

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock. Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE MOTOR TRANSPORT WORKERS BILL, 1961.

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

“In accordance with the provisions of Rule 101 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that the following amendments made by Rajya Sabha in the Motor Transport Workers Bill, 1960, at its sitting held on the 28th March, 1961, were taken into consideration and agreed to by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on Thursday, the 4th May, 1961:—

Enacting Formula

1. That at page 1, line 1, for the words ‘Eleventh Year’ the words ‘Twelfth Year’ be substituted.

Clause 1

2. That at page 1, line 6, for the figure ‘1960’ the figure ‘1961’ be substituted.

3. That at page 1, line 10, for the figures and words ‘31st day of December, 1961’ the figures and words ‘31st day of March, 1962’ be substituted.

Clause 2

4. That at page 4, lines 2-3, for the words ‘required to work or is engaged directly or through any agency, in a professional capacity on a transport vehicle or who attends’ the words ‘employed in a motor transport undertaking dir-

ectly or through an agency, whether for wages or not, to work in a professional capacity on a transport vehicle or to attend’ be substituted.

5. That at page 4, line 7, after the word ‘time-keeper’ the word ‘watchman’ be inserted.

Clause 18

6. That at page 9, line 38, for the words ‘each adult motor transport worker’ the words ‘motor transport workers’ be substituted.

Clause 20

7. That at page 10, line 23, for the word ‘holidays’ the words ‘days of rest’ be substituted.

Clause 28

8. That at page 13, line 3, after the word ‘wages’ the words ‘for the days on which he worked during the month immediately preceding his leave’, be inserted.”

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE FOR THE SPEEDY COMPLETION OF THE HISTORY OF THE INDIAN FREEDOM MOVEMENT—continued

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. J. C. Chatterji. There is nobody here to represent the Government. It is rather a sad state of affairs.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Then, please give them a few minutes to come.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a non-official Resolution. You can start, Mr. Chatterji.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, before he starts, you see those Benches. At least some Minister should be there. It is an unheard of thing. It is getting absolutely into wrong habits.

(Interruptions)

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): You can speak, if you like, without the Minister being present.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is Mr. Dahyabhai Patel who has to reply to you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not that. It is a Government's work that is being criticised here. Therefore, the Government has to intervene

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every word that is uttered will come to the notice of the Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do not seek their favour of being noticed. They should sit here and listen to things here. It is their obligation and duty.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Mr. Dahyabhai Patel is there.

DR. R. B. GOUR: But Mr. Dahyabhai Patel is not in the Government.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was the first person to raise my voice in this House about this thing.

(At this stage Dr. Mono Mohan Das entered the Chamber.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are waiting for you, Dr. Mono Mohan Das.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (DR. MONO MOHAN DAS): Sir, I apologise to you and to the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not look like an accused. Come and sit there and explain to us as to why you are late.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can begin, Mr. Chatterji.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJI: Sir, I spoke on the 9th March and later on the author of the book gave a reply before this House. First, therefore, I shall deal with his reply. On the 9th March I criticised the "History of the Freedom Movement in India" and on the 13th, the author replied to my criticism. I was not satisfied with his explanations and, therefore, am glad to have this opportunity of pointing out the tendentious nature of his reply.

I objected to Dr. Tara Chand's statement:

"The national movement in India was an expression of the conflict between the middle classes of the two countries, one aspiring for wealth and influence, the other already in possession of them."

To prove this statement he quoted from Mr. Schumpeter and Mr. R. Palme Dutt. I am not concerned with Mr. Schumpeter's statement, as it concerns the history of England. As regards Mr. Palme Dutt, on whom he places unbounded faith, I beg leave to remind him that after Gandhiji's death, Mr. Palme Dutt wrote:

"Gandhi's death, in a manner of speaking symbolized all the contradictions of his life. The apostle of 'simple life', he died in the princely mansion of the most ruthless arch-profiteering multi-millionaire of the new Indian ruling moneyed class. The apostle of 'non-violence', he died a victim of the hideous orgy of murder and gang-ridden violence which was in part the nemesis of a quarter century's preaching of 'non-violence' frustrating the revolutionary energy of the masses."

Does Dr. Tara Chand accept this statement of Mr. Palme Dutt with as much assurance as he did the other? If not, why? For, in answer to Shri Sudhir Ghosh's remark that Mr. Palme

[Shri J. C. Chatterji]
Dutt was a Communist, Dr. Tara Chand retorted:

"Therefore, it (i.e., Mr. Palme Dutt's views) should be a better evidence of how things were taken than any statement by non-Communists."

However, even Mr. Palme Dutt does not support Dr. Tara Chand's sweeping remark that our struggle for independence was a middle-class movement, for the last sentence of Mr. Palme Dutt's statement, which Dr. Tara Chand quoted, is:

"The role of the masses in the national movement, alike of the peasantry and of the new forces of the industrial working class, emerged only after the war of 1914-18".

I fail to understand how this sentence supports Dr. Tara Chand's thesis. The gigantic mass movements for our freedom fight took place after the First World War, viz., the 1921 movement, 1930 movement, 1942 movement and the great I.N.A. movement of 1944-45. Similarly, I fail to understand how he could quote a statement of the Prime Minister that some rules we follow are borrowed from the British Constitution, in order to support his statement that India gained freedom under British tutelage.

Sir, Dr. Tara Chand's replies were frivolous replies, not to put it any stronger. But I was surprised when, in reply to my enquiry, he said that if I had looked into the book, I would have found the reference to his statement that wives could be sold by auction in England. Dr. Tara Chand says that in the footnote the authority given is Mr. R. A. Phillip, Georgian Scrap Book. I repeat my former charge that the reference is not given. The footnote relates to the previous sentence. For this scurrilous remark about a friendly country, I demand that proper reference be given.

Dr. Tara Chand's attempt to explain away the bungling about *Ashtadhyayi* is ingenious, namely—

"Anybody who is familiar with Sanskrit knows that *Amarakosha* was written by Amar Singh, that it could not have been written by Panini."

Quite true; but it is people who are not familiar with Sanskrit who would misunderstand and also write as Dr. Tara Chand has done, and even in the second attempt could not reproduce the name of Amara's dictionary—*Nama-linganusasana*.

Dr. Tara Chand seems to have taken objection to my pointing out that *Jimutavahana* and *Raghuṇandana* are names of persons and not of books. He says that if I had referred to page 209 I would have found that—

"It has been stated there that they are human beings."

So, if one writes that the *Koran* and *Hadis* are the names of two persons, he need not feel at all ashamed, if elsewhere he has chanced to mention them as books. I had pointed out that *Riti* does not mean erotics. Dr. Tara Chand says it does in Hindi; but while doing so he quoted a Sanskrit verse, which he claimed was from the *Sahitya Darpan*. Unfortunately, I could not find the verse in the *Sahitya Darpan*, but found it in Apte's Dictionary.

I took objection to Dr. Tara Chand's statement that in the 18th century India passed under the sway of Britain. Dr. Tara Chand has supported his statement by including the wars which took place in 1803 to 1805 also in the 18th century. And what he conveniently omits to mention is that another war had to be fought during 1817-18 before the English sway could be established over the Maratha empire. It was also primarily as a result of this war that the Rajput states, which had hitherto been controlled by

the Sindhua and Holkar came under British sway

Now, as admitted by Dr Tara Chand in reply to my criticism, Punjab and Sind were outside British 'sway' in the 18th century. I have just now shown that a large part of western and central India, a very large part indeed, was outside the British sway in the 18th century. Therefore, I took very strong objection to Dr Chand's statement—it is the opening sentence of his work—that "In the 18th century India passed under the sway of Britain." And, Sir, I must add that a man who can place the events of 1803–1805 in the 18th century, and then omit the third Maratha war to prove his thesis, is either out to prove some preconceived notion or has not sufficient grasp over the details of Indian history.

Dr Tara Chand denied my charge that he had quoted Adam Smith in support of mercantilism. I find, however, from the "Economic Weekly" of April 1, 1961 that it has also come to the same conclusion, that is Dr Tara Chand has quoted Adam Smith to explain mercantilism, and has further hinted that Dr Tara Chand has apparently confused mercantilism with mercantile capitalism. Apparently, therefore, his manner of writing leads to much misunderstanding even among economists.

Dr Tara Chand in the course of his reply several times berated me by stressing that what he has written is accepted by every historian. Since then his book—I refuse to call it History of Freedom Movement—has been the subject of most severe criticism by one hon. Member of the Lok Sabha out of the three, who also happens to be a brilliant historian. Another historian has also severely criticised it in the weekly "Organizer" of March 27. He is Dr R C Majumdar. I hope therefore, that now at least Dr Tara Chand will not

try to justify his baseless conclusions by claiming that all historians, and particularly "those who have treated the history of India from the sociological and economic point of view" will bear him out. It is apparent that he alone is responsible for putting forth these views based on a misreading of Indian history and insufficient understanding of Marxist literature. I, therefore, again urge that this book should be forthwith withdrawn from circulation.

Sir, Mr Dahyabhai Patel has mentioned in his speech about the origin of the idea of writing of this history, and as both Dr Tara Chand and the hon. Minister have stated, it was taken up by the hon. Education Minister of that time, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. But it has been challenged by Dr R C Majumdar and he has said in his statement that it was done under the influence of Dr Rajendra Prasad, the President of India, and that fact has been suppressed. I would like to point out two things about the book—if I get time, I shall say more things. We have seen that it is a very big volume covering many pages, but everybody has criticised that it does not come to the point of history of the freedom fight in India. The real subject has not even been touched but a big volume has been produced. That is why I do not know what the ultimate result would be and how it has been declared before this House that the whole thing will be completed in three volumes, that is, two more volumes will come out. How the whole thing can be covered in these two volumes of the same size I do not understand. So, we must be careful to see that the real history is written in a proper way, and this cannot be done in the way that it has been taken up so far.

Another point I would like to raise. The materials collected in the National Archives should be thrown open to scholars and it must not be delayed by another two years as has

[Shri J. C. Chatterji]

been declared before this House. That is why we are finding so much difficulty in giving our criticisms about this volume of work. What is the result? Had these materials been thrown open to the scholars generally, by this time many things would have come out, and out of them people could get much information about the freedom movement of the country. But it is being suppressed that way. That is why I say, let Government work be done but at the same time let the materials collected in the Archives be thrown open to the general scholars and historians.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Resolution by Shri Dahyabhai Patel suggests that a committee of eminent historians be appointed to assist in the work that has already been undertaken. But the entire discussion and even the speech of the hon. mover of the Resolution have centred round the book that has recently come out, the author of which is an hon. Member of our House.

The question of Indian history, not only the history of our freedom movement, but also the ordinary history for our school children, has been engaging the attention of our national movement since the time when we were being given histories by British authors—eminent, of course, but at the same time motivated by a special desire to educate the children in a particular manner. Now, that we are free and we have control over the resources that go to open the material that will be of help in writing the history of the freedom movement, how is it that our steps are halting? I know of my own ex-Hyderabad State—and I think that steps have been taken in other States also—and the Governments have appointed committees to collect material about the history of the various movements that led to India's freedom. I do not think that much is being drawn from those

materials that have been collected. Even the earlier history that has come out at the time of the Centenary of the 1857 Movement written by Dr. Sen, a Government of India publication, does not draw upon the entire material that has been collected by the various agencies in our country including the State Governments and the committees appointed by them. That is why there was a criticism of that book also, amongst other criticisms, that it does not take into account the movement in South India at the time of 1857 when the revolt took place. So, any history, if it is attempted by individuals however eminent they may be, even if they are assisted by two or three more eminent historians, will not be free from lapses. Why? It is because ultimately you leave the processing of the material and the conclusions to one individual and therein lies the entire mistake.

Now, what has got to be done is that the entire thing has to be discussed at least on two occasions. At first the entire frame of the book is discussed when the material at hand is processed and then one person can draft it. But the draft should also be discussed again by some board or by the same board so that the conclusions are as far as possible collective and they do not go either to embarrass the people or to antagonise them.

In fact personally speaking, I began reading Indian history only after I had graduated in medicine. The history I read was by Thompson or by Vincent Smith. We know how much nonsense there is even in the big book of history written by Vincent Smith. Even in those days could we not find British authors who have given certain objective readings of some material? Yes, For example, I have gone through that huge book by Robert Sewell on the Vijayanagara Empire. There is good material in

it but I cannot be guided by the conclusions of Robert Sewell. I cannot be guided by his entire approach—may be it may be a scholarly approach, but it cannot be considered as a very very dispassionate approach. Similarly, in those days many eminent Indian historians tried to write books on Indian history. We have read for example, Sir Jadunath Sarkar's book on Indian history, his book on Aurangzeb and so many others. So many historians have attempted to make a proper appraisal of Indian history, in their own way they have done it. My complaint is this. Why, after Indian freedom, are our historians quiet? And why is it that the Government of free India does not yoke the historians to fulfil this task? Every university in our country has a Department of History, a Chair. They do a lot of work on history. Every State Government has got its various materials. Why should not the Government come out by making all the archives open to all the historians? Historians can go there, professors of history in the universities can go there and all those who want to be of assistance in this process can go there. We can really have a proper discussion of the evidence that they have collected, discuss the material that is in our possession, and even the entire conclusions can be made open for discussions. And then only can we come to a proper attitude towards our history.

