of this fact that they had wanted the choice of six countries, two from each of the Arab, African and Asian countries and they gave a very peculiar definition of what is an Islamic country. I would very respectfully agree with my esteemed and beloved comrade, Mr. Abdul Samad, when he said that it was for the purpose of representing the voice and grievance of several thousands and lakhs of our Muslim brethren in our country. I would have gone on bended knees and with bated breath to any corner of this world in order to vindicate that choice, in order to vindicate their position. But Mr. Vice-Chairman, that very Preparatory Committee defined what is an Islamic country—a country which has a majority population of Muslims, a country which has a Muslim as the Head of State. May I ask my very esteemed friend, the Minister of Industries, who seems to be much more industrious outside than in the Industries Ministry, and in addition, a man of conscience...

AN HON. MEMBER : And your convenience.

SHRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN : ...

to answer this question as to which category our country belongs ? Can we say that we belong to the first category because we have the largest Muslim population ? Can we say that we belong to the second category because we have got a Muslim Head of State ? If that Preparatory Committee had defined and given a condition that it should be a Government which has, as Minister for Industries a Muslim, we would have certainly welcomed it. Unfortunately for our country, that has not been the approach by the Rabat Summit Preparatory Committee. May I only say — where angels hesitate to rush, why should this Government get in ? I do not know.

I have been endeavouring to bring to the kind notice of this House the historical, political and religious issues and I want to tell this honourable House is it for the purpose of pinpointing the tragedy of the Al Aqsa Mosque burning, it is not so; is it for the purpose of streamlining the political issues about Israel, it is not so. Then what is it for ? It is essentially

for the purpose of realising the midnight dream of the holy monarchs of the region and in order to have their exclusive summit.

Some Members who supported this participation wanted to argue, perhaps very feebly and faintly, is to why we should have had to go to Rabat and said that we went to Rabat in order to vindicate our grief over the Al Aqsa incident. Have we not done this here ? Can we be more eloquent than our esteemed Minister for External Affairs in his great speech in this House giving our resentment at this incident ? Is it for the purpose of giving our strength, our support, to the political issues about Israel ? Have we not done so ? Not only on the floor of this House but in the Press and on the platform of our country we have time and again proclaimed our solidarity and fraternity with the Arab cause and condemned in unequivocal language the Israeli aggression on Arab countries. Then why should we go there ? I have a feeling that the identification of our country with such religious gatherings will further communalise our domestic politics. When I think of this prospect, my whole frame shudders because we are passing through a tumultuous transition in our country when passions and prejudices based upon religion, caste and creed come to the forefront.

Again, my esteemed friend, Mr. Abdul Samad, wanted to link up the Ahmedabad riots with the rebuff we had at Rabat. Apart from what my esteemed friend from Gujarat has said, if you look at the sequence of dates, the irrelevancy of that link becomes obvious. But even for the purpose of argument if I were to take it that the Ahmedabad riot gave provocation, if not inspiration, for the rebuff that we have got at Rabat, may I most seriously ask this question ? I have never been beyond the shores of my country. I have never attended any international gathering. But ever since I began to learn the A, B, C of politics some 35 years ago, I have studied the deliberations, the decisions, the proceedings, the speeches and the extracts of all the international gatherings. And I can tell you with all the authority of knowledge and study at my command that no international gathering can ever take into consideration any matter which is vitally an internal affair. I might have been butchered by my brother, my house could have been burnt and in the fiery flames my roofs could have come down. But no international gathering can ever take up such

questions. And if Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed had been given the grace of attendance in that Rabat Conference and if he could have got in that place, all the courtesy and all the trumpeted reception that he could have had, what would he have done if this issue of the Ahmedabad riot had been raised? Would he sit there silently, unnoticed and unnoticeable with regard to that issue? Instead of his being pushed out, he must have pulled out if that Conference.

Therefore, my respectful submission to this House is that this Rabat incident must stir us to greater depths of understanding. I wait to make this submission very sincerely that what has happened has happened. I am not so much worried whether we went with an invitation, constructive as my esteemed Professor Mr. Ruthnaswamy was pleased to state or whether the invitation was smuggled, as some others would charge or whether the invitation had come orally as some others may justify. I am not worried about how an invitation has been received. But I wonder if all of us go to the invitations that we receive. I got an invitation for a requisitioned meeting. Did I go? Mr. Vice-Chairman, I examined the objects of that meeting; I examined the background of that meeting; I examined who would hoist the International Flag; I examined who would preside over the deliberations. And I examine! so many things and excused myself from attending the meeting.