We need a history to properly assess our past, we need a history to properly understand our past and this understanding must propel us forward to future achievements. That is exactly the need for our history. We need our history to know what our forefathers have done or achieved, we need a history of our people. Individuals have played some role, good as well as bad. Hyderabad—I am referring to my own place obviously—is known to other people, people outside Hyderabad, only through the Nizam and Salar Jung I who helped

the British to suppress the 1857 revolt. It was not known till recently how the armed forces in Hyderabad had revolted against that very Nizam. People were killed, murdered, on the spot. And today, after freedom, we have named our streets after those martyrs. Much more was not known till recently. Only later on when the State Government of Hyderabad appointed a committee, a lot of material had been found and much of the material that is available is by British liberately distorted certain historical liberately distorted certain historical actions and processes.

Therefore, the very approach towards history was an incorrect approach. The whole thing should have been one of collecting material, processing this and of coming to certain conclusions after certain collective deliberations and then the writing of it could not be so difficult. For example, everything must have two aspects. We'll take the Maratha revolt. If anybody wants to tell me that the Maratha revolt was something like the French Revolution, I will not agree because the Maratha revolt against the feudalism of Aurangzeb was not like the French Revolution which was against the feudalists of that country, because, obviously, the Maratha revolt did not give land to the peasant as the French Revolution did. So, there must have been certain negative features of the Maratha revolt also. At the same time there were positive aspects of it. So, a proper balancing of these various events have to be taken into consideration. At the same time a proper language will have to be adopted. Adjectives, epithets, may have to be avoided because we have to work for the integration of our country. There must be a historical understanding of the various processes that have taken place in the country in the past. Well, they may be part of an overall movement but at the same time they have their own individual features. In this very book

[Dr R B Gour]

Cornwalis has been dealt with Cornwalis's introduction of the legal system. Here again my feeling is that the understanding is a little lopsided. The introduction of the legal system by Cornwalis has been seen only in the background of the earlier system where the law of the king was in operation. But how this itself generates certain negative features is not properly assessed. It is a very difficult task no doubt.

There has been a criticism by my friend, Dr Bose, that the Wahabi movement was not mentioned here and all that. Everything has not been discussed throughout his book. It does not deal with the Indian reaction to British rule; it deals with the negative features of the Indian society which made India weak and allowed the British to snatch away our freedom. So, this book, in spite of its 400 pages deals with 3 P.M. only one aspect because obviously I will be

DR H N KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh). But what is the wrong that is there? You make a demand but what is wrong with the first volume dealing only with the causes that enabled the British to establish their rule in this country?

DR R B GOUR. I am not quarrelling with that particular thing, but what I say is that if you emphasise only this aspect, then it will be difficult for you to explain how the positive features arose in fighting the British subsequently, because the 1857 revolt did not suddenly crop up. The positive features must have been there in the past also. Otherwise, only the negative aspects will not be able to explain how it suddenly arose. So, you should strike a balance. There were snags no doubt. For example, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his "Discovery of India" has said that had Akbar—I may be over-simplifying it, or Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had over-simplified it—started a printing

press in our country, probably an industrial revolution would have taken place in India before it took place in England or France—I do not know, I may be over-simplifying it. But here is really a negative feature but at the same time an assessment of the whole economy. There I think I am right. I have gone through that book. So, this problem has to be properly analysed. There were positive features also. You will not be able to explain the 1772 revolts in India, of the peasants in South India. You will not be able to explain the Santhal revolts, because these were positive reactions against British rule which was ruining our economy and pauperising our people. As I said, there was the Santhal revolt against the Sowcars. Well, if you paint the Santhals, against the Sowcars and money-lenders, then you will be distorting the entire process of history. If you take the great famine prior to, I think 1875 or 1872 and the revolt, you will be distorting the entire process if you say that that revolt was merely for bread—butter was out of question it was only bread—that there was famine and that led to the pauperisation of the entire peasantry. The whole thing has to be analysed in the background of British penetration in our country. Therefore, the negative features of our society have to be seen and properly analysed because, obviously without these negative features we would not have lost our freedom. But at the same time the positive reactions of the masses against the various manifestations of the economic situation that was developing have to be assessed and noted down. Otherwise, the future task will be very difficult.

Then Sir, one more thing I want to suggest is this. Well, in any case one individual's personal opinion should not count, he should not be given this whole responsibility and after all this whole thing has to be properly gone into. Ultimately, does his suggestion help us? I do not know. At the present moment Mr Dahyabhai

Patel is asking us to appoint a committee I do not know how it will help at this moment But at the same time this problem must be very carefully gone into In my opinion, Mr Deputy Chairman, so far as this book goes, a lot of material has been collected, a lot of labour has been expended on it and much has been done But at the same time, Sir, some conclusions some remarks—well, they are really not very palatable—may not stand a certain scientific scrutiny That is why I think the criticism that is going on all over the country will have to be very seriously taken and a proper history, not only of our past but also of the freedom movement, has to be compiled For example, there is the small book by Sardar Panikkar, "Survey of Indian History" I think that book helped me much more in understanding something of our past history than anything that I had read in my school days.

DR. H N KUNZRU: Written by one man, not by a committee

DR R B GOUR Does not matter But Sardar Panikkar's book is not a Government of India publication I can criticise that book I can say anything against that book A Government of India publication cannot be Sardar Panikkar's publication or Dr Tara Chand's publication When the Government of India undertakes the project, it must see that the whole thing is properly assessed and discussed, and the conclusions properly drawn Of course, Sardar Panikkar will be able to answer all the criticism that is made against him But the Government of India cannot answer for everything that is written in this book Then why the Government of India comes into the picture? And if the Government of India comes into the picture, then it should come in a proper form and in a proper manner If the Government of India spends money on it, then it has to do it in a proper way Sardar

Panikkar's book is not discussed in Parliament

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN It is time, Dr Gour

DR R B GOUR This is the point, Mr Deputy Chairman, that if the Government of India comes into the picture, it must come in a proper manner, and see that things are done in a proper way

श्री श्रीलभद्र याजी माननीय डिप्टी चैयर-
मैन महोदय, मैं डाह्याभाई पटेल जी को बहुत बहुत बन्धुवाद देता हूँ कि वे इस तरह का प्रस्ताव लाये कि जो हमारा आजादी का इतिहास लिखा जा रहा है उस में जो हिन्दुस्तान के महाहूर इतिहास लेखक हैं और जो बड़े बड़े प्रकाश पंडित हैं, वे मदद दें। प्रस्ताव, मैं समझता हूँ, बहुत सीधा है और सरकार को इस के मानने में कोई उज्र नहीं होना चाहिये। अंग्रेजी में एक कहावत है "Morning shows the day." जो अभी किताब निकली है, उस किताब के बारे में जैसी टीका टिप्पणी की जा रही है, उसमें लेखक महोदय जो ० डा० तारा चन्द हैं उन की इतनी गलती नहीं है, वे सब चीजों के वेता नहीं हैं। वे इतिहास जानने वाले हैं, लेकिन अब इन्सानो से गलती होती है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में उन से भी भयकर भयकर गलतियाँ जरूर हुई हैं। इसलिए उन को मदद देने के लिये कहा जा रहा है। अभी तो एक पार्ट निकला है। जो बाद में आजादी की लड़ाई हुई, अभी उस का जिक्र तक नहीं है। फर्स्ट वार आफ इंडियेस में ले कर अंग्रेज कैसे मैटिल हुए, अभी इतना ही उस में है। कांग्रेस के नेतृत्व में, कांग्रेस के अन्दर जितनी पोलिटिकल पार्टियाँ थी, गदर पार्टी, बाबा पार्टी, कीर्ति पार्टी, आजाद हिन्द फौज और नेवी का जो गदर हुआ, इन सब के बारे में अभी लिखना बाकी है, और जो बड़े बड़े प्रकाश पंडित लोग हैं, स्कालर हैं, इतिहास वेता

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

हैं, उन की मदद लेने के लिये अगर सरकार तैयार नहीं है तो सरकार की वही गति होगी जो हा रही है कि जो वक्ता उठता है वही सरकार पर और लेखक पर दोषारोपण कर रहा है। इसलिये जो इतिहास के बड़े बड़े लेखक हैं उन की अगर मदद नहीं ली गई तो बहुत सी बातें श्रवणी रह जायेगी। आगे जा कर ते किस तरह का इतिहास लिखा जायेगा, वह इतिहास जो हमारी भावी संतति पढ़ेगी, उनकी क्या ओपिनियन होगी, उनकी क्या राय होगी, इसको पहले से जान लेना सरकार के लिये जरूरी है।

कोई प्रस्ताव आता है तो सरकार इधर उधर देखने लगती है, सोचने लगती है, विचारने लगती है कि कितना खर्चा होगा तो खर्चें ता होंगे ही। मेरी समझ से जो इतिहास जानने वाले हैं, जो बड़े बड़े स्कालर और पंडित हैं उनकी मदद लेने की तो बात कही गई है, लेकिन आजादी की तहरीक में जिन लोगों ने हिस्सा लिया है उन की भी मदद ली जानी चाहिये। यह बड़ी खूशी की बात है कि इस पीढ़ी में से जो बड़े बड़े आजादी के योधा लोग हैं, सब अभी मौजूद हैं, उनमें से भी कुछ ऐसे लोगों से मदद ली जानी चाहिये जिनको सब बातों की जानकारी है। वास्तव में कांग्रेस का इतिहास ही आजादी का इतिहास है और डा० पट्टाभिसीतारमैया की किताब से भी उनको बहुत मदद मिल सकती है, लेकिन डा० गोड ने ठीक ही कहा है कि किस तरह से इन सब चीजों को रखा जाये और उन से काबूलजान निगाला जाये, इस पर राय देने के लिये इतिहास के बड़े बड़े जानकारों की मदद ली जानी चाहिये। मैं जानता हूँ कि शायद सरकार इस प्रस्ताव को कबूल करने नहीं जा रही है लेकिन मैं सरकार को चेतावनी देता हूँ कि यदि सरकार ने इस को कबूल नहीं किया या वह इस राय को कबूल नहीं करती है तो

फिर हमारे डा० तारा चन्द जी ने जो इस तरह का चीज बनाई है उसके लिये सरकार पर इसी तरह से प्रहार होगा। इसलिये सरकार को बहुत सोच समझ कर इस बारे में निश्चय करना चाहिये और उस का सिर्फ एक नकारात्मक रुख नहीं होना चाहिये। जब कोई इस तरह का प्रस्ताव आता है तो यह कहने का एक कायदा सा हो गया है कि इसमें बहुत खर्चा हो जायेगा और इसकी क्या जरूरत है और इस काम में जितने लोग हैं सब प्रकांड पंडित हैं। प्रकांड पंडित के हाथ से जो चीज लिखी गई है उस का क्या हाल हुआ है यह नजारा हम लोगों ने देख लिया है। हमारे पूर्व वक्ता ने बताया कि सभाल विद्रोह का जिक्र नहीं हुआ है और इन्होंने किम हारह से मराठा हिस्ट्री का जिक्र किया है। तो यह तमाम चीजे इस में हैं। जो असली आजादी की लड़ाई है, जो असली आजादी की लड़ाई की तवारीख है वह तो अभी लिखी जाने वाली है, उस का जो हिस्सा है वह तो अभी आने वाला है। इसलिये अपने मंत्री महोदय से मैं बहुत पुरजोर अपील करूंगा कि इस चीज को कबूल कर लेने में सरकार की भलाई है और यदि सरकार इस को कबूल नहीं करती है तो इस हाउस में एक योगेश चन्द्र चटर्जी नहीं बल्कि न मालूम कितने योगेशचन्द्र चटर्जी तैयार होंगे क्योंकि हम लोगों को वह चीज खटकेगी, जिन लोगों ने कांग्रेस के अन्दर जितनी पार्टिया थीं उन में रह कर आजादी की तहरीक में हिस्सा लिया है उन को यह चीज खटकेगी कि आजादी का इतिहास ठीक तरह से नहीं लिखा जा रहा है और उस का भावी संतति पर बुरा असर पड़ेगा। इसलिये इस काम में ऐसे जानकार लोगों के रहने की जरूरत है।

मैं लेखक महोदय की समालोचना नहीं करता, उनकी कोई व्यक्तिगत समालोचना करने की जरूरत नहीं है, उनका भी इतिहास से सम्बन्ध है, वह भी जो इतिहास के जानने

वाले है उनमें से है लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में इतिहास तो बहुत से लिखे गये हैं और दूसरी तरह के लिखे हुए हैं और इसलिये यह बात हुई। पंडित मुन्दरलाल ने भारत में अंग्रेजी राज का कैसा बढ़िया इतिहास लिखा। तो इतिहास लिखने का हमारा जो दृष्टिकोण होना चाहिये वह राष्ट्रीय होना चाहिये और अब तो वह दृष्टिकोण अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय भी है और अब सम जवादी भी है। हा यह जरूर है कि बहुत से लोगो ने मार्क्सवादी खयल का हवल देते हुए हमारी आजादी की बहुत सी लड़ाई को बूर्जुवा मूवमेंट कहा है लेकिन आजादी के लिये डेमोक्रेटिक बूर्जुवा रेवोल्यूशन की भी जरूरत थी और इसके बाद समाजवादी रेवोल्यूशन की भी जरूरत थी। १८५७ में जो प्रथम आजादी की लड़ाई हुई उसको कुछ लोग विद्रोह और बगावत कहते हैं लेकिन हम तो उसको आजादी की प्रथम जंग कहते हैं और सही मानो में कहते हैं। तो उस वक़्त से ले कर जब कि ब्रिटिश का पलायन हुआ तब तक का इतिहास अभी बाकी है और उसके लिये जानकार लोग होने चाहिये।

भूपेण गुप्ता जी की जो बात है वह तो चोर की दाढ़ी में निनका वाली बात है और वह समझते हैं कि इसमें कुछ पालिटिशियन रहेंगे और कुछ दूसरे लोग रहेंगे तो फिर अपनी तरह से बात करेंगे। भूपेण गुप्ता जी इसको जरूर जानते हैं कि आजादी की लड़ाई का श्रीगणेश यदि किसी ने किया तो वह कांग्रेस के नेतृत्व में ही किया है और जितनी भी वामपक्षी पार्टियां थीं वे सब कांग्रेस के अन्दर थीं। आजादी की लड़ाई में उनका क्या क्या काट्रीब्यूशन रहा और वह कैसा रहा यह मैं नहीं कहूंगा और बेवक़्त की शहनाई का बाजा नहीं बजाऊंगा लेकिन इतना तो जरूर है कि कांग्रेस ने ही आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी थी और इसी के साथ-साथ गदर पार्टी के या और

दूसरी पार्टियों के जो इतने बड़े-बड़े लोग थे जो कि दूसरे देशों में जा-जा कर आजादी की लड़ाई को मदद करते थे वे थे। कांग्रेस के नेतृत्व में ही किसान मूवमेंट हुआ, किसानों की तहरीक हुई, मजदूरों की तहरीक हुई जिससे कि लोगों में बेदारी आई, जागृति हुई और हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई बढ़ती गई। कांग्रेस के अन्दर जो पार्टियां थी उन्होंने इसमें हिस्सा लिया और उसमें हमारे बड़े-बड़े नेता थे, जैसे कि हमारे मुभाष चन्द्र बोस जैसे नेता थे। उन जैसे एक आदमी का हममें क्या काट्रीब्यूशन हुआ और उनकी पार्टी का क्या काट्रीब्यूशन हुआ यह सब इसमें आना चाहिये। उम्फाल से ले कर, कोहिमा से ले कर मिंगापुर तक २,६०० मील में बड़ी बड़ी आजादी की लड़ाई हुई जिसमें कि ५० हजार के करीब अंग्रेज मारे गये और २५, २६ हजार आई०एन०ए० के लोग मारे गये और उसके बाद नैवी पर, एयरफोर्स पर इसका क्या असर हुआ और उसकी वजह से ब्रिटिश को जल्दी जल्दी भगना पड़ा जब कि वह कई वर्ष तक भागने वाले नहीं थे। लेकिन उन्होंने समझा कि अब जो गोली लगने वाली है वह काली चमड़ी पर नहीं लगेगी बल्कि गोरी चमड़ी पर लगेगी। तो इन तमाम चीजों का जिक्र तभी हो सकता है जब कि इसमें जानकार लोग हों। मैं समझता हूं कि अभी जिस तरह में इतिहास लिखा जा रहा है वह सही इतिहास नहीं है और यदि सही इतिहास नहीं होगा तो हमारी भावी संतति पर इसका बुरा असर पड़ेगा। इसलिये मैं सरकार से गुजारिश करूंगा कि वह इसको कबूल कर लें।

श्री डाह्याभाई पटेल उस पार्टी में है जो कि एक बड़ी रिएक्शनरी पार्टी है, एक बड़ी प्रतिगामी पार्टी है और जो कि समाजवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई लड़ेगी लेकिन उनका यह जो प्रस्ताव है वह अच्छा है और उन्होंने कम से कम एक सही चीज़ आज सामने रखी

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

है। इसके लिये हम उनको दाद देने है कि कम से कम एक अच्छी चीज तो ला कर रखी जिससे कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी का सही नक्शा सामने आ जाये और इसके लिये जो जानकार लोग हैं, इतिहासकार है, प्रकाश पंडित हैं उनकी मदद ली जाये। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इसे सरकार को भी मजूर करना चाहिये और हाउस को भी मजूर करना चाहिये और इसमें कोई आनाकानी करने की जरूरत नहीं है।

अभी लेखक महोदय पर, तारा चन्द जी पर जो प्रहार हुआ उसके बारे में मुझे यही कहना है कि मैं समझता हूँ कि वह इतिहास को वैसा ही जानने वाले है जैसा कि लोग पुराने जमाने का इतिहास जानते थे तो फिर इनका क्या है। अगर इसमें योगेश चन्द्र चटर्जी टाइप के लोग लगे रहते तो फिर जो थोड़ी सी गलती इसमें हुई है वह न होती। मैं मानता हूँ कि जरूर गलती हुई है और मैं समझता हूँ कि आगे भी होने वाली है क्योंकि जिनका आजादी की लड़ाई से मतलब नहीं, सरोकार नहीं, जो उसको जानते नहीं वह हमारी आजादी का इतिहास क्या लिखेंगे। उनको लिखना भी नहीं आता है और न वह उसको जानते हैं और न उसमें उनका कोई पार्टिसिपेशन है, इसलिये वह उस निगाह से लिख ही नहीं सकते हैं। इसलिये जरूरी है कि उस तरह का लिखने वाला हो, उस तरह का पंडित हो जो कि आजादी की लड़ाई में रहा हो और जानता हो कि हिन्दुस्तान की तमाम आजादी की लड़ाई कैसे लड़ी गई, किसान मजदूरों की लड़ाई किस तरह लड़ी गई, किस तरह से ब्रिटिश का पलायन हुआ और किस किस ने इस लड़ाई में बिट्रियल किया, विश्वासघात किया। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जानकार लोगों का रचना सारी चीजों का बढ़िया तरीके से जिक्र करने

के लिये जरूरी है और इसलिये मैं इस प्रस्ताव का तहेदिल से समर्थन करता हूँ और सरकार से भी गुजारिश करता हूँ कि वह इस प्रस्ताव को मान ले। यों तो प्रस्ताव नहीं मानने की सरकार की आदत है लेकिन इसको मानने की जरूरत है और नहीं मानेगी तो माननीय डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहब मैं यह भविष्यवाणी करता हूँ कि सरकार की भी गुड्डी उड़ेगी और लेखक महोदय की भी गुड्डी उड़ेगी। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ।

DR NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal) Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, when I came to the House this morning I did not think that I should be participating in the deliberations on this Resolution. But having heard quite a number of my friends and colleagues in this House, I felt that being a student of history if I did not say anything I would be doing injustice to myself.

Sir, I am happy that my esteemed friend, Shri Dahyabhai Patel, placed this Resolution before the House for discussion, happy because this is an occasion that gives us an opportunity to discuss a matter of history, to discuss a cultural subject. Such occasions are very rare, and I am thankful to him for having given us a full day for such a discussion.

DR R B GOUR He wanted a business-like discussion.

DR NIHAR RANJAN RAY but I do not see the point unfortunately for myself. In his Resolution what does he seek to do? The Resolution states

"That this House is of opinion that a Committee of eminent historians and scholars should be appointed to assist in the speedy completion of the work on the history of freedom movement in India."

"To assist in which manner and how to assist? Is he thinking in terms of a board of editors consisting of eminent historians and scholars or is he thinking of rendering the narrator, Dr. Tara Chand, the assistance that he needs? What does he actually mean? His intention is not very clear in the motion itself. Then he, says: "the speedy completion of the work on the history of freedom movement". The word "speedy" is a dangerous word. In what speed? Does he want a board of editors or a committee or the narrator himself to produce it in one year, two years or three years? What does he actually want? Having asked somebody to write a history, having given him the materials, you just goad him on and say, 'You must produce this volume within such and such period'. I do not know, Dr. Tara Chand may be capable of it. If somebody was just on my shoulders goading me on to write pages after pages and finish a particular book at a particular time, I would refuse to do it. Therefore so far as the motion itself is concerned, I am not in sympathy with it.

Then having heard most of the speakers, I feel that the speeches were made not so much on the motion itself as on the first volume of the "History of Freedom Movement in India" that has recently been published by the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs of the Government of India. Much has been said about this book and much has been written about it also in the Press. I am not in the least worried about Dr. Tara Chand's book. This is the first volume perhaps, first book on the history of the freedom movement. Many such books will be written. I have no doubt that within a decade, Dr. Tara Chand's book will be superseded by many other volumes on the history of freedom movement in India. Most of the points made in respect of the book itself have been more or less in respect of the interpretations, the attitudes and approaches of Dr. Tara

Chand. A writer, a historian, has a right to his personal interpretation, has a right to his attitudes and approaches. One may or may not agree with them. Scholars and historians that will follow him may have much to quarrel with him and take up issues with him but all that the readers have a right to expect of any conscientious historian or scholar is a correct narration of facts. The points made, most of them, had no relevance to facts but, as I said, I am not worried about Dr. Tara Chand's book. Dr. Tara Chand is big enough to take care of himself but what I object to is that certain statements have been made in this House which are very disturbing for any historian and if that be the representative attitude of our legislators, then I am afraid, very few conscientious scholars and historians would be agreeable to write under the auspices of Government. The first is, my very esteemed friend quoted or brought out certain facts and interpretation of facts by Dr. Tara Chand in respect of the history of the Marathas. I felt very disturbed having heard him. If an objective historian, having analysed the facts of history, cannot say what he feels in the light of facts, whether it be the Bengalees or the Marathas, then better not ask for historians at all. I have done a little bit in respect of the History of Bengal and there, wherever I found from facts that our forefathers or our ancestors were at fault, I did not hesitate to castigate my own people. If historians cannot do that, if scholars cannot do that, then good-bye to truth, good-bye to *Satyameva Jayate*.

It has also been said that those who participated in the freedom struggle, those who participated in the movements should also be associated with the writing of the history of freedom movement. Participation in the freedom struggle is one thing, writing of the history of that struggle itself is altogether a different thing.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE
Just like that of Dr Tara Chand

DR NIHAR RANJAN RAY A man
may be in the forefront of any move-
ment but he may be the worst writer
of the history of that movement

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE
Question

DR NIHAR RANJAN RAY This
has been voiced by more than one
person in this House that the partici-
pants in the struggle for freedom
should be associated with it They
are quite at liberty to leave their
memoirs, they are quite at liberty to
report their experiences and leave
them behind for posterity but it is not
for them to write the history of the
movement Even Mr Churchill wrote
out the memories of the wars in which
he took part He did not dare to write
the history of the World Wars

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE
He wrote the memoirs of the World
Wars not the history of freedom
movement

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY
Fighters for freedom may not be good
writers of the history of the freedom
movements But my main point is
that we really want academic detach-
ment and objectivity It is true that
the Indian Historical Records Com-
mission first thought of the project
and they passed a resolution that such
a history should be prepared Then
the Government in the Ministry of
Education, took it up They appointed
a Board, collected a mass of material
which was indeed, really a very valu-
able work but having done that, what
they did was this Prof Kabir, in his
Preface, gives the whole history as to
how the project originated He says

"The Board rendered very useful
service but it soon became clear
that an *ad hoc* body set up on a
temporary basis could not complete
the work of collecting the necessary

material, still less prepare a uni-
fied history by sifting and interpret-
ing the data It included both aca-
demic historians and active politi-
cians and the differences in their
approach were seen even at the
stage of collection of data These
differences became still more mark-
ed when it came to interpreting the
material that had already been
collected"

And then comes this sentence

"It was therefore decided to
transfer the work of further collec-
tion to the National Archives and of
interpretation and narration to one
single scholar of distinction"

The question of individual author-
ship *versus* collective authorship of
official histories has been raised
This is a very important point At
one stage the Government decided
that the narrator should be one and
single person Now, when the mate-
rial had been collected individual
scholars, if they have access to that
material, can take upon themselves to
write the history The question is
whether it is correct to have one
narrator or is it correct to give it to
a collective authorship, that is to say,
appoint a board of editors hand over
the materials to that board and ask
them to sift the materials and then
write a history, a comprehensive his-
tory In fact, my hon friend over
there the doctor, has pointed out that
this question of writing an official
history is a thing of the past I think
he is correct My hon friend Dr
Bose said that when we wanted to
have an official history, we could
have an official history of the army,
of the railways, of the trade-unions
and so on and so forth But to have
an official history of the national
movement, I don't think, is a correct
policy And even then, if we are to
have it it would have been better, I
believe, if we had left it to collective
authorship