SHRI DINE'N SINGH : He failed to take the right decision.

SHRI T. C. ENGALVAROYAN : I am just explaining to the House the fundamental issues that are involved in this incident. My analysis therefore is this that we have to examine, scrutinise and even, if necessary, seen any foreign invitation that comes to us. I remember, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that our great beloved Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has given, as it were, a testamentary direction to this Government and to the successive Governments hereafter that in all places where religion dominates political issues, India at the Governmental level should not go. I am old, not so much by way of explanation, but even so much by justification, not even as an apology—have we not gone to other religious gatherings? It is so, Mr. Vice-Chairman. Who denies that we have not gone to other religious conferences? If those friends want a catalogue of those occasions when

India not as a State but the Indian people went, I shall first give the example of the World Muslim Conference at Modigliano, I will cite the instance of the Afro-Asian Islamic Summit at Bandung, I will give the instance of the World Muslim League at Mecca and I will give the instance of the International Islamic Convention at Kuala Lumpur. To all these places our great Muslim leaders and scholars like my friend Mr. Abdul Samad went to attend these conferences and not, the hon. Minister for Industries of the Government of India.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is again asked as one other excuse—has not our great Father of the Nation Mahatma Gandhi sublimated the Khilafat movement into a national movement and part and parcel of our national struggle? I am rather surprised that such an epoch-making example inaugurated by Mahatmaji should be sought by lesser mortals. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Khilafat issue was involved in our political struggle not in the face of our secularism but as a part of our political, national emancipation work. Secondly, it was Mahatmaji who did it, and that makes all the difference in its consequence and its impact.

Another reason, Mr. Vice-Chairman we are told is that this question of the Rabat incident has to be followed in a very wider context. I will only end with this submission. What is that wider context? The wider context can be in two aspects, either to confront Pakistan or to get new friends and allies for India. I have very carefully examined, Mr. Vice-Chairman, what has happened with regard to our foreign policy. I feel, on the one hand, all our friends are vanishing, on the other our doubtful friends are becoming certain enemies, and on the third, we are not yet getting new friends. The geo-political position and the demographic composition of our country requires a revaluation, of ascertaining who are our friends and then to identify them in the respective regions.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, one more word and I have done. I have been at pains to explain the real political and other issues which have completely overshadowed and eclipsed the real religious purpose behind Rabat. Today we have participated in the Rabat Conference. The damage that has been done to us no bandage will stop that bleeding. Mr. Vice-Chairman, let it be a lasting lesson to ourselves. It is usual that man makes mistakes. It is much more usual that z.

[Shri T. Ghengalvaroyan] Government makes mistakes. But if the mistake is to be justified, if the mistake is to be explained away, if the mistake is threatened to be repeated, we on this side of the House, to the last breath that we can command, will stand up as one man against any such interference in matters with regard to our very cherished ideal of secularism.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have declared secularism as the most emphatic emblem of our democracy, and this participation, or even attempted participation, even the acceptance of the invitation is a bombastic betrayal of the cherished doctrine of secularism in our country which has been given a decent burial. Let us not specialise, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in attending funerals like the Rabat. Hereafter I only hope and trust that this Government will try to learn new lessons and unlearn old lessons. If they do not change then they will be changed and when that change comes, it will be unwept, unhonoured and unsung.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : What a contrast between the performance on two sides ?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) in the Chair.]

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I lost a minute in the change of the Vice-Chairman. I hope, Sir, you will join with me in an expression of pride that this debate is being conducted at a high level on the floor of the House. Occasionally, there are incidents in the Rajya Sabha and there » are words spoken for which one feels sorry. But as one listens to this debate on Rabat, as I said, one has a feeling of pride that we are debating at a very high level. Even Shri Rajnarain was full of good humour today...

SHRI A. D. MANI : And relevant too.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : I am not accepting that amendment. He was full of good humour. I was watching how from both sides there was laughter and enjoyment. The last speaker, my old friend, Mr. Chengalvaroyan, also raised the debate to a high level. He is an old friend of mine and we hope to be friends whatever our political differences. Who could have spoken, for instance, with greater passion and conviction than my young friend, Dr. Mahavir? And then we had two very good speeches, one from my Muslim League friend, Mr.