Even then I have a more fundamental difference. So far as the first volume and the second volume of the history of the freedom movement are concerned, we have no difficulty. Up till the year 1906, 1908 or even 1910, we are so far away from the events that we have that objectivity and that detachment of outlook to see the facts of history without passion and without any kind of prejudice. But when you come to this side of the year 1910, to the years 1910, 1911, 1912 onwards, we find that most of the leaders and workers who participated in that struggle are still in the land of the living. Those of us who dabble in history have a very close memory of events and incidents. Personally speaking, I have very strong subjective impressions in respect of everything that happened in India since 1918, 1919 and after, and in certain phases of the movement, not as a student of history, but as a humble political worker I took part. Therefore, if I want to write a book, I cannot have that objectivity and detachment in respect of things of which I was in a way part and parcel. Therefore, to write of the recent events, from 1915, 1917, 1918 onwards, would be very difficult for any mature historian today. By the very nature of human psychology, of human mind, of human emotions and so on, one cannot have that perspective of things. We are so very near the things and events, that we cannot have that distant perspective which is so very necessary for the developing of that kind of detachment. Therefore, when this question was mooted, someone in charge of it, I believe, it was in 1956 or 1957, I don't remember exactly, approached me to associate myself with this work in the regional committee, I asked: How far are you coming? Are you coming later than 1910, to 1917, 1918, 1919 and so on? And the answer was: Yes, we must come up to 1947. I say, as a student of history, for whatever it is worth, that I do not believe in attempting to write this history on this side of 1910, dealing

with 1911, 1917, 1918 and so on. We have not that perspective yet. That is why I say what the Government should do is this. They have collected a very good part of the data. They have collected an amount of relevant materials. Other materials will be collected, I am sure. Let them collect those materials. And we can do something more. Publish them, volume by volume as calendars, subject by subject, topic by topic. Leave it in the archives. If you print them and publish them, let all the libraries have them. Let the libraries purchase them and then historians will take advantage of all these materials, sift them, process them and write history. We cannot write the history of our own generation. It is the future generation that should pronounce judgment on this generation. Are we going to scratch our own backs? Are we going to write the history of this generation to which we belong? It cannot be done. We can only leave memoirs. We can only leave our records and subjective impressions of our times. These will form the materials and facts for history in a future date. Therefore, I would still plead with the Government that we should not attempt at this stage to write the history of the freedom movement in India for the period ranging from 1910 to 1947. This is my humble request for whatever it is worth, for your consideration.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I for one fail to understand either the volume or the severity of the criticism that has been offered against the "History of the Freedom Movement in India" by my honourable friend Dr. Tara Chand. I consider it a very fine piece of work. A fact here and a fact there may be wrong; an expression here and an expression there may not be quite

[Shri N. Venkateswara Rao.]

happy; a conclusion here and a conclusion there may not be fully justified; but, by and large, I repeat, this is a fine piece of historical work. What has impressed me most is its basic approach to the problem which it has sought to study and interpret. I am no less a patriot than my honourable friends who have been criticising this book, simply because it has some unsavoury facts and some unflattering conclusions to place before us. Well, not only in India, but in every nation, we see periods when it has attained supreme heights of glory and achievement, and other periods when it has sunk rather low. You find, Sir, such a cycle of high tide and low ebb in the history of almost every nation in the world. Why, then, should we be ashamed if we have to acknowledge the hard fact, though it may be unpleasant, that round about the 18th century our nation reached one of its low ebbs? The British conquered our country not because they were strong but because we were weak. They conquered us with our men and our money. They came here as traders, with no idea of conquest, but, having come here, they found us quarrelling amongst ourselves, they found our economy stagnant, our society superstitious, our outlook supine and our philosophy of life sterile and so they found to their own surprise that they could play the role of conquerors. A handful of merchants who did not even have the background of military training found it easy to conquer a whole sub-continent. If some of these basic facts are brought out clearly in this volume, I fail to understand why we should feel irritated, why we should feel angered about it. I believe, Sir, that a nation or a people that has not the courage to face truth, however unpleasant, is not fit to have a good future, let alone a grand and glorious future.

Sir, the speeches made by hon. Members in this House reminded me

very strongly of a passage that I read in a book by Al beruni, the Savant and Seeker after truth, who visited our country round about the 10th century A.D. He says that he found our forbears feeling that their country was the greatest in the world, that their social order was the greatest in the world, that their religion was the greatest in the world, that their thought, their philosophy, in fact everything about them, was the greatest in the world. He says that he found them having a closed mind, he found them arrogant. I believe, Sir, that a nation which has a closed mind and which feels arrogant either about its past or its present, cannot hope to have a great future.

No doubt, Sir, there are, as I said earlier, certain omissions in this book. As my hon friend, Dr. A. N. Bose, pointed out, lack of any reference to that great Indian, I would even say, the first modern Indian, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, is really a big omission. Big too is the omission of any reference to the other sporadic but spontaneous uprisings in India earlier than 1857. Conceding all this and even more, I say that the approach of this book to Indian history, and particularly to the period with which it dealt, is really objective, critical, superb. I may be alone in this House in congratulating Dr. Tara Chand but that would not make me hesitate to offer him my hearty congratulations in producing a work of which he can justifiably be proud. I am not, of course, a professor of history nor am I a professional historian but I am certainly a student of history, and as one who has read quite a number of books on Indian history, I should say that I have come across only three or four books that have a real objective approach and a genuine desire to come to the root of the things. One such is "An Introduction to Indian History" by Prof Kosambi and another is this volume by Dr. Tara Chand. Barring these two and perhaps two more histories of India by

Indians the rest are uncritical and chauvinistic. They say, "We were always a great people, we continue to be great people and our future would be much greater." I am a believer in our future. Having achieved our freedom after three centuries of thralldom we have, I believe, certainly a great future. I also believe that the coming century is the century of India. I have no doubts about that but at the same time we should, I submit, be able to face facts and to acknowledge that we lost our freedom to a British trading company because of certain fundamental weaknesses in our society in the 18th century. By that time our society had become stagnant, it stopped moving with the times, it lacked dynamism. Unless we see these facts and acknowledge them, we will not be able to register any progress in our quest for a better order of society.

I would like to say just one word about another criticism that is made on the floor of this House. Prof. Kabir in his foreword, has expressly stated that the Government is not at all responsible for the conclusions arrived at by Dr. Tara Chand. When he has said that so clearly and categorically I fail to see any reason why Government should be blamed for any conclusion that Dr. Tara Chand has arrived at. It is not that I am quarrelling with his conclusions. As I had been saying right from the beginning, his conclusions are fully justified. They are in line with truth and what is perhaps more to the point, his approach to the problem is objective, it is scientific.

I find some hon. Members criticising Dr. Tara Chand for his having brought in a Marxist approach to the study of this particular period in the history of India. Is it wrong to apply the Marxist approach, provided one knows its limitations? I am a student of Marx. I do not accept quite a few aspects of Marxism but at the same time how can I deny that Marx was

an original thinker. Marx did contribute to world thought, Marx did influence the life and thought of millions and millions of people. Just because I do not agree with certain aspects of Marxism, I should not say that I totally deny Marx and Marxism. There are certain fundamental concepts which Marx had thought out for the first time. Just as Marx owed some of his teachings to his predecessors he bequeathed to us certain aspects of truth, certain ways of approaching truth or certain methods of dialectic and these need not be denied. A great professor like the late Dr. Harold Laski, who was certainly not a Communist, said that there were certain good aspects of Marxism and there were certain bad aspects of Marxism and so, I fail to understand why, just because a Marxian approach has been brought to bear in the study of this sorry period of Indian history, the book should be condemned wholesale.

Sir, you were good enough to give me this opportunity to say just a few words and I should not encroach further on your indulgence. I would only like to add that I congratulate whole-heartedly Dr. Tara Chand on his very good and very sound historical work.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज (महाराष्ट्र)

उपसभापति महोदय, इस किताब के बारे में बहुत से लोगों ने उल्टे-सुल्टे ढंग से बताया है।

डा० रघुबीर सिंह आप ठीक से बताइये।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : मुझे बोलने दीजिये। मेरे बोलने के बाद फिर त्रिटिसाइज कीजियेगा। क्रपा कर के थोड़ा शान्ति रखिये।

उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे आपका बहुत ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना है। यह जो किताब है इसके बारे में और हमारे ताराचंद जी के

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]

बारे में अखबारों में भी निकला है। वह यह है :

“Suppression of Truth, Wrong Reading of Historical Facts, and a Lack of Critical Judgement”

इसमें ऐतिहासिक घटनाओं का असत्य अर्थ बताया गया है। सत्य को इसमें दबाया गया है।

मैं पटेल साहब को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि वह यह प्रस्ताव लाये है। उनसे हमारे मतभेद हो सकते हैं लेकिन हमारे छत्रपति शिवा जी और महाराणा प्रताप जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को प्रेरणा देने वाले हैं उनके बारे में कुछ गलत कहना ठीक नहीं है। उनके बारे में आप सब लोग जानते हैं और शिवाजी और राणा प्रताप के बारे में कहीं कुछ बुरी दृष्टि से लिखा हो तो उसमें हमें दुख नहीं होगा तो और क्या होगा। हमारा जो इतिहास है उसने दुनिया में एक नाम कमाया है और अगर शिवाजी और राणा प्रताप के बारे में कुछ भी गलत लिख तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में लोग क्या समझेंगे, इस पर विचार करना चाहिये। शिवा जी और राणा प्रताप के बारे में इसमें लिखा है :

Pratap and Shivaji—“Hindu Tribal Chiefs”.

कोई भी धर्म हो, कोई भी रिवाज हो, कोई भी संस्कृति हो, अगर किसी के खिलाफ बोलेंगे तो दुख जरूर लगता है। देश में कई प्रकार के मजहब हैं, रीति रिवाज हैं, संस्कृतियां हैं, धर्म है। मैं अभी एक बिल लाया था लेकिन उसकी थोड़ी सी बातों के लिये हाउस में कितना जंजाल पैदा हो गया था, मैन्सेशन पैदा हो गया था। कोई बोलता था कि मैं ईसाईयों के खिलाफ हूँ, कोई बोलता था कि मैं मुसलमानों के खिलाफ हूँ। मैं सामाजिक दृष्टि से वह बिल लाया था। छत्रपति शिवा जी और महाराणा प्रताप हमारे देश के सब से

बड़े माने हुए लोग हैं और यदि उनके बारे में कुछ गलत लिखा जाये तो हमें दुख लगता है। इस बात के बारे में मैं बहुत कुछ बताता लेकिन टाइम नहीं है। लेकिन इतनी मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जो ऐसे बड़े-बड़े लेखक हैं उनके दिल में पालिटिक्स रहती है या क्या रहती है वह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। वे लिखने के वक्त पर कुछ विचार नहीं करते हैं कि उसका देश के ऊपर क्या असर होगा।

हमारे महाराष्ट्र में शिवा जी महाराज के खिलाफ थोड़ा सा किसी ने कहा था तो कितना उनसे वहां सैन्सेशन हुआ था। शिवा जी महाराज हमारे देश के एक बहुत बड़े शूरवीर, एक बहुत बड़े नेता, एक बहुत बड़े धर्म-संस्थापक हो गये हैं। इनके बारे में कुछ कहेंगे तो जरूर दुख होगा। लाला लाजपत राय या टैगोर के खिलाफ कुछ कहेंगे तो पंजाब के या बंगाल के लोगों के मन में क्या भावना होगी?

“जिसको न निज गौरव
तथा निज देश का अभिमान है।
वह नर नहीं, नर-पशु निरा है
और मृतक समान है ॥”

तो इस पुस्तक में इस प्रकार से इन नेताओं के सम्बन्ध में तोड़ मोड़ कर रखे हुए विचारों से लेखक ने केवल किसी विशेष सम्प्रदाय का ही अपमान नहीं किया है वरन् सम्पूर्ण राष्ट्र का अपमान किया है।

डा० रघुबीर सिंह : नहीं किया है।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : आप कहते हैं कि अपमान नहीं है। मामा साहब देवगिरीकर ने जो बोला है वह कितना अच्छा है। “लुटेरे शिवा जी” बोलेंगे तो दुख जरूर लगेगा।

डा० रघुबीर सिंह : यह सत्य है।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज मत्व है ।
दुख लगता है कि हमारे महाराष्ट्र के शिवा जी
के खिलाफ यह कहा गया है ।

डा० रघुबीर सिंह उन्होंने नहीं कहा है ।

DR R. B. GOUR. Mr. Deputy
Chairman, he has not written. The
author has only quoted Rajwade.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज जहा तक हमने
लिखी हुई किताब को पढ़ा है उससे हमें ज्ञान
होता है कि न तो यह पुस्तक ठोस ऐतिहासिक
तथ्यों पर ही लिखी गई है और न इससे सभी
वर्गों को संतुष्ट करने की एक समान नीति
रखी गई है ।

DR. R. B. GOUR: He has only quot-
ed Rajwade and you can criticise
Rajwade for this Do you condemn
Rajwade's findings on Maratha
history?

DR NIHAR RANJAN RAY: That
was not mentioned by Dr. Tara Chand.
He takes the facts and interpretation
from Rajwade.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज राजवाडे को
हम क्या बिल्कुल अंधे की तरह मानेंगे । वह
क्या कोई डाक्यमेंट है जो हम उसको बिल्कुल
अंधे की तरह मान ले । तो मेरा कहना
है कि इसमें सब को संतुष्ट रखने
की नीति नहीं अपनाई गई है । दोनों चीजें
नहीं हैं । न ऐतिहासिक तथ्य है और न संतुष्ट
करने की नीति है । इस प्रकार का इतिहास
लिख कर तारा चन्द जी न तो निष्पक्ष
इतिहासकार के कर्तव्य को ही निभाने में सफल
हुए हैं और न अपने राजनैतिक पार्ट को ही
निष्पक्ष रूप से निभाने में सफल हो सके
हैं । तो मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि
इसे हम राष्ट्र का अपमान समझते हैं

क्योंकि इन दो महापुरुषों पर सदैव ही
भारतवर्ष को गर्व रहेगा । वीर छत्रपति शिवा
जी और महाराजा प्रताप की गौरव गाथा को
निकाल दिया जाये तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान के
इतिहास में रहता ही क्या है ?