Abdul Samad, and then a terrific speech from Mr. Ahmad. Listening to all these I come back to the idea that it is good that we are discussing this at a high level.

It was one of our greatest fighters for freedom you will know who it was -who once said it does not matter with what stick you beat a dog. If you are beating a dog, it is not necessary to be careful about the stick with which you are beating the dog. Today Rabat has become a point of battle, far away from Rabat in distance and in time and it is being fought out on the floor of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. Each party picks up Rabat for its own political purpose. Each party attacks Rabat on the basis of its political aims and objectives and convictions. May be this is not wrong at all. This is what is likely to happen in all political battles. If, for instance, the Opposition using the stick of Rabat is able to bring the Government down, they are entitled to do so because this is politics. You take something, make it into a weapon of attack against your political opponent. But what happened in the Lok Sabha was something quite different. In the Lok Sabha this was debated and by a big majority the Government sustained its place and was not defeated. And I have no doubt that will happen on the floor of this House also. But in the mean time if the Opposition has the satisfaction that they have taken up some issues and hammered away at these issues, they are entitled to that satisfaction. They have struck and struck well and struck unitedly. If, on the other hand, the Government has the satisfaction that it is not struck down in spite of the attack they are also entitled to their satisfaction. So what happens ultimately in a debate of this kind is that certain issues are exposed but the Government stands firm.

We have the statement of our Minister for External Affairs. I read it very carefully as all of you must have read it very carefully. I heard him also as he expounded this matter at another place and on another occasion. I listened to him then with a very critical mind, because on the face of it one is included to join in the kind of attitude which comes from the Opposition. What is it that happened at Rabat ? India was insulted. Why did we expose ourselves to this insult? That was what I thought then. But is it not so easy a matter as that. If I am invited to a festival or a party or some kind of an important occasion by friends, and I go and attend

that party of festival and somebody bangs the door in my face, I am not to blame. On the contrary I would be to blame if I did not accept the invitation which, in my opinion, was *bona fide*. If somebody else misbehaved, how am I to blame? This thought came to me as I read the statement of Mr. Dinesh Singh and also listened to him.

Now, what are the facts? These facts may be challenged because even facts become non-facts as you look at them through different political glasses. The first fact is that this conference was not a religious conference. It is clear as crystal that this conference was debating political issues of the highest value to the people in that area and to our country. So any criticism that we went to a purely religious conference is not sustained by the facts that emerged. The second point is that there was an appropriate invitation. Does anybody challenge the fact that there was a unanimous invitation? And the invitation was to the Government of India. So this also is not something which can be challenged—that there was an invitation and it was a cordial and unanimous invitation. Then what happened? The Government of India sent out a delegation. It would have been total wrong if the Government of India had not responded to this invitation because it was an unanimous invitation and a cordial invitation to a conference which was not simply a religious conference. The wrong began at the other end, not at this end. Up till now, we are in the march of events which nobody can challenge as wrong. Then the wrong begins at the other end. Something happens there. I do not want to go into the details. These details have been dealt with threadbare. What happens is that due to some adventitious causes and reasons, the delegation which they had invited is disabled from functioning as a delegation. Then what can happen? We can run away, we can scuttle. I am glad Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed did not scuttle and run away in fear. He stood up for the dignity of the nation which he represented, for the dignity of the Government which he represented. And he stood up against overwhelming odds of all kinds...

SHRI G. L. PANDE : Where did he stand?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : Please do not interrupt me. You will have your say. You can then take up every point

I am making and tear it to pieces, if you can, but do not shout in this intemperate manner.

Now, what I am saying is that our delegation did not scuttle. There were pressures brought upon it to withdraw, to sit aside, to look aside. But Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed put his back up and said "No, I will not do this. I stand up for the honour of my country. If anybody is in the wrong, I will not be in the wrong you will be in the wrong." May I say that the Indian delegation has put them completely in the wrong and came out with honours? Now, supposing, Sir, in the previous instance which I gave, I am invited to a party and the man who invited me spits in my face, am I the guilty person, or is it he who spit in my face who is the guilty person?

SHRI G. D. PANDE : We should let him spit more and more.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN : So, our delegation yielded to no blandishments of any kind. Then, what did we do? We did something which we have never done before in the history of the Republic of India. We took cognizance of what happened and we took swift action in withdrawing our Ambassadors from Morocco and Jordan. This we were bound to do because we had been badly treated and we had to take action. Now this action which the Government of India took quickly is something which I do not know whether it would have happened under any other Government we have known in this country so far. It took courage to do a thing like this. Now, what is happening, Sir, after the event? Every one of the countries concerned is filling one over another to tell us "We meant no harm." Every country in that area which was party to this kind of wrong is competing with each other to make it clear "We did not want to insult you. We only wanted to act in the friendliest manner and to save you embarrassment" and so on and so forth. I was, some weeks ago, in Turkey and I met some of the friends of the Turkish Government. Nobody was more anxious than these people to say "We meant no insult to India. We were only trying to play a role in which India could be saved from embarrassment and the conference could be saved from embarrassment". This kind of thing happens so often even in our own country.

In the final result, Sir, India has emerged stronger, cleaner, brighter and more

[Shri G. Ramachandran] alert and energetic than ever before. (*Laughter*) You can laugh at me. I can also laugh at you. My dear Mr. Pande, you can wave your hands and talk when your chance comes but not to interrupt me. Sir, he is famous for gesticulations !

Now, Sir, as I said, after this event, the name of India in the world has not suffered one iota because of the misconduct of somebody else. The name of Pakistan and the role of Pakistan is in the mire today because of this. Even in some of the Islamic countries there is a strong reaction against the role Pakistan played in the event.

The biggest attack on the floor of this House has come in the name of India's secularism, which is a thing which I very much prize. The attack on what the Government did is on the basis that India as a secular State must not have attended what they call a religious conference. Now from today does this great advocacy of secularism come? I am not thinking of all the opposition members because it is a very motley crowd, just as we are also a somewhat motley crowd—Some of them who spoke in the most strident voice are the enemies of secularism to-day, were the enemies of secularism yesterday and will continue to be enemies of secularism tomorrow. When my friend, Mr. Ghengalvaroyan talks of it or when my friend, Mr. Ahmad talks of it, I take what they say in the best light because they are on the side of secularism. But if this Rabat debate is going to make such of the parties who have always been opposed to secularism a little more secular, let us thank Rabat !

Finally one word. As I said the attempt is that this is a stick to wreck the Government. If this Government can be wrecked by this stick, let it be wrecked. If this Government is so weak, if this Government is not so firmly rooted in the Constitution and in the minds of the people to be wrecked by this little stick, it is right that it should be wrecked. I will not shed a tear if any Government is wrecked because of such a stick. But I want to warn them that they are not going to wreck this Government by this roundabout method. Rabat in the Lok Sabha proved the strength of the Government. Rabat on the floor of this House will prove again the strength of the Government. But in the meantime, I am grateful that many issues have been made clear so that the Government will think once, twice, thrice, when a future occasion comes and when similar action has

to be taken. That is why I said that this debate has been at a high level and I want to congratulate myself and the Rajya Sabha on that. Thank you.

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन, एक बात मैं जानना चाहता हूँ दिनेश सिंह जी से कि जो 35 आर्दापियों का डेलिगेशन विदेश जाने वाला है, जिस का जिक्र अखबार में आया है क्या उस के नाम तय हो गए हैं ?

**सूचना तथा प्रसारण मंत्रालय और संचार विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री आई० के० गुजराल) :** आप का नाम है, राजनारायण जा रहे हैं ।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री राम निवास मिर्धा) :** यह बात बाद में उदाइयेगा ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं ने इस लिए पूछा ताकि बहुत से लोग उस लाइट में न बोलें इस सदन में ।

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Mr. Vice-Chairman, after hearing the debates of the Syndicate-Jan Sangh-Swatantra benches, one thing has come out clear to all of us. It is this that what they are driving at is not merely an attack on the Government for the insult that the Government received at Rabat—there are no two opinions about the fact that the Government definitely suffered an insult at Rabat. The insult at Rabat is certainly not something which can be glossed over. That was a blunder at the diplomatic level and that blunder has its roots in the reactionary and opportunistic policies of the Government. But I will come to that later. Before I come to that aspect of the question I have to say this also that the attack on the Government that has come from the Jan-Sangh-Swatantra-Syndicate benches is because of their desire to change the foreign policy of the country. Yesterday I was going through some of the thoroughfares of Delhi and I found one big poster, hung up certainly by the Jan Sangh people, and that poster read like this—

‘स्वात से सबक लो, विदेश नीति बदल दो ।

I That is, really they want to change the foreign policy of India, and how do they want to change the foreign policy of India? They want to change it. They want to take