डा० रघुबीर सिंह भल गये अशोक
को ।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज अशोक तो बड़े
महापुरुष थे, उनको मैं जानता हूँ लेकिन जिस
प्वाइंट पर बात आई है उस पर मैं बोल रहा
हूँ । अशोक पर बात आयेगी तो मैं ब्रह्म
कहूँगा, समझे । भारत के इतिहास के बारे में
हमें गर्व है और इस पुस्तक में इन नेताओं के
सम्बन्ध में जो लिखा है वह ठीक नहीं है ।
मेरी गवर्नमेंट से इसलिये प्रार्थना है कि इसके
बारे में कोई कमेटी बननी चाहिये और जब
तक कमेटी नहीं बनेगी तब तक इस काम के
बारे में ठीक नहीं होगा । हमारे प्रोफेसर
हुमायून बखिर साहब ने इसमें प्रस्तावना
भी दी है । मैं नहीं कहता कि वह गलत है
लेकिन जो इसमें गलत लिखा है उसके बारे में
विचार होना चाहिये । अभी महाराष्ट्र में एक
आन्दोलन हुआ । कहा गया कि डित जी को
शिवा जी महाराज के उत्सव के लिये प्रतापगढ़
नहीं जाना चाहिये । उसमें समिति वालों का,
एस० एम० जोशी का और अन्य लोगों का कोई
पोलिटिकल मोटिव हो सकता है लेकिन कहा
यह गया कि पंडित जी को प्रतापगढ़ में शिवाजी
महाराज का जो उत्सव हो वाला था उसमें
नहीं जाना चाहिये । तो वहा बड़ा एजिटेशन
हो गया और वहा की हालत बहुत खराब हो
गई, एक बहुत बड़ा सैन्सेशन हुआ । लोगों को
बड़ा दुख हुआ कि शिवाजी महाराज के
खिलाफ कुछ नेताओं ने कहा और बाद में
उन्हे अपने कदों को वापिस लेना पड़ा । तो शिवा
जी महाराज के खिलाफ जो कुछ उन्होंने

[श्री पा० ना० राजभोज]
कहा था उसको वापस लेना पड़ा और तारामिह
को भी लेना ही होगा।

डा० रघुबीर सिंह : तारामिह।

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज . तारा चन्द।
तारामिह जैसे ऋतार बन गये है कि वह किसी
धर्म को, किसी सम्प्रदाय को और सब को लडाते
हैं वैसे ही हमारे लेखक महोदय भी शिवा जी
महाराज के निचे इधर उधर का कोटेशन ला
कर बे रखने हैं।

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chair-
man, this is unfair. This is what he
says:

"Shivaji's genius shines through
the accomplishment of a threefold
task—the creation of a military force
capable of overthrowing the yoke of
the Deccan Sultans, the unification
of the Marathas under the umbrella
of one State, and the organisation of
an enlightened and stable system of
government."

I do not think better words could
be used for Shivaji.

4 P.M.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : अरे भाई,
जरा समझने की कोशिश कीजिए। आप
क्या जानते हैं, आप कम्यूनिस्टों का इतिहास
जानते हैं। यह लडाई दिल्ली के निकट हुई
और पानीपत तक हुई।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I
seek your guidance—are we speaking
about a book of history or are we
making a little history here?

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : उपसभापति
जी, शिवाजी महाराज जो मैंने कहा, वह
"महाराज" के बोलने से उनको दुःख जरूर
लगा होगा। लेकिन हमारे शिवाजी महाराज
देश के नेता थे, जैसे राणा प्रताप हुए हैं।

कम्यूनिस्टों को तो कुछ पता ही नहीं रहता,
उनका इतिहास तो रशिया का इतिहास है।
जैसा वहां से इशारा मिलता है वैसे चलने
है। मेरे भाई डा० साहब मुझे माफ़ करेंगे।

श्री शीलभद्र धाजी : माफी मत मागिये।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM
SAHAI) in the Chair]

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज मैं अपने
कम्यूनिस्ट भाइयों के बारे में इस समय ज्यादा
नहीं बोलना चाहता। उनको देश के महा-
पुरुषों पर गर्व करना चाहिये, देश की
भलाई में ही अपनी भलाई सोचनी चाहिये।
देश को धोका देना, देश के साथ बिट्टेपन
करना, देश के इतिहास के, देश की संस्कृति
के खिलाफ प्रचार करना ठीक नहीं होता है।
मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि कम से कम यह किताब
देखने के लिये कोई एक कमेटी सरकार को
रखनी चाहिये।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra
Pradesh): Have you read this book?
पढा है या नहीं पढा है?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Can you
tell us how many pages it has?

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : कम्यूनिस्ट
भाइयों के बारे में तो मैं बतला चुका हू कि
उनके पास इतिहास ही नहीं है। तो मेरी
प्रार्थना यह है कि इस किताब के बारे में
सरकार को ऐसी कमेटी बनानी चाहिये।

डा० रघुबीर सिंह कमेटी क्या
करेगी?

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज कमेटी जाच
करेगी कि किताब अच्छी है या बुरी है।
क्या करेगी कमेटी, आप पूछते हैं। कमेटी
सब कुछ कर सकती है। इसीलिये मैं कह
रहा हू वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, कि कोई भी
किस्म की किताब निकले उसमें किसी जानि

की, किसी धर्म की, किसी नेता की आयोजना अगर खराब दृष्टि से की गई है तो कमेटी उसकी जांच करेगी, और यह देखेगी कि उसको रखा जाये या नहीं रखा जाये। जो हिस्सा निकालने के योग्य हो, उनके लिये सिफारिश कर सकती है। (Interruption) आप को टाटम मिन जाते तो आप भी बोलिये। मेरे ही बोलने पर आपको स्मृति कैसे आ जाती है। राजे रजवाडों के इतिहास के खिलाफ मैं नहीं हूँ। लेकिन जब कोई अनुचित बात लिखी जाती है तो हमारी सरकार की ड्यूटी है, कर्तव्य है, फर्ज है, कि हस्तक्षेप करे। मुझे मालूम है, मिनिस्टर साहब ने इन्डिपेंडेंसी इसकी प्रस्तावना लिखी। मुझे उसके बारे में कुछ खान नहीं कहना है। लेकिन हमारे कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों को कुछ थोड़ा सा विचार करना चाहिये कि कमेटी बनाने में नुकसान क्या है। क्या कमेटी बनाने में कम्युनिस्टों का भंडा फूट जायेगा? सरकार से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि कम्युनिस्टों की जो कई ऐसी किताबें हैं हमारी मरहद के बारे में, बार्डर एरिया के बारे में, आजादी के इतिहास के बारे में, उनकी जरूर छानबीन होनी चाहिये। चीनी भाई के नाम से ये लोग अपने देश को धोका देने हैं।

हमको अपने देश की संस्कृति को ऊचा करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। मनुस्मृति में भी महिलाओं और हरिजन जाति के लिये अनुचित प्रयोग जहाँ जहाँ हुआ है उन हिस्सों को निकाल देना चाहिये। मनुस्मृति के बहुत से कोटेशन मेरे पास हैं। मेरे पास समय नहीं है, नहीं तो मैं आपको पढ़ कर बताता। (Interruption) थोड़ा शांत रहिये, मैं बता रहा हूँ। आप पंडित हैं, प्रोफेसर हैं, राजे रजवाडों के भडारी हैं। मैं तो यह बता रहा हूँ कि जहाँ कहीं भी किताबों में बुरी बात लिखी हो, चाहे मुसलमानों का धर्म हो, चाहे बौद्ध धर्म हो, चाहे कोई

धर्म हो, अगर वह ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से किसी के खिलाफ लिखी गई हो तो उसके बारे में कमेटी बना कर जरूर काटछाट होनी चाहिये। यही मैं चाहता हूँ। हमारे बाबा अम्बेडकर साहब की भी एक बड़ी किताब निकली है बुद्धिज्म के बारे में।

(Time bell rings.)

अच्छा मैं एक मिनट में भाषण खत्म करता हूँ। तो सरकार को इस बात की जांच करने के लिये कमेटी बँधानी चाहिये और चाहे कोई धर्म हो या संस्कृति हो, अगर उसमें ऐसी बात लिखी हो जो किसी के विरुद्ध पड़ती है तो उसकी जांच की जाये। मैं नहीं कहता कि सब बुरी ही बुरी बातें हैं अच्छी अच्छी बातें भी हैं लेकिन इतिहासकारों को कुछ सामाजिक समस्याओं को भी अपने सामने रखना चाहिये जिससे किसी जाति, धर्म, पंडित, नेता या और किसी मद्दान पुरुष के विरुद्ध प्रचार न हो।

इसीलिये मैं फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे महान छत्रपति शिवाजी और महाराणा प्रताप के बारे में जो भी पुस्तक में बुरी बात लिखी है उसको वापस लेना चाहिये। छत्रपति शिवाजी के पद चिन्ही पर चलने वाले हमारे चह्वाण जी के नेतृत्व में जिस तरह महाराष्ट्र में शासन चल रहा है उससे हमें बड़ा आनन्द होता है। छत्रपति शिवाजी ने जो प्रेरणा महाराष्ट्र को दी वह सारे हिन्दुस्तान को देन है। हिन्दुस्तान के लोग राणाप्रताप और शिवाजी महाराज को अवतार की तरह समझते हैं। मेरे पास जो वाल्यूम है उसमें कई प्रकार की बातें उनके खिलाफ सरकार ने लिखी हैं। लेकिन उस सब पर बोलने के लिये मेरे पास वक्त कहा है?

इतना कह कर मैं मंत्री महोदय से आशा करता हूँ कि मैंने जो जो बातें कही हैं उन पर वे ध्यान देंगे।

شری مہتی انیمس قدوائی (اتر)

پردیش): جذبات دہشتی چورمن صاحب - انڈی دیو سے اس ریزولوشن پر بحث ہو رہی ہے - ریزولوشن کے مضمون کا جہاں تک تعاق ہے اس سے تو کسی کو اختلاف نہیں ہے لیکن جس طریقہ سے یہ بحث شروع ہوئی اس سے ایسا لگتا ہے کہ یہ سارا ریزولوشن صرف ایک کتاب کے لئے دیا گیا تھا اور اس کتاب کا تذکرہ برابر ہو رہا ہے - بد قسمتی سے میں نے اس کتاب کو پڑھا نہیں اور میری ہی طرح بہت سے ایسے لوگ ہیں کہ جن کی نظر سے وہ نہیں گزری - لیکن سوال یہ ہے کہ ایک رائٹر جب کچھ لکھتا ہے تو لکھتے وقت اس کا دماغ اس کی قلم اس کا خیال بالکل آزاد ہونا چاہئے - ڈاکٹر تاراچند - جو کچھ بھی لکھا ہو لیکن سوال یہ ہے کہ گورنمنٹ نے اس کو لکھوایا ہے - حالانکہ گورنمنٹ کی لکھائی ہوئی چیز پر مجھے زیادہ بھروسہ نہیں ہوتا ہے کیونکہ ہستی بلانی ہے کہ جب گورنمنٹ نے کبھی کوئی چیز لکھوائی تو وہ اس معیار کے مطابق کبھی نہیں ہوئی ہے جیسا کہ خود ایک رائٹر اپنی پسند کے مطابق لکھتا تو ہوتا - لیکن میں سمجھتی ہوں کہ اگر ڈاکٹر نارا چند پارلیمنٹ کے ممبر نہ ہوتے گورنمنٹ سے ان کو کوئی تعلق نہ

رہتا تو ایک ہستی داں کی حیثیت سے اس سے بھی آگے جاتے اور اس سے بہت بہتر لکھتے - پھر بھی میرا یہ خیال ہے کہ اتنا کریٹیسائز کرنا پولیٹیکل طریقہ سے کسی رائٹر کے حق میں نہیں سمجھتی ہوں؟ کہ کسی طرح سے بھی ایک اچھی بات ہوگی - اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوگا کہ ہمارے جو رائٹر ہیں وہ کبھی بھی صحیح بات لکھنے کی طرف توجہ نہیں کریں گے - آج اس ریزولوشن کے ذریعہ جس کمیٹی کا مطالبہ کیا گیا ہے کہ وہ کمیٹی بنائی جائے - یہ تھیک ہے کہ وہ کمیٹی بنائی جائے لیکن وہ کمیٹی کبھی صحیح حالات لکھنے کی طرف توجہ نہیں کر سکیگی کیونکہ اسے معلوم ہوگا کہ جتنے پارلیمنٹریں ہیں سب ہمیں اسی طرح سے کریٹیسائز کریں گے - وہ کبھی بھی صحیح بات نہیں لکھ سکے گی - نہ جاننے کی کوشش کریں گی - ایسا زبردست کویتھسزم کسی رائٹر کا آج تک نہیں ہوا ہے جیسا کہ ہم اپنے ہی ممبر کا کر رہے ہیں - جو چیز اس میں قابل اعتراض تھی - جو بھائی تھیک طرح سے یہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ اس میں کوئی چیز قابل اعتبار نہیں ہے - اس کے بارے میں وہ کہہ سکتے تھے کہ وہ چیز اچھی نہیں ہے - وہ پہلے تحریر یا اخبارات میں اس

کو کریٹیسائیڈ کرتے؟ مینٹیمنس کرتے۔ جو
مسٹوریس — تاریخ دان — ہیں
اور ادیب لوگ ہیں ان کے فلکشن
میں اس کو کریٹیسائیڈ کرتے۔ بجائے
اس کے کہ وہ پارلیمنٹ میں اس طرح
سے پیش کی جا رہی ہے۔