[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

without a written invitation to attend that Conference. Of course, I do not mean to go into the technicalities of whether it is a written invitation or an oral invitation. Even if there is an oral invitation and if it is necessary to attend that conference, I will say "Oral or written, we should have gone to attend this conference." So, whether an oral invitation was given or a written invitation was given, that does not matter. We have to see whether the Conference was of use to the Arab Nationalist Movement, was of use to the West Asian Nationalist Movement. In my humble submission that was not so because it was going to be dominated by the imperialists and the imperialist lackies.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the question of dignity and self-respect has been raised. It is not a question of the dignity and the self-respect being greatly eroded by such sort of conferences and by being rebuffed at such sort of conferences. Actually what happened? Were we rebuffed? That is the thing that we have to go into. We were rebuffed at this conference because, first of all, we misjudged the nature of the conference, and therefore, we were not allowed to enter into the conference because they thought that the Indian Government by entering into that conference would try to disrupt their quasi-imperialist plans and their quasi-imperialist programmes. But then it may be put to me, "If that is the position, did the Indian Government not do the right thing in trying to rush to this conference?" But after all, a qualitative change cannot be effected in a thing which is completely contrary to what you want to aspire for. You cannot make darkness out of light. You cannot make a qualitative change of light to darkness. That is the position in to which we should not be drawn. Therefore, the point is this that we went to the Conference, and we went to the Conference, why? Because we wanted to become—the blunt fact must be said—the leader of the non-aligned group. But I may tell the Government that it is no use trying to be the leader of a non-aligned bloc by gatecrashing into a conference like this; it requires a neutral approach? a progressive approach. If that had been done, this country would not have been in this humiliating and insulting position in the matter of Rabat. Sir, I asked a question today of the Minister for External Affairs on the floor of the House, this morning, as

to why he was not recognising the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, I was told by him that he wanted to be neutral between the two sides. Neutralism between imperialism and nationalism and neutralism between reactionary forces and progressive forces will lead us into this blind alley. Therefore it is necessary that we must cast our lot with the progressive forces of the world and we must annual that influence which the American imperialists are bringing to bear upon us, when they say that we must not trade with North Vietnam, when they compel us not to trade with Cuba. Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will find there has been a new PL—480 Agreement which our Government has entered into with America only recently. You can see how ignominious and humiliating tin-conditions are in that agreement. First of all it was not at all necessary to have any PL—480 Agreement because we are now in a very much better position as far as food is concerned. But we are told that a buffer stock is required. Actually it is a surrender to the American imperialists.

While concluding I would like to say that I do not agree with the criticism that has been levelled at the Government by the Jan Sangh, the Syndicate and the Swatantra benches, because they want a shift to the right. But it is also true that the Indian Government must be on the side of progress, it must orientate its policy towards national interests and against American imperialism. If that is not done, then *'his* sort of rebuff and this sort of insult may have to come in our way very often. Thank you.

COL. B. H. ZAIDI (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the exclusion of the Indian Delegation from participation in the Rabat Conference at a later stage of its deliberations has spread a wave of anger and indignation throughout the Country. But it seems that the indignation of some of our friends has got mixed up with political calculations. India was certainly humiliated, but of all the countries it was Pakistan which was responsible chiefly for our humiliation. Another factor was that the word 'Islamic' was added as a prefix to the Conference. And what added insult to injury was that references were made at the Conference to the happenings at Ah-nedabad. All these factors combined to make certain persons feel that it was an opportunity for them to make use

of the Rabat Conference. I have inferred to launch an attack on the Government of India whose policies did not find favour with them.

I have heart: *ad nauseam* references to the secular policy of India. I have listened to, what I say, the agnostics quoting scriptures. I hope everybody who has spoken in the name of secularism really believes in secularism. It is fashionable today in our country to vie with each other in wearing by socialism and democracy but we know how much faith some sections of our people have in socialism today. Even Mr. Chagla found it fit to make repeated references to the religious nature of the Conference. It is necessary for me to examine this question fully.

Sir, religious matters in my opinion are of two kinds. There are matters which pertain to religious beliefs and practices. With these obviously a secular Government can have very little to do but there are other religious matters which are matters, say, of emotional involvement of a community in a sphere where foreign Governments also are involved. For instance a community may have its shrines and holy places situated in a foreign country. The majority community in our country has practically no shrines or holy places outside India. Therefore some of them find it difficult to understand why minorities like Muslims, Christians or Sikhs should have so much concern about places and institutions which are outside their own country.