جس وقت میں نے اس ریزولوشن
کو دیکھا تو مجھے خوشی ہوئی کہ یہ
ایک بہت اچھی بات ہونے جا رہی
ہے۔ اس میں ہمارے بہت بڑے بڑے
قابل لوگ بیٹھ کر ہندوستان کی
مسٹری لکھینگے اور وہ تمام غلطیاں
جو پچھلے زمانہ میں ہوئیں — انگریزوں
نے بعض چیزیں ایلے فائدہ کیلئے
لکھیں — ان سب کو یہ کمیٹی درست
کردیگی۔ لیکن جو طریقہ ہم نے
شروع کیا ہے اس سے میں سمجھتی
ہوں کہ ہمارے ملک کی مسٹری کبھی
بھی صحیح معنوں میں ہم لوگوں کے
سامنے نہیں آ سکیگی۔ جو لکھنے
والا ہوتا ہے وہ یہ نہیں دیکھتا ہے کہ
کس کام کے متعلق لوگوں کی کیا رائے
ہے۔ فینڈم مومینٹ میر بڑی بڑی
غلطیاں بھی ہوئیں اور بڑے بڑے کام بھی
ہوئے۔ ایسے لوگ ہی تھے جنہوں نے
اپنی جانیں قربان کی ہیں اور ایسے
لوگ بھی نہ جنہوں نے اس زمانہ
میں سبوتاژ بھی کیا۔ جب لکھنے
والا سب واقعات کے ارد گرد لکھنے بیٹھ گا

نو وہ یہ ضرور دیکھے گا کہ کس شخص

نے کیا کیا اور جو کچھ اس نے کیا وہ
کسی کے لحاظ سے غلط بھی ہو سکتا ہے
اور کسی کے لحاظ سے صحیح بھی ہو
سکتا ہے۔ جب ہم اس طرح کی
باتیں سوچتے ہیں تو خیال آتا ہے
کہ بیس برس پہلے پتہ نہیں کہ
غلطیاں ہم نے کی تھیں۔ ہم جب
مسٹری لکھنے کے لئے کسی مورخ کو
کہینگے تو وہ گزشتہ تاریخ میں ہمارے
کاموں میں کچھ غلطیاں نکالے گا اور ان
کے بارے میں کچھ لکھے گا۔ جو کچھ
وہ لکھے گا وہ کچھ آدمیوں کو اچھی
معاوم ہونگی اور کچھ آدمیوں کو بری
معاوم ہونگی۔

میں آپ سے یہ درخواست کرنا
چاہتی ہوں کہ اگر آپ واقعی ہندوستان
کی سچی مسٹری لکھنا چاہتے ہیں
تو اچھے آدمیوں کے سپرد اس کام
کو کیجئے۔ اس چیز پر جو
کریٹیسائیڈ ہو وہ ہندوستان کے پڑھے
لکھے لوگ کریں۔ لیکن جس طرح
سے پارلیمنٹ کے ممبر آج کر رہے ہیں
اس طرح سے نہ کیا جائے۔ میں اتنا
ہی کہنے کے لئے کہتی ہوئی ہوں۔
شکریہ۔

†[श्रीमती अनीस किदवई (उत्तर प्रदेश):
जनाब डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, इतनी देर
से इस रेजोल्यूशन पर बहस हो रही है।
रेजोल्यूशन के मजमून का जहां तक ताल्लुक
है उससे तो किसी को इखतलाक नहीं है।
लेकिन जिस तरीके से यह बहस शुरू हुई उससे

[श्रीमती अनीस कदम]

ऐसा लगता है कि यह सारा रेजोल्यूशन सिर्फ एक किताब के लिये दिया गया था और उसी किताब का तजकरा बराबर हो रहा है। बदकिस्मती में मैंने उस किताब को पढ़ा नहीं और मेरी ही तरह बहुत से ऐसे लोग हैं कि जिनकी नजर से वह नहीं गुजरी। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि एक राइटर जब कुछ लिखता है तो लिखते वक्त उसका दिमाग, उसकी कलम, उसका खयाल बिल्कुल आजाद होना चाहिए। डाक्टर ताराचन्द ने जो कुछ भी लिखा हो लेकिन सवाल यह है कि गवर्नमेंट ने उसको लिखवाया है। हालांकि गवर्नमेंट की लिखाई हुई चीज पर मुझे ज्यादा भरोसा नहीं होता है क्योंकि हिस्ट्री बतलाती है कि जब गवर्नमेंट ने कभी कोई चीज लिखवाई तो वह उस मयार के मुताबिक कभी नहीं हुई है जैसा कि खुद एक राइटर अपनी पसन्द के मुताबिक लिखता तो होता। लेकिन मैं समझती हूँ कि अगर डाक्टर ताराचन्द पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर न होते, गवर्नमेंट से उनका कोई ताल्लुक न रहता, तो एक हिस्ट्रीदा की हैमियत में इसमें भी आगे जाते और इससे बहुत बेहतर लिखते। फिर भी मेरा यह खयाल है कि इतना क्रिटीसाइज करना पोलिटिकल तरीके में किसी राइटर के हक में मैं नहीं समझती हूँ कि किसी तरह से भी एक अच्छी बात होगी। इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि हमारे जो राइटर हैं वह कभी भी सही बात लिखने की तरफ तवज्जह नहीं करेंगे। आज इस रेजोल्यूशन के जरिये जिस कमेटी का मुतालबा किया गया है कि वह कमेटी बनाई जाय, यह ठीक है कि वह कमेटी बनाई जाय लेकिन वह कमेटी कभी सही हालात लिखने की तरफ तवज्जह नहीं कर सकेगी क्योंकि उसे मालूम होगा कि जितने पार्लियामेटरियन हैं सब हमें इसी तरह से क्रिटीसाइज करेंगे। वह कभी भी सही बात नहीं लिख सकेगी, न जानने की

कोशिश करेगी। ऐसा जबरदस्त क्रिटिसिज्म किसी राइटर का आज तक नहीं हुआ है जैसा कि हम अपने ही मेम्बर का कर रहे हैं। जो चीज इसमें काबिले ऐतराज थी, जो भाई ठीक तरह से यह समझने है कि इसमें कोई चीज काबिले ऐतराज नहीं है, इसके बारे में वह कह सकते थे कि वह चीज अच्छी नहीं है। वह पहले तहरीर या अखबारात में इसको क्रिटीसाइज करते, मीटिंग्स करते। जो हिस्टोरियन्स—तारीखदा—हैं और अदीब लोग हैं उनके फक्शन में इसको क्रिटीसाइज करते, बजाय इसके कि वह पार्लियामेंट में इस तरह से पेश की जा रही है।

जिस वक्त मैंने इस रेजोल्यूशन को देखा तो मुझे खुशी हुई कि यह एक बहुत अच्छी बात होने जा रही है। इसमें हमारे बहुत बड़े-बड़े काबिल लोग बैठ कर हिन्दुस्तान की हिस्ट्री लिखेंगे और वह तमाम गलतियाँ जो पिछले जमाने में हुई—अंग्रेजों ने बाज चीजे अपने फायदे के लिये लिखी—उन सब को यह कमेटी दुरुस्त कर देगी। लेकिन जो तरीका हमने शुरू किया है उससे मैं समझती हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क की हिस्ट्री कभी भी सही माइनों में हम लोगों के सामने नहीं आ सकेगी। जो लिखने वाला होता है वह यह नहीं देखता कि किस काम के मुतल्लिक लोगों की क्या राय है। फ्रीडम मूवमेंट में बड़ी-बड़ी गलतियाँ भी हुईं और बड़े बड़े काम भी हुए। ऐसे लोग भी थे जिन्होंने अपनी जाने कुर्बान की है और ऐसे लोग भी थे जिन्होंने उस जमाने में सैंबोटेज भी किया। जब लिखने वाला सब वाकयात के ऊपर लिखने बैठेगा तो वह यह जरूर देखेगा कि किस शक्म ने क्या किया और जो कुछ उसने किया वह किसी के लिहाज से गलत भी हो सकता है, और किसी के लिहाज से सही भी हो सकता है। जब हम इस तरह की बातें सोचते हैं तो ब्याप्य आता है कि २० वर्ष पहले पता नहीं कितनी

गलतियों हमने की थीं। हम जब हिस्ट्री लिखने के लिये किसी म्यूजियम को कहेंगे तो वह गुजस्ता तवारीख में हमारे कामों में कुछ गलतियां निकालेगा और उनके बारे में कुछ लिखेगा। जो कुछ वह लिखेगा वह कुछ आदिमियों को अच्छी मालूम होगी और कुछ आदिमियों को बुरी मालूम होगी।

मैं आपसे यह दरखास्त करना चाहती हूँ कि अगर आप वाकई हिन्दुस्तान की सच्ची हिस्ट्री लिखाना चाहते हैं तो अच्छे आदिमियों को चुन कर उनके सिपुर्द इस काम को कीजिये। इस चीज पर जो क्विटिस्जम हो वह हिन्दुस्तान के पढ़े-लिखे लोग करें। लेकिन जिस तरह से पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर अज कर रहे हैं उस तरह से न किया जाये। मैं इतना ही कहने के लिये खड़ी हुई हूँ। शुक्रिया !]

DR. TARA CHAND (Nominated):
Sir, I have heard the debate now since about half past eleven. The Resolution which has been moved in this House has raised certain matters of importance. The most important matter is whether history should be written by an individual or by a group of individuals, a board or a committee. It is true that histories have been written by individuals as well as histories have been written under the guidance of committees and boards. The histories that have been written by individuals are known to everybody. A large number of histories of India have been written by individuals, histories of the Moghuls and others, and a history of later Moghuls have been written by Shri Jadunath Sarkar. Other writers have written histories of the Marathas or histories of Bengal, and so on. In Europe, there have been histories of the whole of Europe written by single individuals; histories of England have

been written by single individuals, and so on. At the same time everybody knows that committees and boards have also been entrusted with the writing of history. Take the Cambridge Histories. Article History of Europe, Mediaeval History of Europe and Modern History of Europe. These histories have been compiled with a committee or a board in charge of them. Sir, it is possible that a history may be written either by an individual or may be written with a board or committee in charge of it.

Now we should really understand, when a history is entrusted to a committee or board what that committee or board does, because if this House desires that the Government should appoint a committee or board, it should realise what it is recommending the Government to do. In the case of these histories, that is, Cambridge History of Modern Europe or Mediaeval Europe or Ancient Europe, there were boards of editors. The business of the Boards of editors was to lay down the limits and scope of the period within which that history had to be written, then to break that period up, divide it into chapters and say what the contents of these chapters should be. This was all the work that the board of editors or the committee of editors did. Then this committee or board selected well-known writers, experts on those periods, experts on their subjects, and entrusted the work of writing to these gentlemen. You will find, if you take up any of these histories, that all the chapters are marked with the names of the writers of those chapters. The board of editors cannot, does not interfere, and it would be undignified for both the board of editors and writers of these chapters to interfere, in what the writer of a particular chapter has written. Therefore, the aim of entrusting the writing of history to a board or committee is that the board or committee finds out the best writers

[Dr Tara Chand]
and leaves the writing to particular individuals or particular authors, and does not interfere with their writing. No individuals, no writer of self-respect will ever tolerate the interference of anybody else in what he has written. He is responsible for what he writes. (Interruption) So far as histories written by individuals are concerned, they are responsible for them. So far as histories written under such boards and committees are concerned, again, the individuals are responsible. There are chapters, for instance, in the Modern History of Europe about which there are differences of opinion. In fact within the Modern History of Europe there are chapters which conflict with one another where conclusions are different. All those chapters are put together in the twelve volumes of Cambridge Modern History of Europe. The same thing applies to all other histories which are written in such a manner in collaboration. But the board of editors does not regard itself responsible for correcting what it may consider to be the faulty version of a particular event or interpretation of a particular movement. That does not happen, and that should not happen, because, if that happens then you place take away the responsibility of the author and you place that responsibility upon a committee of persons. It is hardly possible for any committee to agree on every interpretation of facts or movements that are going to be discussed in a particular history.

I have heard here suggestions made that Members of various parties either in this House or outside this House should collect together and should sort of lay down the lines on which history should be written. I venture to suggest

AN HON. MEMBER Nobody has suggested that

DR TARA CHAND There was a suggestion from one particular direction and I am absolutely certain that this committee will never come to any agreement about any matter that is written in that book. Therefore, a committee consisting of people of different parties, different views, different looking at things, if you put them together, will mean a complete confusion and no history at all.

Another suggestion was made that there should be a board or committee on which there should be representatives of eminent historians and authors and a certain number of representatives of those who have taken part in the struggle for freedom. That again is entirely unpracticable. I do not say that those who have taken part in the struggle should have nothing to do with the writing of history. They have been making history. Among them there may be some who are as good writers of history as any professional historian. That is quite possible, and it would be very good if some such actors in the movement take upon themselves to write a history of the movement. I would welcome such a thing as that. But it must be remembered that in the first place history has got to be objective. A person who participates in a struggle, by the fact that he has participated in the struggle, ordinarily—I would not say always—ordinarily will not be able to look at facts from a purely objective point of view. I have some experience of that. Many people have come to me during the process of my writing this history and some have urged upon me that so and so did such and such thing in the movement. Other people have come and urged upon me that they were relations or friends of a particular fighter. Somebody has written "My father was in the forefront of the fight at such and such a place. What are you going to do about him in this history of yours?" I say most earnestly that this attitude, this approach towards the writing of history is quite wrong.

No proper history can be written in this way. After all, the first objective of history is truth. We are placing before the country the truth about the movements, the truth of what has happened, because I strongly believe that truth, however unpalatable it may be, is useful for the country. If people know the truth then it will be possible for the country to know what it should do in future. If they made mistakes . . .

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ: Hindu tribal chiefs. Is it a truth?

DR. TARA CHAND: Sir, the point of view of a historian should be that he should be objective and he should be truthful.

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ: What is the meaning of it?

श्री शीलभद्रयाजी : इसके बारे में
जवाब दीजिये ।

DR. TARA CHAND: I am not discussing this. Therefore, it is impossible. To my mind . . .

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ: What is the meaning of it?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: He should say.

DR. TARA CHAND: You were asking people to be patient. You should be patient.

It is not possible, according to my judgement, to appoint a committee and make that committee responsible for the writing of history. That is the Resolution before us. The Resolution says that there should be a committee to write history. What is this committee going to do? If it is going to lay down the limits of the subject and divide the subject into chapters and find out historians to write those chapters, then I say that that thing is not

necessary for the writing of the history of the freedom movement.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The wording is 'to assist'.

DR. TARA CHAND: How are they going to assist? That is the whole question. They will not write. But what assistance are they going to give? Are there two historians in this country who will agree upon the interpretation of all the facts and of all the movements that have taken place in connection with the rise of the freedom movement in our land? There are many people who look at the history of the Congress from 1885 to 1908 in one way. There are other people who look upon this history in a different manner. There are some other people who look upon the history before 1885 as leading up to 1885. There are still some others who start only from 1885 and neglect everything that has happened before 1885. There are all kinds of views, all kinds of attitudes of mind in these matters and it is my feeling that it is wholly impossible to find a committee which will assist the writer in coming to what people consider to be correct. If a historian cannot find out the correct facts by himself, the assistance of those people will not make him find out these correct facts. It is the historian's business to find out the correct facts and come to a reasonable interpretation of facts. There is no history in the world which has been written, which has not been criticised or which has not been found faltering. If you start with the father of the European history, the Greek historian Herodotus, down to the present day, there is no history which has been written about which hundreds of criticisms have not been made and I challenge any committee to produce a history which will be free from criticism, which will be free from fault-finding. That is not possible. (*Inter-ruption.*) I do not say that I have written a history which will remain forever; after ten years my history may

[Dr. Tara Chand.]

be superseded. I will welcome it. The history of the freedom movement will be written not once, twice, but one hundred times. Every generation will go on writing the history of the freedom movement and that generation will look upon the history of the freedom movement from its own point of view. Take the history of England. There are hundreds of histories on England, starting from the 17th century till the 20th century. Hundreds and hundreds of histories of England have been written and they will continue to be written. Let us come to the history of the Roman Empire. Since the 18th century many histories of the Roman Empire have been written. How many more histories will be written on Rome, we do not know. So, I am not vain enough to believe that the history that I am writing is the last word on the subject. (*Interruption.*)

So far as the principal aspect of the Resolution that is before us is concerned, in my opinion, however plausible it may appear, it is wholly unpracticable. Now, why has this Resolution come up here? It is because some people have found fault with certain things that have been stated in that history and some people have found fault with it because certain things have not been stated there. Let me explain one little thing. This first volume of the history of the freedom movement has only two objects in view. One is to describe, discuss, analyse and understand why India lost independence. That was problem No. 1 in my mind. I wanted to understand it for myself, and I wanted to explain to those who read this history, why our country lost independence. And it is a problem of great importance and of great complexity. It is a knotty problem. Every Indian, is proud of the fact that Indian culture and civilization in the 17th century was perhaps higher than the culture and civilization of any other

part of the world. We are proud of that fact. We also say that India was so rich and powerful in the 17th century that European countries looked at it with eyes of greed. They came here to carry on trade with India because they felt that they could take much wealth out of India. Now, what happened to this highly cultured and wealthy country in the 18th century? There were a handful of Europeans living six thousand miles away. They arrived on the shores of this country, and they built their own factories and so on and so forth and then in the middle of the 18th century, they began to conquer this country. Within about fifty years, their sway spread over this country. Why did this phenomenon occur in the history of this country? I wanted to find out the reasons; I wanted to analyse this matter. And, therefore, one part of the first volume is devoted only to discover the reasons for the loss of independence by this country. The other part deals with what flows as a result of the conquest of this country by the Britishers. These are the only two main subjects that are treated of in the first volume.

The second volume which I hope to bring out in about a year's time will deal with the Indian reaction to the British occupation of this country, how India reacted. And when I say Indian reaction, I mean that which comes very spontaneously out of India, not that under which India has been forced, not the imposition of the British—the destruction of the Indian industry, the destruction of the village life of India. That is one type of thing which I have treated of in the first volume. But what the Indian people did when the destruction took place, how they reacted towards it, and what movements went on in this country as a result of that, these will be the subject of the second volume. This second volume comes up to 1906. I will deal with what my friends have suggested. I am aware of their sugges-

tions. I have already done two chapters on the Sanyasi Revolution in Bengal, the Polygar movement in Madras and other revolutions in Gujarat, Maharashtra and so on. All these things are bound to come. But these things could not go into the first volume because I was not dealing with them there. And then we come to 1857 which some call the war of Indian independence, and some call the mutiny. And I personally agree with those who call it the war of Indian independence. I have called it the war of Indian independence. I have reasons why I call it the war of Indian independence. And then I have dealt with, as I understand the history of my country, how before 1857 the British played a destructive part in this country, destructive in the sense that they destroyed the economy of this country, they destroyed the social system of this country and they, if not destroyed, at any rate gave a great blow to the culture of this country. Then from 1857 onwards we see how India gradually began to awake and how by 1885 it had established an organised society in order to win its own rights, and how from 1885 to 1906 this movement of which Congress is one—I agree that it is only one of the expressions of the desire of India to win independence—how this organised movement from 1885 to 1906 functioned and how there were other factors, how there were other societies, how other people were reacting against it, and what happened up to 1906. And then in the third volume, from 1906 to 1947, the whole thing ripens into the attainment of freedom.

Now, that was the manner in which I looked upon the history of the freedom movement which, I thought, began with the loss of independence and ended with the gaining of freedom. Now some people say, "Why have you stated unpalatable facts about the India of the eighteenth century?" I think that we should face these un-

palatable facts that happened in India to learn a lesson. I am more ashamed of these facts than anybody else I am ashamed that our people were doing things of which we should feel sorry, I feel ashamed that in Bengal they sold Bengal away into the hands of Clive and other people. I feel ashamed of it, not because they were Bengalis but because they were Indians. I feel that in the eighteenth century some of the Marathas were acting so badly, and I feel that it must be brought out that our countrymen behaved in a wretched manner in certain situations of life in the eighteenth century. And unless we take a lesson from the mistakes that our forefathers had made, we will never learn to act properly in future. As a matter of fact, even today we find some of those tendencies present in our midst, and we are constantly fighting against communalism fighting against castism, fighting against provincialism and this ism and that ism. Many of the isms were in existence in the eighteenth century, and if it is stated that these isms in the eighteenth century and the result of the existence of these isms was that we lost our independence, I think I am rendering a great service to my country in bringing this out.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not think I need say very much more about this book, but I will strongly urge upon the Government not to accept this Resolution.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have listened with great interest to a debate which has ranged over almost the whole range of Indian history, and I congratulate my friend Mr. Dahyabhai Patel not for bringing the Resolution so much as for his good luck that out of the various people who tabled this Resolution it should have been his good fortune to have been selected.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: The others made room for me at my instance.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: In any case I congratulate him that he gave us an occasion for discussing a matter which should be discussed in this House. I am not one of those who is afraid of discussion, and I think truth must be faced. That is the first lesson of history, and truth must be faced not only over long ranges of period; truth must be faced here and now also.

My hon. friend had one reference to me and he said that he saw my character in a letter which I wrote to him, but from the description which he gave to this House I am not ashamed of what I wrote to him. He said I sent him a polite reply. I do not know if it is a crime to write to anyone in polite terms, and I never thought that courtesy or politeness was an offence. Then he referred to the manuscript which was published under the title "India wins freedom"—Maulana Azad's book—and asked whether the Maulana had signed the book on every page or anywhere in the book. I told him that he had not signed it. I thought again that to state a truth was not a fault. He had not signed the book and I said that to my hon. friend, and if he regards my expressing truth as such as my character, then I accept the compliment, and I hope I shall always be able to live up to that certificate he has given, that I speak the truth and speak it with politeness and courtesy.

Now, Sir, I am coming to the subject-matter of the discussion. One hon. friend after another has pointed out that in a way the Resolution itself is completely misconceived. More than one speaker has said that a committee as such cannot write a history. To that my hon. friend's own reply was, "to assist". But to that again some very pertinent observations were made by my hon. friend who spoke last. What exactly does "assistance" mean? Does "assistance" mean guid-

ance? Does "assistance" mean providing facts? Does "assistance" mean trying to indicate the policy which the historian should follow? Now, so far as the supply of information is concerned, the Board which had been appointed earlier collected a good deal of material. Then the National Archives also collected a good deal of material. There is a lot of published material already available in the country and outside. Every attempt will be made to collect as much material as possible. And then again my hon. friend Dr. Tara Chand requested the assistance of some historians to help him in particular chapters of the book. And a number of scholars, distinguished in their own fields—even though they are not so eminent or so old as my honourable friend—these younger scholars, they are collecting the material for economic history, for certain political and constitutional aspects and for certain social aspects, and placing these materials at his disposal, so that he is assisted. Therefore, Sir, the first suggestion that a new committee should be appointed, again does not hold ground at all.

There was a Board of Editors, and that Board of Editors rendered distinguished service, as I have also pointed out in my foreword. But then that Board could not agree on many points; there were different points of view. There were many historians, and when an attempt was made in that Board to prepare a draft, there could not be agreement about that draft which had been prepared by one of the members of the Board.

A number of names have been mentioned and references have been made to the distinguished Indian historian Dr. Ramesh Majumdar. If his name had not been mentioned I would not have brought him in, but since his name has been mentioned and since he has been writing on this

topic in a number of papers, not always of a very high historical standard, I have to refer to him. I did not know that some of the papers which were mentioned here today have been acknowledged either in this country or in any other part of the world as standard historical journals to which historians send the results of their research. One particular paper which my hon. friend Mr. Dahyabhai Patel referred to again and again and quoted, whatever else it may be, certainly is not a historical journal, and I do not think that the editor of that paper would claim it to be a historical journal.

Well, Dr. Majumdar prepared a draft, but that draft was found unsatisfactory by equally eminent historians. In fact, when that draft was presented to the Board, not to the Government—that draft was never presented to the Government—when the Board was considering that draft, one, eminent historian, Mr. S. N. Sen, who in his own field is certainly as eminent as Dr. Majumdar, said that he had gone through the draft carefully and his impression was that the chapters had not been written in chronological sequence—with the result that repetitions could be found—and that they would have to be re-drafted. Another eminent historian, Dr. Potdar, also said that the draft was to be wholly rewritten on the basis of fresh material. Another historian present there asked whether it had been written by one man at all, he doubted very much that the entire draft had been prepared by Dr. Majumdar, and Dr. Majumdar admitted that it was not prepared entirely by him.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJI: Is the draft open to the public?

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: All these facts will be available. I think Dr. Majumdar is an eminent historian and if my hon. friend will ask Dr. Majumdar, he will bear out that these

things happened in the Board's meeting.

SHRI J. C. CHATTERJI: I wanted to know whether that draft is in the National Archives and whether it is open to the scholars for their examination.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: That question I shall come to when I deal with the speech of my hon. friend; I have certain observations to make on that as well. But I am only mentioning these things to show that Dr. Majumdar did prepare a draft and later he also published a book basing it partly on the material to which he had access when he was acting as the director or editor or secretary, or whatever he was called by, of that Board. Dr. Majumdar's book also has been open to criticism. That also has not been universally accepted. If some people criticised Dr. Tara Chand's book, other people criticised Dr. Majumdar's book with equal vehemence and no two historians in those matters agreed completely. Therefore,....

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ: What about the reference to Shivaji . . .

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: My hon. friend should hold his soul in patience for a little while. He gives a lecture to every one in this House to remain patient. If he will exercise that quality for himself, it will be good for himself.

SHRI P. N. RAJABHOJ: I want to have an explanation from him regarding reference to Shivaji.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Sir, if interruptions are to be permitted like that, it will be very difficult to reply.

Then, Sir, I come to one other general issue before I take up a detailed discussion, a general issue which was placed again and again before this House. Two questions are connected with that. First of all, is this

[Shri Humayun Kabir.]

an official history of the freedom movement? I would respectfully submit to you, Sir, that this is not an official history in the sense in which the term official history is used. It is not a document issue on behalf of the Government. It is a book written by an individual author. It is true that the Government has given assistance to that individual author by placing material at his disposal, by providing him with assistance, but the Government also gave grants to a large number of scholars in different parts of the country and such books are published. It is not also always true that simply because a book happens to be published by a department of Government, in this case the Publication Division, immediately all the views expressed in that book should be attributed to Government. The Publications Division brings out a large number of books. Very recently it has undertaken a series called "The Makers of Modern India", and in that series, "The Makers of Modern India", there will be biographies of almost all the important national leaders of this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whom the Government like.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: And even of some whom the Government do not like provided they have a contribution to make, and if my honourable friend makes any contribution, I can assure him that he will be in that series, whatever his political views may be.