SHRI N. S. RAMA REDDY : Sir I may be permitted to correct my friend. There are shrines in Nepal, which is not India. So the majority community has shrines outside India. Let him not forget that glaring fact.

COL. B. H. ZAIDI : So these religious matters are of deep interest to a minority. Now I ask you one thing. If there is desecration of the holy places not only of Muslims but of Christians and Sikhs in a country outside India, would you like these minorities to be left to their own devices, to carry on their agitation in their own way, perhaps seeking the support of other countries, running to foreign Embassies and so on, or would you like the combined weight of public opinion of all the Indians to be thrown behind that agitation? I hope every right-thinking person and every impartial-minded person in our

country would agree with me that instead of leaving the minorities to defend themselves, wherever there is a just cause for complaint against a foreign country, the best thing for the minorities is to go to their own Government. They must have faith in their own Government. They must have faith in their own brethren belonging to the majority community and they should look forward to their whole-hearted support. This has been the tradition of our country. It is today fashionable to pay the highest respect and reverence to Mahatma Gandhi but as Badshah Khan has been telling us repeatedly we have forgotten the teachings of Gandhiji and also his teachings over the question of Khilafat which was a purely religious issue of the Muslims. It was only Mahatmaji who could do this and I should like, Sir, with your permission to read out the resolution passed by the Indian National Congress at its Calcutta session 1920 under the Presidentship of Lala Lajpatrai. The resolution runs as follows :

"In view of the fact that on the question of Khilafat both the Indian and the Imperial Governments have signally failed in their duty towards the Muslims of India, it is the duty of every non-Muslim in India in every legitimate manner to assist his brother—that is the Muslim brother—in his attempt to remove the religious calamity that has overtaken him." This has been the tradition of our country. This was the way the Congress gave a lead to the country in those critical days. That was how Mahatma Gandhi became leader of the Khilafat agitation, which had its political repercussions to which I need not refer.

My friend Professor Nurul Hasan made reference to the country observing the Buddha Jayanti and the honour we showed to His Holiness the Pope when he visited India. Now Sir all these are examples of how our country has given proof of not only tolerance which is a negative thing but also large-hearted support to every minority making their cause its own, and it is in this spirit that we admire the Government of India for having taken so much practical interest in this question which was agitating the minds of six crore Muslims. Forgetting everything else which has been said in justification of our participation in the Rabat conference, by doing this you gave satisfaction to six crores of your brothers. To me, this in itself is a matter of the utmost value and importance.

[Col. B. H. Zaidi] I; is said, Sir, by some people that Muslims must Indianise themselves. (*Interruptions*) People who want Muslims to indianise themselves would also agree, I think, to Indianise Muslim causes. If they want Muslims to Indianise themselves, and if they also Indianise Muslim causes, then, naturally, I take it, they will throw the entire weight of the Indian nation behind the question of, say, burning of the Al-Aqsa mosque, or the injury caused to the Arabs by Israel, and other similar questions. You cannot talk in one breath of Indianising the Muslims and then looking askance at our Government supporting the Muslims in their just causes.

Then, Sir, as the time is short I would like to make reference only to one other matter. Some of our friends have not fully realised that the agenda, procedure and other matters regarding the Rabat conference were discussed and decided at two levels. There was in the beginning the Preparatory Committee. It consisted of six members of which Pakistan was not one. Pakistan was invited later just as we were invited later to the conference. At that stage the Preparatory Committee invited a number of countries which did not satisfy the two conditions which had been laid down, that is, Muslim majority or Muslim Head of State. They invited a country like Lebanon, which has not got a Muslimity or a Muslim Head of State. By the way, Lebanon is secular. And Turkey is also secular, and Turkey is so secular that they do not have the Muslim Personal Law but a Common Law for all Turks mainly based on the Swiss Codes and his country. Turkey also responded to the invitation in spite of its secularism. So, Sir, they invited a number of countries but at that stage they did not include the name of India. The question is why was India, left out. Sir, at that stage there was only one item on the agenda and that was the burning of the Al-Aqsa mosque. Later on, when conference started functioning, the agenda was enlarged, anti besides Al-Aqsa they included questions relating to Israel vacating the territories ipied by it, their aggression, and also (uestion of the Palestinian citizens, is after the agenda was endorsed and it became political and not religious at all that they thought of inviting India. It was the conference which enlarged the agenda and it was the conference which also invited India. So thie omis-sion on the part of the Preparatory Com-

I mittee was set right by the conference I just as the agenda also was modified by ( the conference. What happened after- '!' wards you all know and you know how '1 Pakistan played its usual game and India I was slighted and insulted.

Well, Sir, we are, I hope, a big nation, | a mature nation. We are now grown up politically. If we are humiliated we should not lose our balance. Other big countries also are humiliated.

The USA which has been helping us a great deal, which has been giving us the food we badly need and other assistance is insulted almost every week in our country—I do not say wrongly. (*Interruptions*) It reminds me of what a Fakir used to say in the streets of Delhi in my childhood

“दो वैसे में दोसो गालियां :  
दूंगा” । Any how उनके मुंह का मज्जा  
नहीं बिगड़ा, वह बिल बिलाते नहीं हैं ।

We as a mature people ought not to lose our balance but we should give careful thought to how to counteract the influence and machinations of a country like Pakistan which is always out to put us down and to do us injury. But it would not do to turn round our Government and treat them as the devil of the piece. In what way, as Mr. Ramachandran said, in what way is the Government possible for the humiliation suffered by India ? Because it was justified for the Government of India to participate at the Rabat conference for the reasons I gave you—eliminate every other reason; eliminate every other consideration—the six crores of your brethren are grateful to the Government of India for their participation at the Rabat conference. So the Government was right. And if we suffered humiliation because of Pakistan, the Government of India is not responsible for it.

Thank you.

6 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : Mr. Kaul.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, before you ask him to speak may I suggest that we adjourn today at 6 o'clock and we can continue on Monday ?

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir. . .

SHRI A. D. MANI : Let us adjou^ now. He can be the first speaker on Monday.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : According to the procedure, you have called me and I must be allowed to speak now.

SHRI LOKAJATH MISRA : That is not so. The House can decide. (*Interruptions*) As far as the Labour Minister's statement is concerned...

SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO : My name was not there and it is still there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : That way there are a lot of names here.

SHRI GULAM NABI UNTOO : I am at a loss to understand why I alone was deleted from the list.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : No one has been deleted; it is still there.

SOME HON MEMBERS : Let us adjourn now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : It seems the House is in a mood to adjourn.

SHRI M. N. KAUL : In that case you may give a direction that it might be noted that you have called me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : Yes, yes. And the suggestion I that the time allotted for this debate would not be exceeded. It would be continued on Monday after which the hon. Minister will reply and the Mover will then reply.

There is one small item. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad was to make a statement at 6-30. In case he makes it now we can finish.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Sir, that is a very serious matter because hundreds of workers are involved. It won't take more than ten minutes.

**STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE STRIKE IN "THE BIRLA COTTON, SPINNING AND WEAVING MILLS, DELHI**

**"THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD) :**

Sir according to the information furnished by the Delhi Administration, the workers of Birla Cotton Spinning and Weaving Mills, Delhi are on strike from the 26th October, 1969, on the issue of bonus for the year 1968-69. The management is reported to have offered 4% bonus in terms of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965. The workers are, however, demanding higher bonus. The matter falls in the State sphere. The Delhi Administration invited the representatives of the management and the workers to bring about an amicable settlement. These discussions, however, did not succeed. A suggestion was made for reference of the dispute to arbitration. This was not acceptable to the workers. In the circumstances the Delhi Administration have referred the dispute to the Additional Industrial Tribunal on the 8th November, 1969 for adjudication. They have simultaneously issued an order prohibiting the strike. The strike, however, continues. The textile workers in other mills expressed their sympathy with the striking workers of the Birla Cotton Spinning and Weaving Mills by going on a day's token strike on the 20th November, 1969.

The dispute has already been referred to adjudication; even so, it is open to the parties to come to an agreement after further mutual discussions. The good offices of the Delhi Administration and the Labour Ministry would continue to be available for the purpose. Government expect that the parties would resume negotiations with a view to early settlement of the dispute in the interests alike of good industrial relations and uninterrupted production.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : Sir, one question only.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : No; there is another behind you.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Just only one question.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : I do not think because if one is allowed there will be a lot of others who would also want to ask.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I am merely suggesting to the Minister, I am merely requesting the Minister to come on Monday and tell us that as far as adjudication is concerned the terms of the