Sir, in this particular series, the authors are taken from all sections of opinion. They have their own particular opinions and Government do not, for a moment, wish to interfere. This is a country, Sir, in which opinion is never dictated from above. I shall come to my honourable friend, who interrupted just now, when I deal with his speech. I know his views and I do not think he will like

some of the things which I have to say, even though I shall not use the language which he is accustomed to use. Nevertheless, in this country opinion is free, and I would only place before this House one challenge.

A number of books have been sponsored by the Government have been brought out with Government assistance. I would challenge any one of the authors of those different books to say whether at any time Government has given any indication whatever that they would like the material to be treated in a particular way. In every case, once we have selected the author—you may say that that itself is in a sense a choice—but once the author has been selected, the author has been given complete freedom. I hope, Sir, that this House will agree with me that in our country, whatever may be the practice elsewhere, once the author has been selected, that author must be given complete freedom of looking for his material, selecting what material he likes.

DR. TARA CHAND: In my case it is absolutely correct.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: As I said, it is an open challenge to anybody whom the Government have given assistance to prove whether Government at any time interfered with him. I hope I shall have the pleasure some time of commissioning my honourable friend, Shri Gupta, to write a book and I can give him this open assurance that once he is selected for a book, he will have the freedom to treat the material as he likes, to give any interpretation he likes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can tell you that you will never run that risk.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: He may not have the courage, I know, but Government will have the courage if the situation arises. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I welcome.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: And I quite agree that he will be very uncomfortable if he is ever placed in that situation, because I have sufficient faith in his intellectual honesty. If he is once given a commission like that, and if he is asked to deal with that matter, he will try to deal with it in his own way as honestly as he can,....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Namaskar.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Because he does not like to face that situation, he is declining my offer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have I declined that offer, Sir? If he asks me to work on that Board, I shall....

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I shall come to that in a moment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to know whether an offer is coming, because he gave the impression as if he is making an offer. I challenge that if an offer is made, well, from our party I will produce even better historians, good historians, if I am not good....

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You need not say "party".

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have no objection. I am not a historian.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: My honourable friend has given away his case. I said I would be willing in certain circumstances for certain topics for which he may have special competence to commission him to write a book, but he obviously has no confidence in his own self; therefore he immediately runs to his party and tries to find out from the party what will be their dictation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No dictation, Sir. I would not ask a medical man to write a history. Quite clear. If you want me, if you have a liking for me, by all means have it. I could not deny.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I shall consider that.

Coming back to the particular issue, once Government have selected an author, they do not interfere with that author.

The second question is: Are these sort of things to be written by a group or by an individual? As Dr. Tara Chand has pointed out, in the end books are always written by individuals. Even if the effort is collective, different chapters are written by different individuals. Sometimes there is collaboration. Two or three people may write a chapter, but in such cases also—I am speaking from experience—one person writes and the other revises it, but ultimately it is the responsibility of the man under whose name the chapter goes. At the moment we are engaged in the preparation of the history of India in the gazeteer series and, there each chapter will be written by a different person, and ultimately it is that person who will be responsible for what is there in that chapter. It cannot be written by a committee. A book cannot be written by a board because there will be difference of opinion at every stage.

Now, I come to my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He wanted to be on that Board. Supposing he were there on the Board of Historians. History, as Dr. Tara Chand has said, is a matter where there is always difference of opinion. With perfect honesty of approach, there is still room for difference. I will give two examples from fairly recent and contemporary history. My hon. friend will remember that from the period of 1939-40 till the period of 1944-45, the party to which he belongs, went about in

[Shri Humayun Kabir.]

this country defending the demands for Pakistan under the name of self-determination; I do not question their *bona fides*. Perhaps, they honestly believed it. I hope that they sincerely believed it. But if they did, here is an issue where I do not think many Indians will agree with them. The vast majority of Indians will say that their party—to put it very mildly and objectively and in a dispassionate manner—was grievously mistaken, was mistaken in a way which is almost colossal in its ineptitude and in its ignorance of facts of history.

(Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta)

Take another case. I was very surprised to find that my hon. friend today spoke of the I.N.A., the Indian National Army. I would like my hon. friend again to look up the references and the files of his own official journal. Again I am not questioning his *bona fides*. I know some of his colleagues. I had discussion with them at that time also. My hon. friend—I do not know if he remembers—the first time I came to know him, we travelled a long time together, the whole day. We were going to attend a conference. I did not know my hon. friend's political views. We argued the whole day. He tried to convince me and I tried to convince him. I thought I had convinced him because in the end, in the evening, he said that he agreed largely with many of the things that I said. But when we arrived at Chittagong for the District Conference...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Me? Who is that? I do not remember to have ever travelled with him.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I am sorry. It was Mr. Basu, one of your friends. (Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta). I am giving it as an example. Forget the individual.

There when we arrived, I found that he had resiled and gone back to his own position. About the People's War during the period 1942 to 1946, I give my friend full credit for his sincerity. He has often suffered for his conviction also. I am prepared to believe that he honestly believed, he sincerely believed that co-operation with the British during the years 1942 to 1945 was the best way of defending the cause of Indian freedom.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We never believed it.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: If he did not believe; I am very glad to hear it but at any rate if he will see the files of his party during that period, the official resolutions and the official policies, I do not think he can deny that his party's official policy at that time was that it was only in this way and this way alone that Indian freedom could be achieved and some of the terms and epithets which it used at that time about the late Subash Chandra Bose, about all our national Congress leaders, those languages, those words....

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I point out this? There was a discussion here on a Resolution and he is taking the opportunity to attack the Communist Party. I only inform him that all these things he had said when he contested Jyoti Basu in the elections and got defeated in 1946 and came here. That is enough.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: That again gives the hon. friend's attitude away. I am not one of those who believe that simply because in a small group of close votes, eight people more voted for a particular person or eight persons voted less for another person...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You said all these things.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: The point is that this is an illustration of how differences will arise at every stage.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Maybe.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: The committee of editors which my hon. friend wants—I am sure Mr. Patel will not want a committee like that or a committee in which immediately there will be a basic difference as to what is history, what is Indian Freedom Movement . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Maulana Azad in his book has stated that he had differed with Sardar Patel. I can understand it. He criticised Sardar Patel . . .

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I am coming in a moment . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you coming to us? You accepted partition and actually made the partition.

(Interruptions)

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Because as I have said, I am pointing out some of the difficulties of the kind of board which you have in view.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

I have said from the very beginning that so far as my honourable friend is concerned, I am prepared to concede that he believes in all these with sincerity, but, in my opinion, he is completely misguided, with complete lack of historical knowledge, with complete lack of objectivity and with complete misunderstanding of the forces which mould the fate of nations but with complete sincerity he pursued a particular line and is still pursuing the particular line, knowing

that this is against the very forces which are shaping the destinies of the world today. Now, I do not know if my friends who are here would want a committee of that type, a committee of historians expressing every point of view.

I was, for once, happy when I heard my friend Mr. Gupta today. Very often I disagree with him but with what he said today, I very largely agreed when he said that truth and truth alone must be followed. I was very happy when he said that history could not be partisan and should not be written from a partisan point of view. I will quote his words. I was so impressed at that time that I immediately wrote it down. This is what he said, "It should be completely non-partisan". Of course, he also said, where also I agree with him, that many elements contributed to the Indian freedom not only political elements. Some of my hon. friends forgot the other elements—the intellectual elements, the elements who worked for social reforms, the elements which worked for religious reforms, the elements which worked for the emancipation of peasants and workers, the elements which worked for women and for their better rights.

Everyone of them contributed, and from that point of view, I think Mr. Patel and also my honourable friend from this side—I forget exactly who it was—were a little unfair when they said that Dr. Tara Chand was not also a freedom fighter. I would submit that if we take this broad conception of freedom, those who stood for truth, those who stood for the dignity of the Indian people, those who tried to advance the cause of the Indian people through their scholarship, those who tried to raise their dignity by their contribution in the field of knowledge, they were as much freedom fighters as those who took part in politics. From that point of view, I think it would not be fair to say that because a particular honourable

[Shri Humayun Kabir.] gentleman or honourable Member did not take part actively in politics, therefore, he is not a freedom fighter. That is why I said that I was happy when my friend Shri Gupta said that he wanted a non-partisan approach, that he wanted a full recognition of the contributions of everyone but then, I found, as is often the case and which makes it such a delight to hear him, because he sometimes jumps from paradox to paradox, with the lightness which one often associates with beings of another order and paradoxically, after saying that history should be non-partisan, after saying that the contribution of everyone should be accepted, he immediately went on to say that bourgeois historians were all wrong. After all bourgeois also has a place in history . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A bourgeois historian cannot write an objective history. He can write his point of view.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order order.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: They have their point of view and it also should have a place in history, according to my honourable friend. If every point of view is to be recognised, if history is to be understood, if you have understood all the different forces which operate in history, bourgeois also should be there. This is Marxism.... (Interruptions). I ask him to read Marx again. I am not sure whether he read Karl Marx. Perhaps, he has read the interpretation of Karl Marx. Whether he has taken the trouble of reading the entire volume of "Das Capital", the 600 or 700 or 800 pages, from beginning to end, I do not know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here is a personal question. For your information, it is not one volume. There are three volumes and I have read them twice or thrice . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding. Order, order.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I am very happy to hear it because it happens to be one of my texts....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But two volumes you forgot....

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, you should not stand when he is speaking....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will get up.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: If he will read his Marx again.....

AN HON. MEMBER: If he answers these questions, it is not parliamentary....

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know....

(Interruption).

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I have not used a single expression which is unparliamentary. If my hon. friend can point out a single expression which is unparliamentary I will take it back. I would request you to.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. I find that always you give ruling in regard to myself. Do it by all means; but he said that I had accused him of using an unparliamentary expression, when did I say it? You should have said that Bhupesh Gupta had never said it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I said that it is not parliamentary etiquette when an hon. Member is speaking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That I understand.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He did not make any reference to you at all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But then when he said—I know you will say this....

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He never said it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He said it, you did not hear it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. I have heard. I do not think he has said it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has said it. Did he not say that I have accused him of using unparliamentary words?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He did not say that.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I am afraid my honourable friend was not probably attending properly. What I said was that if I have used a single unparliamentary expression—and I did not refer to my honourable friend and I referred to myself...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He referred to his speech.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: ... if I have used a single unparliamentary expression, I shall withdraw it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nobody accused you.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I would request my honourable friend to read his Karl Marx once again.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is that parliamentary etiquette to look at me? I know the game very well. I am old

at this game. Ask him to look at you, according to parliamentary etiquette...

(Interruptions)

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I look at you always.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should not be so touchy, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When you are there why should he look at me? He should look at you.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I am reminded of an English proverb that even a cat can look at the Queen. I hope I am not a cat.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is not a Queen either.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I am sure he is not a Queen but in any case....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you are approaching the Queen by occupying the throne.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, when there are accusations and counter-accusations, probably the trend of thought may be lost in this heat. So, we would like to listen to the hon. Minister about all the arguments placed before this forum.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to take up another business at five.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: Sir...

DR. R. B. GOUR: The agenda papers say that at five, Shri Kabir's other Bill is to come. The debate must conclude and at five we must close.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have to close at five.

SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR: I shall close at five. I said that even if we accept Marx I am not a Marxist by any means but I have been a student of Marx but I reject many of the positions of Marx unconditionally and have always said that here was a man who did not understand Hegel properly and who said that he would put Hegel on his feet but actually made it even more topsy-turvy than Hegel left it but that is neither here nor there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is five. We have to take up other business.

5 P.M.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY RESOLUTION ON THE REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP RE. HANDLOOM INDUS- TRY

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (DR. MONO MOHAN DAS): Sir, on behalf of Shri Manubhai Shah, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry Resolution No. 4(15) Tex (c)/60, dated the 5th May, 1961, on the report of the Working Group appointed to go into the working of the handloom industry. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2971/61].

THE SALAR JUNG MUSEUM BILL, 1960

THE MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (SHRI HUMAYUN KABIR): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the following amendments made by the Lok Sabha in

the Salar Jung Museum Bill, 1960, be taken into consideration, namely:—

Enacting Formula

(1) That at page 1, line 1, for the words 'Eleventh Year' the words 'Twelfth Year' be substituted.

Clause 1

(2) That at page 1, line 5, for the figure '1960' the figure '1961' be substituted."

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I want to say one word now. You may ask why I have got up now. Of course, what Prof. Kabir has brought forward is a necessary thing and we will support the motion. But this is the last day of the present Session and the next one will be a separate Session. I wish to bring to your notice a very simple fact. Yesterday, when we were discussing the Bill dealing with the legal practitioners, some of us suggested that since the time was short, we might take it up either before 11 o'clock on the next day, that is to say, on Friday or sometime during the course of the day. I think you were not then in the Chair, but that suggestion was not accepted because today was a non-official day and therefore, official business should not be imported into a non-official day.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): It is after five now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is quite clear and I was waiting here, for we have to adopt this motion. Now, official business has been taken up on a non-official day, of course, after 5 o'clock, and I have no objection. But similarly we could have taken up the other work also either before the non-official work started at